

VOL. 2

NO. 26

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10;00 A.M. - 1:00 P.M.
FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 1983

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell) Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have two important Ministerial Statements to make and I wanted to give the one concerning the problems between the NTA and the government and the Federation of School Boards first but I am unable to do so. I hope I will be able to do it before the Ministerial Statements section of this morning's House is over. We had requested a meeting with the NTA at nine o'clock, and they had agreed to meet with our team at nine o'clock, at which time we wanted to go over our new proposal with them before it was given in the House. I just had a note handed me and I understand they have a copy of the new proposal now. I will go ahead seeing that they now have it in their hands, because we did not want to give it here in the House before the NTA had it themselves. Now that I have a note saying that they have received it, I will go ahead with the statement concerning the teachers.

Mr. Speaker, the dispute between the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, on the one side, and the Federation of School Boards and government on the other, has seen schools closed for almost two weeks - nine school days.

Yesterday, I announced in this hon. House that the government would present a new

PREMIER PECKFORD: proposal to the NTA within
a short period of time.

I am pleased to inform the House that this morning, one hour ago - but really only about ten minutes ago, we had been waiting for them. - the Government-Federation of School Boards negotiating team presented the following proposal to the NTA:

Number one, the 2 per cent rule: Government has issued a letter to the NTA indicating that government's policy of protecting teaching positions during periods of declining enrollment will continue. In other words, government is guaranteeing that for the term of the collective agreement no board will lose more than 2 per cent of its regular teacher positions, regardless of the extent of enrollment decline.

Number two, classification of teachers: Government will not amend its salary regulations to reduce or eliminate the categories of teachers during the term of the new collective agreement.

Number three, professional workload: Within thirty days of the signing of a new collective agreement, government will appoint a Task Force to investigate and make recommendations on the following matters: one, the length of the instructional day for students; two, the hours of classroom instruction for teachers; three, the length of the work day for teacher; four, the length of the school year.

The Task Force shall report on or before March 31st, 1984.

Number four, substitute teachers:

PREMIER PECKFORD: government has modified its position on the payment of substitute teachers by reducing the number of consecutive days of remuneration at the rate of 2/3 of scale from 10 days to 3 days.

Furthermore, government has offered to defer implementation of this policy until April, 1984. In other words, the payment rate for substitute teachers that has been in effect until now will continue until April 1, 1984. Only then will the new payment schedule come into effect.

Mr. Speaker, the government believes this is a significant concession from our previous position. We believe it to be a generous offer. We want the students back in the classroom. We want the teachers back to work.

In the interests of education, we appeal to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, and the more than 8,000 teachers of the Province, to accept these concessions and sign an agreement based on these changes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for us to comment on the merits of all the suggestions recommended by the Premier in the statement because we did not receive a copy of the government recommendations, but suffice it to say any change in government position is certainly welcome. Whether it is a generous offer or not I am not able to say at the moment because, as I said, I do not have the details in front of me. But let me say this, I certainly hope that it is sufficient to open up negotiations

MR. LUSH: and we hope that we will stop negotiating in public as the Premier suggested, that he did not want to negotiate in public, and it appears that is what we are now getting, - public negotiations across the floor of the House. So I hope in the meantime that everybody will be co-operative, and the NTA will see some grounds here to get back to the bargaining table and, as I have said, this negotiating by the government in public will cease, which as the Premier said he did not want, and we hope that both sides will get back to the bargaining table and that there will be sufficient flexibility so that on Monday we can have the students back to school to complete their education, so that the teachers can expedite the learning process that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) talks about, can expedite the learning process so that students will not suffer unduly or suffer anymore in this academic year.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: I wish to draw the attention of the honourable members of the House of Assembly to the proclamation by the honourable the Premier of April 24-30 as Occupational Health and Safety Week. This marks the first time in this Province, and to the best of my knowledge in Canada, that a week has been officially designated to focus on occupational health and safety. I predict that this is the beginning of a movement that will ultimately lead to a similar recognition on a national scale of the importance of occupational health and safety.

The government has made many impressive strides in occupational health and safety in recent years and perhaps none is as impressive as the degree of co-operation that has evolved between labour, management and government through our combined efforts to protect the health and safety of our workforce. The spirit of co-operation and determination that has been demonstrated by all parties in occupational health and safety in this Province is a major force directed at combating the causes of human suffering which result from occupational accidents and diseases.

In endorsing April 24-30 as Occupational Health and Safety Week, I particularly wish to recognize the participation of the Newfoundland Safety Council and other safety conscious organizations in planning various activities during the week which will culminate with the annual convention and exhibition of industrial safety supplies of the Newfoundland Industrial Health and Safety Association and the Division of Occupational Health and Safety.

I am sure all members of the House will join me in support of the Province's first

MR. DINN: Occupational Health and
Safety Week.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra
Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, anything that
relates to this area, anything that will
improve the safety of the workplace, anything that
will improve occupational health in this
Province, then naturally we support it. The minister did
not give too many details on what the week would
be doing, but in any event we are sure that something
of this nature in such an important area can be a very
significant event. The minister takes pride in the fact
that there has been a lot of co-operation in this
area, and I can appreciate the minister wanting to make
that point because there is so very little co-operation
in any area with this government. And we would certainly
hope that there is a lot of co-operation with the
industrial community and with workers in all areas with
respect to occupational health and safety. So we
certainly hope that it will be a good week and that
something very beneficial will come from it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of
the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of deep disappointment that government received the report of British Petroleum Canada Limited that it will not be able to proceed with drilling on its acreage off the Northeast Coast this year.

In its Telex, a copy of which is attached to this statement, British Petroleum would have us to accept that its partners other than Petro-Canada would not support drilling an exploration well in 1983 because of alleged "concern about present understanding of the prospectivity and technical attractiveness of the acreage." The telegram from the President of British Petroleum to myself, a copy of which is attached, states a seismic study will be conducted this Summer which will enable the location of their new programme to be selected that will offer the greatest chance of success. The telegram goes on to state it anticipates site surveys to take place in the Fall and drilling could commence in 1984 as ice conditions permit.

I, therefore, have to report to this House, Mr. Speaker, the very disappointing news that drilling activity in this new location off our shore, that was so eagerly anticipated by residents of the Northeast Coast, in the port of Botwood in particular, will not come to pass. Neither will the resultant additional 200 to 250 jobs which were looked forward to with such anticipation by the people in the area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to allow such a decision to be taken without drawing public attention to the following facts. I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, to all concerned that these are facts which can be verified by previous statements and reports that are there in the press. They are as follows:

1. Prior to my first meeting on December 10th last with the hon. Jean Chretien on the offshore, I was advised by the

MR. MARSHALL: corporate interests and through the Petroleum Directorate to mention B.P.'s desire to receive the approval for necessary federal drilling permits, as it had already received them from the Province, and to get them from the federal government on an urgent basis, otherwise, B.P.'s planned drilling programme on the Northeast Coast would be put in jeopardy. Now, I was advised of this at the end of November this year.

2. While I was hesitant to mention any specific problem while dealing with the vital general question of offshore jurisdiction - because, you know, people come to you when you are going to these meetings and say you should never mention this, that and the other thing, since this was of vital concern the people of the Province, obviously the overall offshore jurisdiction, so one resisted it - but because of the importance and urgency of federal approval of the drilling permits, I did mention it to the minister to attempt to avoid the unnecessary and disastrous consequences of loss of jobs in the Province, particularly along the Northeast Coast.

3. The response I received in that first meeting on December 10 was that he was busy with many matters, which we could all appreciate, people are busy - and since drilling would not take place until the Spring, there was plenty of time to grant the permits. When I urged that preparations needed could preclude drilling this year if immediate attention were not given in short order, he stated he would look into it, I can just recount just generally the conversation. At the end of a very beneficial meeting that looked like we were getting along for the first time in the offshore, I said 'Jean, look, B.P. urgently want that

MR. MARSHALL:

'drilling permit off the Northeast coast of this Province.' His first response to me was, 'Well, they are waiting on you people,' which is always the rejoinder that they give. I replied to him, no, they were not because all our drilling permits had been in place a long time ago. Then his comment was, 'Oh, it is not until March or April that they need it.' My comment was, 'Jean, look, it is not like going downtown and buying a pair of shoes, you just do not go down and pick up a rig and get a rig on site within a matter of a few days. This is needed and it is needed immediately.' So he said he would look into it.

During our second meeting, on December 13, 1982, I made reference once again to the urgency of the approval and received substantially the same answer, that he would look into it. Nothing was forthcoming until the breakdown of negotiations. It is a matter of record that at a news conference on C.B.C., when asked about the same subject by a reporter, Mr. Chretien replied in exactly the same way as he had to me on December 10th, that is, that he had many duties as a federal minister, and he would look into it.

Now, this is a matter of record, and if C.B.C. want to look back at their records, rather than, as they were doing last night, reporting it as if it all happened as of yesterday and there were no past history behind it, they would see from their own clips, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman himself said, 'I am the federal Minister of Mines and Energy, I have many things to do and I will look into it'.

As a result then after that of public pressure exerted by the Mayor of Botwood and

MR. MARSHALL: myself and members of this government, who constantly stand up for the interests of the people of Newfoundland, finally, on February 11th, two critical months later, you will note, Mr. Speaker, the hon. William Rompkey announced Ottawa had finally approved the necessary permits. And I have, for the sake of the press, if they want them - history does not begin immediately - I have their own reports here that they can review.

It is noted that in making the announcement, Mr. Rompkey stated - and he was reported in the press as so saying - that Ottawa had withheld approval while the offshore negotiations were on, presumably thinking them to be a lever. Indeed, the independent Daily Oil Bulletin published out of Calgary in Alberta, in its February 14th issue stated - and I have a copy of this for the press if they wish it as well - and I quote: "The federal government had been holding back any announcement of agreements with companies holding acreage offshore Newfoundland and Labrador as a pressure tactic in negotiations over jurisdiction with the provincial government, according to some observers." Now, that is the independent

MR. MARSHALL:

statement of the Calgary Daily Oil Bulletin.

7. By the time approval was given, the partners with B.P. had already formulated their budgets for 1983. Due to the delay, no provision was made for drilling in the area. Of course, B.P. are the operators, they had within their partnership Petro-Canada and they had other companies such as Cantara and others. Now Cantara and the other private companies already had their budgets made up and this is one of the reasons why B.P. wanted approval so urgently before.

And, finally, by the time approval was given, as everyone knows, ice had covered the area making the necessary site surveys impossible, site surveys which could well have been conducted in December.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I point out all of these facts so people can judge for themselves. The company's statement would have us to believe that the delay in granting permits was not the cause of there being no drilling this year. This was the report last night. It is now reported the reason is to maximize the chances of success, this is what Mr. Quine has indicated, that they want to do more seismic surveys to maximize the chance of success. That was not their position in November and December. It had nothing to do, he said, with the jurisdictional dispute or nothing to do with the delay in federal approval. Yet, statements made by B.P. prior to granting of approvals indicated the unnecessary delay could preclude drilling this year.

The Company can now make all the statements it wishes, Mr. Speaker. However, the facts lead to the inescapable conclusion that approval from Ottawa came too late. Partners had not made the financial provisions for 1983 because of the delay. Neither could the site surveys have been undertaken in February and March as they could have

MR. MARSHALL: been in December had the federal government acted in as timely a manner as the Province and as the circumstances urgently demanded.

The people of this Province are entitled to the facts. The facts are that I had been informed by officials of B.P. that it was extremely unlikely drilling would take place because of Ottawa's delay.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I was informed of it in London too, by the way.

MR. MARSHALL: And they told the Premier in London, and they told me at a special meeting that they had convened in March for this purpose.

Then they went to see Mr. Chretien, this is the sequence of events, and they asked us not to say anything. So I said, 'No, we will not say anything, although we are very troubled by it because the main concern of this Province is that there be drilling up off the Northeast Coast of this Province in an area which so badly needs employment. So we will keep quiet about it and we did not say a word.'

They then went to see Mr. Chretien, who realized for the first time the truth of the urgency I had described to him on December 10. After meeting with him, they now state the delay did not affect their decision not to drill!

With all due respect to B.P., and no matter what sympathy one may have for them, although I had very little sympathy for them today, I am afraid I cannot accept its explanation, which is inconsistent with its previous statements,

MR. MARSHALL: where a controlling authority is prepared to exercise its authority to the extent -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has not been in the House for two weeks. His contribution can be made in debate but not in interrupting an important statement that I am making. I would ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to comply with the rules of this House -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, where a controlling authority to prepared to exercise its authority to the extent that it risks human life, as the federal government so obviously did to Mobil in the recent order to defy Winter drilling, I have no confidence it would refrain from threatening licences and instances of this nature.

Much has been attempted by the Opposition and supporters of the federal position, to paint this government as confrontationalist, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, how can any government, earnestly desiring to fairly and justly represent its people, not point out such rank injustices as this. It just cannot sit back and pretend these things are not happening. Government has no alternative but to speak out clearly in the face of these wanton injustices.

What I have stated, Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, is a matter of fact, most of which can be verified by public record. And I state it without anger. Certainly the anger will be felt by the 200 and more Newfoundlanders who are obviously used as a pawn by the federal government for the offshore negotiations in the most uncaring and callous manner conceivable. Many of these people may have to resort to welfare rather than obtain the gainful employment

MR. MARSHALL: that they rightly expected and are entitled to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly off the Northeast Coast, do not deserve this type of treatment. And I just point out very calmly and coolly that there has to be accountability of those people who are responsible for it. The people, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, people deserve the fate that they allow themselves to be consigned to, and if the people of Newfoundland are meekly going to sit back and allow this type of thing to happen, if they are going to give lip service and just take a Pontius Pilate type attitude, and pay lip service to the people who say the government, when it stands up for the rights of the people in Newfoundland, are being confrontationalists. We are going to get what we deserve, Mr. Speaker, we are going to see this Province consigned to an eternity of welfare payments, and transfer payments. And that is something that no member on this side of the House is ever going to tolerate. And when we speak up for the people of Newfoundland we make no apologies for doing same and we will continue to as long as there is any life and breath left in this administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the situation. It is there to see. The people of Newfoundland have to make a decision on these and they have to have the facts put before them and I want to point out as well that I saw, with a certain amount of concern, this reported last night on CBC as if it just happened all of a sudden, that it had no past history. It had a past history. It is there in the files for the press to see. The facts speak for themselves and the people of Newfoundland are entitled to see these facts.

MR. MARSHALL: I hope that the hon. gentlemen there opposite are not going, in response to this statement get up and exult once again about the loss of the offshore case, get up and talk about, like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) did yesterday, the Petroleum Directorate not having any effect or anything. Do they, Mr. Speaker, take any joy in the loss of 200 jobs or 250 jobs to people along the Northeast Coast of this Province who are entitled to them and should have had them this year and should be able to be gainfully employed from the resources which we brought into Confederation? And let there be no doubt what we mean when we say, Mr. Speaker, no matter what the hon. gentleman may say, let there be no doubt what we say when we brought these resources into Confederation I reiterate once again no matter what any court may decide the Grand Banks of Newfoundland are not the Grand Banks of Ottawa.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: The Northeast Coast of Newfoundland is the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and not of Ottawa and we will never cease until we get justice and equity from this particular resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if you can classify that as a Ministerial Statement or not. It was a very provocative statement, certainly riddled full of politics and, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will be allowed the same latitude as the hon. gentleman was in presenting what he proposes to be a Ministerial Statement which was really a debate. What the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman was doing was debating this matter. But let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that the statement was full of sarcasm and disrespect and hatred for the press, disrespect and hatred for British Petroleum and for the Government of Canada and Mr. Chretien -

MR. WARREN: And the judges.

MR. NEARY: - and for the Newfoundland Appeals Court, Mr. Speaker. But we are becoming used to that, we are used to that now from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have been forced to stand in this House so far this session and we have been meeting here now for about a month, and all they have been able to announce is bad news - one failure after another. That is all they have been able to announce. Yesterday we had a statement of good news for Flat Bay but that had nothing to do with this administration. Anything that this administration has anything to do with, Mr. Speaker, is doomed for failure. Now the hon. gentleman, in his remarks, tried to intimidate the press, provoke the press, and, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reasons, by the way, that we wanted the press gallery moved up here to the centre of the House instead of being over my shoulder facing the government because

MR. NEARY: every day in this House the Premier looks up, nods his head through expressions of various kinds -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Where the press is located in this House is not of relevance to the statement the hon. gentleman is commenting upon. The position on response to Ministerial Statements, that one is confined to making comments upon the statement itself. The subject matter, Mr. Speaker, has been the very sad loss of jobs as a result of the inaction of the federal government and that is what the hon. gentleman should be addressing himself to instead of trying to avoid commenting directly on that disgraceful act.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has always stated that it is difficult to rule on the rule of relevancy. However it is a little difficult to associate the position of the press gallery with the hon. minister's statement.

MR. NEARY: Well it is not very much trouble, Mr. Speaker. I was watching hon. gentlemen when they were making signs and gestures to the press gallery hoping to intimidate and influence the press gallery. The minister came well equipped and well prepared. He brought in a whole raft of propaganda that he hopes he can feed out to the press and that they will use it to try to cover up for the incompetence and mismanagement of the resources of this Province by this administration. The hon. gentleman started out by telling us that although the officials of British Petroleum had stated categorically

MR. NEARY: That is what the hon. gentleman is calling them Mr. Speaker. He does not have the courage to come out man fashion, he drags in this red herring of the history of the -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: There is immunity in this House, there is immunity from prosecution in the law; so you can get up and you can call any member what you want to but there is a sense of decency and there is a sense to the rules. I did not call the people from British Petroleum liars and cheats and I think that the hon. gentleman is casting an inference when he is doing it, an inference on people outside the House who cannot defend themselves. Mr. Speaker, I did not call them liars and cheats, I said they were within the gripping vice of the federal government. And that is, in effect, what they are the same way as Mobil were, Mr. Speaker, when they were precluded from taking actions with human safety deemed necessary in order to protect the lives and safety of offshore workers. So the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is out of order when he gets up using the floor of this House to cast liables on people outside this House who cannot defend themselves.

MR. NEARY: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is merely a difference of opinion. If the hon. gentleman was not listening, the way he tries to twist and turn and squirm, Mr. Speaker, it is pathetic.

MR. NEARY: Because what I was doing was defending these gentlemen outside the House who the hon. gentleman just attacked in his Ministerial Statement, with his sarcasm and his hatred for anybody who opposes this administration. So there is no point of order. All the hon. member is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to use up my time so I will not be able to continue my trend of thought.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The point of order is really a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to belabour the point. The history is there, the record speaks for itself. This administration has one failure after the other, one series of failures. That is all they have had since they took over eleven years ago and since the hon. gentleman who heads this :

MR. NEARY:

administration took over three years ago. One failure after the other. And, Mr. Speaker, instead of being sarcastic, instead of squirting poison, instead of trying to cause the relationship between the oil companies and between this administration and the Government of Canada further deterioration - there is hardly any communications now between this government and the oil companies and the drilling companies and the Government of Canada. That is very sad, Mr. Speaker. We regret that. As I said yesterday in the House, they may as well be sitting in their offices tossing paper airplanes into wastepaper baskets.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a Ministerial Statement as a follow-up to my initial remarks a couple of days ago on the federal government's budget and its relevance to this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government presented its budget earlier this week and set as its primary objective, the creation of jobs.

With the highest unemployment rate in Canada, at 22.5 per cent last month, Newfoundland welcomes any effort by the federal government to tackle this unemployment nightmare. The contribution which the budget is expected to make in reducing unemployment, both in absolute terms and in relative terms, will therefore be the measure of its success or failure.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Overall, the budget is less stimulative than it appears on the surface. Even though the budget is built upon an 'all goes well' set of economic assumptions, the stated impact upon real GNP, employment and unemployment, will be small. Canadian unemployment rates will still hover around 11 per cent in 1984 and 1985. One in every six Newfoundland workers probably will still be unemployed. The youth unemployment rate, which now exceeds 30 per cent, likely will not improve very much.

Mr. Speaker, I was initially encouraged by a number of the job creation initiatives announced in the federal budget. These included additional funding for the NEED programme, the Community Employment programme under the Unemployment Insurance Act and direct federal construction programmes. We were also encouraged by the announcement of funding for a number of new programmes directed towards youth employment. Because youth unemployment in Newfoundland is the highest in Canada, these programmes are needed immediately.

We were advised yesterday by Employment and Immigration Canada that a number of these job creation programmes will not be implemented until after September because of a major restructuring of the job creation programmes administered

PREMIER PECKFORD: by that department, Details of programme implementation and regional allocations will not be announced until the Fall. It is unlikely therefore, that these programmes will be of any benefit until late in the year.

The delay of these badly needed programmes at a time when unemployment is at its highest is deplorable. It appears that the only major federal job creation initiative in the short-term will include the \$4.7 million Summer Canada Programme for youth, and the ongoing \$30 million NEED Programme which was announced some time ago.

Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Newfoundland, submitted to the Federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) nearly \$600 million worth of urgently needed capital projects in this Province covering transportation, fishing infrastructure facilities, industrial parks, and a number of community infrastructure projects. While the \$2.4 billion capital investment programmes sounds impressive it represents for this Province only an average of an additional \$15 million per year over the next four years, if we receive no more than our population share.

We have repeatedly stressed at past first ministers' and finance ministers' meetings the critical importance of a regional development programme which recognizes the unique and adverse circumstances which confronts this government and the people of this Province. We have been requesting special DREE type agreements in each of these areas and we can only hope that Mr. Lalonde and his federal colleagues are now committed to implement some of these proposed projects.

We are pleased to see that the loss of about 200 housing units for low income householders, which was revealed in the 1983 budget of CMHC has now been

PREMIER PECKFORD: reinstated. Although this is not additional funding but simply a reinstatement of traditional funding levels, it is badly needed.

Other measures in the federal budget directed at housing hopefully will help to instill consumer confidence and allow the construction industry to get back on their feet again.

For the business community the budget contained a variety of tax credits and loss carry over provisions which are technical in nature and will have a positive impact on some businesses with the degree of impact dependent upon individual circumstances. It is important to recognize, however, Mr. Speaker, that the benefits described in the federal budget are predicated on businesses making profits, and that businesses incur additional capital expenditures.

The planned index security investment plan, which is designed to make it possible for Canadian public companies to raise increased equity capital, will be of less benefit to Newfoundland than many other areas of Canada since most companies in this Province are privately owned.

During the next couple of months we will be analyzing the consultative paper entitled, Research And Development Tax Policies. A cursory review appears to indicate that while the initiatives contained in the document are going in the right direct to encourage

PREMIER PECKFORD: R and D activity and technological development, they are inadequate in terms of the overall funds needed to establish a strong R and D industrial base in this country.

The tax release provisions on oil and gas revenues are designed to stimulate oil and gas exploration production in Western Canada and do not appear to have any noticeable impact on our offshore oil and gas development prospects. We are pleased that the federal government recognizes the need of the mining industry and in particular junior mining companies to attract exploration financing and we believe that the new provision that now allows taxpayers to use depletion allowances as a deduction from their nonresource income will help to increase investment in mining exploration in this Province.

No one can quibble with the doubling of the child care expense deduction and the extension of the temporary increase of fifty dollars in the child tax credit. These are benefits which will be welcomed by many families throughout the Province. We are concerned however that the federal government has decided to eliminate the indexing provisions in the tax exemption for dependent children since this removes the protection from inflation which taxpayers have previously enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, until more detail becomes available we will not know what portion of the new federal recovery programme will be spent in the Province and over what time period. I believe from the limited information and analysis available to date that the tone of the budget is a step in the right direction but in terms of actual dollars and jobs its immediate impact will be of little consequence on this Province. As the federal government releases the specifics of its projects and programmes we

PREMIER PECKFORD: will be exerting every effort to ensure that the projects and proposals which we presented to them in the past will form part of their new measures.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, while I was listening to the hon. gentleman there I could not help but thinking of the story of the woman who was watching the soldiers marching down the road when her son was out of step and she said to her friend, 'Look, they are all out of step except my Johnnie.' Well, they are all out of step now except our Brian, Mr. Speaker, because the Lalonde Budget was well received by the majority of Canadians, by the majority of business, organizations, well the majority,

MR. NEARY: the Board of Trade, the Chambers of Commerce. Mr. Speaker, the budget has been well received and the best that we could consider that statement to be - it certainly was not a Ministerial Statement, I believe at some point, Your Honour is going to have to lay down the law in this House because that is a misuse and an abuse of power and it should not be allowed to continue because it is taking away from the Ministerial Statement effect, Mr. Speaker.

The most you could classify it as is a reaction to the federal budget. It was a political document. It was a political document designed to continue the federal election campaign which this administration has been carrying on now since last April. It is just a continuation of the federal campaign.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us compare the federal budget to the provincial budget. Did Mr. LaLonde close any hospitals?

MR. WARREN: No.

MR. NEARY: Did he take away student allowance? Did he force the teachers and the students out of the classrooms, Mr. Speaker? And, Mr. Speaker, did Mr. LaLonde in his budget did he attack anybody?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Who did he attack?

The hon. gentleman cannot think of one attack that was made in that budget, unlike the provincial budget which was one continuous attack on various and sundry people red herrings to cover up for their incompetence and their mismanagement.

Mr. Speaker that budget may be a Godsend to Newfoundland, it may be a matter of life and death for Newfoundland because of the job creation programmes that were announced, the training programmes that were announced for

MR. NEARY: for young Canadians will be a tremendous benefit to young Newfoundlanders, because as hon. members know over 50 per cent of the unemployed in Newfoundland are between the ages of sixteen and thirty-five, Mr. Speaker, right at a time in their lives when they should be working.

Mr. Speaker, there are tremendous benefits there for the fishing industry, the mining industry, small business, oil and gas, the construction industry, housing, young Newfoundlanders who want to purchase houses for the first time. But, Mr. Speaker, above all, I think the biggest benefit in the budget was the improvements in the Child Tax Allowances and the Child Tax Credits which will be of tremendous benefit.

Now instead of the Premier standing up today and being critical and being negative, as the administration has been for the last several years negative, what he should have done is he should have stood up and told us what input this administration was going to have in connection with the hundred Capital Works projects that were announced in the federal budget amounting to \$4.2 billion and

MR. NEARY: where these projects will take place in Newfoundland. Will these projects include the Trans-Labrador Highway, the development of the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls, the building of a transmission line, the construction of a tunnel underneath the Strait of Belle Isle?

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should have been positive instead of negative.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). In view of the fact that the police, the Constabulary, moved into Atlantic Place yesterday, broke in some walls and made arrests of some Indian people from Conne River, could the minister advise - I understand a lawyer, an official of his department was on the scene - were there any negotiations between the Indians of Conne River and the minister's officials before the SWAT team moved in?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, number one, I believe in the accuracy of words; there was no SWAT team or riot police. I think one hon. gentleman opposite suggested they were S.S. or Storm Troopers. So if words are to mean anything in the English language, and obviously they should be used with accuracy, they were regular policemen of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

MR. NEARY: Wielding nighsticks?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. gentleman says, 'Wielding nightsticks?'. Again, Mr. Speaker, if language is to be

MR. OTTENHEIMER: accurate, I know wielding night-sticks was a term used by one of the press and that can be called one of two things: It could be called gross sensationalism or it could be called journalistic licence. Hon. gentlemen can pick their choice of which they wish, but I think we want to be fair.

MR. NEARY: How did they beat the walls in?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. gentleman wants to know how they beat the walls in. Hon. gentlemen are very concerned that a wall, a partition, was removed. Hon. gentlemen do not seem to place any significance on the fact that there was not one injury to any person, that the police acted in such a professional and capable manner that not one person was injured. But all we hear was there was a partition of wall which was injured. Well, I would rather lose twenty walls, Mr. Speaker, and have injury to no person, That is what happened yesterday, absolutely nobody was injured.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I should restrict my remarks in answer to the question to what specifically happened rather than get into areas, and that could be one, which might prejudice an outcome of a charge which has been laid. It is not an attempt to avoid it, but that would be unfair to everybody, including the people against whom charges have been laid. That is why I think it would be better not to.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised the Premier is not in his seat during the Question Period, so I will have to ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) my supplementary. Will the Minister of Justice now, in view

April 22, 1983

Tape No. 1335

SD - 3

MR. WARREN: of the fact that the Labrador
Inuit Association has come out in support of the Micmac
Indians trying to get some money to run their community,
in view of the

MR. WARREN:

fact that the Social Action Committee is sympathizing with the Micmac people, in view of the fact that NMIA in Labrador is also having problems, and every group is having problems getting funds through the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development - the department is holding back money continuously from those native groups - would the minister now invite the federal Parliamentary Subcommittee on Indian Self-Government to visit the Province and hold meetings in Newfoundland and Labrador? Would the minister do that, invite the federal Parliamentary Subcommittee on Indian Self-Government to visit the Province and have meetings?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, you know, it would not be really my position to invite the federal Parliamentary Subcommittee to have hearings here. I mean, if they were to be invited by anybody, it would be by a minister with specific responsibility in that area. And, of course, a parliamentary subcommittee can travel and have hearings anywhere in Canada that they wish. Obviously they do not require any invitation. So, you know, a committee or a subcommittee of the federal Parliament can have hearings anywhere in Canada they wish. Obviously, they do not need an invitation.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister.

In view of the fact - and it is a known fact - that the Department of Rural, Agricultural

MR. WARREN: and Northern Development is, the minister has said, because of conditions placed on it, withholding money designated for native communities in this Province, now would the minister strike a Commission of Inquiry into all spending of federal/provincial Native moneys? Would the minister today strike an inquiry into the affairs of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development?

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman made that request of me a couple of months ago as well, as I understand it.

The conditions for the establishment of a Commission of Inquiry I really do not think exist in this circumstance. It is certainly not my intention to establish any Commission of Inquiry. As I understand it, and as has been explained in the House by the Premier and the minister directly responsible, the main issue of contention between the Conne River Indian Band Council and the provincial government is on the question of accountability of those funds. That is my understanding of what the area of contention is. The position of the government

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

and the relevant government department, that the accountability of the public funds which is required for general expenditures of public funds for all departments, that that principle is also operative in terms of money under that particular agreement. That, as I understand it, is what the issue of contention is and I really do not think it is an area where a Commission of Inquiry would be of any benefit.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister does not realize the seriousness and the difficulty that those towns are having with the department. I have taken the opportunity today to send a telegram to the federal Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) to ask for an inquiry. I would like to ask my final supplementary to the Minister of Health (Mr. House). Could the Minister of Health advise why there is a cheque now down in the minister's office for health care for the Indians in Conne River and when they went down to pick up their cheque today the officials would not release it? Why was that cheque for health care in Conne River not released? Can the minister tell why that cheque was not released to those people who need it so badly?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that. I will take it under advisement and get the answer for the him tomorrow.

MR. NEARY:

You are not aware yet they are going to close St. Clare's Hospital.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. membe for Mount Scio.

MR.NEARY: You are not aware the Second World War is over yet.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR.BARRY: I would like to ask the Minister of Justice(Mr.Ottenheimer) with respect to the incident at Atlantic Place yesterday whether any guidelines or instructions have been given to the Constabulary with respect to requiring the removal of press from any scene of police action? I was happy to hear that there had been no injuries at this incident when the police removed the protestors,but I believe that the way of safeguarding and ensuring that the police act properly on all occasions is to have them under the full glare of public scrutiny.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.BARRY: I am somewhat concerned because I have seen one or two other occasions where it appeared to me that perhaps unnecessary limitations were placed upon access by the press to an incident which was of considerable public interest and which I believe required the public scrutiny of the actions of all authorities involved.

MR.NEARY: A good question.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly there are no instructions from the Ministry of Justice with respect to the presence of other people, whether it is press or other members of the general public, in any particular area. Obviously it is a matter where there has to be judgement and discretion, depending on the particular area and the particular circumstances.

MR. NEARY: They would not even do that from day one.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. gentleman, I have not interrupted him, and I would ask also that he would not interrupt me now because it is important to be accurate in this.

So therefore it is a question of judgement.

MR. NEARY: Like Poland.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There we have the accurate use of language again, Mr. Speaker, the comparison of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary with Poland. We have had a comparison with the SS, with the Storm Troopers, now we have it with the Communist regime in Poland

MR. NEARY: Do not blame the Newfoundland Constabulary, blame your policy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY: They are the innocent victims.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: So, Mr. Speaker, there is no overall ministerial or government policy on that. What the police have to do is use their own judgement and their own discretion.

It is my understanding that when a police activity is envisioned in a specific area, that

MR. OTTENHEIMER: people in that immediate vicinity, whether they are press or whether they are anybody else, people in that immediate vicinity are asked to vacate so that there can be no interference, even unwilling interference; I am not talking about planned interference, I am talking about what could be even an unwilling interference.

And it is my understanding that that is quite usual, that in a specific area where there is to be a police activity people are asked to vacate that immediate area so that the police activity will not be hindered or interferred with, and, I add, even unwillingly.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. BARRY: Would the hon. member yield?

MR. LUSH: I yield to the hon. member,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Justice relating to an incident with the Conne River people, the source of the protest appears to be the conflict between the Natives of Conne River and the government with respect to certain conditions attached to the payment of funds. I understand one of those conditions has to do with requiring the Native peoples to obtain certificates of title with respect to certain real estate. That has been raised as possibly threatening the aboriginal land claim which the Conne River people, I understand, are proceeding with in the courts. I would ask the Minister of Justice whether his advice has been sought and whether, in his opinion, it should not be possible to have payment arranged, and to have the necessary certificates or guarantees or warranties or whatever is required by real estate lawyers in the government, to have all

April 22, 1983

Tape No. 1138

NM - 3

MR. BARRY: of this done on a 'without prejudice' basis
so that it would not prejudice either side, either the government
side or the Native side in any aboriginal land claim, which

MR. BARRY:

has not yet been decided in Newfoundland. Granted there has been a report received from one individual at the University indicating that in his opinion the land claim is not a valid one, but there has also been considerable criticism of that report from others who are very knowledgeable in the area. I believe that this entire issue of aboriginal land claims in Conne River is still a matter very much for debate which must be decided by the courts, I would ask the minister, in light of this, whether or not it would be right and proper for the government to ensure the payment of funds without requiring the Natvies to basically concede the whole question of land claims if this in fact is what is being asked?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any direct connection or necessary connection between the payment of funds under the agreement and the question of the aboriginal land claims. On the question of aboriginal land claims, it is generally known that a claim has been made, the government has denied it, the people concerned are taking legal recourse and obviously these things, when they get to court, are eventually settled in the court. In my understanding, the problem has arisen on the question of accountability of the payment of the funds, not on the question of aboriginal land claims, because in the final analysis that matter is before the court and neither a provincial government or a federal government or any interested group can make a final determination; the matter is before the courts and it is the courts which will determine it. My understanding is that if the question of accountability with respect to the expenditure of those funds could be resolved, then there would be no great difficulty.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), a very specific question. In the past the minister has anticipated the wrong questions and consequently gave the wrong answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MS. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, the question is very very specific and related to the inappropriately named Dial-a-Tutor service -

MR. TULK: Ding-a-Ling.

MR. LUSH: - but very appropriately named the Ding-a-Ling service. But, Mr. Speaker, the question is what has been the cost of that programme so far to the taxpayers of this Province? The minister can break it down in terms of what it is costing per hour, what it is costing per day, what it costs for the start up, the installation of telephones and any other audio scientific teaching aids that may have been put there to help these tutors. So all of this, what has been the cost to

MR. LUSH:

this date and possibly a breakdown in what it costs the Province and the taxpayers per hour and per day, and the total money spent to this point in time?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the cost of operating the Dial-A-Tutor service, which has been quite successful -

MR. LUSH: I did not ask about its success.

MS. VERGE: -and it is obviously providing valuable assistance to high school students studying at home while their schools are closed.

MR. LUSH: I did not ask about its success. We all know what a success it is not!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: It can be broken down into the following categories, Mr. Speaker. First and foremost, there is the cost of having the Newfoundland Telephone Company install telephone lines on very short notice. The Telephone Company installed the system with twenty lines activated and a capacity to expand it to a total of forty. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, there is the cost of long distance charges which are made -

MR. LUSH: What are they?

MS. VERGE: - through the use of that service. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, there is a cost of paying the qualified teachers who are serving as tutors.

MR. LUSH: Qualified?

MS. VERGE: Approximately thirty-five people have been engaged on contract to work on a shift rotational basis, and they are being paid at the hourly rate of \$25.00.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to give the Opposition Education critic and all hon. members of this House the precise bottom line dollar cost to government at the conclusion of the Dial-a-Tutor service, which I trust will be very soon because I believe that the new proposal put forward this morning by the government and the Federation of School Boards negotiating team to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association containing substantive changes from the employer's previous position is a fair and reasonable compromise which I believe will be accepted by the teachers of this Province and result in a reopening of our schools on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: The minister in responding to parts of the question mentioned something about the qualified tutors or the qualified teachers or whatever. I would ask the minister, you know, by what standards, or by whose standards is she saying that these are qualified teachers? And my question again, it is very specific, how many of those teachers are certified teachers?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the qualified teachers employed by the Department of Education to

MS VERGE: staff Dial-a-Tutor Service, some thirty-five in number, were interviewed and evaluated by senior officials of the Department of Education who are eminently qualified to judge the qualifications of members of the teaching profession who provide this service. Most of the individuals are graduating or have graduated from Memorial University with degrees in education and/or second degrees in arts or science. A small number of the individuals have considerable experience in teaching, a couple of them recently retired from active teaching. All of them are providing a valuable service to several hundred high school students from communities small and large all around the Province who have been calling in and getting assistance as they try to carry on with their school work at home.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: The minister again did not answer the question. I asked, and I will ask once more, Mr. Speaker, how many of them are certified teachers? How many of them are certificated teachers?

MR. TULK: Yes, spell it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, what is relevant, what students care about, what parents care about, is the qualifications of the teachers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MS VERGE: And from all the feedback I have received, from the reports carried in The Daily News as one example, people are very satisfied with the calibre of service that is being provided by the qualified teachers

MS VERGE: who are staffing the Dial-a-Tutor Service.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Fisheries.

The Minister of Fisheries, two days ago, said that it was his firm opinion that fishermen should receive a price for their lobsters at least 70 per cent of the Boston market price.

MR. NEARY: Or three dollars.

MR. HODDER: Now on that particular day, the Boston market price was \$4.30 a pound, which should have given our lobster fishermen three dollars a pound. In actual fact, on the first day of the lobster season, fishermen on the West coast received from \$2.20 to \$2.30 a pound from all buyers, including National Sea as one of the buyers and from two Nova Scotia companies which are buying in that particular area; and in some other areas they received \$2.40 to \$2.50 a pound. Yesterday and today the same price is being paid. I would like to ask the minister what he intends to do about this situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, we are determined to follow through on our position

MR. MORGAN: and to make every effort to ensure that fishermen do indeed receive a fair price. And we think what we have put in place whereby the fishermen would receive 70 per cent of the wholesale Boston price in Canadian dollars is indeed a fair price and it is fair to the companies as well. Yesterday, for example, it was regrettable in my view that two large companies who buy in both provinces, in this case National Sea and UMF, the United Maritime Fishermen Company, were buying lobsters from fishermen in Nova Scotia and paying them \$3.50 per pound and the same two companies crossed the Gulf, in the hon. gentleman's area, and offered only \$2.20. That to me is simply unacceptable, it is a matter of where the companies are attempting to use the fishermen and to rip-off the fishermen and that is something I do not like as minister. I intend to pursue it further, I held discussions with the Fishermen's Union last evening. The Fishermen's Union today will be co-operating with regards to making sure all fishermen receive receipts for their shipments, because the lobsters being bought here for \$2.20 are indeed being sold in the Boston market for \$4.30 Canadian and that is more than a good profit for the companies. It is being sold today the same price, \$4.30 Canadian, and they can afford to pay the fishermen in Nova Scotia \$3.50, and in one case yesterday \$3.65 per pound. But same companies crossed the Gulf with their agents and offered our fishermen only \$2.20. I note this morning that there are companies on the Eastern part of the Province - or I should say the Southeastern part of the Province because the Eastern part of the Province is blocked with ice, the Northeast Coast in particular - offering

MR. MORGAN: fishermen \$2.75 per pound this morning. That is an improvement, but we still maintain our position, Mr. Speaker, to answer the question, and that is that the fishermen should always receive 70 per cent of whatever the Canadian dollar wholesale price is in Boston in the USA. And if it means keeping the receipts and going back after the companies afterwards, that will be done also.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

In the minister's statement of two days ago, he stated that he would be attaching to each licence that companies and buyers will have to practice consistent buying practices. The second part of that statement was his opinion, He said, "It was my firm opinion that fishermen should receive a fair price for their lobster and that it is my opinion that they should receive at least 70 per cent." Is the minister going to enforce the 70 per cent rule? Will he attach and make it a condition of the buyer's licence? Because I think for once maybe the minister has a good idea. He has tried for a number of years and failed to bring the companies into line, and they are still ripping off the fishermen of this Province. Will the minister make it a condition of the licence that the company pay 70 per cent of the Boston market.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the statement

attached to the buyers' licences - the hon. gentleman is right that no buyer or company in the Province in fact received a buyer's licence until yesterday - notified that a total of 108 companies and buyers would indeed receive their licences, but there would be a statement attached from me indicating two conditions we want them to comply with. One is to practice consistent buying practices, and, number two, is a formula with regard to paying 70 per cent of the wholesale price in the US market in Canadian dollars.

What the companies are now trying to do, to defeat the efforts of this government and this minister on behalf of the fishermen, they are now getting together and saying they will not buy lobsters from the fishermen, "Because of the condition set down by Morgan," That is the statement that is being made, that they will not buy from fishermen if they have to pay the \$3 or pay the 70 per cent. And of course that

April 22, 1983

Tape No. 1343

NM - 2

MR. MORGAN: leaves a very serious situation because if that arose in certain areas of the Province and they refused to buy, fishermen have not got the means of holding their lobsters for any period of time and the fishermen could suffer. That is the last thing we want to see done, for the fishermen to suffer from any actions that we take to improve their situation regarding their prices.

MR. MORGAN: I am hoping as a result of discussions with the Fishermen's Union last evening and as a result of statements I have made in the Western part of the Province, in particular through the media, so that the companies will clearly understand what our position is, so that they will not do what they are now trying to do, to gang up on the fishermen and the government, and to get together and say, 'We will not buy lobsters, we will refuse to buy lobsters' because if they do that, Mr. Speaker, if I have to I will appeal to all the companies in Nova Scotia, all the companies in Quebec and Ontario and elsewhere to come in here, and we will give all the necessary buyer licences required, to come in and buy lobsters from our fishermen. I will not see a situation where these two or three companies - that is the situation in our Province, two or three large companies and they give agents licences to buy throughout the Province. But it comes down to two or three large companies calling the shots and controlling the price of lobster and the fishermen are hurting because of it. If it means going out and opening the door to any buyer, any company anywhere in North America that wants to come in and buy, then that will be done, if they try to gang up and say, 'No, we are going to stop buying from fishermen' - I mean the local buyers.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, now we get to the nub of the problem. We are in the hands of the fish companies and this goes back to what I said in the House not three or four days ago, that we have to be able to hold lobsters here in this Province. And I would ask the minister why is it that this Province cannot set up its own marketing agency, or why can we not appeal to the Saltfish Corporation to market our

MR. HODDER: lobsters for us?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: As long, Mr. Speaker, as we are in this situation we will always be at the mercy of the fish companies. And, Mr. Speaker, if we decide that we are going to stop their licences if they do not meet these conditions, then the fishermen cannot hold their lobsters. So what the minister must do is set up conditions in this Province, because it is a lucrative fishery, much more lucrative than the seal fishery or the herring fishery or the caplin fishery or the crab fishery, the minister must set up conditions so that the fishermen get a fair price for their catch. And I would ask the minister, why is it that he has not considered a government marketing agency or an agency such as the Newfoundland Salfish Corporation?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree that the lobster fishery is, indeed, a different fishery from the rest. It is not government's role to get involved and interfere in private enterprise in setting prices for species. We are not going to do that because the collective bargaining process is there, especially with regards to fish species that are processed here in the Province. We are never going to get involved and interfere with private enterprise in that regard, but the lobster fishery is quite different because the lobsters are not processed here this Province. The lobsters are bought and taken directly away, two or three days after they are bought from the fishermen. And we last year, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: The only processing they get is digesting in your stomach.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who asked the question was serious. The hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) may not be concerned because there are not too many lobster fishermen in his area, but I would ask him to remain quiet while I am answering the question from a gentleman who was quite serious in asking the question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, indeed we recognize the need for maybe government intervention in marketing certain species of fish which cannot be marketed in a proper way through the collective bargaining process in establishing prices, and that very topic was discussed with the Federal Minister (Mr. De Bane) and my colleagues from the other provinces in a meeting in Ottawa on Monday of this week, and we have established a marketing concept. We have agreed upon a marketing concept whereby we will all work together, the two levels of government in particular, possibly some involvement from the fishermen, as well as the private sector companies. And that marketing concept, the details will be worked out in a meeting to be held in St. John's, in fact, on May 4, again with the Federal Minister coming here for that meeting.

With regards to the holding of lobsters, we recognized that problem last year as well. And what we did we allocated a grant of \$50,000 to one of the major Newfoundland companies, in this case Comfort Cove Fisheries, in the hon. Speaker's district, a well-known company with a good reputation, and we are in the process of opening up this year, when the ice conditions improve and when the lobsters are being taken from the Northeast coast, a holding pound, Mr. Speaker, which will see lobsters being held until,

MR. MORGAN: in fact, market conditions improve or, indeed, until after the market closes in the U.S. Then we know we can take these lobsters into the European market, not be depending upon the U.S. market, and get a better price for all concerned, including the companies and the fishermen.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
The time for the Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the following petition; It is a petition signed by some 551 concerned parents who held a meeting last night in St. Andrew's Secondary School, Prince of Wales School here in the city. All the signators are concerned parents, although some of them are more than concerned parents, some of them are teachers, some of them are school board officials, and some are churchmen. This number of names was gotten up in as little as twenty-four hours; in fact, I would think more like about sixteen hours, from supertime last night to this morning, so that is about sixteen hours. And I think if the number of people had signed it, who would be willing to sign it

MR. CARTER: you would have a petition of some several thousand. I was invited to attend the meeting. I will read the prayer of petition first. "We, as very concerned parents, feel that our children are being denied an education which is a basic fundamental right. We appeal to both the government and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association to remove themselves from their positions and show good faith by immediately returning to the bargaining table. We strongly urge that schools re-open no later than Monday morning, April 25th, and that negotiators be prepared to sequester themselves until a settlement is reached." I concur with the sentiments expressed in that petition and have signed it myself, as well, as I am required to do.

At the meeting Mr. Speaker, the points raised were, first of all, that the School Board official pointed out that the whole thing was brought about because of the lack of supervision caused by the withdrawal of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association services. They had not withdrawn all their services, they were still willing to teach, but the fear was with the lack of supervision a dangerous situation could develop with the children in their care. So, the parents first discussed whether it would be possible for them to supply the supervision, even more supervision than would be applied by teachers, that is to say, many parents, in fact, I suppose, all the parents were willing to express willingness to go in and supervise the children so that the schools would then be able to open and once the schools opened presumably the teachers are willing to teach and they would go back to teaching. However, after some debate it became clear that the fact that the teachers had taken away their supervisory role that constituted a

MR. CARTER: strike, and even though they offered to go back, if they did not offer to supervise, the strike would not be over and, of course, that would not solve anything and, of course, the safety of the children certainly is uppermost in everyone's mind. The School Board official explained that according to the NTA agreement itself any withdrawal of services constitutes a strike. Now, none of the parents there apportioned blame. The meeting was held at a very high level of debate, a very high level of decorum, there was no rabble-rousing whatsoever, it was one of the best meetings -

MR. NEARY: You are just using this to play politics.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker I have the right to be heard in silence and I ask you to put that gentleman in his place and I hesitate to suggest where his place is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CARTER: No attempt was made to apportion blame to either side. This was not the purpose of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was for concerned parents to get together and to try and puzzle a way through this situation which has now-or last night had gone on for ten days and

MR. CARTER: showed every sign of going on for some further days. Now, in the light of what has happened this morning, that transpired this morning in the light of the Premier's statement, it is quite possible that this situation will fix itself but this still does not remove the concern of the parents and their continuing concern until the students are back in school. And even that will not remove their concern, because it was stated quite obviously and quite clearly to me and to the meeting itself that ten to twelve days of instruction had been lost and that this would not repair all the damage that was done. In fact, hope was expressed that the Dial-a-Tutor system, perhaps, might even be able to expanded to making tutors available so that students who felt they were too far behind might be able to catch up.

A call was made by the churches to end the strike, that is to say, they became more vocal in asking that the strike be ended. This was one of the options sought and I think that this perhaps may result in more activity on their behalf. The subject of binding arbitration was brought up and it was debated for some length of time. I, myself, said that I did not agree with it, I felt it was a last resort, a very last resort.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! I beg to interrupt the hon. member. His five minutes in presenting petitions has expired.

MR. CARTER: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, the leave is not granted.

MR. CARTER: This is regrettable. At any rate I will just table the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I never heard such a weak and mealy-mouthed presentation of a petition in all my life, I have never heard one so weak. The hon. gentleman never indicated whether he supported the petition and if he did, he did it in a half-hearted way and was just giving a resume of the meeting, of what happened. He did not say that he got his knuckles rapped last night by the CBC for attending and trying to be political and trying to defend the government. That is what I heard, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, we certainly support the parents in their wish to get their children back to school, in their wish to get both sides back to the bargaining table. That is what we have been saying here for the past couple of weeks, get both sides back to the bargaining table. So we certainly agree with that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: I do not know what hon. gentlemen opposite are getting excited about, I am just simply saying that I am supporting the petition, Mr. Speaker, as any hon. gentleman presenting a petition should say. I support the petition whole-heartedly, Mr. Speaker, that both sides will get back to the bargaining table, resolve the dispute and that hopefully schools will open on Monday. That is where I stand, Mr. Speaker. And I do not want to say anything about the present offer by the government, I do not want to say anything that will prejudice the negotiations or say anything so people could accuse us of attempting to muddy the waters, Mr. Speaker. We hope that both sides will get back to the bargaining table. As a matter of fact, I hope they are now back. This dispute has gone on long enough. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it should never have come to this; our schools should never have been closed, our teachers should never have been locked out. The government and the school boards should never have done it, they should never have locked out our teachers. That is who is denying our children their education, Mr. Speaker, the government and the school boards. They locked the teachers out, and where they did not lock the teachers out they locked the students out. So, Mr. Speaker, clearly it is they who are denying our children their educational rights. But, Mr. Speaker, enough said about that, let us hope - a statement made by the Premier three or four days ago, let bygones be bygones - let us hope that we can get back to the bargaining table. I certainly hope that the NTA saw enough in the offer by the Premier this morning that they can accept the offer.

MR. LUSH: As I say, I hope, I am not that familiar with all of the clauses because the Premier did not give us a copy of his statement, so I am not sure what the NTA's reaction will be. But I certainly hope that they can find something in there, Mr. Speaker. I know they will go back to the bargaining table, I certainly hope that negotiations will go on and that the wishes of these people here, that the prayer of this petition will be answered, Mr. Speaker, and that the teachers will be back to the bargaining table, the whole thing will be resolved and that the students will be back in the schools Monday morning where they belong and where the teachers belong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to speak briefly to the prayer of the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition makes three points as I noted them. First, an appeal to both sides in this dispute - the government, school board side, number one, and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association side, number two - to compromise. I do not think the word 'compromise' was used, but that is the meaning I gathered from hearing it. Number two, that the two sides return to the bargaining table; and number three, and I think most important, that schools re-open Monday.

Mr. Speaker,

MS VERGE: government through the Premier himself indicated at the start of this sitting of the House that government has in fact acted on the first request in the prayer of the petition. Government and the Federation of School Boards have compromised. Earlier this morning, our negotiating team presented to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association a new proposal indicating movement, indicating compromise on all of the important issues outstanding in this dispute, the 2 per cent rule, the classification of teachers, professional workload and substitute teachers.

Mr. Speaker, it has to be remembered that this movement followed developments earlier this calendar year when government firmly committed ourselves to lowering the pupil-teacher ratio all the way down to twenty-three to one, which combined with the projected higher student enrolment figure for next year and other parts of our allocation regulations, will yield a 6 per cent growth in the teaching force across the Province. There will be 480 new teaching jobs created September coming. Now we have 8,000 teachers, in September we will have 8,500 teachers. And everyone will remember that in February, government and the Federation of School Boards worked out with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, working dealing with teacher involvement in extra-curricular activities. A compromise was reached on that difficult issue back in mid-February.

Number two, return to the bargaining table: As the Premier indicated before he gave his Ministerial Statement this morning, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association agreed to meet with the employer bargaining team at nine o'clock this morning to receive our new proposal. Arrangements were made for the meeting

MS VERGE: last night through the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Blanchard). The Newfoundland Teachers' Association people agreed to have the meeting at nine o'clock this morning. The employer negotiating team were at the appointed place at nine o'clock this morning, and when the NTA representatives arrived some fifty minutes later, at about 9:50 a.m., the contact was made between the two sides and the NTA did receive the new compromise employer proposal. I have not been briefed on developments since then, but obviously there was an opportunity if the NTA wanted to take advantage of it, for discussions about the new proposal, from the employer side. And, of course, the Deputy Minister of

MS. VERGE:

Labour and Manpower is continuing to make himself and the services of his department available to both sides to assist in our efforts to resolve the dispute and get a settlement.

As to the third point in the prayer of the petition having schools reopen Monday, Mr. Speaker, this is possible if the NTA and the teachers of the Province accept the new compromise proposal from government and the Federation and School Boards. And I, personally, firmly believe that it is a just and reasonable proposal for both teachers and students and should be accepted by the NTA without delay so that it will be possible to reopen schools on Monday.

Mr. Speaker, the NTA rejected an earlier call from government endorsing a request from the provincial Federation of Parent/Teachers Association to place a moratorium on the stike action and have the schools reopen last Monday while time is taken to have the collective bargaining process work, reserving unto the NTA the strike weapon and the right to recall its members from the classrooms should it not be satisfied with the results of continued bargaining. And of course, that option is still available to the NTA if it feels that it cannot accept the new compromise proposal by Monday, if it wants to take more time than that to consider the new proposal and discuss it with its members.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I rise -

MR. BARRY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the member for Mount Scio
on a point of order.

MR. BARRY: Yes, Sir, a point of order arising out of

MR. BARRY: the petition and the fact that my colleague did not have the opportunity to finish making the presentation. The Chairman of the meeting last night, Mrs. Sullivan, wished to have it brought out in the petition that there had been a call for another general meeting if there is a failure on the part of government and the NTA to respond to this petition. So that there will be another meeting and I am sure that the parents will be out again showing their concern at this meeting next week.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the member for Mount Scio rose on a point of order and, of course, the Chair is obligated to hear him until such point as he is satisfied that there is or is not a point of order. I will have to submit that it was more a matter of clarification than a point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition signed by 129 residents from the tiny community of Hopedale in Northern Labrador. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is as follows: 'We, the undersigned, urgently request the government of Newfoundland and Labrador to delay its decision to close North West River Hospital until a sufficient study has been done on social impact and maintenance of adequate health care for upper Lake Melville and Coastal areas. We urge government

MR. WARREN: to consider, number one, chronic care and hostel facilities for North West River; number two, an appropriate out-patients clinic with holding beds at North West River; and, number three, appropriate upgrading of the Melville Hospital.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, those three concerns that have been expressed by the 129 residents of Hopedale, are concerns that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and officials of his department, did not even consider when they put the axe to North West River.

These are concerns, Mr. Speaker, that the minister's department have not addressed to date. The minister has said repeatedly in response to questions I have asked in this House, that the chronic care and the acute care will be taken care of in Labrador. When the minister gets up will the minister tell us where in Labrador the chronic care will be taken care of. Will it be in North West River? Or will it be in Happy Valley/Goose Bay or some other place? Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think when the budget came down on March 17, there was information in that budget that the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) was not aware of. A member of the Cabinet, a member who represents North West River did not know that a hospital, a town, was going to be wiped out in his district by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I support the 129 residents of Hopedale and I would like to lay this petition on the table of the House and have it referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I was on the phone when the hon. member began presenting his petition and I did not get the full import of what the petition was about. I know it does relate to the concerns of people from the community referred to about the closure of the North West River Hospital, and, of course, what is going to happen in patient care and in chronic care in the particular area.

I know, Mr. Speaker, the rule of thumb, of course, is the fact that - or the rule in the Standing Orders in responding to or talking to petitions is that you support the petition and, of course, what I get from that petition is, is there going to be good health care delivery in the general area for the people of the Coast of Labrador. And I can assure you that is one of our main objectives in consolidating the services that we have in North West River, and in Lake Melville, is to give

MR. HOUSE: a better, more effective
and efficient service.

The presenter of the petition has asked me to address what is specifically going to happen. I would say first of all, Mr. Speaker, with regard to acute care there will be more beds per thousand now in population in that particular area of the Province, which that part of Labrador serves, than in any other part of Newfoundland, I believe, even with the closure of North West River.

MR. ROBERTS: There will be less than there were before.

MR. HOUSE: There will be less than there were before. I think we had somewhere around twelve beds per thousand, and the Canadian average, I think, is somewhere around five. So we are grossly overbedded there in that particular area.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the provincial average?

MR. HOUSE: The provincial average is about between five and six. But you have to bear in mind when we are talking about beds, we are talking about the Health Science Complex, for instance, and the Janeway as provincial beds that pertain to Labrador, as does St. Anthony pertain to Labrador.

So what they are asking is a better service. Mr. Speaker, we are going to give a better service. I believe we have determined that there are going to be ten additional beds attached to the Melville Hospital already. And the chronic care will be looked after. That is the reason why some are in the Melville Hospital and some are in the Paddon Home in Happy Valley.

Now, I am going down, Mr. Speaker, tonight and will be meeting, in North West River tomorrow at three o'clock, with the Committee and the public and this will be the main topic of discussion. I just want

MR. HOUSE: to assure the people of Labrador that our prime objective is to efficiently run a good health care system. And I think what we have in mind is going to be even an improvement over what we had, despite the fact that we are going to close the North West River Hospital.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for the Straft of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words if I may in support of the petition. The prayer of the petitioners was, I think, succinctly stated by my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). And I will say to the minister that I understand my friend for Torngat has two similar petitions from other residents of his district which, I understand, he proposes to present when this particular proceeding finishes and so presumably the minister will have an opportunity to expand upon that aspect of the matter if he wishes.

I think the points which the petitioners raise are legitimate ones.

MR. ROBERTS: They were asking, as I heard the petition, for essentially three points.

MR. HOUSE: I did not hear it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I appreciate that the minister did not hear it but, as I have said, he will have a chance in the next round in a minute or two to deal with these points. One is the question of chronic care, the second is the question of the outpost nursing, or, I suppose, the type of service to be offered through the facility, which, I understand, will remain in North West River, and finally, the question of the upgrading of the Lake Melville hospital which then, once the hospital in North West River has been closed, the Melville facility, of course, will be the only acute care facility in all of Labrador with the exception of the Jackman in Labrador West and the very small, almost first aid type hospital, emergency type hospital which is still being operated by CFLCO or by the GRHS for CFLCO at Churchill Falls, and that is down to, I think, one doctor and three or four beds. And while John Price is one of the most competent practitioners in the Province, I know the minister would agree with me that the Churchill Falls hospital is not really very much more than an emergency first aid station.

But I think these points are legitimate ones and I would hope the minister could address himself to them. The concern which I have is one which I think is wide-spread throughout the Labrador part of the Province but also here on the Island. And I have attempted to elicit some comment from the minister. If he will not, we will just keep at it because the concern has to be addressed, and that is that people are unsettled, people feel, and there is a lot of evidence to support their feeling, that the government are making major changes in

MR. ROBERTS: the health care delivery systems in this Province, are making them for strictly financial reasons - and people are unsettled. Long-established patterns of delivery are being threatened, long-established patterns of life in the health care system are being threatened, and people are concerned because they do not know what is happening. And there is a feeling, and it is growing, that the government are not being straight, they are not being candid, they are not telling people what it is they have in mind. The government, the feeling is, have no long-range plan or even a short-range plan, all they are doing is responding to the ad hoc directives of the Treasury Board. And I have heard it said, by the way, with no discourtesy to the minister, that the Treasury Board is now running the Department of Health, that the Department of Health has ceased to be anything more or less than the recipient of directives from the Treasury Board. Now, I would be the very first to say - and in my time as Health Minister, I lived by this principle - that money is important. You have to pay for health services. They are expensive and they need large sums of money to enable them to function. But money is not everything.

I suspect my time is drawing to a close. I will have an opportunity to speak in a couple of minutes again under the rules. But I would say to the minister that the concern is growing throughout this Province that we have lost control, the health care system is out of the control of the health care professionals and is now in the hands strictly of the financial people and that the

MR. ROBERTS: government's health care policies are nothing more or less than ad hoc reactions to financial directives which inevitably say, 'save money, cut expenditures'. That is bothering people at all levels I would say to the minister. It is bothering the health care professionals, it is bothering the people who run the hospitals, it is bothering the people - the men, women and children - throughout this Province who must receive these services. And what these people on the Coast of Labrador and in Hopedale are saying mirrors that. A hospital which was in place for eighty years has been wiped out overnight in a budget, not in a health care document, in a budget, by a fiat, by a stroke of a financial pen it has been wiped out. And the people who signed this petition are saying, 'What is going to replace it, what is going to happen, who is going to meet our needs? We are still here, we have health care needs and they must be met.'

I support the petition, Sir, and I would say to the minister that there is a great challenge to him now - he has had a pretty easy time of it by and large as minister for the last two or three years - a great challenge to him now throughout the Province. He cannot hide behind the Orsborn Commission. It is a good group, let us hear what they have to say, but the minister cannot simply abdicate behind the -

MR. CALLAN: What is the name of the commission?

MR. ROBERTS: The Orsborn Commission. That is the name it will probably be known by, David is the Chairman. It is a good group but the minister cannot abdicate for the next twelve months and hide behind the skirts of a Royal Commission. He has to face up to these issues man fashion, address them and satisfy people.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I stand to present a petition signed by fifty-five residents of the tiny town of Rigolet in my district.

The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is basically the same as the prayer of the previous petition I presented. I will quote from it because the minister, the first time, failed to hear what I had to say. 'The undersigned urgently request the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to delay the decision', that is the important part of the petition, Mr. Speaker, it is asking the minister to delay the decision to close the North West River hospital until sufficient studies have been done on the social impact and maintenance of adequate health care for the Upper Lake Melville and coastal areas.

Mr. Speaker, the petition is asking the Department of Health, asking the government of this Province, to delay the closure. The closure, Mr. Speaker, will take place, according to the budget, anywhere between three and six months as of March 17th. We already have one month gone. So the closure is going to take place anywhere now between two and five months. So, Mr. Speaker, the latest that the hospital will be closed is by November.

MR. WARREN: So what the people are saying in this petition is, will the Department of Health and the government of this Province delay the closure until a proper study in health care is done. It goes on further to say, "We urge the government of Newfoundland and Labrador to consider chronic hospital facilities for North West River, appropriate out-patient clinics with holding beds for North West River, and appropriate upgrading of the Melville Hospital."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister did not in his first preamble support the petition. All the minister is saying is, 'We will give better health care.' I do not care what the minister says, the minister's department will not give better health care to Labrador residents by closing down a hospital. It will be impossible. The minister is not giving better health care to the people out on the Avalon Peninsula by closing down the Whitbourne hospital. No way can the minister give better health care by closing down hospitals. This hospital, Mr. Speaker, was built for the people along the Labrador coast and the people in North West River and now, all of a sudden, the minister's department is going to take away this cultural connection of those people. They will have to fly out to St. John's or St. Anthony or go up to Lake Melville. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the minister should realize that the Lake Melville hospital is structurally in worse condition than the hospital in North West River. This has been certified, this has been verified for the minister's department by engineers; one building is practically a concrete building and the other building is practically a wooden building thirty-two years old. Now, the building in Lake Melville is

MR. WARREN: thirty-two years old. They had a major roofing job done on that building last year and even now you can walk into that hospital and there are buckets all over the floor to catch water coming through the roof. So, therefore, there has to be work done on that building. If the minister were going to build a large hospital in Happy Valley-Goose Bay to facilitate everybody, then it would be much better. But he is using a building that is not up to standard. The building is below standard. And all the minister did was use the Fire Commissioner's report - the Fire Commissioner was the scapegoat - to say that the hospital in North West River needs a lot of renovations. The federal government said that they would

MR. WARREN:

pay for the upgrading, so why cannot the minister keep the hospital open?

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the minister would be closing down a hospital the Lake Melville Hospital is transferring patients to, transferring patients from Lake Melville Hospital to the North West River Hospital. Just one day last week there were seven patients transferred from the hospital that he is going to upgrade, to the hospital he is going to close down. There is something wrong. There is something not working properly. There is absolutely something wrong.

You know what is wrong, Mr. Speaker, it is that the minister's department does not care about health care for the people along the Labrador Coast and in Lake Melville in general. All they are going to do is a patch up job to save taxpayers' money.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are many ways other than closing down hospitals to save taxpayers' money. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay this petition on the table and have it referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I guess I can get up and just reiterate what has been said. I feel sort of uncomfortable in supporting a petition, and that is what I am supposed to do, support, but I just have to respond because I know in both petitions debate has been entered into and, I suppose, we can argue back and forth, but all I will say now is that I do accept the petitions, accept them, and we will certainly be guided by what has been said.

MR. HOUSE: Now, I have to take some exceptions to the sort of things about the department not being able to administer. The department is quite capable of administering. The Department of Health gave \$306 million to hospitals to administer their programmes, and there is no Treasury Board input there at all. So I think what is being said there is utterly wrong, and it is certainly not out of the control of my department, or out of the control of the officials.

One of the references to the Coast of Labrador - Rigolet, for instance, is making a case about losing good health care. Rigolet has got one of the most modern clinics, as does Makkovik, and we are putting these in conjunction with the DREE programmes all along the Coast. Mr. Speaker, what is being said is that people coming in from the Coast are going to be at some disadvantage because

MR. HOUSE: they cannot get to North West River.

We are saying the same thing, that what they were getting in North West River they are going to be able to get in the Melville area. The fact of the hospitals - the hon. member talked about the Melville Hospital. He must have gotten some consulting engineers and hired them to do his study. We had them do our studies and our studies showed that the Melville Hospital is quite good and structurally sound, but it does need repairs and renovations and we are going to do them. This is part of the programme to upgrade. Now it is one of two things, either the hon. member is intimating close Melville and keep North West River open or vice versa. Now, to leave the hospital in Melville and close the one in Goose Bay, I do not think that would satisfy the people in Goose bay either.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that the people have to bear in mind is that North West River is sixteen miles or there about from the hospital in Melville. They are just as close in North West River to a hospital, say, as people in Manuel's are. Now that to me does not present a great problem. But I would say offhand, in speaking to this petition, one more time that the people in that area are going to get health care, as good as it is possible to get in that part of Labrador. We cannot get any better than we are going to have. We are going to have an ideal clinic in North West River, we are going to ensure that the chronic care are going to be taken care of and we are going to ensure that there are adequate acute care beds.

MR. SIMMS: Better than the Avalon Peninsula.

MR. HOUSE: And that is certainly better than a lot of other parts of Newfoundland.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Presenting a petition, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not presenting a petition I want to speak in support of the petition that was so ably presented by my colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) regarding the closure of the North West River Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is almost an identical situation to what we had last year, in last Spring's budget, in Markland. What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a callous act by a callous government. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) a few minutes ago said that the Department of Health is being run by Treasury Board. Well, the Department of Health, Mr. Speaker, is not the only department that is being run by Treasury Board.

MR. CALLAN: We have seen in the last couple of weeks that the Department of Education is also being run by Treasury Board, because they wanted to save \$10 million or \$20 million on the backs of the teachers and the students in this Province.

But, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the prayer of this petition, what the minister seems to be forgetting here, and if I can draw an example, Mr. Speaker, from the Markland situation, you know, all the same types of arguments are being used regarding North West River, all of the same types of arguments are being used as were used last year regarding the closure of the Markland Cottage Hospital. And the Premier in this year's budget has set aside \$1 million for the new clinic at Whitbourne, Not the Markland Clinic any more, it will be the Whitbourne Clinic, \$1 million. But the Premier and the minister can set aside \$20 million or \$50 million for whatever facility at Whitbourne and it will not change the unforgivable fact, Mr. Speaker, that the people out there were betrayed and the people out there were let down and they will never forget it.

MR. ANDREWS: Did you not get a little (inaudible)?

MR. CALLAN: No. I can tell the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) and the Minister of Health (Mr. House), I can tell them that no matter what is put out there, a multi-million dollar ultra-modern facility can be put there, it will not change the fact that the chronically ill, Mr. Speaker, have to come into St. John's. And the minister says, 'North West River is only sixteen miles away'. And last year he was saying that Markland and Whitbourne and Norman's Cove and Bellevue and Green's Harbour and New Harbour, they are only an hour away from St. John's. That, Mr. Speaker, is not true. That is not

MR. CALLAN:

true.

MR. HOUSE:

order.

Mr. Speaker, on a point of

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Minister of Health.

A point or order, the hon.

MR. HOUSE:

The hon. member is addressing a petition regarding North West River Hospital and the community of Rigolet, but he is debating the issue at Whitbourne. And the fact of the matter is , not only is he debating the closing of Whitbourne which was an acute care hospital, he is debating it in terms of chronic care. And Whitbourne was never a chronic care institution anyway. So the hon. member is totally out of order. He is not addressing the material allegation in the petition.

MR. CALLAN:

Speaker.

To that point of order, Mr.

MR. ANDREWS:

about.

He does not know what he is talking

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

member for Bellevue.

To that point of order, the hon.

MR. CALLAN:

Obviously the minister is smarting,

MR. CALLAN: and obviously the minister knows that in his comments on this petition and the previous one, and the member for the district of the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), you know - obviously there is some leeway there for comparisons, which is what I am doing, drawing comparisons, I would say, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule there is a legitimate point of order. The hon. member should be referring to the prayer of the petition and directing his remarks to the prayer of the petition.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the minute that I have left -

MR. BAIRD: Throw that billy goat out.

MR. CALLAN: In the minute that I have left, or thirty seconds, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I support the prayer of this petition. I support the efforts of the people in North West River and Melville and other areas around who are saying in essence that more in-depth studies should have been done. Let us hold off a decision until all the studies are in and the reports are made.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains with another petition.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have another petition to present. It is signed by 193 residents of the town of Nain in my district.

MR. WARREN: The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is identical to the prayer of the other two petitions and subsequently, I will not bother to read the prayer of this petition. However, Mr. Speaker, in my brief remarks, I will make some remarks from - the minister has this in his possession - a summary of comments made by Catherine Baikie Pottle, President of the Health Service Committee in North West River.

MR. HOUSE: And she is not a doctor.

MR. WARREN: She is a doctor.

MR. HOUSE: She is not a doctor.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: This is signed by Catherine Baikie Pottle, President of the Health Service Committee in North West River, and here are some of the comments, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has had in his possession, for the past three weeks: "Let me remember a very strong and forceful promise made by Premier Brian Peckford to the people of Labrador in August, 1979,

MR. WARREN: that the people of Labrador would be consulted on the affairs that affect them. Mr. Peckford, Sir, this has affected the people of Labrador very, very deeply. We were not consulted when the government decided to close the hospital."

Here is another comment:

"The government patted themselves on the back for saving thirty jobs in Labrador West, a couple of days ago; the same government patted themselves on the back for taking away ninety jobs and closing down not only a hospital, but practically a town! Mr. Speaker, "a total lack of concern for the environment and culture of our people were handed down in the Budget Speech of March 17th, 1983. The disgraceful, downgrading of health care that has been slyly, slyly ongoing for years must halt". Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the words of Catherine Pottle, and they are true, that this government through the minister have been slyly, slyly, ongoing for years -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. WARREN: - downgrading the health care in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A point of order. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I refer Your Honour to Standing Order 92: "Every member offering a petition to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains. In no case shall such a member occupy more than five minutes."

And Standing Order 97 says:
"There shall be no debate on a petition, unless the House

MR. MARSHALL: has it under consideration", which means that it is a part of the main proceedings of the House not the routine.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is entering in to the realm of debate. Presenting a petition is certainly to present the views of the people, the allegations in the petition itself. He is getting into areas of debate and general health care services and other general matters relating to government.

MR. WARREN: No, I am not.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order I do refer the hon. member to Standing Order 92 which does say: "Every member offering a petition to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes and the number of signatures attached to it" and so on.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House) has this report in his hand and this report has everything to do with the petition that I am presenting. This report also says, Mr. Speaker, "we will not be second or third-class citizens of this Province". They said "we will not tolerate having to fly out of Labrador for health care to accomodate a facility hundreds of miles away". This Mr. Speaker, does concern the petition. "We will not accept a total lack of concern in consulting with our people." This petition is asking for a study to be done into health care. The minister has not consulted the people, there has been no study done.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to again make a short response to this in accepting the petition and the right of people to petition. I just want to point out to the member that he is absolutely wrong. I only mentioned the profession of Catherine Baikie Pottle by virtue of the fact he is saying she is a medical doctor and he is using her as a person who has knowledge in medical care. She is not a medical doctor, she is a playwright, a dramatist. There is a Doctor Baikie in North West River but it is not this particular lady. The hon. member must know these people better than that, she is not a medical doctor.

The thing I just want to bring up is about me slyly closing hospitals. Mr. Speaker, the hospital in North West River has been under review as have a lot of other hospitals, for years. We are not saying, 'Well, this is all set. Here is a hospital here. That can stay there for the rest of its life, we will staff it. Even though there are no people using it, even though the population, the people using that hospital have decreased by 50 per cent, even though there is no surgery going on there, even though there is very little going on other than dormitory care basically, we have to keep it going forever.

And the other implication in that particular part of the petition was the fact that, of course, we should keep the hospital open for

MR. HOUSE: social reasons. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a good reason, there is no doubt about it. But in the times-I must make this perfectly clear--that we are living in, dollars we have to spend on health care must be used for health care. And I can assure the hon. member that at no time ever in the past four year have we had better service in Labrador than we have now, no time ever. And we have good people getting in there. We have a surgeon going into Labrador. When they say go hundreds of miles from Nain in relation to the North West River hospital, the Melville hospital is as close to Nain when you fly in as it is to North West River. The same service is going to be available. And that argument, Mr. Speaker, is not good. But I do say I want to support the part of the petition that says that they want good,adequate health care services.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are giving that and the actions we are taking now will continue to improve it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to stand and speak in support of this petition as well. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat what I said just now

MR. CALLAN: that this is a callous act by a callous government. It happened last year in Markland, it is happening this year in North West River, and I predict, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as the new hospital is opened in Clarendville the Come By Chance facility will get the same announcement. The Botwood facility may also get the same announcement.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I must remind the hon. member that he has to refer to the prayer of the petition while speaking on it.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being called out of order I wanted to refer specifically to some of the concerns expressed in this same document that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) referred to a few minutes ago. It is quoting the Minister of Health (Mr. House) directly. It says here, "Mr. House, Sir, you say it is the government who decides to build hospitals and it is the government who decides to close hospitals." The minister said that. I heard him when he said it a while ago. 'Let us remind you, Sir, and please do not forget again, we, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are the government, you, Sir, have chosen to be our servant.' I think that is something that is being forgotten.

The Premier, in his remarks yesterday regarding the teachers, was forgetting the same thing, that we are the government and we are doing this because we want to save taxpayers' money and so on. But it is the taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, they are the government, and

MR. CALLAN: the Minister of Health, and the Premier and myself, we are servants of the people. We are the servants of the people.

Getting back to another quote here, Mr. Speaker, from these objections and this study that was done. It says, "Mr. Minister, open your eyes to the realizations of the very human factors involved. Paying a patient's way out is not the issue. The patient must travel without relatives or friends."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister of Health (Mr. House) realizes how much more it is going to cost the families to have to go and visit their friends and relatives in a hospital sixteen miles away. I know how much more it is costing the friends and

MR. CALLAN: the relatives of a cancer patient, for example in Whitbourne, who have to drive to St. John's, sixty miles away, to visit their dying father or brother or mother when it used to be that they could go to the Markland Cottage Hospital and visit them. That is just one factor, a very human factor, Mr. Speaker. The cost in dollars to families in visiting, in telephone calls, in accommodations while visiting, the cost in keeping the family at home, all of these are human factors. And, as I said just now, Mr. Speaker, almost an identical situation and almost the very same human factors involved in the closure of the Markland Cottage Hospital as we have here in the closure of the North West River Hospital. A callus government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Letting the people die.

MR. CALLAN: A government who is running every department of government -- the Treasury Board is running every department of government. Mr. Speaker, what is happening today? What is happening today to the sixteen or eighteen or twenty psychiatric patients with the psychiatric ward closed? What is happening? We saw a lady on Here and Now last night.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman, I think, wants to be relieved, he wants to be taken out of his misery so he gets completely irrelevant. Now, Mr. Speaker, I quote once again. I mean, there are proceedings in this House for the presentation of petitions, Standing Order 92 which Your Honour referred to a few moments ago, and Standing Order 97, 'there will be no debate on the petition'. And what the hon. gentleman is doing now is entering into a general debate with respect to health care. He is not

MR. MARSHALL: addressing himself to the petition and to the names as required under the Standing Order and he is therefore out of order. I mean, the hon. gentleman or no hon. gentlemen can invent their own rules and take the House on their backs and misuse the rules of this House for their own purposes, they have to comply with the rules that are here.

MR. CALLAN: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order. The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: I think the minister is very, very touchy this morning. There are three items mentioned in that prayer, Mr. Speaker, three items.

MR. WARREN: He does not even know what they are.

MR. CALLAN: He does not know what they are so, therefore, the President of the Council does not know if I am in order or not. The fact of the matter is, I am out of order because my time has elapsed. I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order I rule there was a valid point of order, but the hon. member's time has elapsed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, Order 3, concurrence motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3, concurrence motion, When we adjourned the debate Tuesday we discussing Government Services Estimates Committee.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure who adjourned the debate yesterday.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, a point of order,

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. CALLAN: I have been recognized.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not want to be trespassing on the hon. gentleman's time but my understanding is that the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) adjourned the debate yesterday and that being so I think it is the custom.-You Honour may not have been in the Chair - I think it is the custom to recognize the person who adjourned the debate -

MR. CALLAN: He should have stood up. Why did he not stand up?

MR. MARSHALL: - then, obviously, immediately thereafter the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) could be recognized, you know.

MR. WARREN: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I think if we refer back to Hansard of yesterday, the hon. member's time had elapsed when the debate closed.

April 22, 1983

Tape No. 1364

MJ - 2

MR. BAIRD:

No, it was not.

MR. WARREN:

It was so. It was ten minutes exactly.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Order please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

It elapsed yesterday evening.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will have to check with the table to see who adjourned the debate.

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is correct that the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) did adjourn the debate -

MR. SIMMS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

-but his time had elapsed at that time.

MR. WARREN:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue,

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, in this Concurrence Debate now we are on Government Services and if I can take another couple of minutes, to continue to talk about the Department of Health and the services that that department is supposed to be providing to the taxpayers and the sick and the elderly of this Province, let me repeat what I said just now, that in the two successive, two consecutive budgets since this new administration took over we have seen

MR. CALLAN: the closure of a cottage hospital. Last Spring it was Markland, this Spring it is North West River, and I predict, Mr. Speaker, that there will be another one next Spring.

MR. WARREN: Oh yes, Buchans.

MR. CALLAN: Well, perhaps Buchans. How about Botwood? The member for Botwood has not been around for a while. I do not know if he is sick or on holiday. If he is on holiday I would say he deserves it. But anyway I would say -

MR. BAIRD: He does not have to explain where he has been. Where has Hiscock been the past month?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: - Mr. Speaker, if government is going to do it in the order in which it should be done, then, obviously, I would say that Botwood is the next logical choice. Because we do have an ultra-modern facility in Grand Falls which is quite near, in close proximity to Botwood, and I am sure that if government is going to follow on this trail -

MR. SIMMS: How near is it?

MR. CALLAN: Well, the member should know.

MR. SIMMS: I certainly do, but do you?

MR. CALLAN: Well, you tell the hon. House.

MR. SIMMS: The hon. member does not, does he?

MR. CALLAN: That is what he does.

MR. SIMMS: What is it? How far?

MR. CALLAN: It is about as far away from the hospital in Grand Falls as the Sir Robert Bond Bridge is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:
sidetracked.

Mr. Speaker, I will not be

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:

I will not be sidetracked by a former Speaker, who is not acting very much like a former Speaker,

MR. BAIRD: Three gunshots, that is how you would measure it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

I will not be sidetracked by the former, former Speaker -

MR. SIMMS:

I apologize for throwing you off.

MR. CALLAN:

- or the former Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question, the hospital in Placentia will not be closed down. In the five year plan, anybody who wants to read it, it is not spelled out specifically, in detail, but the inference is there that the Placentia Hospital will be upgraded. And I would say, well, perhaps a new hospital is very much more in order. I would think, very much more in order. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if the present administration were a little wiser they would not have spent the hundreds of thousands of dollars that they did spend on the arena on the Argentia Base there, just outside the Argentia Base. I think it is half way out in the Atlantic because once you get to the Argentia Base you have to drive for five miles out on a point to get to the arena anyway. Earlier, in another debate, I talked about the Whitbourne Stadium and the financial problems that are being experienced there, I would say the arena in Placentia, or in Argentia is in ten times the financial shape, worse condition financially, than the Whitbourne Stadium.

April 22, 1983

Tape No. 1365

NM - 3

MR. CALLAN:

There was no need,
Mr. Speaker, for that facility to have been built there. The
stadium at Whibourne was quite capable of accommodating
the sports minded people

MR. CALLAN: in a radius of at least thirty or forty miles. This past Winter in Whitbourne stadium, we had a hockey team come in from Brigus, the Brigus Bruins, that our team from Norman's Cove beat quite fairly and quite cleanly, and we had another team from Southern Harbour, Mr. Speaker, which again is thirty miles down the Trans-Canada towards Clarenville. In other years they played in the Clarenville stadium, this year they played in our stadium. And considering that, Mr. Speaker, it is quite easy for the people from Placentia, Dunville, Fox Harbour, Argentia to come and play in our stadium. The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that it was a waste of the taxpayers' dollars for that facility, for that hangar, a former aircraft hangar at Argentia, to have been turned into a sports facility.

MR. BAIRD: That is not a coat hanger now, is it? or a slip hanger.

MR. CALLAN: I wish that the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) would go out and hanger - hang himself or something.

Mr. Speaker, if the medical facility in Placentia is going to be replaced by a new facility, I would say it needs to be done. It is a good move by government. And in the five year plan as well, Mr. Speaker, it is plain to be seen that the facility at Bonavista will not be removed, and I do not think it will be removed even when we have the new facility built at Clarenville. But the Come-By-Chance facility; I predict that the Come-By-Chance facility will be gone within four or five years.

MR. BAIRD: He is like a fellow with a crystal ball.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, certainly the member for Humber West must have more and better things to do than to sit over there like a clown.

MR. SIMMS: He works hard for Corner Brook and Humber West.

MR. CALLAN: I know he does not have any constituency work to do, because there are no constituency

MR. CALLAN: Each community has its own individual problems. As I have said, last week, here in this hon. House, I presented a petition on behalf of the people in Hillview.

MR. SIMMS: Good Speech Wilson.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the former Speaker should know that he should not call hon. members by their first name -

MR. SIMMS: I am encouraging you.

MR. CALLAN: - let alone keep interrupting a speaker who wants and has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: We should take the former Speaker's picture down.

MR. CALLAN: There is the former, former Speaker getting in on the act now, Mr. Speaker. He is the former, former Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday when my ten minutes ran out I was talking about another department that comes under Government Services. I was talking about two others actually, I was talking about the Department of Transportation - the minister's chair is presently occupied by the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), he is not here. I guess he is out doing the nation's business or the Province's business, perhaps out in some Tory district telling some Tories they are getting some pavement this year. Mr. Speaker, I was also talking about the Department of Municipal Affairs. It used to be called the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing; they took the Housing off and so the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook) is only now concerned with Municipal Affairs.

MR. BAIRD: She is doing a great job, too.

MR. CALLAN: Well, we will find out what a great job she is doing. And I am sure that she has the ability and she has the experience as the former Mayor of Gander but, unfortunately, getting back to the remarks made earlier by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), unfortunately her department is also being run by Treasury Board. And another thing, Mr. Speaker, that is unfortunate, and the minister knows what I am going to say is true, is that she does not have the leniency, it is not her choice to decide for which towns water and sewer projects will be approved. A list is compiled by her Deputy Minister and her Assistant Deputy Minister and others, a priority list is compiled by her officials of the towns that should get water and sewer because of what the Department of Health has to say about those particular towns and so on and so on, and that priority list

MR. CALLAN: goes up to Cabinet. Now, there, Mr. Speaker, is where the list gets tossed around and beat around just like the list of highways projects, captial works projects in the Department of Transportation, That is where that list gets knocked around,too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I will get back to it some other time.

MR. MCLENNON: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCLENNON: Mr. Speaker, it is not too often I get up in the House but I felt it was a good opportunity to get up and get in on the debate pertaining to the Government Services Committee. Perhaps one of the reasons why I do not get up too often is usually most of the resolutions in the House are pertaining to fisheries and I certainly would like to give leave to the professional colleagues that I have over here, such as the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn), and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), himself, who can certainly talk about Fisheries far better than I. because as you know I -

MR. SIMMS: You have a squid plant.

MR. MCLENNON: Cement plant?

MR. SIMMS: Squid.

MR. MCLENNON: Squid plant. Oh, yes I only have one fish plant in my district and that is a squid plant operated out of the town of Windsor and, I must say, a successful one that opens every year. It is a seasonal type plant but very successful.

MR. WARREN: How do the squid come, up the Exploits River?

MR. MCLENNON: No, the squid comes up the Exploits

April 22, 1983

Tape No. 1368

MJ - 2

MR. MCLENNON:

River, boy. Do you not know that?

But I must say there could be a lesson learned from that little plant there in Windsor. It seems to operate every year, year in and year out, opens and closes, seasonally. Perhaps there is a lesson to be learned there for some hon. members.

I would like to congratulate my colleague, he is not here today, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart). When he got up just a couple of days ago and gave

MR. MCLENNON:

a report pertaining to his Committee, I must say he certainly gave a lot of information. One of the points that he did make at one particular meeting there was nobody there from the Opposition, no member from the Opposition in attendance. I thought that was disgusting.

But then again the hon. member went on and told in great detail various things that were happening in the departments involved and under his Committee. And I said, Well, I guess it is nice to give all members a chance to know what is happening, but I do not necessarily agree with the Opposition finding out about what is happening. If they want to find out what is happening in a particular department they should certainly have the interest to attend these very important meetings.

The hon. member certainly went into forestry and tree planting, silviculture, budworm spraying and various other things pertaining to my district. I attended some of these meetings myself because of the interest that I have, especially relating to forestry and silviculture programmes etc.

I would also like to congratulate the Chairman of our own Committee, Government Services Committee, the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward), Mr. Speaker now in the Chair, on the excellent way in which he conducted the meetings of our Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MCLENNON:

One particular meeting that we did have pertaining to Transportation Estimates, we came to that meeting and I realized that while we had two hon. members from the Opposition there, neither was on the Committee and neither had submitted a notice to the Clerk saying that they were replacing anybody.

MR. SIMMS:

That is perfectly allowable,

is it not?

MR. MCLENNON:

That is perfectly allowable,

certainly.

Again to show the fairness of this government and of the Committee Chairman, he allowed three hours of discussion at our first meeting, and then again came back the following night and allowed close to another three hours, with entirely different members in attendance on the second night. So it takes a lot of patience I am sure. And I must say, the minister had a lot of patience because he had to answer the same questions on the second night as he answered on the first night. And again we are always been condemned for being arrogant and unfair and this and that. And I think that was one fine show of fairness on behalf of the Committee Chairman and the hon. minister involved.

At our meetings pertaining to Municipal Affairs

MR. MCLENNON:

I have to mention that most of the questions to the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) were directed to her from our side of the House. The Opposition, they were represented but I must say the hon. member who was there from the Opposition did not seem to have too many questions for the minister. He got up and criticized the minister saying this and that about her department, and that she is perhaps unfair, sort of gives things to only the PC towns or whatever. You know, I think, outside of my hon. colleagues from St. John's and probably Corner Brook and Grand Falls, that we all have many small communities and towns within our constituencies. I have, I am sure, Liberal towns within my constituency and I have made representation to the hon. minister many times, seeking numerous things, in support of these towns, and I can certainly go on record and say that I have had 100 per cent co-operation. One very recent thing pertaining to one of the towns in my district, the small community of Buchans Junction applied for a NEED programme and, of course, as we know, under these programmes - it was a water and sewer NEED programme, to help hook up the remainder of the community with water and to do a section with sewer. The NEED programme, of course, is labour intensive and there was not enough money under the programme to buy the materials that were needed. I made representation to the minister and I was pleased with the response; there was money made available by her department to see that that project gets on the go this year. The NEED programme would not have been any good without the co-operation of Municipal Affairs and I again thank the hon. the minister very much for her co-operation in this particular area.

Also, under Municipal Affairs, this year, as we are all aware, we have had a couple of very serious disasters in the Central Newfoundland area. Number one,

MR. MCLENNON: of course, the Bishop's Falls one. Again this was handled through the Department of Municipal Affairs with the deputy minister being involved as Chairman.

MR. CALLAN: What is happening there?

MR. MCLENNON: What are you saying? Speak up.

MR. CALLAN: What is happening there?

MR. MCLENNON: What is happening in Bishop Falls?

MR. CALLAN: Yes.

MR. MCLENNON: Well, everything is cleared up in Bishop's Falls. The people have been settled with and my understanding is they are quite happy with the settlements that they have received from government.

To move on, of course, in my own district we had a very serious disaster in the town of Badger,

MR. McLennon:

and again a lot of co-operation from various departments of government; Municipal Affairs, Transportation, Environment and so on. Again the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Randell, was appointed to the position of Chairman to oversee the assessment of the various damages in this town. When the water subsided up there the assessment team were, I must say, very quick to move in and to do personal assessments one on one with the people. This week the assessments will be finished. I talked to many of my constituents up there and they, again, are very, very happy with the way the assessments went. They felt this one on one thing gave them a chance to get their points across, views across to the assessors, and again they were very, very pleased. The Department of Transportation certainly came to the scene of that disaster and equipment was offered to move heavy sheets of ice that were spread throughout the town because of the flooding waters. Again the Department of the Environment certainly sent people out to assess the thing, to assess the blasting and so on that had to take place to ensure that the environment would not be interrupted to badly. I certainly have to compliment Mr. John Greer from Emergency Measures, who was certainly on the scene as quickly as possible. He acted very quickly in bringing in a demolition team to get the river unblocked and cleared and moving again. And, I must say, I have to certainly compliment this gentleman. He certainly did an excellent job.

In the past year, covering various departments, I must say I have had excellent co-operation from all the ministers. I have had various ministers come out to my district, to Buchans; the

MR. McLENNON: hon. Minister of Tourism
(Mr. Windsor) and the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation
and Youth (Mr. Simms). I have meetings now planned with
the Red Indian Lake Development Association to talk about
various things in the forestry sector. The hon. minister,
hopefully, will be coming out next week with me. I have
meetings lined up with the various councils in the Millertown-
Buchans area, and with the hon. Minister of Transportation
(Mr. Dawe), to discuss various road conditions and see what
we can do with the various road problems up there this
year.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!
I have to inform the hon.
member that his time has elapsed.

MR. McLENNON: Oh, well, it is too bad, Mr.
Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for
Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this is certainly
another large area of government departments that one can
talk about to illustrate the incompetence of this
government, the failure of this government

MR. LUSH:

to come to grips with the problems, the real problems faced by the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker. These departments under discussion can certainly demonstrate these facts, the incompetence and the failure of this government to come to grips with the problems of this Province, the labour problems, Mr. Speaker, the transportation problems, the problems faced by municipalities and the problems faced by the hospitals of this Province, and the health of our people. These departments, Mr. Speaker, demonstrate the government's clear intention, the government's policy of pouncing on the sick and on the handicapped and the aged, those people least able to fight back, those people incapable of fighting back at this government. So, Mr. Speaker, all of these policies are demonstrated under these particular departments.

I certainly wish that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) were here because I want to have a few words to say about that particular department. And the hon. gentleman who just spoke again referred to absenteeism. Well, I remember at the estimates of the Department of Transportation keeping that thing going six hours almost single-handedly, Mr. Speaker, because I wanted the minister to provide for the Committee the list of areas that were going to get capital moneys for road construction, pavement and the like. And I was going to hold up the estimates for that particular department, but I found out that I had no right to do it. I could not do it because there were time restrictions. So, Mr. Speaker, an hon. member is restricted in this hon. House from being able to make his point and to be able to show this government up.

MR. LUSH: I was only able to hold up these estimates for six hours and in that time, the minister would not agree to present the list.

MR. TULK: What about my assistance?

MR. LUSH: I am sorry. Yes, the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) was there giving me very, very capable assistance. I am sorry about that. He was there on the first night. So between the two of us, we were able to hold it up for only six hours.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. LUSH: But in that time we could not make the minister agree to bring down that list of areas that were going to receive capital funding in this fiscal year for road construction and paving.

MR. LUSH: We could not get the minister to give us that list. He squirmed and wormed and came up with no substantive reason as to why he could not present that list, Mr. Speaker. He tried to make excuses but he certainly presented no substantial reasons as to why that list should not be presented. And I fear the reason why the member did not present the list is because he was afraid that it would expose his department for what it is, Mr. Speaker, the biggest pork barrelling department in this present government, probably one of the biggest pork barrelling departments in all of Canada. So, Mr. Speaker, I fear that is the reason why the hon. minister would not submit the list. Now the hon. minister submitted the list two years previous, he presented the list. Of course, then he was able to include the Trans-Canada Highway agreement. What a sneaky way to do it, Mr. Speaker. If any member's district lay within ten miles of the Trans-Canada Highway, then that was counted in his district. In the district of Terra Nova, I think one year they had down that the Terra Nova district was going to get \$12 million and they included in that the construction of a bridge on the Gambo River, Mr. Speaker, which is some eight miles removed from my district. That is the kind of thing they did. But now, of course, with that drying up, not being able to do that, with all of that work now concentrated in the minister's own district, he could not very well make the list look at all non-partisan. He could not do it, so that is why he is not presenting the list. And I would venture to say when that list is published, or when the list comes out in whatever form it will when the tendering is called in the papers, I expect,

MR. LUSH: I hope it is not true, but I expect there will not be one inch of road for reconstruction or paving in any of the districts on this side of the House. That is what I expect will happen, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, that shows up the hon. crowd for what they are. In the Terra Nova district; there has not been one inch of new pavement placed in the Terra Nova district since 1975, or since 1972, since this hon. crowd came into office, not one inch of extra pavement in the Terra Nova district. I am not talking about pavement put in by municipalities that come under the cost sharing programme that they have in the Department of Municipal Affairs, I am talking about capital expenditures from the Department of Highways. There has not been one inch of pavement placed in the district since 1972. There has not been one dollar spent on new construction, reconstruction, since 1977, in other words, since this

MR. LUSH: new administration came in, this clean administration, this administration that believes in equality, this administration that believes in fair and just treatment of our people. Not one dollar spent in the Terra Nova district since 1978 or 1979, whenever it was that the new administration came into office, whenever we experienced that new rebirth, whenever the renaissance period occurred in this Province - that was in 1978 or 1979. That is the record, Mr. Speaker.

Now, if that is not a pork barrelling department I do not know what it is, Mr. Speaker, spending the taxpayers' dollars, Mr. Speaker, in trying to protect their own hides and trying to beef up their own support. That is what they do, Mr. Speaker, with the tax dollars of this Province, not only of this Province but with Canadian tax dollars, Mr. Speaker, with the tax dollars of all of Canada, because 50 per cent of the money, 50 per cent of the revenues of this Province come from Ottawa.

MR. TULK: 52 per cent.

MR. LUSH: We will settle at 50 per cent. So, therefore, 50 per cent of the revenues of each department are federal dollars and they use those federal dollars, Mr. Speaker, they use those Canadian dollars to protect their own hides, that is what they do. If I had any say on the dollars they would not get any. They would not get any if I had any say on them. It is no wonder they run into problems with the funding of the Rural Development Associations and all the other problems that they run into Mr. Speaker. It is no wonder with the imprudent spending of their money. I do not know but it is almost misappropriation, Mr. Speaker. And they punish the people of this Province, this government that gets up and preaches about equality, fair and just treatment, Mr. Speaker, Do as I say not as I do, that is the policy of this provincial government, do as I say not as I do, because they provide a very poor example

April 22, 1983

Tape 1374

PK - 2

MR. LUSH:
and treating people equally.

of fair and just treatment

MR. TULK:
themselves.

They should be ashamed of

MR. LUSH: The Department of Transportation is the one most guilty, Mr. Speaker, most guilty. But I do not think they will buy any extra votes by this policy, by this policy of discrimination and by this policy of trying to punish people who did not vote for them. I do not think they will pick up any support by that. As a matter of fact, they are going to lose support because people are going to see them for what they are. Our people are going to see them for what they are, preaching about equality, preaching about just and fair treatment and they go around practicing everything but.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to produce them any votes. As a matter of fact, it is going to be the opposite. It is going to be the opposite and the people of this Province are not going to tolerate that kind of treatment, Mr. Speaker. They are not going to put up with that kind of treatment and when they get the chance, when they get the opportunity, just like the teachers Mr. Speaker, just like the teachers, all of the people throughout this Province who have been penalized, this government will get their just treatment. They will get their just treatment, Mr. Speaker, and they will be booted out. They will be booted out and replaced by a group of people who will not only, Mr. Speaker, who will not only espouse equality, who will not only articulate equal treatment and fair treatment and just treatment, but, Mr. Speaker, will practice it, will practice it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

elapsed.

The hon. member's time has

MR. LUSH:

So quickly?

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. member for the
Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour.

Mr. Chairman, I - Mr. Speaker,
I am sorry - saving your reverence. Let me just say a word
at the outset in response to the gentleman from St. John's
North (Mr. Carter). He stood up this morning to present
a petition, which is one of the few occasions in the history
of this House that he has said anything standing in his place
as opposed to slouching in his seat, his normal posture. And
my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the Leader of the
Opposition, interjected a remark or two which I may add,
improved considerably the tenor of the debate as well as
the substance of what was being said, and the gentleman from
St. John's North was the very first to claim the protection
of the Chair, to which he is entitled Your Honour. I simply
find, and I say this to the gentleman from St. John's
North that, you know, here he is the very first to interrupt
rudely and persistently, as he does - and he is not witty, he does
not do anything except his little rude solecisms down there,
and yet he is the very first to snivel and whine when he gets
the sort of treatment he invites. If he is part of the man
that he thinks he is, if he is even a portion of the man that
he thinks he is,

MR. ROBERTS: he will conduct himself by the same set of rules no matter the circumstances. Now, I say this to him now, under the rules of this debate, the Concurrence Debate, I am allowed ten minutes and that is all I am entitled to have and so that is all I will have, of course. I want to make a couple of points about my district and if the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), boorish and rude and ignorant as he is does not want to hear about these points, then could I ask Your Honour now to say to him if he interrupts, 'Please would he be good enough to observe the rules of the House.' You know, he snivels and whines when he is on the receiving end and yet when he is on the giving end he does this. He cannot have it both ways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point or two about the Transportation Department Estimates, which of course, are included in the bundle of Estimates which we are debating here this morning and I want to make a point, Mr. Speaker, which is essentially the same as that made by my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) when he just spoke. It is a fact that since the present administration took office in March 1979, whenever the date was, there has not been a single provincially funded road reconstruction/ construction paving project in the district of the Strait of Belle Isle.

AN HON. MEMBER: There has been none in my either.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, nobody could maintain that there are no needs in the district of the Strait of Belle Isle and nobody could maintain that the fact that for four years - the fifth year is coming up now - the four construction seasons in which there has been no money spent, during that period, Mr. Speaker that there are -

MR. CARTER: They need a new member.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not claiming the privilege of the Chair. I am willing to mix it up with half-wits

MR. ROBERTS: or idiots or any kind of cretins -
c-r-e-t-i-n-s for the benefit of Hansard - but would the
cretins opposite please allow me to make my points.

I have already asked, now would Your Honour please do
what Your Honour has always done and enforce the rules of
the House and ask them please to govern themselves as best
they can according to the rules.

MR. SPEAKER(McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. the member is entitled to
be heard in silence.

MR. BAIRD: (Inaudible) live it up.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour is not even allowed to
speak without the cretins interrupting you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I was
making in the sentence in which I was rudely interrupted - and
I do not think it at all amusing, my friend from St. John's
North (Mr. Carter) may, but that just shows his bad manners.

MR. ROBERTS: The point is this that no money has been spent in the Strait of Belle Isle district on provincially initiated road projects initiated since this government took office. They finished a road that had been started when Bill Doody was the minister responsible for Transportation. That road was finished, the road to the community of Grandois. Nothing else has been done and nobody could maintain that the needs of the Strait of Belle Isle district have been met so that no money need be spent. Now, the only obvious conclusion is that there has been a deliberate decision by this administration, by the Premier, by the Transportation ministers from time to time, by all of them, to draw a line around the Strait of Belle Isle district and to say, 'We will spend no money there.' Now, the reason they have done that, Mr. Speaker, is that the people in that district have dared to elect a Liberal member. And, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that coming from an administration headed by a Premier who bases his whole approach on the, in my view, fallacious argument that we are not being treated equally within the Canadian Confederation but who bases his whole view on equality, that this conduct by this administration, which is deliberate and marked, a deliberate, reasoned, conscious decision, this is not only reprehensible, it tells a very great deal, Your Honour, about the calibre and about the moral fibre of the men and women who make up this administration.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: It really does, Mr. Speaker. Now, if they think it will help them to win the district then I say to them they should look at the election results. If they think for a moment that the people of the Strait of Belle Isle district or the people of any other part of

MR. ROBERTS: this Province will be bludgeoned or browbeaten or bribed by this crowd -

MR. NEARY: Blackmailed.

MR. ROBERTS: - or blackmailed, then they are wrong. If they really want to win the Strait of Belle Isle district, if they cared about the people down there - these are our fellow Newfoundlanders who are driving over roads that are not fit to be driven over, and yet, in other parts of the Island they are paving driveways and back roads. And yet, the main roads, they say, 'No money.' They say, 'No money,' and yet, Mr. Speaker, when you look at their expenditures, the pattern of expenditures, it is a deliberate, conscious plot, and they are all in it. Any man who does not object to it in the Cabinet, any man who puts up with it is stamped with the stigma. 'All that is necessary for evil to prevail is if good men do nothing.' My friend from Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) is not part of any deliberate, conscious plot but he stays silent, so he is stamped with the stigma; so is my friend from Ferryland (Mr. Power) and my friend from Gander (Mrs. Newhook) and my friend from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn). My friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is not allowed in the Cabinet so he is not stamped with the stigma.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only money that has been spent in the district other than the road to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Fischot.

MR. ROBERTS: Not the road to Fishchot.

MR. BAIRD: Roddickton.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the road to Roddickton is not in my district but I will talk about the Roddickton road if my friend wants. But the road that runs up North from Croque into St. Julien's, other than that one road which

April 22, 1983

Tape 1377

EC - 3

MR. ROBERTS: is simply completing a project
that was started by Bill Doody - to give him the credit,
Bill Doody did it.

MR. ROBERTS: He did not have to but he did it because he saw the need and he was honest and fair and man enough to do it. The only money spent was on federal/provincial projects and I say without any hesitation that the only reason those federal/provincial projects including the cross-country road to Roddickton, are there is because the Government of Canada and Bill Rompkey insisted on it, insisted on it. In fact the cross country road to Roddickton, the truth of the matter is, Sir, that the Government of Canada said to the government of the Province, 'Unless you accept money for the cross-country road there will be no money for anything on the transportation package this year. And there is a matter of \$17.5 million coming under that this year and part of it quite properly goes'.

The priorities are clear, The road to St. Lunaire / Griquet needs to be paved. We have not had a Highway's Minister with enough courage even to go in the area in the last three or four years, I think the last one to go there was my friend from Trinity North (Mr. Brett), he had the courage to go there.

MR. DINN: I was there.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. DINN: I was there.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) is not the Highway's Minister.

MR. DINN: I was at that time.

MR. ROBERTS: He was the Highway's Minister. I said the last three or four or five. I cannot keep up with the revolving door Cabinet, they go in and out, you know. But the present minister has declined a number of invitations. I hope he will come. Let him face the people, let him drive on the roads. You know, the road

MR. ROBERTS: is so bad now or was a fortnight past, that, Mr. Speaker, the people drove on the skidoo tracks. The skidoo trail made by skidoos going back and forth, kids and people playing around on the side of the main road, was better than the main road. There is no possible excuse for some money being spent.

The government this year are asking in these Estimates before this House now for a total of \$62.6 million for highway construction and road reconstruction - \$26 million of that is federal and the rest, \$36 million, is provincial. Now let them cut out something to meet the needs of that district.

MR. CARTER: How much do they want?

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) asks how much? Make a start, they are not going to finish it all at once, our Liberal government will finish it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, let them make a start, let them -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. ROBERTS: May I finish the sentence?

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not doing it by leave, I asked Your Honour if I could finish a sentence and Your Honour said I could. The sentence was, let the government treat all of the people in this Province with the same equality and the same even-handedness that they claim they want from the Government of Canada, and I agree they are entitled to it from the Government of Canada. Let them apply the same

April 22, 1983

Tape No. 1378

SD - 3

MR. ROBERTS: standards here; they have not
done so yet and the record stands and it confirms it.
Let them change it now, Sir, the people expect that,
the people deserve it, they are our own flesh and blood
after all.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNICHOLAS): The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I do not have a lot to add to this debate but I think the point should be made here and made quite clearly now that obviously the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) is no good. If he were any good he would go around - you get more flies with honey than with vinegar - he would go around to the various departments concerned, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Health and the various other departments and he would sit down with the various ministers and the officials - he knows all the officials, - in fact I think he had a hand in appointing some of them and he knows them all on a first name basis, he should go around and sit down and have a cup of coffee and get in with the deputy ministers and say, 'Now, do not be such a louse, give me what I want,' and I am sure that they would do as he requests. But it is high time that the people of the Strait of Belle Isle realized what a nothing they have in the form of a member and they should get rid of him. It is true that he perhaps raises the tone of the Opposition a little, because he comes from a good background, but, nevertheless that is not enough to justify him, sitting over there and being one of the eight. I think that he should turn over a new leaf and start being nice for a change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to concur with my three colleagues who have spoken on these matters either today or previously, on how the present administration is discriminating against people who live in Liberal districts

MR. NEARY: in this Province. There is no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker. My colleague from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) has taken the government to task, and my colleagues from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), and now I am going to state my case, Mr. Speaker, as far as my own district of LaPoile is concerned.

In 1975 the Tory administration in this Province promised the people in Grand Bay West, in Port aux Basques, that they would pave the road, they would reconstruct and pave the road to Grand Bay West - in 1975. That is eight years ago, Mr. Speaker. But because they dared to elect a Liberal in 1975 nothing has been done with that road. It is almost a three mile stretch of road from the Trans-Canada Highway to the community of Grand Bay West.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people who live in Port aux Basques and in Grand Bay West and in Cape Ray can look over in St. George's district, represented by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), and they can see country lanes being paved, they can see parking lots being paved

MR. NEARY: and they hear about parking lots to night clubs throughout the Province being paved. They can see every day they are driving by roads that lead to Summer cottages being paved in the minister's own district and not one dollar, Mr. Speaker, has been spent on that road in the way of reconstruction, preparing the road for paving. It is outrageous.

And the only reason it is happening, Mr. Speaker, is for the reason my colleague the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) just stated, the only reason is because the people are Liberal in that riding, in that district.

MR. HODDER: It is the same in my district.

MR. NEARY: The same in Port au Port, Mr. Speaker. But apart from that this administration is continuously whining about assistance from Ottawa. I was looking over the list of NEED projects, where funds have been allocated under the joint federal/provincial agreement and, Mr. Speaker, under the list of NEED projects all Tory districts, 90 per cent Tory districts.

MR. SIMMS: 90 per cent of the districts are Tory.

MR. NEARY: Oh, is that so?

MR. HODDER: Not in Port au Port.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman saying that the decisions then are made on Tory districts and not on need, not where the greatest need exist?

MR. SIMMS: Are they not?

MR. NEARY: No, they are not. They certainly are not. There is no reference to need at all.

MR. SIMMS: That is not what I said.

MR. NEARY: No, that is what I am saying, that is the inference the hon. gentleman is leaving.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what you can do about this kind of situation in between elections. I really do not know what we can do about it. Now, the hon. members will get up and they will say, oh, yes get a new member. Well, next week, when the House meets on Tuesday, I understand Monday is a holiday, I am going to bring in the correspondence that I have had on the road to Grand Bay West; I will bring in the correspondence and I will lay it on the table of this House, and then we will find out, Mr. Speaker, who is doing their job and who is not doing their job. I have written more letters about the road to Grand Bay West than anything else that I have ever written about since I have been in public life, and I will put the correspondence on the table of the House and if members are fair, when they hear me read it they will soon determine where the blame lies. The blame does not lie with any of the members on this side of the House I can guarantee you that. It is a deliberate plot, it is a deliberate policy on the part of the administration.

MR. TULK: That is the only one they have, the only policy they have.

MR. NEARY: That is the only policy they have. They know how to play the politics.

Mr. Speaker, it is a funny thing they sit over there day in and day out and tell us how pure and clean they are, what a decent administration, an administration of integrity and honesty. There was not an administration in the whole history of Newfoundland who had made more political appointments than this administration, who had pork barrelled more than this administration. It is immoral and obscene. What they have done, in at least the last three years, since the present Premier took over. It is

MR. NEARY: immoral and it is obscene

Mr. Speaker. We are getting near one o'clock, could I move the adjournment, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MARSHALL: No, Mr. Speaker, he has a couple of minutes.

MR. NEARY: No, but I can carry on beyond one, I still have time left. I can go until about seven minutes after one.

MR. MARSHALL: Who said so?

MR. NEARY: I said so, because - unless the hon. gentleman wants to reduce the ten minutes.

MR. TULK: He would like to do it.

MR. NEARY: He would like to do it, the hon. gentleman would like to muzzle the Opposition. But Mr, Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate, so the hon. gentleman can rise the House on time.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's hair is gone grey, I do not want him to lose it all so I will not set hin in a fit of apoplexy or whater it is.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Snow White And The Seven Dwarfs

MR. MARSHALL: Snow White And The Seven Dwarfs.

Mr. Speaker , I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M. and this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, April 26, at 3:00 P.M.