

VOL. 2

NO. 27

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.  
TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1983.

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please.

Before we begin today's proceedings, it is a distinct pleasure for me to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery today Dr. Wolfram, the Austrian Ambassador to Canada, who is visiting Newfoundland as part of her official visit to the Atlantic Provinces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker I wish to apprise this hon. House and provide details of the recent initiatives taken by the Government as it relates to the ongoing dispute between the Government and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. I have put together, for the benefit of hon. members opposite and all members on this side of the House, the last pieces of documentations starting with Friday's compromise proposal to the NTA, our statement during the week-end concerning it, and our statement of this morning, as well as a letter to the President of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association requesting that the new proposal that was put on the table on Friday be subjected to the vote of the membership of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. So I table that for hon. members, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know when this government is going to stop responding.

It seems to be a consistent method of this government to carry

MR. LUSH:

on negotiations in public, bargaining across the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, and calling press conferences before statements are presented to the House, calling a press conference and then coming and making the presentation to the members here. Mr. Speaker, it is a deplorable way to carry on negotiations and I certainly hope that this method of carrying on negotiations in public will cease and that the Premier will see to it that both sides are at the bargaining table Mr. Speaker, where these negotiations should be carried on. The NTA made a counteroffer to the Premier on the week-end that certainly should have provided basis for negotiations, but instead of that we still see the Premier carrying on games and making a real mockery out of the collective bargaining process. That is where it has to be resolved Mr. Speaker, at the bargaining table, and this is what we should do. This is the expeditious way to clear up this matter, it is the proper way to clear up this matter, it is the only peaceful and harmonious way to do it and that is to ensure that the full process of the collective bargaining act is applied in this particular case. These public negotiations, Mr. Speaker, are doing nothing other than aggravating feelings and making parents uneasy. Let us get down to the real nub of this, get students back to the school, the teachers back to the school by carrying out the full process of the collective bargaining act.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. It is indeed unfortunate that drastic action has been taken by the Conne River Micmac Band Council in an attempt to resolve a dispute with the provincial government over funding for projects in the Community. It is in fact, Mr. Speaker, a terrible condition. It seems to us that the provincial government has imposed terms and conditions that were not part of the original agreement signed by the provincial and the federal governments.

I would like to make one final appeal to the Premier and ask him would he review this matter quickly to determine if there would be any way out before a human life is lost?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the terms and conditions that are applied to the disbursement of funds was agreed upon by both levels of government. Both the federal and the provincial government agree on these terms and conditions because both governments have to live under terms and conditions, imposed by legislatures, that we must be accountable for the money that we spend.

This morning the minister and myself have been discussing the matter to see if we can resolve the situation and I understand that our officials now, through the minister's department, will be meeting with the representatives of the Conne River Band Council at four o'clock to further discuss the matter to see if we can resolve it. But for the hon. member to say that we are imposing unfair and unreasonable and unusual conditions on the disbursement of these funds is not true. Both governments

PREMIER PECKFORD: agree with these conditions. They are set down because government has a responsibility, to the hon. member and to this Legislature, to ensure that the monies that are spent are accounted for, and we do that for all funds that are disbursed in various programmes to various groups throughout the Province.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1981 there was an agreement signed between Canada and Newfoundland's Native people of Labrador and of the Conne River Band Council in Conne River and this agreement contained conditions attached to the disbursement of funds. Could I ask the Premier to lay upon the table of this House the extra conditions that the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has put to the disbursement of those funds?

MR. NEARY: Over and above what is in the agreement.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not see any problem in that, Mr. Speaker. We can provide that for the hon. member. I think it was last year there were certain funds spent in Conne River that were not spent according to the way they were supposed to be spent. I can see the hon. member getting up in this House, when an Auditor General's Report comes out lashing into the government, saying, 'How come you as a government did not protect legislatively the position of the taxpayer by insuring that these funds were spent wisely?' So the hon. member cannot have his cake and eat it too. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If the hon. member wants to see the additional conditions, no problem. These have been agreed to by the federal government as well as ourselves, and it is a method the government uses to protect itself so that we are responsible to this legislature. I mean, that is not too much to ask, that we must be responsible. Otherwise, as I say, the Leader of the Opposition could get up and accuse the government of mismanaging the taxpayers' funds. We do not want to be exposed to that accusation and we are trying in every place and every department to ensure that we are living up to the spirit and the letter of all the legislation that is in place to ensure that we are being accountable to the people of this Province.

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

MR.WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. I think this is the fifth day that we have eleven individuals on a hunger strike in this Province. They are on a hunger strike, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier cannot negotiate. That is the whole thing: He cannot negotiate with Ottawa, he cannot negotiate with the teachers and now he cannot negotiate with a small community in the Province.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr.Warren) is proceeding to make a speech. He should ask a question.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member had a question there.

MR.WARREN:

I am not finished. So, Mr. Speaker, the Premier cannot negotiate on anything. Apparently the Department of Rural Development is having a meeting at four o'clock this afternoon with this Band Council, Would the Premier personally take it upon himself to try to sit down and negotiate with a group of people in this Province? And if he does not he is going to be held responsible for any loss of life in this instance.

MR.SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well , Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can charge me with being responsible for whatever he likes. I am quite aware of what I am responsible for and what I am not, and I do not think that is normally the spirit in which the hon. member asks questions. The hon. member has been a very responsible member of this House and I am surprised that today he would make this kind of allegation personally against me or against any member of this House. I think it is unfortunate that the hon. member would take that kind of attitude today and I am sorry that he has so done.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as it comes to my personal negotiating ability or lack of it, I can only say to the hon. member that since 1979 this government has been successful in negotiating at the Long Harbour phosphorus plant to save the taxpayers of this Province \$140 million to \$150 million, we negotiated new power contracts with Bowaters and Abitibi-Price, and we negotiated new land tenure systems with Bowaters and Abitibi-Price people. The Mineral Act was changed. We negotiated with the mining companies, when I was Minister of Mines and Energy and since, a 400 per cent increase in the amount of mineral revenue that comes into the Treasury of this Province. So if the hon. member wants to try to make comparisons and there are not apples and apples, he can go right ahead but the parallel is there. As far as the offshore goes, Mr. Speaker, I stand by our position that this Province will not sell out the offshore oil and gas resources in the same way as Nova Scotia has done. We think we have a better case, we think that the same rules and regulations that apply to Alberta should apply to Newfoundland. We also believe it on hydro transmission, we also believe it on fishery. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not ashamed at all at the accusations that come to me either from the hon. member or from members of the NTA who try to accuse me on other matters to try to substantiate the issue that we are now in dispute with on them. I apologize to no one on that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know to whom I should direct this question now that the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) has returned the Premier is making statements on education and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has been on the periphery. So I do not know



MR. LUSH:                    who I should direct the question to, but we will give the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) an opportunity to make some comments,    We should inform him that nothing has changed since he has been away, we still have the government's new approach to negotiation by public negotiations. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made today by the Premier, I wonder if the minister can indicate just what he thinks this new approach by the Premier will now achieve this approach, Mr. Speaker, which is seeking to interfere with the internal operations of the NTA? So I wonder if the minister can comment upon how he thinks this new approach will expeditiously solve the teacher's dispute? Just what does he think the press conference this morning will achieve, Mr. Speaker, in terms of bringing the teacher dispute to an expeditious and satisfactory solution?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, not much has changed in the two weeks, the same old involved questions, but I think I got the nub of what the hon. member was trying to get at. Hopefully what it will achieve is this; the NTA is a union but it is also a professional organization and I know something about professional organizations. Members of professional organizations like to make up their own minds. They like to see the issues, they like to make decisions themselves. That is typical of professional organizations. So I hope that the initiative we took this morning will mean that the members of the NTA will study the new generous offer put forward by this government, these reasonable points we have put forward, and they will make up their own minds on it and then they will take a vote on it and tell their executive about their vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) whether he thinks instead of playing games, instead of trying to do through the back door what they cannot do through the front door, instead of interfering with the internal process of the NTA, whether it would not be better for the government to allow the NTA the full process of collective bargaining and grant binding arbitration which they have requested, Mr. Speaker? Would not the government be better advised to grant the NTA binding arbitration to settle this dispute, a procedure, a process which they have been requesting for months now?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we have groups in the public sector, public employees, who have binding arbitration. We have the fire fighters, we have the police and that mechanism is open to them. Now, of course, there is another aspect of those groups. They do not have the right to strike. Perhaps I could ask the hon. member is he suggesting that the NTA should have binding arbitration but should not have the right to strike?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not get the drift of what the minister was saying, I do not know whether anyone else did.

MR. LUSH: I do not know whether he was saying the teachers were not allowed the process of binding arbitration or whether they were. Nobody suggested that it was either/or, that they should be allowed binding arbitration or not allowed to strike. And I remind the minister this is not a strike - the minister was away and probably did not know - this is a teacher lockout. This is a lockout and not a strike.

The minister is probably not aware that some days ago in this House the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) did say that the teachers had the right to binding arbitration. Now is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) saying they do not have that right?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the hon. member read the Teachers' Collective Bargaining Act, and that Bargaining Act lays out what is a strike and what is not a strike - at least it lays out what is a strike. And the action taken by the teachers of this Province on the advice of the N.T.A. executive, I do not think many of the teachers of this Province knew this is what the Executive at the time was getting them into, but at least on the basis of what they voted on and what the N.T.A. Executive subsequently did, they, under the terms of that Act, did enter into a strike situation and there is no doubt about that. We have been very careful to get legal opinion that.

That legal opinion has not been seriously questioned, not in a way that it should be questioned if anybody had any real doubt about it, i.e., reference to the courts.

From our point of view, and we are quite convinced on this on the best grounds available to us, there is a strike situation at present

DR. COLLINS: involving the teachers of this Province, the members of the N.T.A.

Now on the question of binding arbitration, any group who requests of the employer, and the employer agrees, can have binding arbitration. Any two parties to a dispute, if both sides agree to binding arbitration they can have it. That is not confined to teachers; anyone in this Province can have that. The teachers can have binding arbitration if both sides agree to it. We have not agreed to it and we have given our reasons for not agreeing to binding arbitration. This is a matter

DR. COLLINS: that should be settled through the collective bargaining process. We have been attempting since last August to have it settled through the collective bargaining process. I would remind the hon. member that the negotiating process was terminated, and it was terminated in the most definitive manner you can terminate negotiations, that is by one side going on strike. And I would ask the hon. member to consider which side went on strike, in other words, which side terminated negotiations?

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it would appear that this government certainly do not want to solve this situation because the one avenue now open is binding arbitration and the minister, by his own admission, is saying that the government will not agree to it. They will not agree to it, they will not agree to a measure that will satisfactorily solve this dispute.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, my final question to the minister is: I wonder whether the minister has reckoned, since he has been back in the Province, how much money the Province has now saved as a result of this teacher dispute? My calculations come to somewhere around \$14 million. Can the minister verify that figure, whether it is close to the amount that has been saved since the teachers have been locked out by the government? I think it has been eleven days and from the best sources that I can get I calculate that to be around \$14 million which the Province has saved since this dispute started. Can the minister verify that figure?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in answering the hon. member's questions, it is difficult to know where to start he makes so many erroneous statements during the asking of the questions. There is not one way to terminate this dispute and the strike. There is more than one way and I have already indicated the best way, the best way from both sides of the fence -

MR. LUSH: What is that? I did not hear that.

DR. COLLINS: - is for professional people in the membership of the NTA to look at the proposal that government has put on the table, look at it dispassionately and sensibly, say, 'Is this a reasonable approach to take or is it not a reasonable approach to take?'

DR. COLLINS: each member looking at it and then having their say on what they see.

MR. LUSH: The contract should be reasonable.

DR. COLLINS: That is the best way and that is available. Now in regard to the saving of money, Mr. Speaker, when a group of workers voluntarily decide to go on strike, the employer clearly saves money. He does not have to pay these workers. This is not an unusual situation, one follows the other, it is a necessary thing that happens. We did not want to save money this way. We do not wish to save money this way. Clearly if we wanted to save money this way, which would be perfidious of us - we would never even dream of doing it - but if we wanted to do it we could have done it back in last August. We could have done it back October, last November, last January, last February. We would not have to wait until April to do it. So, I mean, what the hon. member is getting at is ridiculous of course. The point is that the money saved is not something that we wish to do. We want the students of this Province to continue their education. I am a parent, I think the hon. member is probably a parent; he like I, and all the parents in this Province, want our children back in the school, and the only people who can put those children back in school are the teachers of this Province who must look at the proposals we have on the table and determine if they are reasonable. If they feel themselves in the aggregate it is reasonable, our children can go back to school within a few days.

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

MR. NEARY: As a member of the Legislature and a parent with two kids in school, I am also very anxious to get the children back in school and get the teachers back in the classrooms. But the way the government is going about it, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that that is a long ways away.



MR. NEARY:

I think

the NTA President requested a blackout during any mediation or any negotiations that may take place, and I think that is a reasonable suggestion, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier agree that from now on when mediation and negotiations are taking place

MR. NEARY: there will be a news blackout placed on the mediation or these negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, right now, Mr. Speaker, there are not any negotiations, but we have been prepared right from the start to agree to not going public with the negotiations as they proceeded. It was the President of the NTA and others who began to announce positions and to take positions publicly, which obviously, as a government that is elected by the people, we then had a responsibility to respond to and to give our point of view. and I do not think we could be asked to do less. And when negotiations begin again we are quite prepared to accept any of those kinds of conditions. We believe as a matter of course that the only way negotiations can be successful is if there is a blackout and silence on the whole matter until the two parties have reached some kind of a resolution. But as the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) has said, I firmly believe that, you know, it is in the best interests of everybody now, and I think it is a responsible position for us to take, for the NTA leadership to put the proposal that we put on the table on Friday to the membership.

I honestly believe that some of the leadership of the NTA were hasty in responding. Within only a couple of hours they had responded to a significant departure in our position from what it had been up to then. On reflection I think a lot of people believe that perhaps they were a little hasty. If they had waited for a few more hours and consulted widely with their membership, I think the response that they would have given to government would have been much different and would have provided a basis on which we could have negotiated some kind of an agreement. But the negativism, the entrenched position

PREMIER PECKFORD: that was taken when they came back through the mediator, not only to reject outright the significant concession on substitute teachers but on the professional workload, you know, the way that they approached that, plus putting new items on the table that had not been there before, left very little room.

Now we can all go tit for tat, back and forth, but the bottom line of it is since all of this started, you know, that is the way it happened over the weekend.

So I think the appropriate mechanism now, so that there be no other drastic action, if the NTA wishes to change the position it took on the weekend and to resume negotiations with a blackout, fine and dandy, we are prepared at a moment's notice, at the drop of a hat to do that. But we also believe that we all must be responsible and so must the NTA negotiating committee and their executive. And I firmly believe that the time is ripe for it because I think they have achieved significant gains from the government since they began their strike.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

and since they began their demonstrations and so on. They have achieved, and successfully achieved, significant benefits and concessions from this government. Now I think the time is ripe, and we have put that on the table, for the leadership of the N.T.A., as the President of Treasury (Dr. Collins) says, to go to their membership. The mandate that they had at the beginning was a selective withdrawal of services which then was supposed to not involve a definition of a strike, and which subsequently did, and that is the only mandate they had. And, you know, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; I have to report to this House and I think that the leadership of the N.T.A. should report to their members, especially in light of the professionalism which the teachers of this Province show, and want to continue to show as part of their mandate of delivering educational services to the young people.

So, you know, I sincerely hope, both personally and on behalf of government, that the N.T.A. leadership will see fit to call for a free vote. If, of course, the leadership wants to make a recommendation as part of that vote, that is entirely up to them to do - to recommend rejection, to recommend acceptance, to make no recommendation. But I think it is time for the teachers of this Province to speak on a significant proposal that we put on the table. We did it consciously, and we were bitterly disappointed that within a couple of hours the leadership had seen fit to so negatively reject the package and to put new items, that had not been on the table before, on the table for the first time.

But as far as a blackout goes, we agreed with the Federation of Parent/Teachers Associations and Home and School Associations last week in going back to the table, blackout and all the rest of it. Our position

PREMIER PECKFORD: has been consistent on that. But my view right now is that we need to have from the professional teachers of this Province an indication of just where the membership stands on significant concessions already given. I am sure that the teachers of this Province, as well as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) understands that we have to negotiate next month with the nurses of this Province, we have to negotiate with thousands and thousands of employees, and whatever pattern is set in this set of negotiations will also be set for the other negotiations. You know, we have a responsibility to this House and to all the taxpayers of the Province to be fair and reasonable. We believe that at the present moment, as a result of our proposal on Friday, that we are being fair and reasonable in the approach that we are taking, given the economic realities of the time, and we stand by that, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.NEARY: A supplementary, Mr.Speaker.  
I would consider the hon. gentleman's answer a cowardly  
attack on the negotiating team for the NTA and an interference  
in the internal operations of the NTA. Mr. Speaker, the  
hon. gentleman got up and tried to play to the galleries,  
play his little games to the galleries. Let me ask the  
Minister of Justice (Mr.Ottenheimer) -

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.NEARY: I sat here in silence when  
the hon. Premier was just making that ridiculous statement  
he just made, trying to cause dissention in the ranks of  
the NTA, because that is what the hon. gentleman is doing.  
Last week the Minister of Justice undertook to examine  
the legal aspects of this dispute to determine whether it  
was a strike or a lockout. The hon. gentleman said he would  
get his legal advisers to take a second look. In view of  
the fact that the teachers are not violating their collective  
agreement, that the extra curricular activities that were  
suspended were not written in any collective agreement so  
therefore for all practical purposes it was a lockout because  
they had reported for work, they wanted to go to the classrooms  
and the school boards locked them out, has the hon. gentleman  
had his officials take a second look at this to determine  
whether it is indeed a lockout or a strike?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon.Minister of Justice.

MR.OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, there was no  
doubt in my view, and there is no doubt in the minds of the  
legal people who have reviewed it and whose duty it is to  
advise government, that the current action is a strike. There  
is no doubt in my mind on the legal question that  
it is a strike, and it is my understanding that that is not a  
matter in legal dispute. It might be a matter in polemics,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: but it is my understanding that the legal advisor, the solicitor of the NTA has advised his principals, the executive of the NTA, that it is legally a strike. So in my mind that is very definitive.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) we prepared to table in this House any documentation he has to substantiate, to back up what he just said? Obviously the hon. gentleman did not just discuss this matter with legal counsel in his department, no doubt he had the opinion in writing, so would the hon. minister table that opinion in this House so that we can see what authority they are using for the government calling this a strike and the teachers and everybody else calling it a lockout? And would the hon. gentleman also tell the House if his department has taken a look at the legal position of the teachers after the end of June? If the strike, for instance, lingers on until the end of June, when the Summer vacation starts, when the teachers are entitled to be paid, would the government not have to pay the teachers after the end of June? Has the hon. gentleman looked at that aspect of it? The schools are closed as of the end of June, and we hope that the dispute will be settled long before that, but in case it does drag on till the end of June, are not the teachers entitled to be paid during the three months of the Summer that they are off because their salaries are based over a twelve month period? Has he looked at that? Could he tell the House whether he has given advice to the

MR. NEARY:

Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) and, if so, would he tell us what that advice is? Because there is a feeling abroad that the teachers are entitled to be paid the end of June if the strike carries on that long.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I was certainly pleased to answer in a very clear and unequivocal matter the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) first question with respect to the legal status of the present action and state unequivocally that it is a strike. With respect to what opinion if any I have given the government in a possible hypothetical situation arising as of the end of June, number one, I think I would be precluded by the rules for answering a hypothetical question. You know, it is a matter of two months or more away and it would not be appropriate to answer a hypothetical question based on a hypothetical situation. Obviously, if one were to do that there are all kinds of series of hypothetical situations that could be put forward, so it would not be appropriate for me to do.

The hon. gentleman asked if I would table the legal opinion which either I have received or I have rendered, or whatever the case might be. The only reason I would refuse to do that would be on matter of principle. This matter is not a matter of legal dispute. As I say, it might be a matter of polemics, but every minister is accountable for the truth of what he says, and I know the hon. gentleman was not saying or implying that I was lying, but if every time I stated something I had to come in and prove it, then it would be as if I were misleading the House or not telling the truth and there were an onus on me all of the time to establish that I was telling the truth, and it is not just me, but any minister of



MR. OTTENHEIMER: government would be in the same situation. Any minister of government would almost acquiesce in the suggestion that unless he can prove that he is not misleading the House he is in fact misleading the House, and that is not a position that I wish to put myself or my colleagues in as a matter of principle. As I point out, I am not aware that this is a matter of legal dispute, it is my understanding that the solicitor of the NTA has advised his principals that legally it is a strike. I mean, that is not a matter of dispute. There has been no reference to the court to ask whether it is, and in my opinion everybody is agreed that it is a strike from the legal point of view, I know in polemics, in argument, people can argue back and forth and say it is a lockout or it is a this or a that, but strictly speaking, legally, I am not aware of any legal dispute on that particular matter.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister made a statement that he knows for a fact that legal counsel for the NTA is calling it a strike, is that what the hon. gentleman is saying? Has he seen the opinion of the lawyer for the NTA? And, Mr. Speaker, we are not accusing the hon. gentleman of anything, we are just merely asking to have the opinion tabled. First of all, let me ask the hon. gentleman if he does have an opinion in writing, and, if he does, we are asking to have the opinion tabled so that we can examine it to see what authority legal counsel in the Justice Department used for arriving at their conclusion. We think we are entitled to have that because after all the minister is acting in a dual capacity, he advises the

MR. NEARY: Cabinet as Attorney General and he also enforces the law in this Province as Minister of Justice. So as Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) we think that he should table this opinion in the House so that we can take it and have our lawyers examine it, not that we disbelieve the hon. gentleman, But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see an independent law firm called in to give an opinion on this. The hon. gentleman is asking his own servants, people who work for the government, who work for the minister, to give an opinion. Has the hon. gentleman thought about getting an independent opinion of lawyers on this particular matter? It is a very moot question, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, just a clarification, I did not say that I was sure, I said it was my understanding that the solicitor for the NTA had, in fact, advised the NTA executive that these actions -

MR. NEARY: What is it, gossip or just rumours or what?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - did constitute a strike. I said it was my understanding.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now the hon. gentleman says he would like to have an independent opinion. Obviously it is his prerogative to get an independent opinion, to get an additional opinion if he wants to -

MR. NEARY: That is your job as Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - that is anybody's prerogative -

MR. NEARY: Well, if you come over here and let me go over there, I will get one -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - the NTA or anybody. The hon. gentleman has a lawyer in his caucus. I am sure there are at least a few lawyers, a number of lawyers who are supporters of the hon. gentleman's Party. Anybody is entitled to get a legal opinion if they wish. And as I say, the hon. gentleman has a lawyer in his own caucus. So I am sure if he wanted an additional legal opinion there would be no difficulty to get one, They are not hard to come by.

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

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of seventy-three residents from the community of Paradise River, who are supporting the community of North West River in its effort to have the hospital there continue at the present status.

I happened to be reading the Grenfell Health Regional Services, March issue, concerning the clinic in Paradise River. It is a very small clinic, the population is about 100 and, of course, they send their people into North West River. They are rather concerned about the downgrading of the services. The petition says: 'We, the citizens of Paradise River, completely oppose the decision to downgrade the North West River Hospital to a clinic. Health services on the Labrador Coast are deteriorating every year and what is urgently needed is to improve them, not to make them worse. In addition, it is far too expensive for us to pay our way out of our own pocket to fly to St. Anthony or St. John's for hospital care, and this will, no doubt, be necessary more often if

MR. HISCOCK: North West River Hospital is closed. We fully support the Health Care Committee of North West River in their efforts to reverse this decision and call on all coastal residents to do the same.'

At the meeting that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) attended in North West River, the media brought to his attention letters that were written to the committee down there and to the members of the council, that no change would be made in the status of the hospital. In actual fact, a letter in 1981 signed by the present Premier also stated that no changes would be made. And if this is going to be the way, Mr. Speaker, that letters are going to

MR. HISCOCK: go out from Cabinet and from the Premier and are not going to be backed up by them, then obviously the people of this Province are going to lose faith in the leaders of the Province.

Seventy-three people feel that they need better health services in North West River instead of having to go to other areas. I support the continuation of the North West River hospital. Even though the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has said that it is going to close, they are now looking at the possibility of, through the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), having it operated as a chronic care unit. And, of course, I am sure that the Minister of Social Services will say no, there are sufficient chronic care facilities in the Paddon Home or in the hospital.

MR. HICKEY: How can you presume what I am going to say?

MR. HISCOCK: Well, we will soon see if the minister wants to rise and support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

The hon. the Minister of Social Services on a point of order.

MR. HICKEY: How dare the hon. member take the liberty of assuming what I am going to say or write next week. I know he is a very intelligent individual but he is not a mind reader. That is the problem with gentlemen over that way, they assume too much, methinks.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition to that point of order.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If my colleague hurt the hon. minister's feelings, then he is rather testy today. He should try to

MR. NEARY:                   restrain himself. That is not a point of order. The hon. gentleman is abusing the rules of the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):       The hon. the Minister of Social Services to that point of order.

MR. HICKEY:                   I was not a bit testy until my favourite sparring partner stood up. Now I am getting a bit testy, maybe. I was not a bit testy. I have a good relationship with the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER:                Order, please! There is no point of order.

                                  The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:                Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since we only have five minutes and people are getting up on points of order, I would have assumed that the Minister of Social Services would have waited until some other time to make his point.

                                  I support the residents of Paradise River and hope that the government will reconsider, particularly now that we have saved \$14 million from the teachers. Maybe we will be able to spend some of this money in keeping open our hospitals throughout the Province, not only in North West River.

                                  So, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and lay it upon the table of this House and ask that it be sent to the appropriate ministers and particularly, the Premier, who wrote them saying, yes, it will continue to remain in its present status.

                                  Thank you.

MR. HOUSE:                   Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the petition from the people of Paradise River.

As hon. members are aware, we had three petitions in the House of Assembly on Friday on the same matter.

In addressing the prayer of the petition, they are requesting, of course, that we not downgrade the health facilities and in some parts of the petition they are saying that if the North West River hospital is closed, people will have to go to St. Anthony and St. John's.

MR. HOUSE: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the services are going to be provided in Happy Valley/Goose Bay and their very own brief had stated that it has been ten years since it was recommended to close that particular institution in North West River, as an in-patient facility. I was there this weekend and I pointed out to the people that the efforts we are going to make now are to upgrade and provide more, more and better services. Because hon. members well know that North West River Hospital is some twenty-five miles on a paved road from the hospital in Goose Bay, and of course in the last ten years it has dropped down to 40 per cent occupancy and there is no surgery, a lot of the services that are going on there, by their own admission have been services that, of course, could be provided in a hostel, in some cases.

So, Mr. Speaker, in looking at this and I believe the people in Labrador themselves, in North West River, recognize that it would have to close as that kind of facility. They wanted to be assured that there would be hostels for people in transit, we gave them that assurance; they wanted to be assured of good service, the best possible service, and we gave them that assurance. This will not affect the Coast whatsoever. And the Coast of Labrador, Mr. Speaker, has double the number of people now than they had six years ago, delivering services to them. I believe it has gone from 23 to 46 people serving the people in health care on the Coast. So it is not being downgraded every year, Mr. Speaker, it is being upgraded yearly. I certainly will take the petition. And what they are looking for are better improved services and I guaranteed the people in North West River, and the people



MR. HOUSE: in Coastal Labrador that there would be improved services in the area serving the Coast and Goose Bay.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, last week we had three petitions from Labrador in support of the residents of North West River in their efforts to try and save their hospital there. And when I stood to support the petitions presented last week by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) I said then and I say again now that the decision recently rendered by this government in its budget a month ago, the decision to close down the hospital in North West River, is a callous act of a callous government.

In two successive years, in two successive budgets, last Spring and now this Spring, we see this government, without any prior consultation, quite the opposite, Mr. Speaker, we see a government writing letters to various and sundry organizations and individuals in towns like Whitbourne, and Markland and North West River, writing letters during election campaigns saying, "Before we make any decision regarding the facility in your town we will consult with you," and so on,

MR. CALLAN: and then that same government callously and unilaterally making a decision -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: Not even the member for the district -

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health on a point of order.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, last week I rose in my place when the hon. member was speaking on other petitions, and pointed out that he is supposed to support the petition.

MR. CALLAN: Did you?

MR. HOUSE: And to talk about the material allegations in the body of the petition. He is not supposed to enter into debate. It is stated clearly in the rules, he is not supposed to enter into debate. He is talking about a callous government closing hospitals and this sort of thing. It has nothing to do with the body of this particular petition. What he is supposed to be doing is pointing out how that is going to cause deterioration in health. And if he cannot do that, Mr. Speaker, he should not be speaking, because he is entering into the realm of debate now and that is clearly not allowed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue, to that point of order.

MR. CALLAN: The Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Speaker, is obviously smarting, the truth hurts. He cannot sit there and listen to it, so he gets up and lectures the Speaker on how to run the House of Assembly.

MR. CALLAN: Obviously, if I was out of order—it is the role of the Speaker to call members to order and not the Minister of Health (Mr. House).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: So there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

To that point of order, it is correct that when hon. members rise to speak to a petition their comments should be kept to the prayer of that petition. However, it is very difficult, perhaps, for the Chair to rule on the rule of relevancy. Having said all of that, the time has almost expired for the hon. member, and maybe he wishes to continue his remarks.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say once again that I concur with the voices of the people in Paradise River, eighty, ninety or one hundred people. Whether it is small or large is totally immaterial, but I concur with their concerns about having the medical facility removed from the town of North West River as this same government removed the facility from a town in my district last year, unilaterally. Not even the member for the district, a member of the Cabinet was aware, he said, that the facility was being removed. I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:(Russell)

The hon. member for

Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise

to present a petition on behalf of 207 residents of Cartwright who also support the community of North West River in wanting the North West River hospital to continue in its present status. Culturally Paradise River and Cartwright have used the North West River hospital. The Minister of Health (Mr. House) said before that surgery and other functions have not been taking place there for a while. The government has deliberately, deliberately down-graded the services of that hospital to the present status so that they can now say that the services can be provided at Happy Valley/Goose Bay. So, we have seen the down-grading of the hospital in North West River. We will see the downgrading in Placentia, in Buchans, in Botwood and Bell Island and Mr. Speaker, before this government's term is up these hospitals will also be closed and put into clinic form. This is one of the reasons why the government has set up a Royal Commission, to take the pressure off themselves and have the people on the Royal Commission bring in these recommendations, instead of having the intestinal fortitude to do it themselves.

The other thing I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 207 residents of Cartwright who have signed this petition, culturally they have gone back and forth to North West River; it is a community similar in size, with the same type of attitude.

MR. HISCOCK: and when the people go there they have many friends with whom they often stay, whereas if they go to Happy Valley/Goose Bay they will have to stay in a hotel, which is probably sixty dollars a night or so, and this will put an undue expense on relatives having to go there to visit their loved ones who are in the hospital.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen this government continually downgrade the health services in this Province, continually downgrade the education facilities. Anything that the previous Liberal administration of years ago did, Mr. Speaker, to build up -

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

MR. HISCOCK: - this government -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - Mr. Speaker, is tearing down -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - and if the people of this Province do not wake up, Mr. Speaker, anything -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to remind the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) that when an hon. member rises on a point of order it is the obligation of the Chair to recognize him and that the member speaking at that time is obligated to take his seat. I recognize the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House) on a point of order.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the reason for my point of order is that we have just ruled that there is no debate allowed in the presentation of a petition.

MR. HOUSE: The fact of the matter is, there are untruths being stated, there are things that are wrong being stated. I cannot get up when I go to speak on this particular petition and rebutt because it will be debate so, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member should be reading first of all the prayer of the petition. I do not know what to respond to, if I do respond. He has never read the prayer of the petition, I do not know what the people in Cartwright want. Mr. Speaker, all I am trying to do, I am not trying to be difficult, I am trying to point out it is not a time for debate or if it is, I would like to have the opportunity to debate also. But the other point is that I do not know what the petition is saying, so how can it be responded to?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order, the hon.  
the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Obviously I have hit a sensitive nerve.  
When the minister was down in North West River he got a  
welcome that he did not expect and as a result, Mr. Speaker,  
he is now trying to muzzle any form of presenting  
the facts. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. House)  
is a little bit testy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would remind all hon. members of  
our Standing Order 92 which says, "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." And  
I think our Standing Order is very clear as to the kind of presentation  
that an hon. member should make when presenting a petition.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition  
is rather brief and I did mention it before, that the community  
of Cartwright supports the community of North West River in  
having the decision to close the hospital and turn  
it into a clinic reversed. It was rather brief  
but it is to the point. And as I said, Mr. Speaker, the residents  
of Cartwright want to see this facility remain so that they  
can continue to have cultural ties with North West River.  
But as I also stated, Mr. Speaker, we in this Province  
seeing a continual downgrading of services and I would go so far  
as to say that within the next couple of years we will see  
extra billing in this Province, people going to a  
hospital having to pay more money. They are paying for their  
beds now.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 3, Concurrence Debate, Government Services.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order 3, Concurrence Debate, Government Services Committee.

The debate, as I understand it, last day was adjourned by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who has approximately three minutes left to finish up his remarks.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I only have three minutes left so there is not much I can say except that I am becoming increasingly concerned about the doubts that are being created as to the possibility of Hibernia being put into production in the next twenty years. We are hearing statements from various and sundry people, because of the oil glut in the world and because of the decline in the world price of oil, that Hibernia is not as attractive as it used to be and the possibility of it getting into production in the next ten years is very unlikely, indeed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, apart from the fact that the administration blew it when they put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeal Court, when they took the resource and said to the three judges in the Newfoundland Appeal Court, 'You decide the future of this resource,' apart from that probably being the biggest blunder in Newfoundland history, while all this was going on, with the delays and the procrastination on the part of the administration dragging out the exploration and drilling and getting ready for production, while they were



MR. NEARY:                                 delaying that, Mr. Speaker.  
the price of oil was dropping and there was an oil glut  
in the world.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:                             Mr. Speaker, it is probably  
a point of information to the hon. gentleman. I will not  
hesitate to enter into debate with him at any time he  
wishes to with respect to Hiberina and our assertion of  
our jurisdiction and our attempts to get justice and  
equity from that resource, but what is now before the  
Chair, Your Honour, is the Concurrence Motion on the  
Government Services Committee, What is before this House  
now is the matter of the Government Services Committee  
Estimates that were considered - the Department of  
Finance, the Department of Municipal Affairs, the  
Department of Transportation and the other departments  
involved, but the Department of Mines and Energy was  
involved in Resource Committee. So the hon. gentleman  
is really talking about another order and I do not know  
whether he realizes it or not.

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

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

MR. NEARY:                                 I realize what I am saying,  
Mr. Speaker. We are talking about Finance, we are talking  
about Labour and Manpower, we are talking about jobs,  
we are talking about increased revenue to try to balance  
the budget and to reduce the deficit. So what I was  
leading up to, Mr. Speaker, was that these delays would  
not create any badly needed jobs for the unemployed in this  
Province and it would not generate any new business or

MR. NEARY: any new revenue for the Province, all as a result of the procrastination and the delay on the part of the hon. gentleman and the administration that he supports.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is correct that we are doing Government Services Estimates Committee, and the hon. member should refer his remarks to the different Heads under the Government Services Committees.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, as I said there when I was speaking to the point of order -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Is that the way the House goes now, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I thought that at least somebody on the government side would stand because we usually alternate from one side to the other, I do not know why, but there are not many left over there, I realize, out of the forty-four, but at least there must be somebody over there who could stand and try to give some accounting for government's actions. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) is there and that, of course, is one of the departments which fall under Government Services. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not here, I do not know where he is, but perhaps I can take a minute, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the Department of Transportation as I did last week. I referred to the Department of Transportation last week and the secretive way in which public funds are dispersed by this government. I asked, in the Committee, the Minister of Transportation to table a list of capital works programmes: Where in this Province will pavement

MR. CALLAN: be provided? Will it be provided for the town of Hillview in my district, or in Markland, or Northwest Brook or Hodge's Cove? Where?

Over the weekend, Mr. Speaker, I heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) announcing \$500,000 for his district.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear.  
Bonavista South. Well-deserving people out there.

MR. CALLAN: Every year, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Fisheries does, and I have warned especially the newer members in the backbenches on the government side, I warned them, you watch the Minister of Fisheries,

MR. CALLAN: even if the government brought down a zero budget in the Department of Finance, no money at all to be spent on new capital works programmes in the Department of Transportation, even if the government did that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would get \$500,000 or \$1 million for his district, by hook or by crook he would get it.

MR. MORGAN: A bigger vote in the next election.

MR. CALLAN: You see what happens, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) does, he goes out and he makes a public announcement that he has got \$500,000 for his district, and then he comes back to Cabinet and Cabinet says, "How come you did it? You know that you are not getting any." "Well, now that I have made the announcement you will have to give it to me." You see this is what he does. I do not know how else he does it. But I would say that is what he does. He holds the Cabinet up to ransom. He has done it before, Mr. Speaker. The former Premier, Premier Moores, was held up to ransom by this very same minister. You know, if you do not do this, or if you do not do that I am going to tell all - a deep, dark secret that this minister holds over his own Cabinet of which he is a member, and over his own party of which he is a member.

But, Mr. Speaker, so much for that. As I said, last week I discovered that the district of St. Mary's-The Capes will be obtaining, this year, approximately \$1 million for road work -

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear! A good member.

MR. CALLAN: - and I would say as I said last week, Mr. Speaker, jolly good for them. They well deserve it. Because I know that in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes there are approximately 150 miles of dirt road, Not so in the district of Bonavista South, Mr. Speaker, not so there. And even

MR. CALLAN: in Bonavista South,  
Mr. Speaker, if the people there were getting very important stretches of highway upgraded and paved, even there I would concur and I would agree. But that district, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MORGAN: - Bonavista South.

That is unfair.

MR. CALLAN: - which is represented by probably the most arrogant member of the Cabinet, and the minister who cons the Cabinet into giving him some money because of the way that he does it -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you agree with the way that he does it.

MR. CALLAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree. Of the 2,000 miles of unpaved roads in this Province I am certain that on a priority list this road in Bonavista South is well down towards the bottom of the heap. There are other and more important stretches of highway that should be done with the limited finances that this government has in the Department of Transportation this year.

But, Mr. Speaker, another department that comes under Government Services is the Department of Finance. The government has now saved approximately \$15 million over the past eleven days,

MR. CALLAN:

has saved approximately \$15 million. The question that is obvious at this time, Mr. Speaker, is what does government intend to do with this windfall that they have, thanks to their treatment of the teachers in this Province? They have a \$15 million windfall, will any of that money be put into roads, will it be put into the Department of Municipal Affairs to provide water and sewer for the many towns that need it around this Province, including some in the district of Bellevue? But, Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition was saying before he was interrupted, just now, actually, on a point of order, what this concurrence debate is all about is the finances of the Province, the Department of Finance. Mr. Speaker, if we had had an offshore oil agreement signed two months ago, or better still two years ago, but even if we had it two days ago or two months ago, this Province, Mr. Speaker, would be a lot, an awful lot better off financially; there would not have to be the cutbacks that we have in the Department of Health in health services to the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that the reason that people in this Province are not marching in the streets and protesting in every possible way is because a large majority of the people out there do not realize how much this Province is losing because of this very, very long delay in a negotiated settlement with Ottawa. People do not realize the kind of activity that would be created if the deal were signed, say, tomorrow. That is why, Mr. Speaker, in conversations with some of my colleagues, some of my colleagues suggest that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), a former minister in the Cabinet of the present administration, who negotiated the ERCO deal and who was on his way to negotiating a good deal with Ottawa before he resigned because he could not do it the way he wanted to because the Premier stopped him from doing so, some of my colleagues suggest that

MR. CALLAN: if the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) were to cross the House he would make a good addition to this Opposition and to this side of the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree, I do not think that it would be a good thing for the member for Mount Scio to come across on this side of the House at all. Because, Mr. Speaker, I would say that if anybody

MR. CALLAN: is letting down this Province any more than are the Premier and his colleagues, if anybody else is letting down this Province any more, it would have to be the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). You see, the member for Mount Scio cannot have it both ways. He cannot just subtly and every now and then, perhaps once a month or once a week or whatever just kind of suggest, you know, that 'I am the Prince-in-Waiting and the present Premier is doing things all wrong.' But as long as he just sits on the fence and does not break totally with his party, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Mount Scio is doing more harm to this Province than even the Premier is doing, and God knows what harm is being inflicted by the Premier and his colleagues. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if the member for Mount Scio is going to be taking the odd flick at the Premier and the administration in which he is a backbencher, then he should do it one way or the other, either totally break off and say - because it was a month ago, I believe, or less, that the member for Mount Scio was at the university suggesting that he knew how to negotiate a deal with Ottawa, he had the answer. Well, why does not the member for Mount Scio ask the Premier, go to the Premier and ask to be admitted back into the Cabinet so that the Premier can delegate him that duty, or do one of two things or one of a half a dozen things, Mr. Speaker? But he cannot just sit there, coming here perhaps one week saying something to embarrass the government and then waiting another month. And, of course, meanwhile the Province is just drifting on with no compass and no course. And then the member for Mount Scio expects that in two years time when the Premier calls a leadership convention, he is going to march right into it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Scio should be reminded that the people of



MR. CALLAN: this Province will probably not forget that he should have spoken out two years ago. In 1985 or whenever it is that he hopes to become the new Premier or the new Leader of the P.C. Party is not the time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will continue later on.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: If none of my colleagues are going to rise, I will spare the Assembly from having to listen to three Liberals consecutively.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just spoken touched a very, very relevant point but he did not really come to grips with the problem. He used the superficial observation that if we had a negotiated agreement our financial position would be better. What a superficial statement to make! I would agree with him, if we had a negotiated agreement - well, we had a negotiated agreement, Mr. Speaker, an agreement in principle

MR. MARSHALL: that was concluded between this government and Mr. Chretien the past December and January this year. If that agreement was in fact delivered, as we still await its delivery, we would indeed have been on the road towards a better financial situation than we have at the present time.

But on the other end of the stream, if we had a negotiated settlement that was going to give us an agreement such as the agreement that has been signed with the Province of Nova Scotia, which is the only one that the federal government is prepared to give to this Province, we would not, in fact, be in a better financial position. As a matter of fact, on the balance, when you weigh the pros and the cons of it, in the near short time we would be, in fact, in a worse financial position than we are in today, because we would have to provide for all of the infrastructural costs and we would have to bear all of the additional attendant costs which would come with development, without the wherewithal or the means to bear those costs. We would end up in a position where further increases in salaries would be unable to be entertained, where we would have to look at further cuts in education, health, and social services and what have you.

So that is the situation. The hon. gentleman can get up like some of his colleagues and very superficially say from time to time - it sounds like motherhood, and it sounds so great to say - if we had a negotiated settlement we would be in a better financial position, or similarly like motherhood is saying, that there should be negotiations - I am talking in relation to the offshore. Without going into the history of what transpired or the substantive positions, then, you know, that is what they do. I am quite sure that the hon. gentlemen there opposite would enter into,

MR. MARSHALL: and would enter into very, very quickly any kind of an agreement that was put before them, just to sign an agreement. They did that once before, at one other stage in our history, with respect to the Upper Churchill, and we saw what has happened in the long-term on that; we are subjected to pressures that the hon. gentlemen there opposite would not allow themselves to be subjected to in the short-term, with respect to the Upper Churchill case, we are subjected to pressures now, but we are certainly not going to bend to those pressures because we know what the long-term problems will be with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are considering here the passage of the Committee 's report, concurring in the Committee's report that considered certain departments which are styled as Government Services Departments; they involve the Department of Finance, the Department of Public Works and Services, the Department of Municipal Affairs, and the Department of Transportation , there is another one as well, on all by which Committee deliberations have been held and have shown that by and large there departments had been administered within a very reasonable, efficient and effective fashion.

MR. MARSHALL:

Because I can talk about Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker, I am going to have just a few words relevant to Municipal Affairs insofar as it pertains to a controversy that has come up recently with respect to the parking garage enquiry in the City of St. John's. Now, I speak of this and I am going to pass my opinion on it because I am a sitting member for the City of St. John's and I want to respond to it.

I do not want to get into the interplays between the various councillors with respect to that report, and neither do I want to get into the comments that have been made as to the length of time and the cost of the report, that is something else. But I would like to point out from my own point of view, as a member for the city of St. John's, Mr. Speaker, that the councillor who originally initiated this enquiry, Councillor Wells, at the time made certain statements with respect to the cost of the garage, and as a result of this there was an enquiry that had occurred. The commission conducted its enquiry and made its findings, As I say, there are various things I will not comment on such as the cost, the length of time, or the interplay now between the councillors. But I wish to observe—because I know it is a pretty lonely world when somebody gets up and asks for an enquiry. I remember when I was in Opposition myself, for example, if I can digress for just a moment, having gotten up in this House when there were only four or five members on the other side, and said that there should be an enquiry into the cost of the piece of land over at Holiday Inns. There was a certain contractor then who had in those days - I will not name him because those days are gone now, but the only way to conduct business was to be very friendly in a very real sense

April 26, 1983

Tape No. 1404

NM - 2

MR. MARSHALL: with the government of the day.  
And I remember at that time pointing out irrefutable proof  
of the fact that the property was bought from that entity  
at then exorbitant rates. I

MR. MARSHALL: was greeted at the time by a commission. This was the way government dealt with it at the time. If you were in opposition and you made a statement that prickled them, they had a royal commission set up and that royal commission held its hearings, enquired into the statements, it filed its report and the government sat on it for a year, never filed the report, itself. When there was a change of government we filed it, and it bore out every single thing I said. But I remember it was a very lonely road to go at that particular time, because people were enquiring as to whether you were right, and it appeared that you had your neck on the line and what have you. In that case it was borne out. And that is why I get up and I speak today with respect to this matter - one of the reasons - because there is no doubt, from that parking garage report, that the positions that were taken by the councillor who asked for that report were in fact borne out. And I do not feel that that councillor needs - it is not my province to get up and protect one councillor or another, he is quite capable of protecting himself but as far as I am concerned, that particular councillor's position was borne out and I do not particularly think that he deserves the criticisms which he has been subjected to through various quarters, shall we say, publicly, as a result of it. In actual fact he made a statement, an enquiry was made - in a little bit different circumstances, it was not thrust on him, he asked for it - and the enquiry actually bore him out. And, now, whatever the council do with it - they can do whatever they wish, that is their prerogative - I do not think it needs to be taken from the point of view of saying, 'Look, this is going to be put on the back burner, the commission should never have been held in the first place.' I doubt very much whether those particular statements would have, in fact, been made if Councillor Wells had not, in fact, been borne out.

MR. MARSHALL: In other words, if it was shown that the cost was reasonable and what have you, you would not have gotten statements made to that effect.

So I just want to associate myself with the position because I realize, particularly from the reports that are coming out, that what Councillor Wells is experiencing now might appear to be a little bit of a lonely world. But the fact of the matter is he made a statement, there was a report, it took a long time for the commission to bring in the report, that was no fault of him and maybe no fault of the commission, but he was borne out, Mr. Speaker, and I want to point that out. I want to point out, also that because there might be a cozy little clique or what have you in the small, little City of St. John's we do not want to embarrass people or anything else - we are talking about people being involved in matters of public trust and discharging their public duties - that

MR. MARSHALL: we should not just merely, because we are members of a little club, how are you, just merely put the report on the shelf and dust it off from time to time. The report was conclusive, there was no indication in the report that there was any wrongdoing or anything like that, but surely to heavens when there has been such a large amount of extra expenditure involved, I do not think that the appropriate course is to say you are just going to put it on the shelf in City Council where it can draw dust. There obviously were problems, if you read the report, with respect to administration that increased the cost, with respect to approach, with respect to dealing with private contractors at the time. We are told that these problems have now been corrected. Hopefully, they have been, but I think that they deserve to be examined in light of the report which the council commissioned itself and which was conducted by a very well respected and very impartial chairman, the former Chief Magistrate of the Province of Newfoundland, former Magistrate Hugh O'Neil.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to, if I could, under this heading in the concurrence debates, talk about the Transportation Department which, I understand, is one of the headings that we are discussing. I would like to, perhaps, look at it in relation to some of the things that were said this year in the Throne Speech and the contradictory way that propaganda by this government is being handled. In real practice what is happening in the Department of Transportation is not at all related to the kinds of things that were being said in the Throne Speech.



MR.TULK: But before I do that, Mr. Speaker, before I get into that aspect of Transportation and that aspect of the Throne Speech, I would like to congratulate the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) on an excellent speech, the ten minute speech that he just gave. I am sure he will be back at it again. I would also like to comment on something, perhaps, that he said about the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry).

MR. HOUSE: Do you agree with him?

MR.TULK: Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the member for Mount Scio there may be two or three ways of looking at just what it is the member for Mount Scio is trying to do. My friend from Bellevue suggests that he is having it both ways, that one day he is criticizing the government and the next day he is with them. I think I should suggest to the member for Bellevue, and we would have to have a discussion on this, obviously, and there is no doubt that we will if ever the need arises, but I would have to suggest to the member for Bellevue that perhaps what is happening is that the member for Mount Scio is finding it increasingly frustrating to sit on that side of the House. The government will probably, as they have done with just about everyone else in this Province, will probably force him to break ranks with them. And I know, being the member that he is, that he probably sees them at certain times as doing things that are contrary to the very principles that he believes in. He may be trying at this point in time to make the biggest political decision of his life, that is whether he is going to

MR. TULK:

stay with the government or leave it. He may believe also that he was elected as a P.C. - I do not know what the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) believes - he may believe that he was elected as a P.C. and should stay as a P.C. With regard to a number of people talking about him leaving the government, I think it would be a wise decision for the member for Mount Scio indeed to leave the government. A lot of people in this Province are now saying that he should -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: - that he should perhaps sit as an Independent in this Province or perhaps even join another party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that he would be credible in any party and I know that on this side of the House, in spite of what the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) says - and I am sure the member for Bellevue would agree with this - that if he decided at some point that he wanted to join another party in this Province, we would certainly have to have a discussion on this side of the House about that.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) over there.

MR. TULK: Now, there is a member in this House that we will not have, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). If that is one of the conditions of the member for Mount Scio coming over, I am sorry, the member for Mount Scio is going to have to stay over there because we are just not going to downgrade this party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: We are not going to downgrade this party with the member for Burin - Placentia West, no doubt.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, to come back to the Throne Speech, the things that were said in the Throne Speech and the things that are now being said in concurrence and the kinds of answers that you get in Estimates Committees in this House, I will, if I might - I know I do not have much time but I will, if I might, just quote from the Throne Speech a quote that was made, I suppose printed by the Premier - it sounds like him - and put in the mouth of His Honour in this House. It says, "My government views with deep concern the substantial drop in federal funds being used in this Province to assist in developing the infrastructure essential for growth and prosperity." Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House share that same kind of feeling. If you apply that principle to Newfoundland as it pertains to the federal government, if the federal government is not giving enough funds to certain parts of this Province, then certainly I think it is fair to say, as my friend from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) said, and rightly so, and as my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) clearly stated the other day, I think it is very clear that if you are of a certain political stripe in this Province, if you cannot be blackmailed as the government tried to do with Bellevue in a by-election in which the member for Bellevue

MR. TULK:

was re-elected, if you cannot be blackmailed into voting for this government, then the word 'equality' that the Premier keeps throwing around does not apply, it only applies if you see things the way that the Premier sees them.

He also goes on to say in the Throne Speech that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians know that the lifeblood and very essence of this Province is our rural personality. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a good philosophy again but what happens in practice? What happened in my district this year with the Department of Transportation? What happened to the people in Labrador with transportation this year? Well, we saw the people of Fogo Island paying seventeen cents a pound for airfreight. For every pound of freight that went to Fogo Island this year by air they paid seventeen cents a pound more, subsidy. In other words, a block of margarine went up seventeen cents a pound, probably more than that. A grapefruit - I think my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) can verify whether I am right or wrong - in Labrador this Winter went from - was it thirty-six cents to \$1.23 a pound?

MR. WARREN: One dollar and twenty-eight cents.

MR. TULK: One dollar and twenty-eight cents a pound. As a result of the transportation system.

MR. WARREN: Each.

MR. TULK: Each! That is each. One grapefruit went from thirty-six cents a pound to \$1.28 a pound as a result of the transportation system that is in place in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: One grapefruit, you do not sell grapefruit by the pound.

MR. TULK: One grapefruit, you do not sell grapefruit - according to the hon. gentleman's education you do not sell grapefruit by the pound, you sell them one,

MR. TULK: two, three, four, five, six  
or whatever you want. Have you got that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is  
equality, that is the type of equality that the Premier  
of this Province is proud of talking about. That is  
exactly it, that is what he sees.

Mr. Speaker, if we wanted to  
we could look at, too, the kind of thing that is now  
going on with the teachers. The same kind of thing comes  
through in the Estimates Committees, it comes through in  
this House, that if you do not agree with this Premier,  
if you do not see things the way that he sees them,  
then you are treated as an inferior. And that is it  
exactly, Mr. Speaker. I believe that if you look at  
all of the issues in transportation, in problems that  
we may have with the federal government, in problems  
that we may have with municipalities, in problems that  
we have with the teachers, in problems that we have  
with the trade unions, I think that is exactly the  
problem that we are having, that you are seeing people  
who are as equal as the Premier and his government,  
you are seeing them react to being treated as inferiors.  
That is exactly, I believe, the central issue in the  
teachers' strike or the teachers' lockout.

MR. TULK:

I consider it to be a lockout.

It does not matter how you define it, the fact is that our schools are closed and they are closed as a result of the attitude of this government. This government has treated teachers as inferior.

The Premier said to them, his negotiating team said to them - the government has a choice, either they have to stand up and call the negotiating team of the NTA liars, or they have to stand up and admit that what they say is true. The negotiating team from the government side said, "You really do not have the confidence of the teachers, you really do not have anything, so you take what we say or you take nothing." That is the problem, Mr. Speaker, that is the problem with equality in transportation.

To come back again to my own district, the Premier has told them in no uncertain terms that because you elected a Liberal you cannot have what you should have. You cannot have what you should have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is he talking about? Is he talking about developing this Province or is he talking about playing really little, childish political games? Mr. Speaker, if you look at Fogo Island you are looking at one of the outstanding organizations in this Province in the form of the Fogo Island Co-operative, one of the outstanding organizations in this Province, and yet, Mr. Speaker, today they are pulling fish over twenty miles of gravel road and that has come about as a result of a change in the ferry schedule. And I sat in Committee with the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), we held up the Committee for six hours because we were asking the minister to produce a list of what his road work was going to be in this Province this year. I kept asking him, When will you give a commitment to the people of Fogo Island that you are going to pave that

MR. TULK: road? He cannot give any commitment. He does not know how much money he has got. He does not know what he is going to do this year. He does not know whether he is going to do a mile of road or ten. Yet, Mr. Speaker, that same group of people this year produced 16 million pounds of fish, \$30 million, new dollars, not old dollars, not dollars they were playing around with, new dollars for the Canadian economy. And the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) stands in this House and talks about the quality of fish. Those same people on Fogo Island have their own quality control programme in place but what happens Mr. Speaker, when you take that fish and drive it over twenty miles of gravel road? What happens to it? Well, we know, the quality decreases substantially. And yet, as I have said, the Province chooses to ignore the transportation system of that Island.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): member's time has elapsed.

Order, please! The hon.

Affairs.

The hon. Minister of Municipal

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, first of all, in addressing the Budget estimates in my department I do wish to emphasize that our government in its effort to assist the municipalities of this Province has one of the most generous grants and subsidy systems in the whole of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: And, Mr. Speaker, you will note from the estimates that our government this year will be paying out something like \$68 million in grants and subsidies.

And I would also at this time like to make a comparison. If we were to go back, say, eleven years or twelve, maybe, no, further back than that, and we were to look at the amount of subsidies paid out by the Department of Municipal Affairs, by the government, it was at that time \$1.7 million. If we look at that same figure today, Mr. Speaker, we are now paying out, just eleven years later, \$21 million in subsidies. And this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress, has been during the administration of the P.C. Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, it is also very significant to note that today we have somewhere near three-quarters of our municipalities with water and/or sewer wholly or in part or in the process, and the larger part of this progress has taken place during the past ten years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just for a minute or so may I just say a few words about the grant system in my department. I think everyone is aware, all of the members in this hon. House are aware that every municipality receives a general municipal assistance grant, and this grant is made up of three components; One is the population component, the second is a social assistance component, and the third is a road mileage component, and we pay out \$3,200 per mile



April 26, 1983

Tape 1410

PK - 2

MRS. NEWHOOK:

municipality.

of every local road in every

Then, of course, there is the tax incentive grant. Now, this is an additional grant which is payable to our municipalities which have the property

MRS. NEWHOOK:

tax in place and it matches a percentage of every dollar of revenue collected, including grants in lieu of taxes.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have, in addition, a street paving and construction grant and this grant is on a cost shared basis, where the government pays out 60 per cent of the cost and the municipality has to find the other 40 per cent.

Also, we have a fire fighting grant and this programme is designed for the purpose of fire fighting equipment, whereby our government pays 75 per cent of the fire fighting equipment and the municipality is required to pay 25 per cent.

Another 75/25 cost sharing programme that we have is for the provision of new garbage disposal sites and there, again, my department pays out 75 per cent for new sites. Also, it can be extended to equipment and other things in connection with garbage disposal sites.

And, Mr. Speaker, I could talk about other grants, such as the recreation grant which is distributed to municipalities for municipal and regional stadiums.

And also we have a preliminary engineering studies grant related to proposed municipal projects and feasibility studies, and we have this grant which is distributed amongst municipalities in our Province year after year.

And we also have an emergencies assistance grant. And, Mr. Speaker, this is provided to all municipalities regardless. If they are PC or Liberal or whatever they might be, every municipality that is in financial need, a need that they cannot cope with, a need that they have not provided for in their budgets, something extraordinary, we have this emergency fund and it is, like I say, distributed

MRS. NEWHOOK: on a need basis regardless of what the colour code of the municipality might be.

MR. HODDER: We are a colour code?

MRS. NEWHOOK: Well, I mean red or blue.

MR. HODDER: It was my understanding that green was Tory.

MR. DINN: No, green is NDP, envy.

MR. TULK: No, no. Green is Tory.

MR. DINN: Red is Liberal.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that apart from 311 municipalities our department is also responsible, through our water community services, for the provision of requested services to forty local service districts. And these local service districts have been established for the purpose of providing some services to unincorporated areas such as water, maybe some sewer, garbage collection, fire protection, and it could be street lighting, but just a number of services.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Also, we are responsible for funding forty-six of the old water and sewerage disposal committees. These were set up a number of years ago and because they are incorporated, of course, they are still eligible for funding under our community water services programme.

Our department maintains thirty-nine industrial water systems servicing mainly fishplants but, of course, some of them do supply water to municipalities as well.

Mr. Speaker, I do take issue with some of our members in the Opposition who feel that the Liberal districts are being discriminated against with regard to capital projects. I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we do try to provide money on a need basis and we also try to continue systems that are in the ground and where we have a lot of infrastructure underneath the ground and no services are operating. So we try to continue on these systems until we do get some connections, some hookups from that particular service.

MR. HODDER: Are you going to table your list?

MRS. NEWHOOK: Naturally.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, with \$127 million worth of requests from municipalities and since the great majority of these are from our forty-four P.C. districts, it is only natural, of course, with only eight Liberal districts that there is not as much money going into those eight as is going into the other forty-four. But, Mr. Speaker, if we were, say, to look at the Liberal districts with regard to capital projects: Let us take Eagle River. Now, the municipalities in Eagle River are 90/10 funds. I am not going to take credit for all of the money that is going to be spent in

MRS. NEWHOOK: Eagle River. I am just saying that in Eagle River this year there are plans to spend something like \$5 million to \$6 million in water and sewer projects, of which our government provides 10 per cent and my department implements the programmes. And not only that, we have to provide that money up front and it is not until the projects are near completion that we are refunded the federal government share. So we do have to provide for

MRS. NEWHOOK:

these monies in our budgets, Mr. Speaker. Then, of course, we have the other part of Labrador where water and sewer in the main is provided through the Native People's Agreement.

MR. NEARY: 90 per cent again.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Yes. I admit that. And I am very happy. I am happy that the federal government is providing that 90 per cent.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please! A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member is speaking in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and has been subjected to continual harrassment and rude interruptions, as well as being against the rules, by the two members there opposite, particularly the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), and I think that if they cannot observe the rules of common politeness and decency they should be called to order.

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

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order. The hon. minister can handle herself, Mr. Speaker, and we were interrupting with a couple of very pertinent questions and the minister was answering. And I do not think the minister was answering to the satisfaction of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), that is why he got upset and got up on this point of order. The minister was being too honest and too straightforward for the hon. gentleman who has a buttoned-down mind. So I would submit, Mr. Speaker, we agree that the rules say that every member has a right to be heard in silence but in every parliament in the world, Mr. Speaker, certain interruptions are allowed, especially if the questions are pertinent to the topic under discussion.

MR. TOBIN: You had a different tune when we were interrupting you.

MR. NEARY: No, but you are rude.

MR. TOBIN: And you are ignorant.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please! To that point of order there is no point of order, but the hon. minister is entitled to be heard in silence.

The hon. minister's time has now elapsed.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I have to observe that two of my colleagues who spoke earlier in this concurrence debate made some very interesting comments. As a matter of fact, they expressed opposite points of view concerning the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). I was rather startled, taken back, to hear the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) say that the hon. gentleman would not be welcome because the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are fed up with people crossing the House. And then he went on to give various other reasons as to why he would be opposed to the member for Mount Scio joining the Liberal caucus. And then I was further surprised to hear the view of the -

MR. TULK: President of the Party.

MR. NEARY: - President of the Party, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) who said that he would welcome the member for Mount Scio, I believe, with open arms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is rather interesting, to hear the opposing viewpoints on the member for Mount Scio. I do not know how the vote would go but if that is any indication, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that the caucus would be divided.

MR. NEARY: But if I was in the position, first of all I would have to say to my two colleagues that the very first thing that has to happen is that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) has to make up his own mind. He has to make up his mind, Mr. Speaker. But I was rather



MR. NEARY:

interested in hearing their comments and I am sure that hon. members must have been surprised to hear the opposite points of view - there are two viewpoints.

I must say that I learned something new in the House today when I heard my two colleagues comment on the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) -

MR. TOBIN:

Now tell us about Basil Power.

Tell us about his letter.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman

has not taken his course in good manners yet, I see.

Mr. Speaker, the question that I want to put to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)-he is not in his seat, but it has to do with the Premier's apartment. As hon. members know the taxpayers of this Province are paying \$10,800 a year for an apartment for the Premier. The first time in our history, the first time, to my knowledge, that it has happened anywhere in Canada, it is just not done anywhere outside of Newfoundland, where we shamed the Premier into leaving Mount Scio house, that beautiful palace up there in the Garden of Eden and then he left there and asked the Treasury Board to approve an apartment for him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to know under what authority did the government rent an apartment for the Premier? And I would like to know where in the estimates, I have gone through the estimates with a fine tooth comb, I would like to know where in the estimates money is allocated to pay for the Premier's apartment?

I hope the Minister of Finance is listening to me or the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), who has not been in his seat for the last

MR. NEARY: couple of days. I notice that the attendance on the government side of the House today is very, very poor indeed. I could have called a quorum anytime I wanted to this afternoon.

MR. TULK: Demoralized they are.

MR. NEARY: They seem to be demoralized, they are hardly fit to live with in the House these days, they are testy, they are jumpy and irritable and it is a job to keep them in their seats, Mr. Speaker. The next thing we are going to have to get are seatbelts, because it is up to the government members to keep a quorum in this House.

MR. TULK: Tell them the definition of seatbelts.

MR. NEARY: I thought we made seatbelts compulsory in this Province, Mr. Speaker. Do we have to make seatbelts compulsory for the government members? Because it is up to the government to maintain a quorum in this House and not the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to my question to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and I hope the minister will come in now when I take my seat, if he is listening, and tell me where I can find the money for the Premier's apartment in the estimates? If it is lumped in with something else, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that that is illegal. Because the Cabinet or Treasury Board may have given the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) the authority to rent office space for government employees, Mr. Speaker, but if Treasury Board authorized the Minister of Public Works to rent an apartment for the Premier, then that is a horse of a different color, that is a different matter, that has to be listed as a separate item in the

April 26, 1983

Tape No. 1414

JV - 3

MR. NEARY: estimates, otherwise there is  
no authority for it. I am asking the Minister of Finance  
(Dr. Collins) now to give me the authority for

MR. NEARY: paying for an apartment for the Premier, the first time in the history of Newfoundland. Where can I find in the estimates the money that is allocated to pay for this apartment? The people of this Province have a right to know, Mr. Speaker. They have a right to know. I am willing to take my seat if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) wants to come in and provide me with the answer, or any other hon. gentleman. We are now doing estimates, we have a right to know where taxpayer money is being spent, how it is being spent, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: Tell us about Roaches Line.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I could tell the hon. gentleman about Roaches Line. A gift, that was a gift that the former Premier gave to the people of this Province, a gift.

MR. TOBIN: How many acres of land?

MR. CARTER: Where did he get it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said, 'Where did he get it?' If I were the hon. gentleman instead of asking a question like that, if I were the hon. gentleman I would go down in the Registry Office, as I have done, and do a search, and if he does not know how to do a search himself get somebody to show him how to do a search, I would gladly let him have my secretary, do a search and he will get the answer. But the hon. gentleman in his simplicity should not ask leading questions, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. gentleman may be embarrassed in his simplicity.

MR. TOBIN: How many acres of land?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is the question that I would like to see answered. You know, I could ask for a quorum call, I suppose, while I am waiting for the Minister of Finance to come back and give me the answer, but if the hon. gentleman would just come to his seat I would not ask for a quorum call. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to know and the people want to know where this money is covered up

MR. NEARY:

in the estimates, in the Budget?

I have not been able to find it. It is probably in there somewhere, it is camouflaged, it is covered up under some other vote. They cannot lump it in with rental of office space. It is not office space, it is sleeping quarters. It is a private apartment paid for by the taxpayers' of this Province. And Mr. Speaker, we have every right to have all the details of where that vote is in the estimates? I am still waiting for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), he is back from Florida. The old red rooster is back. We heard him again this morning insulting the teachers, making provocative statements about the teachers dispute and again last night. The old red rooster cannot resist trying to intimidate the teachers, Mr. Speaker. I still say though, as bad as he is, that if the Premier had stayed out of the negotiations and left it up to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) or the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) or the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) even, that we might have had an agreement by now, if the Premier had not stuck his nose

MR. NEARY:

into it. Because we know what the weakness is on the part of the Premier, we know he has a great character weakness. The weak point is that he is a very poor administrator and he cannot negotiate, he cannot negotiate with anybody.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. Minister of Labour

and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand upon what the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) was saying with respect to grants to municipalities and certain provisions for different municipalities in the Province. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting when one hears public comment by mayors and councillors in the Province about the different grant structures that are available to them through Municipal Affairs. It is not very often pointed out the amount of dollars that goes out to different municipalities. And today, because I am not only Minister of Labour and Manpower and a member of the government but a member for Pleasantville, I would like to go through some of the provisions that have been made by the minister with respect to the city of St. John's, because I do not think we are very often made aware of the amounts of dollars that go out from just one department in government with respect to the capital city, the city of St. John's.

Now for the

hon. member's benefit, with respect to rental accommodations, Public Works and Services has some \$5 million in there for rentals and I am sure when the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) was at the committee he provided that answer, no problem for the hon. member if he had attended that committee. So, you know, that is a

MR. DINN: bit of a dead issue. But I would just like to go through if I could some of the grants and some of the different provisions that have been made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) over the past few years with respect to the city of St. John's, because it is not often made public and probably today through this Government Services debate we can get some of the provisions out. And I will just go back a few years, say 1976, when some \$11,760,000 was provided to the city. I do not know if hon. members realize it, but over the past five or six or seven years in the city of St. John's we went through several crisis. One, hon. members will remember, was the fact that the capital city of Newfoundland and Labrador ran short of water when there was not enough water provided by Windsor Lake to supply the city. They had the capability of something like 15 million or 16 million gallons per day but that was not enough to provide the city with the capability of providing water in the city. And we had, for example, decrees by the city council and a special board that was set up that you were not allowed to water lawns or you were not allowed to use excessive water, you were not allowed to leave you taps running and that kind of thing. It happened somewhere around 1975. The Summer of 1975 was a particularly difficult year with respect to water in the city of St. John's. An agreement at that point in time was reached with the federal government whereby some \$38 million was provided for the city of St. John's and area - it provides water now to the town of Mount Pearl and is providing water to the town of Paradise, but some \$38 million was provided through a programme developed between the federal and provincial governments to provide \$38 million for the Bay Bulls Big Pond water system in the city of St. John's.

MR.DINN: That is just one item. If we want to look at the main sewer systems in the city of St. John's, one can look at the Rennie's River trunk sewer system, the Waterford Valley relief trunk sewer system, the Northeast trunk sewer system, the Pleasantville trunk sewer system and so on. By the way, Mr. Speaker, for your information, a lot of the overflow from the Northeast of St. John's went into Quidi Vidi Lake and that became a very, very polluted lake over the years. One system in particular came off the former Pepperrell Air Force Base down there, the North Atlantic supply division for the US Air Force, and it did not have the capacity to handle the sewer from the Northeast that flowed into that system, so we put in a new system. As a matter of fact, I think hon. members would be amazed at what has been done in the city with respect to sewers, for example, a hugh tunnel that comes from the head of the lake right through underneath the penitentiary and down to Temperance Street at a cost of about \$7 million, just for that one item. So there has been about \$50 million in sewer systems and trunk sewers, there has been \$38 million for the regional water system and, of course, that was just for the system and did not include the piping that would supply water to Mount Pearl and the ongoing provisions that are made by the minister to supply water to the town of Paradise. So I think we should reflect every one in a while on what things the government is providing, as it should, for the capital city of Newfoundland and Labrador, the city of St. John's. Now just in reviewing, I took a little time between different sets of negotiations and that kind of thing to try to find out what basically has been provided to the city of St. John's. I think hon. members should be aware that whilst the city members



MR. DINN: do not get a lot of credit for the work that they do, like Your Honour, they spend quite considerable amounts of time in attempting to find out what the needs of the city are and attempting to impress upon the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook) those needs and indeed to get some of those needs satisfied. There was an area in the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) district on the Southside of the city of St. John's which lacked a water system and the provincial government went on a 50/50 programme to supply water to the Southside of the city of St. John's. The need was identified, there was a problem over there of pollution -

MR. CALLAN: And we cannot get one thing for Bellevue.

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) now is interrupting again, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that at that point in time there was a programme whereby very little revenues came back from

MR. DINN: from municipalities with respect to paying for water and sewer systems. The Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation basically financed the systems and in most years the Minister of Municipal Affairs made grants available to pay off the debt of the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation. That was not the way that the Southside was financed; it was financed 50 per cent dollars, cash on the barrel head from the city and 50 per cent from the Province. As a matter of fact, I am sure that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) tomorrow, with her 310 municipalities in the Province, would welcome a programme whereby she would only have to pay half of the water and sewer systems that she puts in in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. But that was a deal that was worked out, it is now in place and it works, and the people on the Southside of the City of St. John's are relatively happy with that system.

But, Mr. Speaker, just to go through a couple of the past years, you know, before 1978 in this Province the City of St. John's got no capital grant whatsoever from the provincial government.

MR. CALLAN: (Inaudible) in 1971.

MR. DINN: Well, in 1971 the City of St. John's got nothing from the former, former government only a lot of abuse from the former, former administration.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to talk about pork barrelling, if he wants to reflect back to 1968 and talk about pork barrelling, the only thing the City of St. John's got from that administration when that party was in power was abuse, 'the dirty merchants.' All you could hear was the papers were no good, the people were no good.

MR. CALLAN: Oh, come on!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that is true. It is

MR. DINN: in Hansard. I can pick up a book and relay to the hon. member what was said about the people and the council in the City of St. John's, but right now that is not the case. There is a great attempt to treat St. John's as fairly as we treat other municipalities. They do not get as much in grants. The hon. minister would tell the hon. House that, for example, on a dollar for dollar basis the City of St. John's gets forty-five cents on the dollar up to \$2 million, and after that gets twenty cents on the dollar for every dollar that they collect in revenue. So there is a little bit of discrepancy there but the City of St. John's does not complain much in that if the people of the City of St. John's knew of all the things that are provided just through that one department headed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) who, I am happy to say, is probably one of the best if not the best Minister of Municipal Affairs ever, and I say

MR. DINN: that, knowing that I was the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: So the minister can take that as a compliment or whatever way she wants to take it. But the city of St. John's, for example, in 1982 - 1983 will receive \$6,947,920 in various grants and subsidies: in lieu of motor taxes, for example, \$10,000; Bowring Park \$10,000; Mundy Pond Urban Renewal debt charges \$128,915; Mundy Pond NIP debt charges \$99,000; Rennie's River trunk sewer - as I said earlier, that debt has to be paid off now and that is paid at the rate of \$89,615 for just this year alone; the Avalon Arena debt charges \$24,724; paving this year, principal and interest, \$336,252; Fort Amherst water and sewer system -

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

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe I will take it up a little later on because I think people should know.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I am some proud his time is up. The barrage of figures that was coming across there was enough to turn your head.

Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to reply to some of the comments that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) made. I want to say right off that I believe that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, unlike many of the ministers on that side of the House, means well. I think she tries to do a good job. It is unfortunate that she is burdened by the government

MR. TULK: of which she is a part and for which she has to share some of the responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the minister started off to say that the capital works projects of her department are determined by need, and then went on to say in the most illogical fashion possible that really since you had forty-four Tory districts - I believe she used the word 'Tory', I am not sure, she could have used the word P.C. - that since you had forty-four Tory districts versus eight Liberal districts, it is obvious that they should get more, Mr. Speaker, and that they should get the lion's share of what was in the budget. Now, how do you connect that with a claim that her projects are portioned according to the need of a district?

Mr. Speaker, I would tell the minister that what she has really said and what her government really said is that need is determined according not to the need of the people in the area but according to whether indeed you are a Tory district or whether you are a Liberal district.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to hear the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) lay out the criteria by which she apportions capital works projects in this Province, and I would love to hear her tell that to the people in my district, particular in places such as Clarke's Head, Davidsville, Gander Bay South, Main Point, Carmanville, Ladle Cove, Aspen Cove and Fogo,

MR. TULK: where you can no longer get a permit to build a house because of the sewerage problems that are on that Island. Two years or three years ago it was found that indeed 75 per cent of the water, I believe - the minister can correct me if I am wrong - 75 per cent of the water that the people in Fogo, for example, were drinking was probably contaminated. I would like for the minister to tell the people of the town of Fogo that indeed she is proportioning the capital works of her department according to the needs of the people.

I would love for her to tell the people of Joe Batt's Arm, Mr. Speaker, that she is doing that and tell it to the people of Stagg Harbour, Island Harbour and, indeed, in Tilting. In Tilting I understand - I have never seen the written correspondence but I believe it to be correct because I have no reason to doubt the Community Council and the people who serve on the Council in Tilting; a good P.C. place, by the way - that they were promised by this government that indeed their problems with water and sewer would be taken care of. Mr. Speaker, they are still sitting in Tilting today waiting for that problem to be solved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come back again to a theme that I have used in this House, and I want to use it for the minister in particular in relation to what she has said in her few words. Because, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell her and I want to keep telling this government - and we have to keep telling this government in the hope that it will eventually get through their heads - that when you put dollars into a place like Fogo Island, like Musgrave Harbour, like Carmanville and so on, you are putting dollars into a place where people should be encouraged to live rather than discouraged. Mr. Speaker, this government does not do that.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister is completely wrong, is completely off track when she says that our capital works projects are apportioned according to need. I would also like for the minister, if we have time in this Concurrence Debate - and I know she will do this; unlike the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) I know she is going to do it - I would also like for her to tell us when she is going to table in this House the list of capital works projects for this year. I believe this minister will do it, unlike the Minister of Transportation who probably has the biggest pork barrelling department in the government, the minister who moved, for example, \$4 million out of Bonavista North into his own district, blamed it on the Management Committee, and then told us in the Estimates Committee that we will have to wait for a new agreement in order to get that brought back into Bonavista North. That is what he told us and that is what he did to one of his own members.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also make a comment on the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), who I think he was perplexed by the fact that the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and myself were debating the merits of having the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) cross this House. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I believe I could convince the Leader of the Opposition, and perhaps even the member for Bellevue, into saying that, yes, indeed we should do that, that we should allow the member for Mount Scio to cross this House.

MR. NEARY: He has to make up his mind.

MR. TULK: Indeed he has got to make up his mind. I agree with the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) on that point. But I can tell the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) what is in store for him if he keeps doing this kind of thing to the Premier and to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) on the other side, I can tell him what is going to happen if he keeps standing up in the House, because the most thing that I heard this weekend, Mr. Speaker, in my own district when I talked to people was, "Did you see the look on the President of the Council's face and the Minister of Justice's (Mr. Ottenheimer) , when the member for Mount Scio was standing up asking a question about the Conne River Indian Band?"

MR. NEARY: They were shocked.

MR. TULK: Did you see the look on their faces? Now, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member for Mount Scio exactly what is going to happen if he keeps going after the government like that. They will give him the flick.

MR. WARREN: Now they will not.

MR. TULK: They will not?

MR. WARREN: No. No way.

MR. TULK: I think it is quite possible that they might. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, I feel about as arrogant as the Premier, I feel I could convince my colleagues that indeed the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) might be welcome in this party.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are the president of the party so you have to work that out.

MR. TULK: No, no. We do things over here in a democratic way. We would discuss the issue.

MR. NEARY: I wish you would drop that subject. Will you drop it? Forget it!



MR. TULK: You have not made up your mind?  
Okay.

MR. NEARY: Drop the subject. No tales  
out of school.

MR. TULK: No, I will not tell any tales,  
I will drop it. In any case, Mr. Speaker, let me move on to a  
question that concerns forestry. I suppose the President of  
the Council (Mr. Marshall) might jump on his feet and try to  
get me ruled out of order, but before I raise it, let me  
give him a word of explanation. I asked the question of the  
Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) and was  
consequently referred to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins),  
and since we are doing the Finance Department I suppose the  
question would therefore be relevant.

It concerns the Forest Land  
Management and Taxation Act, the question that I asked last  
year in the Estimates Committee. I think it came out of the  
Auditor General's Report for the year ending 31st. of March  
1981. I asked the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands  
if indeed he had collected the taxes that, according to  
the Auditor General, were due to the government under the  
Forest Lands and Management Taxation Act from Abitibi-Price  
because of their mismanagement of what? How many acres?  
I mean, it was some hundreds of acres that were being mismanaged.  
The Auditor General said it had been proven conclusively  
by the minister's own department that it had been mismanaged  
and that therefore they should pay the land tax on that  
unmanaged portion of their block. The minister did not give  
an answer last year. I asked him again this year in Committee  
if indeed he could now give me the answer. He promised, I think,  
to give it to me last year but did not give it. I asked  
him again this year if he could now give it to me - and I thank

MR. TULK: him for that - I subsequently received a letter from him referring me to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), so I would like for the Minister of Finance to answer the question.

MR. NEARY: He has not been in his seat for the last hour.

MR. TULK: Wherever he has gone he was here a minute ago.

MR. NEARY: Gone back to Florida.

MR. TULK: Here a minute ago and flicked off out in the sun again, I suppose. The sun must have come out or something and he had to go out. But I would like to ask the

MR. TULK: Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)  
if indeed he has collected that tax from Abitibi-Price for the way they are treating the forest of this Province. I would also like to know from the Minister of Finance if it is his responsibility to revoke their certificate of managed land which they have.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is a question that I would like for the Minister of Finance to answer if he is around somewhere in the vicinity of the House, or perhaps the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) can answer it. Mr. Speaker, the President of the Council is always the first to stand up in this House and tell the Opposition that they should ask very meaningful questions.

MR. MARSHALL: What question?

MR. TULK: If he was not listening, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it for him in a minute. But he is always standing up in this House asking the Opposition to ask meaningful questions about the Estimates and about the Auditor General's Report and so on. Well now, Mr. Speaker, it is a very clear-cut question that I have already asked to a minister of the Crown, namely the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), and have now been referred to the Minister of Finance. I am wondering if somebody can answer it.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, there are a few points that should be made in this debate and before I get to the serious part of it I think I should deal with some of the allegations that members from this side may be crossing over to the other side. It must be dreadful for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to realize that there is nothing that he can do that would enable him

MR. CARTER: to cross to this side. There is one possible exception; if he were to agree to go out and hang himself then perhaps we would admit him to this side posthumously but then, of course, that would defeat the whole purpose. But there is absolutely nothing he can do - he could bend over backwards, he could agree to destroy all his records, he could agree to apologize to all the people he has blackened over the years, he could agree to repudiate all the things that his former, former leader has done, he could and should, I think, apologize to the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) whom he so treacherously knifed in the leadership campaign - but even if he did all of that there is nothing that he could do for our side, or for any party, I would think, to accept him. So it must come as a great point of displeasure, a great point of dissatisfaction to him.

Now while we are on the cost of government services, the Opposition office, Mr. Speaker, is something that I think should be looked at very, very carefully. Now all members, all private members and all government members, have an almost unlimited right to use the telephone and I think they do it pretty responsibly. Many of them come from distant districts and their needs to keep in touch with their district mean that they have to use the telephones constantly, and also, of course, every call is a long distance call. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition abuse that privilege and I would like to see their telephone bills laid on the table of this House so that a committee of this House could scrutinize them.

MR. NEARY: Scrutinize the bills of all the members.

MR. CARTER: Yes, I am sure that our side would not mind but we will see what will happen. I think we should scrutinize very carefully the cost of running the Opposition office because I well remember, when our party was in opposition, we were given a vote of \$10,000 a year and that had to pay for everything; it had to pay for secretarial staff, it had to pay for telephones, it had to pay for any travel that was necessary for the Leader of the Opposition to do. That \$10,000 was all that we got, Starvation! I realize that money went a little further in those days so we are not really talking about oranges and oranges, rather oranges and apples, but, still and all, even making allowance for inflation, it was a pitifully small sum when you consider what an opposition is supposed to do. And now the opposition gets all the money it wants and I think it wastes it. But anyway that is only a very small percentage, I suppose, of the total budget.

Opposition members have been asking constantly throughout this debate why they get so little done in their district, why every department that they approach does so little for them, and whereas they feel that there is a glaring inconsistency here in the amount of government money spent in government districts is so much greater. But, Mr. Speaker, put yourself in a minister's position; supposing you were a minister or a deputy minister of some department and a peremptory knock comes at your door and you are greeted with one

MR. CARTER: of the apparitions opposite, how are you going to react? If the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) comes, the first thing you would hear from members of your department is some comment that the eagle has landed, but if the incredible Tulk comes in and you are a deputy minister you may well say, 'Well, Mr. Tulk, when did you last visit your district?' because I understand that he never goes to his district, or very seldom. In fact, there are some members of his district that doubt that he exists, I understand.

AN HON. MEMBER: It only seems that way.

MR. CARTER: Well, you know, I have very few illusions left but one of my illusions is the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). But, anyway, that is the problem, Mr. Speaker; the members of the Opposition I think enrage and antagonize the various government departments. And also, of course, the government departments know that there is no way of satisfying them. Anything they do give them they will be spat upon, they will not be thanked, they will just be abused further, so I do not think there is anything they can do. Those are a few points I would like to leave open for the debate. On the Opposition office, I would like to see a close examination of their expenses and the amount of money that comes in, and I think it would be very instructive.

MR. MARSHALL: And a psychiatric examination of the member.

MR. CARTER: Yes, while we are at it we might have

MR. CARTER:

a psychiatric examination of the hon. members. You never know what new diseases might turn up, new conditions.

Anyway, I am just about finished. I would like you to respond to that because some of the points I have made have been serious even though they may be presented in a light hearted way. So, we will let it go at that.

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

The time for the debate on this report has now expired.

On motion, that the report of the Government Services Committee be concurred in, carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Before I call the next order of business, just so we can be quite clear, I intended to call the Budget Debate immediately after the Concurrence Debate, but at the request of the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) last Friday -

MR. NEARY:

Is this a point of order?

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, I am just asking the hon. gentleman there opposite a question now.

- at the request of the member for Port au Port last Friday I agreed from the Government side that we would forego Private Members' Day tomorrow because the hon. gentleman, I understood, wanted to lead off the debate, to hold the debate today and Wednesday, and he had to go out of town on Thursday. So it was arranged in the spirit of co-operation. He is not here now. If he is going to be here tomorrow, I would be prepared to ask the House if they would like to adjourn and begin the Budget Debate tomorrow. If not, I would like direction, because this is the course of the business that was mapped, in a spirit of co-operation, with the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, while it may be true that my hon. friend was attempting to accommodate our spokesman on Finance, the fact of the matter is that our spokesman on Finance is not here - he is on some very, very important business - he will not be here tomorrow, and I would hope that the House will proceed as usual, that tomorrow will be Private Members' Day

MR. MARSHALL: We agreed that it would be a government day tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman can call whatever order of business he wants.

MR. MARSHALL: When, tomorrow?

MR. NEARY: Today.

MR. MARSHALL: What about tomorrow?

MR. NEARY: No, tomorrow is Private Members' Day.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will call the business, but I will give the hon. gentlemen there opposite notice as well that there will be no more co-operation or deals we will go exactly by the Standing Orders. What I was doing was being done entirely for the purpose of accommodating the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and had agreed with him with respect to it and also agreed with Private Members' Day. So I just want to put it on record the way in which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is responding and say that we will go by the rules, but we will go by the rules completely all the way through.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move the order with respect to the Budget Debate, Committee of Ways and Means, Motion 1.

On motion, the House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.



COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Motion 1.

The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, and  
I regret to hear the hon. gentleman stand in his place  
and threaten the Opposition. There were no deals.

MR. MARSHALL: There was a deal.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, there were no  
deals.

MR. MARSHALL: Ask the member for Port au Port.

MR. WARREN: Yes, lay it on the table in  
writing.

MR. NEARY: My colleague did indeed -  
I am just confirming what the hon. gentleman said - my  
colleague did indeed ask the Government House Leader  
(Mr. Marshall) to accommodate him, which the Government  
House Leader agreed to do, but the fact of the matter is  
my colleague is not here so we just revert to business  
as usual.

MR. MARSHALL: We will do everything at your  
convenience then.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, neither does  
the hon. gentleman run this House.

MR. MARSHALL: We will see the sincerity of  
the Opposition tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: Well, we will see the sincerity  
of the Opposition anytime. We will put our honesty and  
integrity and sincerity up against the hon. gentleman any  
day in the week, any second of the day.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no  
breaking of any faith, of any agreement. My colleague is  
not here, he is on very, very important business. He

MR. NEARY: will not be here tomorrow  
and he may not be here all week.

So when my colleague did not turn up, that was it. We just go back to business as usual. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) can threaten us all he wants. We have certain protection under the rules of this House and the hon. gentleman can get up and he can try to bully the Speaker, he can attempt to bully the Opposition but it will not work, Mr. Speaker. We have been subjected to that kind of misuse and abuse of power before. We have witnessed the arrogance of this administration, Mr. Speaker. We know that the hon. gentleman is going for a short session of the House, that is obvious. The course that the hon. gentleman has the House set on now, I would say that the House will be closed before the middle of May, once the Budget Speech concludes. And they cannot close the House until we are finished with the Budget Speech. If they could, Mr. Speaker, the House would be closed today. They have to call the Budget Speech, that is why it is being called today. It is not to accommodate anybody. It is being called because the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman wants to force the Opposition into the budget speech to get it over with. We can only move one amendment to the budget speech, a vote of non-confidence in the administration, and that will be done in due course, and after that, Mr. Speaker, I would say by mid-May, there will not be a gig left in the House; by mid-May she will be as dead as a dodo because they cannot stand the pressure, they cannot stand the criticism, they cannot stand to see the teachers in the gallery every day, they cannot stand to see the Micmac Indians and the construction workers and the unemployed and the other people. We have had, Mr. Speaker, this year, I would say, record attendance in the galleries. It is too bad we do not have record attendance for the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Collins). This is one of the hon. gentleman's five rare visits to the House, but we have record attendance in the galleries, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, if the confrontation policy of the administration has done nothing else, it has filled up the galleries every day for at least the Oral Question Period.

DR. COLLINS: It is the people's House.

MR. NEARY: It is the people's House and I am delighted to see them here. Every night I leave this House and I go home I am swamped with phone calls, and my colleagues are finding the same thing, because people who sit in the galleries call and say they never witnessed anything like it in their lives, the childishness and the negative attitude and the arrogance of the members of the administration. They have never seen anything like it.

Mr. Speaker, now we know the real reason why they will not allow live broadcast

MR. NEARY: of the daily proceedings of the House of Assembly. We know they will not allow it because then the people of Newfoundland would see the arrogance and the attitude of this administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of the Budget Debate. I do not intend to take too long in this debate unless I am provoked by the hon. gentlemen there opposite. I intend to make a short speech. But, Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the process hon. members will not attempt to intimidate me or provoke me because as hon. members know I am quite capable of carrying on for a week or ten days if I want to. As hon. gentlemen there

MR. NEARY:

opposite are very anxious to get out of this House. This will be one of the shortest sessions, I would say, of the House of Assembly on record. We will have very little legislation once the Budget Speech is finished. There may be one of two pieces of legislation but, generally speaking, once the Budget Speech is finished you can mark it down that the House will adjourn until some time this Fall, Mr. Speaker, and legislation will be left until the Fall of the year. That is the way I see it now. I do not think that there is any way we can prolong this session of the House. There are only eight of us in Opposition and we have done our duty. My colleagues have worked hard during this session of the House. They have worked hard both inside and outside of the House and they are to be commended, Mr. Speaker, for the remarkable job, the commendable job, that they have done so far in this session of the House.

For the last week, I suppose, ten days or longer, ten or eleven days, my colleague the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has managed successfully and very skillfully and very responsibly to keep the teachers' dispute before the House, before the people of this Province and I want to congratulate him for the fine job that he has done, Mr. Speaker, in that regard.

My colleagues to my right and left have asked very penetrating questions of the administration. Unfortunately the answers are not forthcoming. Every day we have questions on the Order Paper. We are not getting very many answers from the administration. They are only answering questions that they do not think are embarrassing to them. And so my

MR. NEARY: colleagues, Mr. Speaker,  
as hard as they have worked in this session of the House,  
are prepared to stay here until Christmas if needed  
to help resolve the difficulties and the problems that  
are confronting the people of this Province. It is too  
bad the administration does not feel the same way.  
We have discussed in caucus, my colleagues and myself,  
and I have put it to them and they have raised it themselves,  
what happens after the Budget Speech has ended. I said,  
"Well, the scenario so far seems to be that they want  
to get all the essential things done because they cannot  
close the House until the Estimates are passed and the  
Budget Speech is over and done with. And they are trying  
to force the issues so that the House will close early,  
so that the House will

MR. NEARY: close before mid-May and then they can all go home and no longer can we ask questions, no longer can we make positive suggestions and constructive ideas to the administration on how they should deal with the teachers' dispute, how they should deal with the Micmac Indians from Conne River, how they should deal with the problems in Labrador West, how they should deal with the Bowater difficulties in Corner Brook, how they should deal with the disaster at Buchans, how they should deal with the critics in the fishery, how they should deal with record unemployment, how they should deal with the deficit they have in current account, how they should deal with the unemployment amongst construction workers.

Mr. Speaker, they want to get out of the House as fast as they can. They are like a crowd of zombies over there. Look over at them every day, they are shellshocked. In the last week or so because the galleries are filled with teachers they have somehow or other managed to get the Premier to restrain himself. They have him calmed down. Every once in a while he goes off his rocker again but, Mr. Speaker, the strategy now is to keep him cool and calm while he is in the House so that the teachers and the others who come into the galleries will not see him for what he is.

MR. TULK: And then he goes out to the common room and dances around.

MR. NEARY: And then he goes out in the common room and he dances a jig, Mr. Speaker, or he will call a news conference and insult the reporters who dare ask penetrating questions, who would dare question his philosophy and his policies, and he goes off his rocker again. Any day we want to in this House we can put the Premier up in the chandeliers.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, while they may have him cooled off and calmed down temporarily, that will not last long. But they want to get the House closed because they cannot stand the pressure, especially the Premier and the ministers.

The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is bringing additional pressure on the administration. Look, I have to say this to my two colleagues - one to my right and one to my left - I wish you would just drop that subject because it is becoming embarrassing. I have one colleague who says, 'No, do not let the hon. gentleman in', and I have another colleague who says, 'Yes, let him in'. That matter is not to be discussed at this particular point in time. So I hope they will not raise it again in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker. The last thing we want to do is embarrass the member for Mount Scio.

MR. TULK: I am not trying to embarrass him.

MR. NEARY: No.



MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has to make up his own mind and I am sure that that will be done in due course. But it is interesting to hear opposing viewpoints from my colleagues in the caucus.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is expressing a point of view that not only has the admiration of members of this side of the House, but he has gained the respect of an awful lot of people throughout Newfoundland and Labrador. There are an awful lot of people who subscribe to the hon. gentleman's viewpoint, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Are you ready?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not making any comment at all. I am just saying that there are an awful lot of people who respect the view being expressed by the member for Mount Scio. I would say it is a pity that the hon. gentleman did not resign from the party, cross the House when he resigned from the Cabinet when he was Minister of Energy. The hon. gentleman could have provided a great service to the people of this Province. But the hon. gentleman has a lot of courage now, Mr. Speaker, a lot of courage to state publicly and in this House the things that he believes in. And one of the things that he keeps repeating is the fact that this administration cannot negotiate. This administration cannot negotiate with the teachers.

MR. TULK: That is right. Confrontation is their basic tactic.

MR. NEARY: That is right. They believe in confrontation. They are unwilling or unable to negotiate with the teachers, with the Conne River Indians, with the oil companies, with the Government of Canada, with the

MR. NEARY: Government of Quebec, with the Board of Trade. They are unwilling or unable to negotiate in good faith with anybody, and as a result of their confrontation politics an awful lot of people, Mr. Speaker, in this Province are suffering unnecessarily. We know that there is a world-wide recession, we do not have to be reminded of that.

MR. TULK: He could fit in over here.

MR. NEARY: Who could fit in?

MR. TULK: The member for Mount Scio.

MR. NEARY: Look, just forget that. Will you drop it?

Mr. Speaker, an awful lot of people are suffering unnecessarily in this Province and my colleague, when he interrupted me there, reminded me again about the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). I only wish that they would follow the advice

MR. NEARY:

that has been given by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who now has come out publicly, man-fashion, Mr. Speaker - and I would suspect, by the way, and I have to say this in all sincerity, that I believe the member for Mount Scio has a following on the government side of the House, on the government benches. I believe the member for Mount Scio has a following - and stated publicly his criticisms of the Premier, saying that the man is a disaster -

MR. TULK: Do not give it all away.

MR. NEARY: - that he has to be removed from the job as quickly as possible, Mr. Speaker, he has been very critical publicly of the hon. the Premier.

MR. TOBIN: Are you saying your party is not that open that you cannot have differences of opinion, discussions, or whatever?

MR. NEARY: We just heard two opposite viewpoints, one from my colleague on my right, and one on my left, when they were discussing the future of the member for Mount Scio.

MR. TULK: And spirited we were, too.

MR. NEARY: That is right. So you talk about an open party. The hon. gentleman is criticizing the administration, the policies, the Premier, privately and publicly, Mr. Speaker. Here you have an administration which believes in confrontation politics, and we are not saying that, the NTA are not saying it, the nurses and the public servants are not saying it, the people in Corner Brook are not saying it, or Labrador West, it is one of their own members who is saying it, one of their own members. And I would think that the hon. member who is making these statements has a following. I believe he has a following.

MR. TULK: I am sure he does. He must.

MR. NEARY: I am sure, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is not just acting alone.

MR. TULK: They cannot be all confrontationalists over there.

MR. NEARY: No, I would think that he has a following. I think that he is out to cook the Premier's goose one way or another. And it will be interesting to see how the story unfolds, Mr. Speaker, in the days and weeks and months ahead. It will be very interesting indeed. And as far as my colleagues are concerned about whether or not he would be admitted to the Liberal caucus, I am not happy about people when they cross the House. I think the people of Newfoundland are fed up with people crossing back and forth across the House.

MR. TOBIN: You have faults.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I advised the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) a long time ago to go and see Mrs. McBride, who runs a course in this city in self-improvement, good manners and etiquette, and I believe the hon. gentleman is in desperate need of a course in good manners, self-improvement and etiquette, and if the hon. gentleman cannot find Mrs. McBride, perhaps he might go see Mr. Young, who runs Dale Carnegie courses in this Province.

MR. NEARY: But if the hon. gentleman refuses to do that, Mr. Speaker, then they should take him down to Mr. Taylor, who runs a poodle parlor downtown and get him groomed.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabour the point about the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) except to say that I personally have a great deal of admiration for him, a great deal of respect. And I hope now that my colleagues will drop this subject and it will not be raised anymore because the member for Mount Scio has to make up his own mind.

MR. DINN: Can you not get something else to talk about?

MR. NEARY: He has to make up his own mind. I know it hurts him, Mr. Speaker, I know it hurts him.

MR. MARSHALL: What has this got to do with the debate?

MR. NEARY: It has all to do with the debate, Mr. Speaker, because what I am trying to impress upon hon. gentlemen is the fact that it is not only teachers who are critical of the administration, of their policies, of their philosophy, of their negative attitude and their confrontations, it is not only the Opposition, it is not only welfare recipients, it is not only the unemployed, it is not only the people in Corner Brook, it is not only the people in Labrador West but it is their own members, respected members who sit in their own benches.

MR. TULK: The former Minister of Energy.

MR. NEARY: The former Minister of Energy, Mr. Speaker. And the reason I bring it up at all

MR. NEARY: is to try to impress upon the administration the need to change their policy, the need for them to get off the disaster course they are on, the need for them to learn how to negotiate. One of the great flaws and weaknesses in the Premier, the man who leads the administration, is the fact, Mr. Speaker, his great weakness is that he is a poor administrator. He is a well meaning fellow.

MR. TULK: Where did he learn it?

MR. NEARY: That is right, where did he learn it. He cannot negotiate. The great flaw in his character, the weakness in his character, Mr. Speaker, is that he cannot negotiate. He is paranoid about other people's points of view. The hon. the Premier thinks that the Tory way is the only way. If you do not do it his way, the Tory way, then you do not do it at all. Mr. Speaker, there is another point of view and hon. gentlemen should listen. You know, hon. gentlemen idolize the Premier so much, Mr. Speaker, that they would turn their backs on their constituents just to please the Premier, all except, of course, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). They would turn and have turned their backs. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the member for Humber West, has turned her back -

MR. TOBIN: She is not Humber West.

MR. NEARY: Humber East, okay.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Education, the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge), has turned her back on her constituents on numerous occasions and is doing it again now. The Minister of Education turned her back on the employees of Bowaters.

MR. HEARN: Nonsense.

MR. NEARY: It is not nonsense. When the Minister of Education was called into the Premier's office, into the Cabinet room along with the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) and the three of them were told by Bowater's officials that No. 7 paper machine was going to shut down, they sat on the information and covered it up. Mr. Speaker, you can almost forgive the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, but the member for Humber East, who represents a large number of these employees and their families, sat on that information, covered it up and will never be forgiven by the people of Corner Brook.

MR. RIDEOUT: Why would she want to do that?

MR. NEARY: Why? That is a good question. Because the hon. minister was embarrassed, I would say.

MR. RIDEOUT: You are so nonsensical.

MR. NEARY: What was so nonsensical.

MR. RIDEOUT: Everyone is going to know who shut it down.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the minister sat on the information until I let the cat out of the bag in this hon. House. The people of Corner Brook, especially the employees affected by the closing of No. 7 paper machine, should have been given advanced warning, advanced notice so they could start to fight for their jobs and fight to keep No. 7 paper machine in operation. It was too late when the bomb was dropped. That is the damage that the Minister of Education did to her constituents. Mr. Speaker, can you believe that

MR. NEARY: Bowaters came up from South Carolina, got together with the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and the Premier, said, 'Look, we are going to give you information in private, we want you to treat it as confidential,' and the Premier of this Province and the two ministers who were with him said, 'Yes, we will treat it as confidential.' and then Bowaters dropped the bomb. Now they were committed. Instead of the Premier taking the attitude, 'Look, Mr. Bowater or whatever your name is, you give us the information and then I will decide whether we keep it private and confidential or not.' Any responsible Premier would have done that rather than be dictated to by Bowaters. That is what happened; they took the information and sat on it for weeks, they covered it up and they did nothing about it. Then the Premier went off to Europe on a seal ban expedition, thought that he was talking to the President of Bowaters, which is the biggest joke of the year in Corner Brook, and it turned out that it was just one of the officials of Bowaters he happened to bump into in Canada House while they were having a reception over there, it could have been the janitor as far as he knew, and then tried to mislead this House and the people of Corner Brook and the people of this Province.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making about the Minister of Education is she has turned her back on the teachers, turned her back on the parents, turned her back on her constituents.

MR. BAIRD: She has turned her back on you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, she sits there day in and day out gawking at the Premier with calf's eyes, turning her back on her constituents just to satisfy the Premier. They have some kind of a mutual admiration going over there.

MR. WARREN: What did you do, get the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) to come and help you?



MR. NEARY: No, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) has not been in his seat all afternoon. Thank God, I am glad he was not here because he would have been embarrassed to hear this discussion going on.

So, Mr. Speaker, it was embarrassing for the people, the employees of Bowaters, for the mayor and town council in Corner Brook, for the unions in Corner Brook. And when the bomb finally did explode, when they had this information and sat on it, covered it up, then they went scurrying down to South Carolina in a last minute effort to ask Bowaters to give them some information, which they do not have yet. Bowaters refused to give them the information, Mr. Speaker. As a result of their policies, as a result of their confrontation politics, as a result of their childishness and their arrogance, everybody in this Province seems to be losing whatever respect they had for the Premier and for the administration.

As I said a few moments ago, I do not hate the Premier, I do not think anybody hates him. I think he is a nice fellow. I think he is a decent Newfoundlander. I think he means well, Mr. Speaker, but it is unfortunate for this Province that the hon. gentleman is such a poor administrator and that he cannot negotiate, that he holds everything and everybody up for suspects. He is suspicious of the NTA executive, he is suspicious of Quebec, he is suspicious of Ottawa, he is suspicious of Nova Scotia, he is almost paranoid, Mr. Speaker, a terrible, terrible attitude for the leader of the administration in this Province to have. And it is taking its toll on Newfoundland and on the people of this Province. There is not a group that I can think of outside of the churches, and I would

MR. NEARY: say their turn is coming, they will soon feel the brunt of the Premier's tongue if the bishops and archbishops and the church leaders keep getting involved and making common sense suggestions and putting forth ideas, asking the government, Treasury Board and the teachers to get back to the bargaining table, asking the administration in Ottawa to sit down and negotiate an agreement on the offshore. If they keep doing that, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY:

pretty soon, one of these mornings when the Premier gets up on the wrong side of the bed, loses his cool, goes off his rocker again, he will attack the churches. Up to now he has come pretty close on a couple of occasions. Up to now I think he has taken on every other group that you can think of in this Province. Every group he has taken them on, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think he has a friend left in Newfoundland or Labrador and he has very few friends left across Canada. The mainland press is turning on him like mad dogs. One time he used to be the darling of the mainland press. He used to be the darling of the press here in Newfoundland. But public opinion has turned against the hon. gentleman. And you can start, Mr. Speaker, with the teachers and work down. The teachers are against him, the public servants are against him, the nurses are against him, the people in Corner Brook are against him, the construction workers are against him, the fish plant workers are against him, the fishermen are against him, the Conne River Indians are against him, the people who live in mining communities are against him, the people who work in the construction industry are against him. Mr. Speaker, what a time to have an election! What a time to have an election!

The hon. gentleman was trigger-happy on April 6th, brave then, courageous then. Where is his courage now? I heard the hon. gentleman in this House today say that the executive of the NTA should put the government's latest offer to their membership. Intruding into the internal affairs of the NTA, trying to cause dissention, that is what the hon. gentleman was up to. But if he is so sincere, Mr. Speaker, about putting that proposition to the membership of the NTA, why did he not put his proposal on the offshore to the

MR. NEARY: people a year later when he failed to deliver on his mandate, when he failed to deliver on a negotiated settlement? Why does he not put it now to the people of this Province if he is so brave and he is such a fighter and he has so much courage? He is there to give advice to the NTA, "Put our proposal to your membership." I challenge him now to put his present situation to the people of this Province. Do it in the form of a referendum or do it in the form of a general election. We will find out how much courage this fighter has a year later.

MS. VERGE: You said last year's election was not necessary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that unless we clear up this leadership problem on the other side, there will be nothing left, we will have nothing left in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I think the member for

MR. NEARY: Mount Scio (Mr. Barry)  
is right, that we have to get rid of this menace, this  
cancer, as the hon. gentleman is saying publicly, before  
he ruins the Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: The member for Mount  
Scio does not say anything like that.

MR. NEARY: The member for Mount  
Scio does say it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the  
Premier may be able to bolster the morale of his troops  
by saying that time is on his side. That is what he  
has been doing now for the last several months. He  
has been saying to his caucus and to his ministers  
and to his members, 'Do not worry, we are down in a  
valley right now but we will come out of that valley  
because we have three years to go'. And like he said  
about the teachers the other day, 'When we settle with  
them, it will all blow over.'. Mr. Speaker, I was wearing  
a button the other day - it is home right now, it is  
in my other coat-which says 'Teachers will remember,' and  
I believe they will. I believe they will remember, Mr.  
Speaker. They will remember who shafted them, they  
will remember who put the gears to them, Mr. Speaker.  
It will not blow over. And hon. members when they go  
into their caucus the next time they have that meeting  
and the Emperor stands up and says, 'Look, do not worry  
about it, time is on our side' I think they should start  
asking questions: How much time? What can we do to get  
up out of this valley we are in? How can we scrab and  
claw our way back in the popularity polls? How can we  
get back in with the teachers? How can we endear ourselves  
to the electorate that gave us so much trust and confidence  
a year ago?

MR. NEARY:

The member for St. Barbe, (Mr. Osmond) who sits down there in the corner, I am sure must stay awake at nights wondering what time they are going to come up out of that valley they are in

Mr. Speaker, maybe in his simplicity, maybe the hon. gentleman is so naive, that he believes that, he believes that politics is hills and valleys and at the moment the administration is down in a valley and the Premier's image is battered and bruised and severely damaged, but he will recover - maybe the hon. gentleman has himself convinced of that. Maybe the hon. gentleman is an optimist.

The next time the Premier says that and the hon. member for St. Barbe, who has had to bear the brunt of the teachers' dispute in his district, and the people down in the Gros Morne National Park who are very critical of the administration, and the fishermen down in the hon. gentleman's district who are very concerned about the fish plants and where they are going to sell their fish, now when the hon. gentleman is sitting there listening to the Emperor standing there waving his arms, frothing at the mouth, wild-eyed, and he is saying, 'Do not worry, ladies and gentlemen, we have got time on our side,' if I were the hon. gentleman I would ask a few little innocent questions.

MR. TULK: The Premier says, 'I can fight them all now.'

MR. NEARY: He can fight them all, that is right, 'Just leave it to me, boys. We will bring in the experts from Toronto, the image makers, and we will pump out the press releases, and we will brainwash the news media, and we will answer every letter that appears in letters to the editor, and we will send out our propaganda and we will put it in the liquor stores. Do not worry, everything is going to be taken care of and everything is going to be all right'. Unfortunately, I think he has his caucus brainwashed except one, and possibly a few who may be following the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). I think he has them brainwashed. Because the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond), instead of turning his back on the people who helped elect him down there including the teachers -

MR. OSMOND: Why do you not come out to my district and see what is going on?

MR. NEARY: I have been invited on several occasions and, Mr. Speaker, I have some good friends in Bonne Bay and on the Great Northern Peninsula. I have many good friends down there and I am very familiar with that part of the country. I camped on numerous occasions in Western Brook and I have a lot of friends in Rocky Harbour and Norris Point and Woody Point, as the hon. gentlemen might be aware, and in Cow Head and in Daniel's Harbour. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. gentlemen, instead of allowing the Premier to brainwash them in caucus and say, 'Look, just sit tight, boys, do not panic, time is on our side', that I believe the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentlemen should get up and ask him how much more time we need and what strategy is he going to use to get the party out of that valley that they are in.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is back in his seat. I was just saying to the House that I am pleased that the member has not been brainwashed by the Premier's optimistic statements to his caucus, trying to bolster the morale of the members of the caucus, saying, 'Do not worry, boys, do not worry, she will come back, she will blow again. Just leave it to me'. Blind faith in the Emperor, Mr. Speaker! They know in their hearts that she is not going to blow again. And they can attempt to change their leader the next time. The hon. member for Mount Scio can cook the Premier's stew all he wants and he can continue his strategy of trying to undermine the hon. gentleman to jockey himself into position to change the leadership of the party but, Mr. Speaker, will the



MR. NEARY: people of Newfoundland fall for that the second time? Will the people of Newfoundland look upon it as a born-again party, a new party as they did when Mr. Moores left and the present gentleman took over and they tried to portray the image as a new party? Will that work a second time? Will it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MORGAN: As long as you hang on to the Liberal Party it will.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they seem to be very, very concerned and worried about my leadership. I must be getting to the hon. gentlemen. I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): It is noted that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has adjourned the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m.