

VOL. 2

NO. 29

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

Mr. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of
Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, it is my
pleasure, acting on behalf of my colleague, the hon.
Haig Young, Minister of Public Works and Services,
to announce, at this time, the tender award for
construction of the shell of the new Confederation
Complex Extension. The contract, valued at \$20,767,300
has been awarded to the local general contracting firm
of Seaboard Construction (1978) Limited.

The award of the tender
was made in accordance with the Public Tender Act and
Government's Provincial Preference Policy.

As far as is reasonably
possible, all the materials and equipment used in the
construction of the building will originate in
Newfoundland and Labrador, and where essential materials
and equipment cannot be of local origin, preference will
be given to those which are fabricated in the Province.
Thus, the load-bearing structure of the building is to
be of reinforced concrete because it is of completely
local origin.

The successful contractor
will be using Newfoundland sub-contractors wherever possible
under the Provincial Preference Policy.

Mr. Speaker, right now it
might be wise for hon. members to know that we spend about

MR. DINN:

services suitable for completion of the open space. Tenders for the site work and fitting up of the open space will be called at the appropriate future time. The accepted tender was within the Department of Public Works and Services' estimate for the work. The total additional cost to government for accepting a tender in accordance with the provincial preference policy amounts to not more than 3.2 per cent of the lowest tender.

The building comprises some 35,000 square metres in gross area or 375,000 square feet and will rise some six storeys above ground level at the lowest point.

Four hundred man years of tradesman employment are expected to be generated by the work and this contract should be fully completed in twenty-four months. Mr. Speaker, this is part of this government's policy at this crucial slow period in our economy to generate much needed employment, especially in the construction trades.

When the complex is fully occupied, it is expected to house over 3,000 civil servants and other government personnel.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, if I may make a brief response in accordance with the rules on behalf of those of us on this side of the House, let me say first of all without debating the matter, that we on

MR. ROBERTS: this side are far from convinced of the desirability or the utility, much less the need of building this expensive building in a day and age when we cannot afford to operate and to staff the buildings we now have. The fact remains that this particular extension is unnecessary and will cost the people of Newfoundland infinitely more than the alternatives that were available to the government.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SIMMS:

That is not true.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is true. I will deal with that in debate I am not allowed to debate here so I will not nor are my hon. friends and they should not either, Mr. Speaker. Secondly, when you read between the lines of the minister's statement what he is saying is that this contract has not been given to the lowest tenderer in fact there were three tenderers lower than the one that was awarded and in fact it is going to cost I am told - and the minister confirms this - between \$600,000 and \$650,000 to implement this decision. I simply say to the minister at this stage - the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) who made it on behalf of his absent colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young)-that the government owes the House an explanation in detail, at the very least they should table the details of the bids and of the analysis because of course the labour content is the same, Mr. Speaker, no matter who does it. The 400 man years of tradesmen employment will be performed entirely I would hope by Newfoundlanders no matter whether the contractor is a Newfoundland contractor or whether the contractor is a mainland contractor, the taxes are the same, the benefits to the Province are the same and so I simply say to the government at this stage (a) that it is a fact that this is the fourth lowest bid not the lowest or even the second lowest and secondly there is a burden on this administration to demonstrate, a burden which they must discharge to demonstrate to the people of this Province that in accepting the fourth lowest tender they have acted wisely and properly. As for the Public Tender Act it is toothless, it is at best an expression of intent and I notice the government have legislation on it to gut it. But the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) the half Minister of Energy or the Minister of half Energy as the case may be, knows far better than I do from an instance which he saw last

MR. ROBERTS: Summer how very toothless the Public Tender Act is. And here is another example of it, it is a statement of pious platitude and when it comes to the crunch the government have not followed it, so let them now discharge the burden of showing they have acted wisely. We are not saying that they have acted improperly what we are saying is that the question is there, it is a legitimate question and it must be answered, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). Does the Minister of Justice not think that the members of this House are entitled to an explanation as to why plainclothes police were mingling with the teachers and parents and visitors to the galleries yesterday? Does not the hon. gentleman think the members of the House are entitled to know why they were there, why they were acting in the carrying out of their duties within the precincts of this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, there is no problem with that at all. As a matter of fact, I think the simplest way of answering the hon. gentleman's question is to read to him a quite brief letter which I have written and delivered to the Speaker that explains it. Dated today, 'Dear Mr. Speaker, Yesterday afternoon, acting on information they received that there might be a breach of the peace somewhere in the environs of the Confederation Building, two plainclothesmen of the Constabulary were on the Confederation Building premises. In the performance of their duties they checked various parts of the premises and surroundings, and were also present for a while in the House of Assembly visitors' galleries.

The appropriate procedure before the police entered the House of Assembly galleries is to receive the concurrence of the Speaker. The police officers in question were unaware of this. The police force has now been told what the appropriate procedure is, that is, that they seek the concurrence of the Speaker

MR. OTTENHEIMER: before entering the precincts of the House, and I have no doubt that that procedure will be followed.'

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the reading of the letter that the hon. gentleman just read for us in this House, but the fact of the matter is that the privileges of this House have been breached, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) what he intends to do about it.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman thought the privileges of the House have been breached, there is an obvious proceeding the hon. gentleman could take. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) gave a good and sufficient answer to the hon. gentleman. I suggest the hon. gentlemen use the Question Period for what it is intended, to get along now with other questions affecting the importance of the business of the Province.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, given the pettifoggery of the President of the Council, I will address a question to the Minister of Justice, who is obviously prepared to deal with matters on their merits. Would the Minister of Justice

MR. ROBERTS: ask the Chief of Police if he is prepared to apologize to the House for what was, I accept, an unwitting breach of our privileges? But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, it is, as the minister will concur, a breach of the privileges of this House for any policeman to come within our precincts without first checking with Your Honour, unless there is some open and obvious breach of the law. Because men and women come to these galleries, Mr. Speaker, it is not an open breach of the law, in fact it is a discharge of their rights under the law. Would the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) consider asking the Chief of Police for an apology simply because his force did breach our privileges even though I accept, as do my colleagues, they did it unwittingly? As for the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), I would simply say to him that if he had been listening late yesterday afternoon my friend did raise it in the House, not as a matter of privilege but as a matter of concern. Obviously the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is not the least bit concerned, but that is obvious from his conduct on this and other matters.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am not obviously debate with the hon. gentleman whether it was a breach of privilege or not. I know that the hon. gentleman is aware that there would have to be a finding to that effect. I mean, it could be a breach of privilege -

MR. ROBERTS: Do you want a motion on it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - it could not be a breach of privilege. What the hon. gentleman asked, if I would ask the Chief of Police to apologize to the Speaker, actually I think that what the hon. gentleman requires

MR. OTTENHEIMER: there has been performed in speaking with the Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: The Speaker has not told the House anything about it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The Speaker may confirm it. I have read the letter which I gave to the Speaker and I also informed the Speaker on behalf of the police force, which answers to this ministry, of their regret and apology. I expressed it on behalf of the force. I think that suffices.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that Your Honour will clear up this matter in due course.

MR. ROBERTS: His Honour could take action.

MR. NEARY: That is right. We do have a Committee on Election and Privileges and maybe the matter, if it is not cleared up by Your Honour, should be referred to that committee.

I would like to come back now to probably the worse crisis we have ever had in our whole history in connection with the dispute between the teachers and the administration. The Premier made a statement yesterday to a group of ladies, parents and children who were visiting from Valleyfield and Badger's Quay to the effect that some kind of extraordinary action, something dramatic was going to happen in the next twenty-four hours. The twenty-four hours will be up in another few minutes, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what dramatic action he is going to take in connection with the dispute with the teachers?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, a CBC reporter interpreted remarks made by certain people who were in to see me yesterday that I said that there would be some kind of a development within twenty-four hours. I did not say that. That is what the CBC reporter said the women said I said.

What I did say, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is interested, is that -

MR. NEARY: I am rather amused.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. Well, I guess the Leader of the Opposition deals with the media and I deal with the media and we know how things can get said. What I did say to the ladies in the conversation we had covering twenty or thirty minutes was they said, "Well, what can we do?" And my answer was that I guess as parents you can continue to express your concern in the way you are doing now, and also to the leadership of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, and if there were sufficient amount of pressure put on by the Parent/Teachers Associations, and other interested groups around the Province, that I was hopeful that within a twenty-four to forty-eight hour period that that kind of pressure would result in there being new developments in the dispute. That is what I said.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, now would the hon. gentleman tell the House if indeed there has been any new developments in the last twenty-four hours, if the administration, of which he is the head, has taken any new initiatives to return to the bargaining table to sit down and talk and negotiate a settlement with the teachers and get them back into the classroom and

MR. NEARY: get the children back to school? Have there been any new initiatives?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now I have been accused, in this hon. House and outside, by quite a few different groups or people or whatever, individuals, that the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and government are negotiating in public and making statements and all the rest of it, So I think it would be

MR. NEARY: extremely wise, even though the Leader of the Opposition has asked the question which I guess he feels he has an obligation to ask, even though if I answered it in its totality then he or somebody else could accuse of negotiating in public, so all I can say to the hon. member, as he undoubtedly is aware, that the government is making every effort today, last night, this morning, yesterday evening, yesterday afternoon, yesterday morning, to bring an end to this dispute. So I would say no more than that, but obviously there is not a lull in activity, there is activity, I will leave it at that for the hon. member right now because I do not want to get into descriptions and so on which in one way or another might lend an air of pessimism or lend an air of optimism on the situation. But obviously I am and the government is very concerned about the situation. We have been meeting on it almost daily, and in between that myself hourly, and obviously there is activity and I should leave it at that for the time being. And, of course, we are as eager to get the thing over with as anybody else.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

We are glad to hear that there is some kind of movement taking place to break this logjam. We are not asking the hon. the Premier to give us any details of any negotiations or any mediations or discussions that may be taking place. All we are asking the hon. gentleman is to tell the House that something is happening. And I just want to make sure that I understand the hon. gentleman correctly, that something is happening that may lead to a settlement of that dispute. Now the something could be negotiations, it could be mediation, it could be arbitration or it could be legislation. Could the

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I said, if I wanted to say more I would have said it in the answer to the original question and I have no more comment to make on it at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the negotiations themselves, the Premier, in the last seventy-two hours or so, accused the NTA of bringing new issues to the bargaining table. Could the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what these new issues were?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I could very well to the hon. gentleman privately if he wants me to do so, but I do not want to be provocative now. I have answered the question as best I could,

I made the statement, I stand by the statement, I can prove the statement. Honestly, squarely, I can prove the statement. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would like for me to give him that information after Question Period, I will be only too happy to do so. But I am not going to entertain or get involved in the dispute at this point in time by doing any of that kind of thing for obvious reasons which the hon. Leader knows about. But if he personally wants substantiation of the statement that I made, I am only too pleased to give it to him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are having a change of strategy now today. The hon. gentleman is not going to give us any information at all. Even though the hon. gentleman has made the information public, he is not prepared now to give us the answer across the floor of the House.

Could I be a little more specific with the hon. gentleman and ask him if one of the new issues that he is accusing the NTA of introducing into the negotiations has to do with pensions? Is that one of the issues?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman knows no limits so we have to impose them on him by the parliamentary rules, Mr. Speaker. Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, page 129, dealing with Questions, says it is not in order to "repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused." Now, I think the nature of the question the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked has already been posed to the Premier in two or three previous questions and the Premier has dealt with it, and I think that this is an appropriate time in which to invoke this particular rule.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously is trying to stop the Opposition from asking very penetrating and very important questions. My supplementary had nothing to do with the first question.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, all the hon. gentleman is trying to do is to muzzle this side of the House, as he tries every day.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that there is no point of order. All the hon. gentleman is trying to do is dictate to the Chair.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the President of the Council, to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentleman wants to respond, let him respond not in personal rhetorical attacks but why not let him respond using the established rules that are before us. It is here. Beauchesne, for the information of the hon. gentleman there opposite, is a little red book that everybody knows guides the proceedings of this House.

MR. OTTEHEIMER: We got a green one.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, it is green for the Opposition and maybe the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), but it is a red book. It says on page 129 clearly -

MR. NEARY: He is using up our time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is going to try to interrupt but this is a serious point of order.

- "repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused."

MR. NEARY: Sit down, boy, and do not be making a fool of yourself.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, in this House of Assembly the government at all times does not invoke these rules as a matter of course. There are times and places where they apply and, I would submit to Your Honour, at this point in time it does apply and it should be enforced.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The reference referred to by the hon. the President of the Council is contained in Beauchesne, 357 (d) which says, "A question oral or written must not repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused." It is the Chair's understanding that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): (Mr. Neary) posed a question to the hon. the Premier, who declined to give an answer for reasons which he has stated, and in essence the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, or any other hon. member, should not repeat the same question.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not repeating the same question, this is a completely new question, and the question has to do with teachers' pensions. Could the hon. the Premier - or perhaps the President of Treasury Board may be in a better position to supply the answer - tell us if this current dispute will affect the pensions of teachers in any way, shape or form who may be retiring before the end of this calendar year?

MR. MARSHALL: It is the same thing, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: As I have indicated before on behalf of government, we are not prepared to get into the details of the dispute at this point in time for obvious reasons.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Premier and also in regard to the teachers' lockout. And the question: The Premier requested the NTA, meddling into their union affairs, to conduct a new vote on the Premier's new proposal. If the NTA met the request for a vote of their members and ended up having it rejected by the members, what would the Premier request then?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier,

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am not going to negotiate in public, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: I have another question to the Premier. Concerning that Ding-a-Ling Service, are all the operators of this service certified teachers? Do they all have their teaching certificates?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier,

PREMIER PECKFORD: I understand that they are all qualified people in the subject areas to which they

PREMIER PECKFORD:

have been assigned to answer questions from the students who call in. They are all qualified and have degrees in the various subject areas. The service is working very well, as a matter of fact, extremely well. And we are going to have to look at how the teachers of the Province and so on, and the educational system in the future can utilize not only this kind of a process, but how we can improve upon it and make it even better. So it has been working very well.

MR. NEARY:

Will you take out whatever you have in your mouth. I hope it is sticky enough so you cannot move it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have a cold and I have something in my mouth here for it.

MR. NEARY:

Get somebody to rub your chest.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I invite the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), if he is concerned about my health -

MR. NEARY:

I have a cold
(inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- he can assist. I do not know if the hon. Leader of the Opposition has a medical degree or has some particular expertise in that way.

But that system is really working well. From an educational point of view it might have some application after this dispute is over and can be of great assistance to teachers and students and so on. But they are all qualified individuals in their subject areas. So, as I said, they are answering questions in that area for which they are qualified.

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible) qualified in her area.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, that is right.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) degree in biology.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The person to whom the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is referring, I think has a Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Education, Bachelor of Nursing, so I would imagine that the person is fairly qualified in the field of biology.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Almost as qualified as the Leader of the Opposition.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, almost as qualified as the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
Before I recognize the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), it has been brought to my attention that there may have been somebody in the galleries who has taken a picture. I would like to remind visitors that the use of cameras is strictly forbidden in the galleries.

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

MR. HISCOCK: I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), It is my understanding with regards to the rules of this House that in order for money to be paid out to teachers or to anybody else they have to be certified, and therefore a teacher's certificate is needed in order to receive money and you have to have so many courses. I believe there are people operating under this service who do not have a certificate and I am wondering is it legal to use taxpayers' money to pay them. Are we not breaching the rules of this House by paying out money to people who do not have proper qualifications?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, it

would have nothing to do with the rules of the House.

There is absolutely nothing illegal whatsoever in the procedure being used by the Department of Education, and by the Department of Finance, presumably, to pay for the Dial-a-Tutor service and the hiring of qualified people performing the tasks which are assigned them, nothing illegal whatsoever.

MR. HISCOCK: A further supplementary
to the Minister of Justice.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Has the Minister of Justice
contacted the Auditor General to see if this is a matter
of legalities?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Legalities?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman
really does not know what the Auditor General is supposed
to do or the rules of the House. He has everything
all confused. Why would I consult the Auditor General to determine
whether something is legal or illegal. That is what we
are paying good money to people in the Department of
Justice for. The Auditor General deals with auditing of
the Province's accounts -

MR. HISCOCK: And money is being spent.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - and he
reports to the House of Assembly. He does not report to the
Minister of Justice, he does not report to the hon. member
for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), he reports to the entire
House of Assembly. This has nothing to do with contacting
the Auditor General to see if this is legal or if that is
legal or if something else is legal. It would be quite
improper to contact the Auditor General. He is a servant
of the House and he makes his annual report to the House of
Assembly. This matter has nothing to do with the Auditor
General or my getting in touch with the Auditor General at
all.

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

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to something the Premier said there a short while ago about there being movement, that the ice seems to be slackening up a little bit.

Now he has clammed up, Mr. Speaker, the pendulum now has swung completely the other way. He goes from one extreme to the other, the hon. gentleman does. Now would he tell the House what period of time are we talking about? When can we expect to get an answer from the hon. gentleman as to when negotiations will resume, mediation will take place, arbitration will be implemented, or legislation will be brought into the House? What period of time are we talking about? Are we talking about by noon tomorrow, by noon on Saturday, or are we talking about the weekend? Is there a possibility of the teachers and the children being back in the school by Monday?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I used the word 'activity'. I did not use the word 'movement'. I never used the phrase 'loosening of the ice'. So for the benefit of the press gallery, who I am sure heard what I said, I said 'activity.' So the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) should not try to describe what I said earlier in other terms which would tend to lead to a certain description being put on what I said, I said 'activity.' And I am not a prophet. I cannot tell the Leader of the Opposition because I do not know what timeframe. I honestly do not know. I told the Leader of the Opposition

PREMIER PECKFORD: that there is activity.

That is all I have said and that is all I am prepared to say at this point in time.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier, in view of the fact that there is activity - I put my own interpretation on what the hon. gentleman said because the hon. gentleman is leaving the impression, rightly or wrongly, even by mentioning the word 'activity' that there is some movement or something happening - now while that something is happening, would the hon. gentleman give an assurance to this House that he will call off the troops, that he will call off his campaign workers and stop the dirty tricks that are being used, Mr. Speaker, by the administration to try to turn this into a political -

MR. MORGAN: You would do anything to get a vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Did the hon. gentleman receive his letter yet? The hon. gentleman is going to get a nice little letter from the parents and from the teachers about his behaviour in this House. Mr. Speaker, stop the dirty tricks, for instance, telling campaign workers to call into the open line shows and say they are teachers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the point of order must be patently obvious. The hon. gentleman is making a speech to the galleries. Standing Order 31 (c)

MR. MARSHALL: "In putting any oral questions, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as it may be necessary to explain the same." The hon. gentleman is out of order for a whole host of reasons listed in Paragraph 357 of the book that the hon. gentleman seems not to be aware of and to ignore as well the principles of it.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was straying into the realm of debate and if he persists in that I will have to rule him out of order.

MR. NEARY: I apologize to the Chair,
Your Honour.

Let me ask the Premier if he is aware that his campaign workers in the last election have been told, given instructions, to call into the open line programme and say they are teachers? Would he not consider that to be in the realm of dirty tricks?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that question does not deserve an answer. I mean, I have answered that to the public. I was asked it last night. I am completely unaware, I know nothing about it. In the same way yesterday I was asked about there being some security people here in the precincts of the House. I absolutely know nothing about it, nothing, zero, about it, and to imply somehow or another that I or the government is involved in dirty tricks is just trying to implicate the government and trying to do things through the back door which the hon. member cannot prove to the front door.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

The fact of the matter is that
it has been admitted by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer)
that there were plainclothes police in the gallery and that
is what we -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I said I did not know anything
about it and I did not.

MR. NEARY:

He does not know anything
about anything, Mr. Speaker, that is the trouble.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to change the subject slightly again because I want to ask the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development again about an up-dating on the caribou meat that is lying on the ground about thirty-five minutes flying time from Nain, and the Ski-doos and the sleds and the tents and so forth. Is there any possibility of getting a service going to bring this meat out of the country before it is spoiled?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I should inform the House that my Goose Bay office has been monitoring this situation since the whole affair began earlier this week. And if the hon. gentleman might recall, yesterday I outlined that I presented a proposal to the communities affected where they can avail of X number of dollars under the Native People's agreement to not only fly out the equipment and the meat that is in there now but harvest additional animals if they so desire, and I was waiting for a response to that proposal. There has been no response. The only thing I can add to what was said yesterday is that the hon. gentleman's colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), is in the Goose Bay area now, I understand, trying to arrange something with the German air force to try to have them fly the meat out, which obviously is not connected with the provincial government at all. But I can advise the hon. gentleman that, in checking with some of my colleagues, there are no funds available in any general vote now of government to remove the machines and

MR. GOUDIE: the meat from the area other than under the Native People's agreement, which is the position I put to the communities and, as a matter of fact, my parliamentary secretary is discussing with one of the leaders in Nain now this concept and there has been no response to date.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised to hear the answer because of all the helicopters that are in the area and in view of the money that the government is spending on advertising and on travel and so forth these days.

But in the meantime, the hon. gentleman mentioned the German air force who no doubt have the equipment to do the job. Now, would there be any objection or would the provincial government have to make a request of the German air force in order to get them involved? Would it have to go through official channels? And if so, has the hon. gentleman made any approach towards the German air force, who are carrying out manoeuvres and exercises in the area, to do the job that we cannot find the money to do?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, if the German air force, which has just over the last number of days moved back into the Goose Bay area for their particular season of exercises or whatever they do, decide that they want to go in and do this, then that obviously does not affect the provincial government.

MR. NEARY: No objection from the authorities?

MR. GOUDIE: No, there is no objection at

MR. GOUDIE: all. As a matter of fact, over the last two or three years they have made emergency medical flights and other activities to various communities along the coast and more power to them, glad to see them do it.

MR. NEARY: Well, a final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman undertake then to notify the German air force that there is no objection on the part of the Province, that they would indeed welcome

MR. NEARY: any activity they could provide to get this meat out before it spoils? Because I am sure with a little encouragement from the hon. gentleman, from the administration, the German air force would probably be happy to do it.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the hon. gentleman's colleague is in Goose Bay now and at this time, I understand, is trying to make that arrangement. They already know they can go ahead and do these things without having to deal with the provincial government on any official basis.

MR. NEARY: They might be afraid of getting into competition with commercial helicopters.

MR. GOUDIE: If it will help any we can make contact and let them know that I have no objection, but it is not necessary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to come back to another topic - the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) I notice is in his seat today - there was a fire last weekend down at the Boys' and Girls' Home at Pleasantville. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman could give us some details of that fire? I understand, for instance, that two girls were locked in cells while flames were coming out through the windows of the building at Pleasantville. I believe the House is entitled to have a report on that fire. Perhaps the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) or the Minister of Social Services could give us some details, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, there is nothing unusual about my being in my seat, I am in my seat whenever I can be. The hon. gentleman, as usual, puts his own trimmings and his own interpretation on things when he is asking questions. It almost becomes redundant to respond.

I do not know who informs him that two girls were locked in the detention unit where flames flying all over the place. That is about as accurate as a good many more things he says. There were three girls, as I understand it, in the detention unit, and in another section one boy. The detention unit is such that the boys and girls, whenever they are there, can come out into an open space, a larger room. It is not like a jail, Mr. Speaker. My information is that at no time was there any danger to any of the children who were in the detention unit, number one. Number two, the children were removed from the building immediately, alternate accommodations were found.

MR. HICKEY: The three girls who in fact that were in the detention unit where housed in the school, which is adjacent to the dormitory where the fire was, and which is equipped with facilities.

So it was just a simple matter of moving some beds to that building across the space in between and they were housed there. The other children, some six or seven boys, were transferred to Whitbourne, other girls were sent home, and two other girls were placed in a home in St. John's. The most up to date information that I have is that the building has been cleaned up and some repairs will be made and within the matter of a week to ten days everything will be back to normal.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The time for Question Period has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills entitled: "An Act Respecting An Increase In Certain Pensions", "An Act Repecting An Increase In Certain Pensions For Transferred Employees" and also, "An Act To Amend The Uniform Services Pension Act".

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table answers to Questions Number 55, 65, 69 and 88 asked on the Order Paper by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan).

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the petition which I present today has been signed by 812 men and women who live in my constituency, most of them residents of the Town of St. Anthony, although I see in looking through the petition that men and women who live in some of the nearby communities, including St. Lunaire and Griquet, are among the signatories.

The situation which has given rise to the petition has come about as a result of a proposal by a group of business men in St. Anthony to open a drugstore, a commercial store, in which there will be contained a dispensary for prescription and other drugs. These men now operate a store, what they are going to do is turn it into a drugstore by adding the services of a pharmacist and a dispensary. That of course is entirely their right, it is a free country and if these business men who run this business and ran it very successfully over the years wish to operate a drugstore in addition to their present business more power to them as long as they satisfy the requirements of the Pharmacy Act and the requirements to the St. Anthony Council. However, there is a problem because of a policy which this administration has continued - and I used the word continued because to be fair about it this policy has been in effect as long as I can recall, it was in effect, for example, during the period I was Health Minister and long before that and as far as I know it has been effect ever since.

MR. ROBERTS: The policy requires that where a privately operated pharmacy opens the Government will not compete in a publicly funded pharmacy. I think I have stated it accurately, if I have not the Minister of Health (Mr. House), who I hope will speak in this debate, will doubtless correct me, but that is the gist of the policy. The inevitable result of that policy, Mr. Speaker, over the years, has been to drive up the cost of prescription drugs in particular to the men and the women who must then go to a privately operated pharmacy as opposed to the publicly operated one. That is the inevitable result. I do not think there have been any exceptions to that. The issue then, here in St. Anthony, is whether the Minister of Health will require the publicly operated pharmacy, the publicly operated dispensing service to be precise, which is provided by the Charles Curtis Memorial Hospital in St. Anthony, whether that must be discontinued. That dispensary or its predecessors have been operating now for ninety years and more. That is how long the Grenfell people have been operating a hospital and its facilities in St. Anthony. It serves far more than St. Anthony of course, because the hospital is the base hospital for all the Grenfell services, both in Labrador and on the Island, and serves as the primary treatment centre for people in a large area. I think everything North of a line on the Northern Peninsula, from, say, Blue Cove to Harbour Deep, everything North of that the people look to the St. Anthony Hospital as being their primary treatment centre in addition to being the referral centre. There are small health facilities

MR. ROBERTS: at Flowers Cove and at Roddickton but neither of those is a hospital facility in any sense of the word. If the government insist upon the closing of the hospital dispensary, then, Mr. Speaker, the results will be inevitably to drive up the cost which people must pay for drugs which, of course, is something they must have. If your doctor tells you you need a prescription, you really have to go and get it, there is no choice. It will also drive up the cost to the government, Mr. Speaker, because, of course, the government pays a large number of drug bills, either through the Senior Citizens Plan or through the Social Assistance Plan.

The prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker, is a very simple one - I will read it: "We the undersigned, strongly disapprove of the move to establish a Drug Store in St. Anthony at this time. With the high rate of seasonal employment and a large number of people on fixed income, we feel that these people cannot afford the high cost of drugs which will result from the establishment of such an outlet. We strongly recommend the continuance of drug dispensing under the present setup." That is the prayer, Mr. Speaker.

I support it completely and without reservation. In doing that let me say two things: First of all, Mr. Speaker, allowing the hospital pharmacy to continue to operate will not, in any way affect the right or the ability of these private businessmen to do what lawfully they may, namely, to operate a drug store and a dispensary in St. Anthony. Let them compete,

MR. ROBERTS: that is the very heart, the very pith and essence of the entire free enterprise system as we know it.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I am told - and I have made enquiries on this - that the cost of the drugs, the hospital in giving out its drugs does not do so for free, Mr. Speaker, it levies a charge. I am told that that charge is a true and an accurate charge based on the cost of dispensing the drugs, including not only the cost of the materials but the cost of the labour and the cost of the necessary facilities or that portion of the hospital which is used for those purposes. So there is no indirect cost to the public chest, the cost is borne by the prescription charges whether they be paid by the individual or paid by some department of government on behalf of that individual as a result of some other programme.

So, Mr. Speaker, there would be no cost to the people of the Province in allowing the hospital to continue. There would be a cost to the people of that area, a large area of the Northern Peninsula if the drug dispensing in the hospital were not allowed to continue. And finally, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I submit that there is just cause here for an exception to the policy which has been in effect. The St. Anthony hospital, the Curtis Hospital is a unique organization, unique in the area it serves and the way in which it serves that area. There is no comparable facility anywhere in Newfoundland and Labrador.

My time, I gather, is just about up, Mr. Speaker. I would simply say I support the prayer of the petition. I do so without any reservation or hesitation because I believe it to be in the

MR. ROBERTS: best interests of the people of that area and I would say to the Minister of Health that what these people ask is reasonable. What they ask is that he direct his officials to refrain from directing the hospital at St. Anthony to cease the practice of drug dispensing. It affects the Eagle River district, it affects St. Barbe district, it affects the Torngat Mountains and Naskaupi districts, it also, of course, affects most directly my own district. I support the petition, Sir.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the petition and again, of course, the rules do not allow me to debate it and I guess, in this case, I just want to explain more of the policy.

First of all, I am very familiar with it. I have had a delegation from the St. Anthony area in my office and I have responded to the issue by letter.

The hon. gentleman is correct when he states that the policy of government is to not interfere with a legitimate business and the dispensing of drugs in the proper way is a legitimate business. Of course, whenever we have a drugstore located in a community, be it St. Anthony or Twillingate or Norris Point or any other place, we ask our facilities, our boards of the hospitals, or in the case of cottage hospitals our administration people there, to desist from dispensing except in emergency cases. So that is the first problem we have here.

Now, to make an exception, Mr. Speaker, for the community of St. Anthony or the community of Norris Point or the community of Twillingate would be

MR. HOUSE: similar to saying to all the hospitals here in town, You fellows go ahead, you have the legitimate right to dispense drugs. So, Mr. Speaker, we have a policy. I do not know - the hon. gentleman said we are continuing it - I do not know but he was the Minister of Health who put that policy in place. I am not sure of that.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no.

MR. HOUSE: But, anyway, I am saying that it was there and, of course, the very fact that drugstores are springing up is because we have encouraged them to spring up, because we think it is better done through the drugstores.

MR. ROBERTS: I put the pharmacists (inaudible) through CTT to gear up the pharmacists in the Province. That was my contribution to this.

MR. HOUSE: So, Mr. Speaker, that is the situation and, you know, as I said, there is a way. The board has written us, incidentally, and asked if they could continue. And we have just written them back and told them that our policy is that we will not interfere with the legitimate dispensing of drugs or compete with private enterprise.

I have also, I think, told them that they could lease out space in the hospital and pay a pharmacist to run a pharmacy. But with the process that we have here, the policy is not to permit it or to ask boards to refrain from it and most often, in all cases, boards have not carried on with it. But I will just say to the hon. gentleman I will have further discussions with the board on that matter.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by my colleague the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) on behalf of 812 of his constituents in St. Anthony, Griquet and St. Lunaire. I was surprised to hear - and I cannot debate with the hon. gentleman - him say that government's policy is not to compete with private enterprise. I could ask the hon. gentleman about the Newfoundland Abattoir, where they sell chicken and pork, if that is not competing with private enterprise.

MR. HOUSE: We will sell them that one if they want it.

MR. NEARY: Sell them that one! I am sure the hon. gentleman would do anything, would sell anything. He would sell the gold filling in his grandmother's tooth if he thought he could get away with it.

Mr. Speaker, the key words-

MR. HOUSE: My grandmother will be 100 on Monday.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and, Mr. Speaker, I wish her well. Congratulations!

The key words in the petition presented by my hon. colleague is that the pharmacy in this hospital serves quite a large area. It serves three or four districts: Eagle River, Labrador South, a part of St. Barbe and practically, I would say, two-thirds of the Great Northern Peninsula, because down in the other end, I presume, Norris Point -

MR. HOUSE: It would not affect them down there.

MR. NEARY: That is right. It would not affect the people who live in the Bonne Bay area.

MR. NEARY: So circumstances alter cases and I believe in this particular instance the hon. gentleman should overlook that policy of not competing with private enterprise, because I really do not believe from that vast area of Newfoundland and across the Strait of Belle Isle to Labrador, I really do not believe that the Curtis Hospital would be competing with the drugstore in that area. The drugstore would serve the needs of the immediate locality, St. Anthony and -

MR. HOUSE: That is all it will effect, really.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is right. But people from Labrador South are getting drugs, from well down the Great Northern Peninsula, quite a distance away, and when they go to the hospital to see the doctor I presume they get their prescriptions filled at the same time, so I believe that service should continue. And I believe in this case the hon. gentleman should make a special case out of the dispensing of drugs in that hospital in St. Anthony, and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, to reconsider, because the conclusion that I came to as a result of the hon. gentleman's speaking to the petition was that he really was not in favour of the prayer of the petition. So I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to reconsider that and make a special case out of the tip of the Great Northern Peninsula, as far as the government policy for dispensing drugs is concerned.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Motion one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Motion one, Committee of Ways and Means. I think the debate was adjourned last day by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for letting me know he is not leaving because I am about to have a few words. He has a Public Accounts Committee meeting out in one of the back rooms there, and I wish him well. I only wish my colleague could get the Newfoundland Hydro under the wing of the Auditor General so that the Auditor General could examine the accounts of Newfoundland Hydro -

MR. SIMMS: Do not go calling a quorum now?

MR. NEARY: - so that the Public Accounts Committee of this House -

MR. SIMMS: Do not go calling a quorum.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. SIMMS: Do not call a quorum like you usually do.

MR. NEARY: What do you mean, do not call a quorum?

MR. SIMMS: When our members are outside at a meeting.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, when I am speaking I do not call a quorum. I might draw it to the attention of the Speaker. But my hon. colleague - before he leaves - made a very valid point there sometime ago about getting Crown corporations within the -

MR. ROBERTS: We all will have a chance to vote for that.

MR. NEARY: That is right - within the ambit of the Auditor General. I think that is a very, very good suggestion. We saw a classic example recently of why that is necessary, why it should be done, and that was in connection, Mr. Speaker, with a report done by an independent group of chartered accountants, done for the Public Utilities Board in connection with a hearing that is going on before the Board at the present time for an increase in electricity rates in this Province, and I will deal with this shortly.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are now into day two in the budget debate. This is

MR. NEARY: day two and to read the newspapers and to listen to the media you would never say there was a budget debate going on in the House. The budget debate is one of the most important debates to take place in this House. There are two occasions during the year when the government have an opportunity to state what plans they have to develop our Province, to deal with the economy. There are two chances, they have two cracks at it, one is in the Throne Speech and the other one is in the Budget Speech, moreso in the Budget Speech than in the Throne Speech.

So the main purpose of the Budget Speech is to give the government an opportunity to bring good news to the people, to bring glad tidings to the electorate who put the administration in power. That is really, Mr. Speaker, what it is all about. That is what a Budget Speech is all about, to give us a comprehensive report of the financial condition of the Province with regard to revenue and expenditure and borrowing, and to tell the people what plans the government have for developing the Province, for developing, for instance, our natural resources and for dealing with the problems in the economy. That is what a Budget Speech is all about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, did the last Budget Speech brought down by this government, did that Budget Speech deal with any of these items, any of these matters, that I just outlined? No, Mr. Speaker. The Budget Speech brought down by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this Province was full of ridicule and slander and criticism of just about everything and everybody that you could name. It was just one chorus of criticism of the federal government, and of the Government of Quebec, a criticism, Mr. Speaker, that we hear now every day in this hon. House.

The Budget Speech was negative in every, every respect. Unlike the federal Budget that was brought down last week by Mr. LaLonde, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: the provincial Budget was negative, The federal Budget was positive, and the federal Budget criticized nobody. There is the difference, Mr. Speaker. If hon. gentlemen watched the Budget Speech from the House of Commons and heard what Mr. LaLonde had to say and read the reports of the federal Budget that was brought down on April 20, Mr. Speaker, and they compared it to the Budget Speech in this House - it was not televised, by the way, it was not televised because of a policy decision on the part of the government caucus and not the Opposition, by the way.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. CARTER: It was all your fault.

MR. NEARY: No, no it was not. No, let me straighten that one out now right fast. We were asked if we would agree to have the Budget Speech carried in a live broadcast from the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and we agreed, we said yes. We thought we had made our point as far as televising the proceedings of the House of Assembly are concerned. We had made our point on two or three previous occasions, so, therefore, we decided to lift the ban,

MR. NEARY: as far as we were concerned, and we agreed, Mr. Speaker, to allow the television cameras and the microphones to be brought in on the floor of the House of Assembly so that the people of Newfoundland could hear and see the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) delivering his Budget Speech, because we wanted the people to hear it first-hand. We did not want them to get it second-hand no more, Mr. Speaker, than we want the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to get the daily reports from this House, from the daily sessions of this House -we do not want them to get them second-hand. We would rather have the microphones and the television cameras here on the floor so that people, if they wanted to, could turn their television to the channel where the live broadcast was coming from the House of Assembly and they could see their member, the Premier and the ministers, and members in living colour, hear what they have to say, see what they do in the House, their behaviour, what attitude they have and so forth and so on. But the government will not allow that. In the last fifteen years, every year we have had a debate in this hon. House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was just handed a note which says that "NTA President, Wayne Noseworthy, has conferred with the district presidents of his association and that they have decided not to hold a vote on the government's latest offer, instead the NTA want the government to put forward a more realistic proposal than the latest one on the table."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think any of us are surprised to hear that news. None of us should be surprised.

MR. CALLAN: It would have embarrassed the Premier if they had voted on that.

MR. NEARY: My hon. colleague might have a point. If the vote had gone ahead and they voted

MR. NEARY: 85 or 90 per cent in favour of the negotiating team and the executive of the NTA, then the Premier would have been boxed into a corner, he would have been placed in a very, very embarrassing position. I wonder what he would have done then, Mr. Speaker? What would the hon. gentleman have done if the teachers had gone ahead with the vote and received overwhelming support from the membership? They already had the mandate. They did not have to go back to their members, anyway. But let us use a hypothetical case and let us say that they did go back to their membership and they received overwhelming support from the rank and file members, what would the hon. gentleman have done then, Mr. Speaker. He would have done handsprings. He would not know what to do. He is mysterious enough in this House now, Mr. Speaker. He does some unusual and queer things now, what would he do then? You would not be able to hold him.

MR. CALLAN: Not queer, strange.

MR. NEARY: Strange things, my hon. colleague reminds me. That word is not unparliamentary, I suppose. But he does some strange things, some weird things, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes we wonder if the hon. gentleman is with it at all. But we are not surprised to hear this bit of news, at least I am not. They have a mandate, they intend to deliver on that mandate.

MR. NEARY: During the Question Period today, Mr. Speaker, the Premier sat over there and sulked and would not give us any answers and told us there was some activity taking place. And, Mr. Speaker, one option I forgot to toss in there, by the way -

MR. CALLAN: His resignation.

MR. NEARY: His resignation, that is right. I forgot to ask him if the fifth option was that he would go down to the Lieutenant-Governor, turn in his badge, pass in his resignation and call an election. What a time, Mr. Speaker, for an election! What a time for an election! The hon. gentleman is a fighter. The hon. gentleman calls himself a fighter. He says he has courage. He says he has courage and he says he is a fighter. Well, Mr. Speaker, all he fights with are Newfoundlanders and Canadians. He fights with the teachers and he fights with the press. He fights with everybody in Newfoundland and Labrador. That is all he fights with. And then when he confuses issues and causes all kinds of confusion and frustration then he walks away. Now, if he is the fighter that he says he is, Mr. Speaker, if he is such a gallant fighter and he thinks he can fight, Mr. Speaker, I challenge him now to go back to his corner and come out fighting; go down to the Lieutenant-Governor, turn in his resignation and admit that he has been a flop and a failure as Leader in this Province, throw in the towel. If he is such a fighter, if he has so much courage let us see his courage, Mr. Speaker. Is it courage? Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman has any backbone, any courage and any fight in him apart from being a big bluff who tries to portray the image of a fighter - all he is doing is fighting in his own little ivory tower while people outside, whom he cannot hear, are hopelessly grasping for help in this Province.

MR. CALLAN:

And he will not go out and talk to them.

MR. NEARY:

And he will not go out of his ivory tower and talk to them. He would not go out and talk to the teachers the other day, out in front of Confederation Building.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is not necessary to have an election now, although I have grave doubts about that, because the reason you have forty-four members sitting on that side of the House, the reason the Premier is where he is is because of an election that was held April 6, a little over a year ago. Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the issue in that election? It was a one-issue election, the issue was to negotiate an offshore agreement. They asked for a mandate. They had a mandate, they had a huge majority in the House. They had a mandate, it was an unnecessary election, it cost the taxpayers' of this Province probably a couple or \$3 million, unnecessarily, Mr. Speaker. After the election they started closing down hospital beds and fighting with the teachers and fighting with the students over at Memorial about their student allowance and so forth. But if the hon. gentleman has any courage now, and he keeps telling us and we keep hearing it, sometimes in editorial comment, what a courageous man he is, what a fighter he is. Well, now, I am going to call his bluff, call his bluff, because, Mr. Speaker, although they have four years to run in their term of office, they have not been able to fulfill their mandate and they have the Province on the brink of financial ruin. The economy of the Province is collapsing, Mr. Speaker.

So without belabouring the point I will just repeat my challenge to this great fighter, this great he-man, this great gentleman who waves his arms and froths at the mouth, wild-eyed, tries to leave the image

MR. NEARY: in this Province that he is a fighter. Now we will find out how much of a fighter he is, because right across this House today I am issuing a challenge to that hon. gentleman to go down to the Lieutenant-Governor now and turn in his resignation and ask for a general election. The hon. gentleman from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) smiles at that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is he a fighter or is he a coward? Members of this House will decide the answer to that, in due course. The hon. gentlemen sit over there day in and day out and they criticize me and they criticize the Opposition. They tell us that the people of Newfoundland do not take us seriously, that we are just a big joke. Now, Mr. Speaker, let them put their jobs on the line, let them find out for themselves who is considered to be the big joke in this Province. I know the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) cannot answer me. The Premier every day after Question Period leaves the House and goes down to his office and then he is the first to come back and stand in this House and criticize members on our side of the House who are away on business, which is unheard of, by the way, in the precincts of this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will give the hon. gentleman a reasonable period of time to make up his mind.

MR. MARSHALL: If you are going to the Lieutenant-Governor yourself, why do you want us to do it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do not worry, that is tucked away in my computer.

MR. MARSHALL: He now has a computer.

MR. NEARY: That is tucked away for future reference.

MR. NEARY: Let us see, Mr. Speaker, how much nerve the hon. gentleman has, let us see what kind of a fighter he is, let us see how much courage he has.

MR. MARSHALL: Everybody knows.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that the laugh might be on the other side of his face, if the emperor, Mr. Speaker, has the nerve and the courage to call an election now. We are going to be disappointed, because I know he will not do it, I know he will not accept my challenge. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate because there are many groups in this Province now who would like to get back to the polling booth, who would like to get a crack at the ballot box.

MR. NEARY: There are now a lot of Newfoundlanders who are having second thoughts about what they did a year ago, second thoughts, Mr. Speaker. They would love now to be able to get back to the ballot box.

You have the construction workers who would love to be able to get a crack at this administration. You have got the fish plant workers in Grand Bank and Burin and Ramea and Gaultois and Harbour Breton and Fermeuse, and St. Anthony, would they not love now to be able to get to the ballot box to get a dart at the representatives of the Tory Party in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Buchans, would they not love to be able to get a dart, and the people of Baie Verte and the people of Labrador West, and the people of Harbour Main-Bell Island. And, Mr. Speaker, would not the nurses and the public servants love to get a crack at this administration now? Would they not love to get to the ballot boxer?

And, Mr. Speaker, what about the parents of children who are out of school, would they not love now to be able to send their message to the Premier and to the administration? What about the students over at Memorial University, and at the College of Trades and Technology, and the sixteen vocational schools throughout the Province, would they not love to be able to mark their x's now, to cast their ballots now?

Mr. Speaker, if there was an election today hon. gentlemen, I am afraid, would not be over there very long. And that is why the hon. gentleman will

MR. NEARY: not call his election,
he has no courage, he has no intestinal fortitude.

MR. HOUSE: He has a mandate, boy, for
five years.

MR. NEARY: He has a mandate for
five years, Mr. Speaker. I say to the hon. gentleman now
that he can try all he wants to drag in red herrings
about mandates, the gauntlet has been flung down in front
of the hon. gentleman, and I am willing to bet you now,
Mr. Speaker, that he does not have the courage, he does
not have the courage to do it. The mandate is there.

Well, the teachers also
have a mandate.

MR. ANDREWS: You said that eighteen months
ago.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the teachers
have a mandate, but the hon. gentleman is questioning
the teachers' mandate just the same as the people are
questioning the hon. the Premier's mandate.

MR. ANDREWS: You called for an election
eighteen months ago.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I certainly
did not.

MR. ANDREWS: And you got it, buddy.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the teachers have
a mandate to negotiate and deliver an agreement. Who is
questioning their mandate?

MR. NEARY: The same gentleman now, his ministers are telling me -

MR. DINN: You are changing the subject now.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not changing the subject, I am coming back, do not worry. And there is no way the hon. gentleman is going to get off the hook that easy, Mr. Speaker, because, as I said, my challenge will prove once and for all whether we are dealing with a fighter or a coward. It is just as simple as that, Mr. Speaker.

It would be unusual to have an election a year or a couple of months after the last provincial general election, but in this case, I think it would be warranted. I think the people of this Province would welcome it, I think it would be justified and it would be warranted, Mr. Speaker, because the Province is in ruin as a result of the mismanagement of the resources by this administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will just have to wait and see the answer to that challenge. It is a challenge - the hon. gentleman can laugh all he wants - it is a very serious challenge. It is a challenge that I make on behalf of all unemployed people in this Province, all people on social assistance, students at the university and at the colleges and at the vocational schools. It is a challenge that I fling at the hon. gentleman from the nurses, from the public service employees, from construction workers, from the parents and from the teachers. I cannot think of any other groups, Mr. Speaker, that the administration have not picked a fight with at one time or another, or who have not had to knuckle under pressure from the hon. the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) may treat it lightly; the hon. gentleman may just look upon it as a joke, but it is no joke, Mr. Speaker. I am very, very serious. Mr. Speaker, people are concerned about their future, concerned about this Province. They are concerned about the behaviour and the attitude of the Premier. They realize what they are up against, Mr. Speaker. They had great confidence and faith in the hon. gentleman a year or so ago. They thought indeed that he was a fighter. A lot of people did not know what he was fighting for. And they gave him a mandate, a very large mandate to govern this Province, but the trouble is that the hon. gentleman has not been governing. He is a very

MR. NEARY: poor administrator. The flaw in his character, the flaw in his ability, Mr. Speaker, is that he cannot negotiate and he is a poor administrator. He means well the poor fellow and I will give him credit, he is a good Newfoundlander. He is no better a Newfoundlander than anybody else sitting on either side of this House, no better or no worse. We are all good Newfoundlanders. The hon. gentleman is in that category of a good Newfoundlander but the trouble is that he cannot cope, he just cannot govern the Province. The hon. gentleman feels, aided and abetted by the President of the Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), who has a very buttoned-down mind, the Premier aided and abetted by the hon. gentleman sometimes strays too far afield, goes too far, makes anti-Canadian remarks and statements that can only do damage to this Province.

MR. CARTER: That is a personal attack.

MR. NEARY: It is not a personal attack. The hon. gentleman happens to be Premier of this Province.

MR. CARTER: Is your time not up yet?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman's time will be up if the Premier will accept my challenge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would be permanently retired to the savory patch if we had an election right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a quorum call, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A quorum call. Call in the members.

Order, please!

With the agreement of both sides, there is a quorum present.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grand Bank has been interrupting me on a number of occasions this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I have news for the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), I just had another message delivered to me which says that -

MR. MATTHEWS: What does he mean, another message?

MR. NEARY: This was a telegram that was sent to the member for Grand Bank yesterday, 'We feel that you can no longer be quiet about the NTA Collective Bargaining agreement' - there you go, he has the telegram there now, look. 'We feel that you can no longer be quiet about the NTA Collective Bargaining agreement. We request an immediate public statement on your stand on this particular issue. Time is running out.'

MR. TOBIN: That is not just to him, everybody got one.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, listen to what the telegram says -

MR. MATTHEWS: You are messenger boy now, are you?

MR. NEARY: - 'Time is running out.'

MR. MATTHEWS: It ran out on April 6th for the man who sent that, you know we won.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. MATTHEWS: I said, time ran out on April 6th for the man who sent that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it says here -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. gentleman is aware that this telegram is truly representing
160 -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is from a teacher playing politics!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: -160 teachers in the area. And it says that the hon. gentleman met two weeks ago with 160

MR. NEARY: teachers and he told them, Mr. Speaker,
of his support and to date he has been silent.

MR. MATTHEWS: One hundred sixty, eh?

MR. NEARY: Wait, I am coming to that now.

The telegram and petition was hand
delivered to him yesterday on behalf of 160 members of
the their branch. Now is that correct or not?

MR. CALLAN: He is sitting on the fence.

MR. NEARY: Delivered to him yesterday on behalf of 160 members of their branch. They want an immediate reply and a public statement.

MR. TOBIN: I wonder if he would be familiar with Lewisporte?

MR. NEARY: They want an immediate reply from the hon. gentleman and a public statement.

MR. MORGAN: You are playing politics on the backs of the teachers.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was down in Ramea some time ago -

MR. HOUSE: Where did you stand in 1969, when you were the Minister of Labour?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman makes his statement and he runs out through the door.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am enjoying the hon. gentlemen.

MR. HISCOCK: Why do you not go out on the steps and talk to the teachers?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is this not wonderful? The arrogance! The most vocal that we have over there now are the two hon. gentlemen, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), the two hon. ministers who are trying to recoup the deficit on the backs of the sick and the poor.

MR. HOUSE: Judge Mifflin never had a thing to say about us.

MR. NEARY: Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker. Twenty or thirty more laid off in Grand Falls today and who is the most vocal, Mr. Speaker, across the House? Who is the most vociferous? Who is continuously interrupting me? The two hon. ministers, Mr. Speaker, who should be going around this Province hanging their heads in shame.

MR. NEARY: They should have their heads down between their legs, Mr. Speaker, these two hon. gentlemen, trying to recoup a deficit, brought about as a result of their mismanagement of the fiscal affairs of this Province, on the backs of people on Social assistance and people who are sick and people who cannot defend themselves.

MR. HICKEY: Tell us who gave the teachers collective bargaining.

MR. NEARY: Tell us who gave the teachers the checkoff which made the NTA, tell us that?

MR. TOBIN: What did Joey say about the teachers?

MR. NEARY: One of the greatest Reforms, Mr. Speaker. Hon. gentlemen like living in the past, I believe, Mr. Speaker. The trouble with the hon. gentlemen is they have the opposition syndrome. They just cannot get it out of their system.

MR. CALLAN: Gutless cowards, that is whay they are.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is the president?

MR. NEARY: Oh, we will find out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Joey Smallwood said in this place right here, let the teachers hang, and you were Minister of Labour. You were then Minister of Labour and you did not open your mouth.

MR. TOBIN: No, nor the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) either, and he was sitting next to Joey.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am rather enjoying this. They are awfully testy! They are awfully jumpy and jittery over there today, and, of course, people who are seated in the galleries can observe the arrogance, Mr. Speaker. They can observe how members there opposite abuse and misuse the rules of this hon. House. They can see the arrogance, especially the arrogance of the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) who is noted for his rudeness.

MR. CALLAN: The coattail member.

MR. NEARY: The coattail member, Mr. Speaker, who should take a course in self-improvement. The hon. gentleman would have been well informed to take a Dale Carnegie course before he ran for politics.

MR. TOBIN: Is that right?

MR. NEARY: That is what the hon. gentleman should have done.

MR. TOBIN: There will be no Mifflin reports as there were on you when you were in government.

MR. NEARY: He has a gutter snipe mentality, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has a gutter snipe mentality.

MR. TOBIN: There will be no Mifflin reports on me when I walk out. I worked in Social Services, you know I worked there, and you know what I know, too.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman cannot take it he should not be interrupting me across the House. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, also has to remember that one of the rules of this House is that if you are going to speak or interrupt or be rude or nasty that you have to do it from your own seat.

MR. TOBIN: No, that is not one of the rules.

MR. NEARY: Of course, the hon. gentleman would not know that.

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

MR. SPEAKER (MCNICHOLAS): On a point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the rules of relevance are very wide-ranging in the Budget debate, but I would be indebted either to you, Mr. Speaker, or to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who is now speaking, as is his right, if I could be told what he is being relevant to. I am not asking that he be relevant, merely that he define what he is trying to be relevant to.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Of course, Your Honour, I do not have to waste time to speak to that. It is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is just another excuse for the hon. gentleman to get up and show his ignorance for the decorum and the rules of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I would rule that it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. NEARY: And so, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will be able to carry on my few words, my few remarks

MR. NEARY:

is mad. I mean, Mr. Speaker, I did not bring on this teacher's dispute. I did not bring it on. The pressure that is on the Premier and on the administration is not my fault. If they have mismanaged the economy and the development of this Province and the resources and the fiscal matters in this Province, that is not my fault. Why should they take it out on me? Why should they get mad with me? They should be getting mad with the Premier, the leader of the administration. That is the gentleman they should be mad with, The Minister of Health (Mr. House).

MR. HOUSE:

I am not mad with you.

You are boring, that is all, you are boring.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman cannot resist interrupting me, he cannot resist it. I would not say that I am that boring. I may be getting the hon. gentleman's dander up, I may be getting to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and he does not have much dander to get up. I may be getting to him, but if I am hurting the hon. gentleman's feelings, well, there is a recourse, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman can step outside and have a smoke, if he smokes, or he can step outside and have a coffee. So if I am boring and monotonous I apologize. I hope I am not. And if hon. gentleman would just stop intimidating me and trying to provoke me, then I may carry on with my few remarks uninterrupted, Mr. Speaker. But if they keep it up we are going to have a great time here this afternoon. We will have a great time and I will not get my speech finished this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to come back and I do not want to belabour this point any longer, but I think I answered the member for Grand Bank when he had a very broad smile on his face when I mentioned having

MR. NEARY: a general election. He thought there was no need for it. Well, I just gave him an example of why there was a need for it. The other need, of course, in the hon. gentleman's district has to do with the fish plant in Fortune and Grand Bank and the fish plant

MR. NEARY:

in St. Lawrence. And that is ample reason, I think, for the hon. gentleman now to account - you could call an election, I suppose, an accountability session. And if the hon. gentleman is so sure of his seat then he would not be ashamed, he would not be afraid to have an accountability election. It is only a year later. I realize that it is only a year later but I believe, in view of the extraordinary circumstances in this Province at the present time, I believe we should have an early accountability election, call it an accountability election to give the people now an opportunity, a little over a year later, to let the people know how they feel about this administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was comparing there a short while ago the provincial and federal budgets. The provincial budget was full of negative statements, full of criticism, full of condemnation, full of slander, Mr. Speaker. And when you compare that budget to the budget brought down by Mr. Lalonde last week in the House of Commons, it was completely opposite. Can the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) find one paragraph in the federal budget that criticized anybody?

MR. MATTHEWS: If you keep it up you are going to be criticized sooner than you think.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman find one paragraph in the federal budget that criticized anybody?

MR. MATTHEWS: Why do you not read the whole thing?

MR. NEARY: No. I just have here the highlights, this is only the highlights. I am asking the hon. gentleman if the hon. gentleman can give me one example in the federal budget of criticism of anything or anybody?

April 28, 1983

Tape No. 1525

SD - 2

MR. MATTHEWS:
that sound to you?

Yes, \$200 million. How does

MR. NEARY:
a positive statement.

\$200 million to me sounds like

MR. MATTHEWS:

Overnight?

MR. NEARY:

A very positive statement.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Why was it put in there?

MR. NEARY:

Why was what put in there?

MR. MATTHEWS: The \$200 million extra.

MR. NEARY: \$200 million extra?

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know what the hon. gentleman is driving at and I would say that that cameraman, by the way, that cameraman should have gotten an increase in pay for the job that he did. He got more money for this Province, he got more money for the other provinces of Canada. Out of that \$200 million a couple or \$3 million more will come into this Province. So I compliment that cameraman. I think he did a great job and I think that cameraman, who used such imagination, who was so quick and alert when he zoomed the zoom lens in on the budget, should get a raise in pay.

MR. TOBEN: What about the (inaudible) and what about the statement about the fishing industry?

MR. NEARY: We should pass a resolution in this House, send it off to that cameraman and thank him, Mr. Speaker, for the service that he has provided for the provinces and for the people of Canada.

MR. BAIRD: It ran into a \$200 million mini budget.

MR. ANDREWS: What about the \$650 million for airport (inaudible) and \$630 million for the -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lalonde's -

MR. ANDREWS: What about the fishery?

MR. NEARY: Does the hon. gentleman want to hear about the fishery?

MR. ANDREWS: If it is a very positive budget, where is the money for the fishing industry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me deal with that question. I am sure the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) did not really expect me to give him an answer but I will. I will deal with his question because it is a very timely, very current, and very important matter. The matter of restructuring the fishing industry in this Province is one of the items that was left out of the provincial budget. Nowhere in the provincial budget can you find five cents for the restructuring of the processing sector.

MR. ANDREWS: (Inaudible) dollars.

MR. NEARY: Not a cent, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman can rant and rave all he wants, there is not a penny anywhere in that budget to restructure the processing sector of the Newfoundland fishing industry, the deep-sea fishery, not a cent. And Mr. Johnston, the Chairman of the Ad hoc Federal Committee, wired the Premier of this Province and asked the Premier, on behalf of his administration, if the administration here was prepared to put up their share of the financing of the restructuring.

MR. MATTHEWS: I thought he appointed Mr. Kirby as the -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Johnston asked the Premier to give a commitment on behalf of the provincial government as to how far they were prepared to become involved in the restructuring of the deep-sea fishery in this Province, financially.

MR. ANDREWS: \$61 million last year.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is untrue and that is a figment of the hon. gentleman's imagination. \$61 million last year.

MR. ANDREWS: It is not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fish plant

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fish plant in Ramea is closed. And I will just deal with that one because that is in the hon. member's district.

Now, let me ask the hon. gentleman a question. Has he gone to the Premier, his leader, his emperor, in the last week and said to him, 'Look, Mr. Emperor, would you tell me now so that I can tell the plant workers and the fishermen in Ramea where the plant is closed - would you please tell me how much we are prepared to put in to get that plant reopened? How much money are we prepared to put into the pot to get that plant reopened?' Has the hon. gentleman done that in the last week or two?

MR. ANDREWS: Not worthy of an answer.

MR. NEARY: Not worthy of an answer.

MR. ANDREWS: The people of Ramea know the answer to the question.

MR. NEARY: Yes? What is the answer? The answer is that the hon. gentleman has been bluffing the people of Ramea.

I happened to be down in Ramea, Mr. Speaker. I was in Ramea about five weeks ago, six weeks ago, and I saw a telex from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on the wall, saying that everything is going to be alright. 'Everything will be hunky-dory, everything will be okay when the Kirby report is made public.' That is what the hon. gentleman was saying.

MR. SIMMS: Do you want an answer to that question?

MR. HOUSE: You are the challenger, do you want an answer to the question?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want an answer but I am not giving up my turn. The former Speaker can go down and he can slip all the parliamentary tricks he wants to the hon. gentleman but it is not going to work.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has not been here long enough yet.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I have been asked a question, not as the Minister of Fisheries, but as I would suspect, an ordinary member of the House of Assembly, and if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would like an answer to that question, I would care to answer.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you want to assist the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), if you want to help him, why do you not take him out and give him a short course in the rules of the House?

MR. SIMMS: We are watching you every day, boy, and we are learning.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is right. And you are learning. You are watching and you are learning every day.

MR. SIMMS: I have learned a lot from you, I must say.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is right, you did. When you were in the Chair you also learned a little bit.

MR. SIMMS: And you learned a lot from me, did you not?

MR. NEARY: Well, the kinds of things that the hon. gentleman was teaching I am afraid I did not want to learn, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: We have had many conversations.

MR. NEARY: We certainly did, that is right, private and otherwise. I must say, I have found the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman is a decent fellow.

He should not interrupt me and get caught in the crossfire,

he should leave that to the guttersnipes.

MR. ANDREWS: Where are you more at home?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member

who represents Ramea in this House has been bluffing his constituents, has been bluffing the plant workers and bluffing the fishermen in Ramea. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member thinks he is fooling the people of Ramea, then I have to tell him, Mr. Speaker, that I was there, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that he is not fooling the people of Ramea, they know the difference. They know, Mr. Speaker, that the processing sector of the Newfoundland fishery is provincial jurisdiction.

MR. NEARY: They know that and they know that any initiative -

MR. MATTHEWS: The Kirby Task Force has done nothing. Nothing.

MR. ANDREWS: They know that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they also know - I will take this Hansard and I will send it down to Ramea and let the people read the hon. gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, the people know that the processing sector is provincial jurisdiction and they also know this, that this provincial government under whose jurisdiction that plant comes, have not lifted a finger to help the people of Ramea. They have not responded -

MR. ANDREWS: Three months ago we put \$3 million into that plant.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker, they have not responded to Mr. Johnston, Chairman of the ad hoc federal committee, the Premier has not told Mr. Johnston how far this Province is prepared to go by the way of helping to finance plants that are not opened.

Mr. Speaker, I heard a statement yesterday - I read a statement in the newspaper or I heard it on the radio - by the MP who represents that area who is so frustrated over the inactivity, the lack of interest on the part of the Province that he came out publicly and stated that maybe what the Government of Canada should do, what the federal government should do, is ignore the provincial government and go ahead and open these plants even though it was not their jurisdiction.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was being panicky.

MR. NEARY: Well, would you blame the member for being panicky?

Mr. Speaker, there is no money in Ottawa?

April 28, 1983

Tape No. 1528

MJ - 2

MR. MATTHEWS: No, because there is no money in Ottawa for what they say they are going to do.

MR. NEARY: There is no money in Ottawa? Mr. Speaker, I believe that I heard a figure of \$250 million that would be required in Newfoundland to restructure the deep-sea fishery, the processing sector.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was for Atlantic Canada.

MR. NEARY: No, \$500 million for Atlantic Canada, \$250 million in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, has the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) or has the member who represents Ramea (Mr. Andrews) and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) have they also gone to the Premier and apart from saying, 'Look, Mr. Premier will you provide the answer; how far are we prepared to go? Are we prepared to do anything or are we just going to sit here like dummies and twiddle our thumbs?' Now, in addition to that have they gone to the Premier and said, 'Look, Mr. Premier, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), your colleague, has not yet appointed a negotiator to negotiate the restructuring of the processing sector of the deep-sea fishery.' Mr. Speaker, have they done that? Has the member for Grand Bank done that?

MR. TOBIN: Did you hear about the poll in Burin-St. George's?

MR. NEARY: Has the member for Burin gone to the Premier lately, in the last twenty-four hours, today, yesterday,

MR. NEARY: last week and said, 'Look, Mr. Premier, I do not think we are going to get anywhere with this restructuring until we appoint the negotiator. we were asked three weeks or a month ago to appoint'.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the poll that was done in Burin - St. George's.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the negotiator?

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the poll that was done in Burin - St. George's.

MR. NEARY: I can tell the hon. member about the poll that is being done in Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the poll that was done in Burin - St. George's.

MR. NEARY: And I would not want to give the hon. gentleman diarrhea before the House is over today.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the poll that was done in Burin-St. George's and why Mr. Simmons -

MR. NEARY: I would not want to give the hon. gentleman the Summer complaint before the day is over, but have they gone to the Premier and said to the Premier, 'Look, between three weeks and a month ago we were asked to appoint a negotiator to negotiate the restructuring of the offshore fishery in this Province'.

MR. TOBIN: You are listening to Roger Simmons and he does not understand. You are being misled. Do not listen to him, he does not really understand the issue.

MR. NEARY: Is it not great, Mr. Speaker. I mean, I am satisfied to stay here all day if I have to. But I am asking the hon. member to give me a straight answer, yes or no, has the provincial government yet appointed a negotiator to negotiate with Mr. Kirby?

MR. TOBIN: Well, what do you think?

MR. NEARY: Well, I am asking.

MR. TOBIN: Well, see, where you are wrong is when Kirby was given the mandate to negotiate by the federal government, the mandate for negotiations was given to Kirby by the federal Cabinet not to the provincial Cabinet. If the federal government had asked us to look after it, it would have been done long ago.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me try to straighten the hon. gentleman out in that little statement that he just made because obviously he is not familiar with what is happening. Mr. Kirby was given a mandate by the federal Cabinet Committee to implement the recommendations for restructuring the deep-sea fishery in Atlantic Canada. Now, each province was then asked to appoint a negotiator to negotiate with Mr. Kirby as to what plans the provincial government wanted in that province to restructure the section of the industry that comes under their jurisdiction. Okay? They were asked to appoint a negotiator. Now, have they appointed that negotiator?

MR. TOBIN: Okay, just to set you straight on that, this government is waiting for Kirby to call a negotiated meeting, which he has the mandate to do. All he has to do is notify this government that he wants to negotiate the restructuring and people will be in place, yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a pity -

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Kirby is just back from Europe somewhere, now he is in New York and the fishery is no longer important.

MR. NEARY: It is a pity and a shame that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) or the Premier has not told the hon. gentleman what is going on.

MR. TOBIN: I am very much aware of what is going on.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kirby is looking for somebody in this Province to negotiate with. He wants to know who has been named by the provincial government - one, two, three people. How many? Who are they? Identify them. Who shall I negotiate with in Newfoundland and Labrador? And right up to this moment Mr. Kirby, Mr. Johnston,

MR. NEARY: nobody knows who the negotiator is for this Province.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Kirby has been out of the country with nothing to do with the fisheries for the last two weeks.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, all you have to do is pick up your papers, listen to your radio and television and you will know. But just look at the damage that is being done, look at the time that is being wasted and look at the possibility of us losing out in any funding that is available for the restructuring of the processing sector.

MR. TOBIN: You are wrong 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: I am right, Mr. Speaker, I know I am right, Mr. Speaker. I am right. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) confirmed in this House, outside of this House, that no negotiator has been appointed by the provincial government.

MR. TOBIN: What are we going to negotiate?

MR. NEARY: Here is what they have to negotiate -

MR. TOBIN: Yes, I know. But Kirby has to call them to do it.

MR. NEARY: Here is what has to be negotiated. There has to be a merger of the companies, the processing companies, the Lake Group of Companies, John Penny and Sons and Fishery Products. There has to be a merger of these companies. There has to be negotiations with the banks, with the owners, with the shareholders of these companies.

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, what we are up against here as far as the fishery is concerned is the fact that the administration have not yet appointed a negotiator. Kirby cannot find anybody to negotiate with. Now, I am becoming very, very concerned. Mr. Speaker, I am very, very concerned about the way things are developing as far as the restructuring of the offshore fishery is concerned, very concerned. I am not at all happy about it, As a matter of fact, I am very displeased about the way things are going. And I am rapidly coming to the conclusion that it is time to give that super bureaucrat the Royal Order of the Boot, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: Who is that, Kirby?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Kirby. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Government of Canada to restore the responsibility for the fishery to Mr. De Bane, the Minister of Fisheries, give him back the authority that has been taken away from him by this super bureaucrat.

AN HON. MEMBER: They do not trust him.

MR. NEARY: Well, they should trust him, because he is a very decent man, and I like him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: Sure, and I agree with you 100 per cent.

MR. NEARY: But I am becoming increasingly alarmed and concerned about Mr. Kirby who is looking at the Newfoundland fishery from the vantage point of Wellington Street up there in Ottawa. And I do not like that, Mr. Speaker. I do not like the power and authority that is being put in the hands of this super bureaucrat.

MR. TOBIN: I agree with you, Right on!

MR. NEARY: I was convinced a long time ago, if I needed any convincing, that this gentleman does not understand the local psychology, he does not understand the heritage and the tradition and the way of life in this Province. He looks at the job, the mandate that he has been given, he looks at it in a hard, cold, callous, dollars and cents way, profit and loss, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: No social conscience whatsoever. You are right on.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I finally got the hon. member to agree with me on something. But if I am right on, remember that I am the first who said it in this House. He is a super bureaucrat, no heart. I am of the opinion that Mr. Kirby has been given too much authority, has been given authority that belongs to an elected person, to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. DeBane). I think that there is a bit of a struggle going on, there is a bitter struggle going on. I think that the heavies in the caucus, the heavyweights are winning out. And I have to come back to what I said in this House some time ago about my criticism of this administration here for not getting solidly behind the People's Conference for muddying up the water, Mr. Speaker, and they did.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) your colleagues.

MR. NEARY: No. They did muddy up the water. They had an opportunity to send a message to Ottawa which would leave no doubt in anybody's mind up there that this administration was solidly behind the resolution that was passed unanimously at the People's Conference. Instead of that they created doubt, weakened the position, created confusion.

MR. SIMMS: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true, Mr. Speaker, and as a result of that I would say that the federal members in the Cabinet who were for Option 3 as amended had the legs knocked out

MR. NEARY: from under them, had the props knocked out from under them by this Province not getting solidly behind them. You put yourself in Mr. DeBane's position. He is there and he is up against fierce competition and he is advocating the same thing that the People's Conference wanted and that is Option 3 amended. That is what Mr. DeBane favoured. And you have another heavy in the caucus who says, 'No, we want Option 1, we want the Nova Scotia type agreement.' And then, Mr. Speaker, the telegram arrives from the People's Conference, a message arrives from Newfoundland and then, the very next day

MR. NEARY: after the message arrives, we have a proposal put forward by the Provincial Government which is different than the message.

MR. TOBIN: Wait now. Wait now! That one was put forth first. It was the week before.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, would that not create some doubt? Would that not make the members of the Cabinet wonder if there was solidarity in this Province?

MR. TOBIN: You were making some sense. Now just be honest.

MR. NEARY: No, I just want to get things in the right perspective. If the hon. gentleman would just leave me alone I will come back to the other matter, but I just want to get it chronological order.

MR. TOBIN: And the Premier's position endorsed the people's.

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, that is right. But it is nice, because the hon. gentleman keeps reminding me of things.

MR. TOBIN: That is fair enough.

MR. NEARY: Right. That is right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: I am giving him the right information, see.

MR. NEARY: No, the trouble is it is his lack of knowledge that motivates me into trying to provide him with some information.

Mr. Speaker, when the message arrived in Ottawa from the People's Conference then there was another document which arrived from the Provincial Government which was completely different than the recommendations from the People's Conference. And if you were in that Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, if you were a member of that Cabinet supporting Option Three as amended, and

MR. NEARY: your colleague who is a heavy from Nova Scotia, came and said, 'Look boy, you have not got the support, you do not have 100 per cent support from Newfoundland, they seem to be divided. You got the Provincial Government saying one thing and you have the People's Conference saying something different.

MR. ANDREWS: Is that not shocking.

MR. SIMMS: Oh, come on now 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is true.

MR. TOBIN: Who took part in the People's Conference and who was the first man to ignore it?

MR. SIMMS: We heard what Cashin said about it.

TOBIN: And who was the first man to endorse the People's Resolution? The Minister of Fisheries for this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I was the first one who went up to the mike and said, 'Let my name be first'.

MR. TOBIN: No, you shouted from your chair.

MR. NEARY: No, I did not. I went to a microphone. I was standing in the middle of the floor and I walked up and I made a brief statement. I did not want to play politics as hon. members were doing. I said, 'I would like for my name to be number one on that telegram' and then I took my seat.

MR. TOBIN: You shouted it out, but the Minister of Fisheries said it first.

MR. NEARY: I got a resounding applause from the audience and I took my seat.

MR. TOBIN: Who got the standing ovation? It was the Minister of Fisheries who brought the people to their feet, not you.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, so the case was weakened and as a result we now find ourselves in a position where we are faced with Option One as amended.

MR. NEARY:

Option One amended.

Now what is Option One amended? Option One amended is a merger between Nickerson's and National Sea, which will make the Nova Scotia company a very powerful company indeed. Nickerson's and National Sea. National Sea is the best managed company right now in the whole Atlantic fishery.

MR. NEARY: National Sea have good management and they have been able to meet their financial requirements and meet their loan and pay back the money they borrowed and their productivity is excellent, so they right now have a good reputation.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I interrupt the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to inform the House that there are no questions for the Late Show today.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Does that mean we finish at 5:30 P.M., Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Unless there is agreement by the House to continue.

MR. NEARY: Well, I hope I will be able to finish by 5:30 P.M., Your Honour, but if I cannot, well, we will rise the House at 5:30 P.M., I guess.

So you will have a very powerful Nova Scotian company. And in Newfoundland, when you merge Fishery Products, which is about \$100 million in debt, and you merge the Lake Group of companies with Fishery Products, which is about \$30 million or \$40 million in debt, and you merge John Penny and Sons company with Fishery Products and the Lake Group of companies, you have a very weak Newfoundland company. That Newfoundland corporate entity, compared to the Nova Scotia company of National Sea and Nickersons, will be very weak indeed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they have thrown in a sweetener. They said, 'Well, maybe we will give the Newfoundland corporate entity scallops. We will give them scallops because there is a good market for them and a good price, they are a money-maker. So we will give them the scallops. And we will also give them access to a couple

MR. NEARY: of ports in Nova Scotia so that there can be intraprovincial activity.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the way the situation stands at the moment and it is unfortunate that it worked out that way. And, on the basis of that decision that was taken by the ad hoc committee of the federal Cabinet, Mr. Kirby was given instructions to proceed with the restructuring of the industry in Atlantic Canada. And Mr. Johnston, chairman of the committee, immediately communicated that information to the provincial governments of the four Atlantic Provinces and Mr. Kirby met with officials from the Department of Fisheries of this Province and Halifax a couple of weeks ago

MR. NEARY: and asked the provincial government to appoint a negotiator so that they could negotiate the restructuring here in this Province. Mr. Speaker, up to this moment we have not heard any announcement from the provincial government, from the administration here, from members there opposite, that a negotiator has been appointed. Kirby is gone off on vacation. The people in Ramea and Burin and Gaultois and Grand Bank and Harbour Breton and Fermeuse and all the other places are still up in the air as to their future. They do not know where they stand. A decision is long overdue. It is cruel the way the people in these communities have been treated. They have been bluffed and hoodwinked. They have been given wrong information by their representatives. It is shameful, Mr. Speaker, the way they have been treated. It is shameful the way that Kirby has treated the problem in this Province. There is a struggle going on between the federal and provincial governments as to who is going to put up the money for re-opening plants that are not considered to be economically viable. That battle is going on. And I have to ask the question here today, who is going to put it up? Has this government put forward a plan to the Government of Canada to assist in the financing? Will it be done on a fifty/fifty basis? Will it be done seventy-five/twenty-five? Will it be done ninety/ten? Or will the federal government have to do what Mr. Simmons suggested yesterday, and that is take the bull by the horns and stop beating around the bush and let the federal government take it over and open the plants, put their financing in, get the plants open. Is it going to come to that, Mr. Speaker? Is it going to come to that?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we have an emergency situation. We have a crisis in the fishery. It is an emergency. The season has advanced now, Mr. Speaker, to the stage where I doubt very much if it would be worthwhile to re-open these plants.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the fishery in this Province is more than just a livelihood for people who live in communities where you have fish plants. It is more than that. The fishery

MR. NEARY: is a resource of an industry that affects every man, woman, and child in this Province, Mr. Speaker, if it does cost a couple of hundred million dollars, it does cost \$250 million to revitalize the fishing industry in this Province, in my opinion that would be little enough price to pay for this great industry, the backbone of our economy. It would be little enough.

Mr. Speaker, I would not blink an eyelash myself of spending a couple of hundred million dollars or \$250 million to revitalize the fishing industry in this Province. I would not bat an eyelash. We have hon. gentlemen now who are stating publicly, this is a lot of money, There are a lot of lives involved here, Mr. Speaker, a lot of human suffering, a lot of communities involved that have been structured and craved out that made their mark in Newfoundland based on the fishery; their very way of life, their tradition, and their heritage, which may sound like old, worn out words, Mr. Speaker, but they are true - maybe old hats to some hon. gentlemen.

Now I ask hon. gentlemen, does Mr. Kirby understand this?

MR. TULK: Kirby does not understand anything.

MR. NEARY: Does he understand?

MR. TULK: He does not understand anything, you know that.

MR. NEARY: Or will he carry on with his present attitude of if plant does not pay close it down, leave it closed. I do not like that kind of an attitude, Mr. Speaker. I do not like it. And I do not care who appointed Mr. Kirby whether it was NDP, Liberals, or Tories, I do not care who they were, I am getting kind of fed up with this man, I am getting fed up with him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let no hon. gentleman in this House think for a moment that anybody is parroting the federal line in this House. We are all Liberals, of course, we are. We are all Liberals, and I am proud to be a Liberal, and I am proud to support a Liberal Government in Ottawa, proud of it. But that is not the point, Mr. Speaker, Nobody is infallible, not even on that side of the House. I believe the federal Cabinet should admit their mistake, man-fashion, and the moment that Kirby lands on Canadian soil again, the moment he steps ashore from his vacation in Europe, that somebody be there to greet him with a No. 9, and give him the Royal Order of the Boot. The sooner we get rid of him the better, in my opinion. And that is not a condemnation or a criticism of my colleagues in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, it is a statement that I make out of frustration

MR. NEARY: and anger with this man and with his attitude. Once he submitted his report and gave Canada - probably for the first time we have, I suppose, a Canadian fishery policy - once he did that, once his report was made to Cabinet, I believe that Mr. Kirby should have been sent on to his position as Vice-President of CN. I do not think the man has it in him to restructure the Newfoundland fishery. As I said, he looks at Newfoundland from the vantage point of Wellington Street, in Ottawa, and that is not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Be careful,

MR. NEARY: I know, I know. If this is picked up that I am here criticizing Kirby! But we have discussed it, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues and I have discussed it and my colleagues can speak for themselves when the time comes. But I personally am fed up with Kirby. I never want to hear that name again in connection with the Newfoundland fishery. As far as I am concerned he has carried out his mandate, now let him go in peace. Let us hear no more about Kirby. I do not want to hear any more about him, Mr. Speaker. Let the provincial and federal ministers, the provincial and federal governments get on with the job.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I regret to hear that, but I am glad that the Premier gave me that little bit of information -

MR. ANDREWS: Put pressure on your colleagues now.

MR. NEARY: - that the pressure is on to negotiate head to head, minister to minister, government to government. That is the way it should be, I am not disputing that, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am glad to hear that.

MR. NEARY: I want Kirby out of the middle. Get him out of the middle of that situation and let the elected

MR. NEARY: representatives of the people, both on a provincial and federal level, deal with the matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I am all for that. That is what I have been saying for that last half hour, Mr. Speaker. And if that is what the hon. gentleman is trying to accomplish, then he has my blessing, Mr. Speaker. How can I make it more clear? I never want to see or hear tell of that super-bureaucrat again. I never want to hear the name Kirby again.

MR. ANDREWS: Well, stop talking about him.

MR. NEARY: I wish I could, but we have to. The trouble is that he is jammed in between. He is Mr. In-between.

MR. ANDREWS: Get after his boss to get rid of him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be a line or two of what I am saying today get out so that somebody will read it and say, 'My God, look at this, boy! Kirby is not very popular down there. Kirby is not even very popular with the Liberals.'

Mr. Speaker, the thing is, we have to get on with the job. It is too important an industry, it is our most basic industry, it affects every man, woman and child in this Province.

MR. TOBIN: Do you think the federal government, Johnston, should be at the meeting in St. John's next week?

MR. NEARY: I do not know anything about the meeting. What is the meeting all about?

MR. MATTHEWS: Have you not been invited?

MR. NEARY: You mean the People's Conference?

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know what could be accomplished -

MR. TOBIN: It would seem that Mr. Tobin and Mr. Simmons, there is no depth to them at all. They get up and say what they like and then they go to Ottawa and there is no action. Should not the persons responsible be there, Mr. Johnston and Mr. De Bane?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will be there for part of that session. Because the House is meeting in the afternoon, I will be there for part of it, and my colleague, who is our spokesman on Fisheries, will be there, I suppose, for the whole day. I hope it will not develop into a political wrangle. I hope that it will be as constructive as the last People's Conference, which I enjoyed very much. I believe in solidarity. I believe in it even with the teachers. I believe in solidarity.

MR. NEARY: I believe the communities should be united. I think every fish plant worker and every fisherman in Newfoundland right now should be behind this great cause.

MR. TOBIN: Wait now! There was nothing happened in the last of it, there was no answer. As a matter of fact, the telex was not even acknowledged. Do you not think that the people with the answers should be there to respond?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to deal with the nitty-gritty of this, I am not going to deal with the small potatoes. What I am talking about is much larger than that, I am talking about a government negotiating with a government, not with a superbureaucrat. And I think it is wrong, Mr. Speaker. I really believe the federal Cabinet is wrong.

MR. TOBIN: Why do you not send a telegram and tell them so.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in case the hon. gentleman is worried that I have not communicated my criticisms and objections and my recommendations, I want to assure the hon. gentleman that it has been done in the proper place. It has been done.

MR. TOBIN: Tabled?

MR. NEARY: I am tabling it now. I am putting it on the public record now as I put it then, and I hold nothing back. My position on behalf of the caucus and my colleagues has been made abundantly clear to the people who are directly involved.

MR. TOBIN: I am delighted to see you are following the lead set by Mr. Peckford.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am following nobody's lead. As a matter of fact I am leading now this House. No doubt when I take my seat, when I finish later on this afternoon or tomorrow or the next day, as soon as I take my seat, other members will stand and they will say, 'Well, that was very good. We were glad to hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) say what he said. That was very good'. They in turn will then reinforce what I said and they will condemn Kirby and they will condemn this and they will drag in red herrings, Mr. Speaker, no doubt they will do that. But I want them all to remember that the first one who said it in this House was on this side of the House. Just remember that. All they will be doing from then on is parroting what I have said. And I will be glad to hear their comments, Mr. Speaker, be glad to hear them. It is a very important debate. I think every member of this House should participate in the Budget Debate. This is our second day. There is no hurry to close this House as far as I am concerned although the government seems to be in a hurry to shut the House down and get her closed. I believe every member should take advantage of the debate, should involve himself in the debate even if he only talks about the fishery. I have spent the last three quarters of an hour talking mainly about the fishery. I have not really come to the main thrust of my remarks yet because the fishery is very important, Mr. Speaker, and, not only that, it is urgent. Urgent, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker, what kind of a conscience must people have, leaders have, politicians

MR. NEARY: have to lay back and twiddle their thumbs and wait for something to happen? What kind of consciences do they have? What kind of a conscience does the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) have, to sit over there and support an administration that just sits back, lays on its oars and waits for something to happen?

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

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: A direct question was addressed to me in debate, I think, with or without the concurrence of the person speaking.- I do not mean the Speaker, I mean the person speaking.-

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: - that I have the right to reply. And if the hon. member wants me to make it a point of privilege, I will gladly do that.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not a point of privilege either.

MR. CARTER: I support this administration because it is so superior to previous administrations, and especially the one the hon. gentleman supported.

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! There is

no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the

Opposition.

MR.NEARY:

And so, Mr. Speaker, when

hon. gentlemen rise to stand in the debate as they no doubt will, some of them will, I presume the word has gone out from the Government House Leader that only a few members are permitted to speak because they have to get the House closed by the latter part of next week. Close her up and get out of here because there is too much pressure on the Premier and on the ministers, too much criticism.

AN HON.MEMBER:

July or August.

MR.NEARY:

Would the hon. gentleman

be happy with that, July or August? Well, Mr. Speaker, if I get as many interruptions as I got earlier this afternoon I will probably be on my feet till July. But when I did get straightened out there, I believe I did make a few very important statements on the fishery. And I was glad to be able to get into that topic, Mr. Speaker, because that is the number one priority, that is an urgent matter for both levels of government at this point in time. And I only hope that Kirby will not be allowed to continue as the middleman in this great struggle that is going on. If there is going to be a battle, let it be between two governments and not pawn off the responsibility and the jurisdiction on a super-bureaucrat who knows nothing about the Newfoundland fishery.

Now I think I have dealt adequately with that matter, Mr. Speaker. I want to come

MR. NEARY: now to something that has been bothering me for some time and that is the way that Newfoundland Hydro is being managed. We all suspected for some time, Mr. Speaker, that the reasons for the increase in electricity rates in this Province were brought about mainly because of the mismanagement of Newfoundland Hydro. Well, this was confirmed recently in a report that was commissioned by the Public Utilities Board. The Public Utilities Board, as hon. members know, is now conducting a hearing into an application from Newfoundland Hydro for an increase in electricity rates, and this report was commissioned by Newfoundland Hydro. It commissioned a firm of independent chartered accounts, Noseworthy, Keating Howard and Cohen, to review certain funds that were expended for four projects, the Holyrood project Stage 2; the transmission line, Stoney Brook to Buchans; the Upper Salmon project, and an interim report on the Cat Arm development. Two actions, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY:

resulted in a direct cost escalation. I want hon. members to pay attention to this, this is very important, because they have to bear in mind that the Auditor General does not have access to the records of the Newfoundland Hydro. The Auditor General is not allowed to audit the books of Newfoundland Hydro. It is done by independent chartered accountants. I think Peat, Marwick do it. "Two actions which resulted in a direct cost escalation were, (1) the payment to three contractors for progress billings earlier than allowed for in the contract which resulted in additional interest costs of \$278,000 from the first billing to November 30, 1981. (2) The release of surety deposit in the amount of \$268,165 when the contractor experienced financial difficulties when the contract was 56 per cent completed. He subsequently went into receivership, bankruptcy, and could not complete the contract even though he had been given back his surety, his deposit, on the project."

Now, Mr. Speaker, how could this happen? How could it happen? I think the House is entitled to an explanation of these two items. Well, let me go on and talk about something a little more serious. 'Other Matters,' page 21 of that report.

"The deficiencies in pre-planning and cost estimating resulted in the following conditions. (1) A tender call for the clearing of 36 hectares when the actual clearing amounted to 98.06 hectares. (2) There was a cost overrun on poles as a result of design faults, survey inaccuracies, inferior quality of poles, and inadequate construction practices." Let me read that again, Mr. Speaker, let me just read that again. I mean, when I first read it I could hardly believe it. "There was a cost overrun run on

MR. NEARY: poles as a result of design faults, survey inaccuracies, inferior quality of poles, and inadequate construction practices."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if they think that is bad, just listen to this.

MR. HISCOCK: How much is the cost overrun?

MR. NEARY: It does not say here.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with that shortly. But I want to just run through these other matters. 'Item (3) There was a cost overrun on conductors as a result of the budget being prepared based on outdated quotations.' How can hon. members explain that? Listen to this one Mr. Speaker, this one is a dandy, a beaut., (4) The permanent access road to Cat Arm was budgeted based upon aerial photographs and topographical maps. The actual cost to July 1982 was \$27.5 million compared to the tender price of \$11,977,000

MR. CALLAN: Is that not beautiful. That is Ottawa's fault, you watch.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, who can they blame that on? That is Ottawa's fault? The teachers' fault? The students' fault? The Conne River Indian Band's fault? Whose fault is that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CALLAN: Joey Smallwood's fault.

MR. NEARY: Is it Joey Smallwood's fault?

And number five, Mr. Speaker, just listen to this. 'The construction camp services contract and the 69 KV transmission line at Cat Arm cost significantly more than budgeted for because of insufficient and inadequate information when tendering commenced.' Now, Mr. Speaker, remember that this was the administration that came in last week and told us that the cost of the Cat Arm development had dropped considerably. The minister who made that statement forgot to mention that it had escalated considerably a couple of years ago. It has not dropped back yet to the original estimates. Now, Mr. Speaker, I issued a challenge to the Premier earlier this afternoon and I am going to fling another challenge on the floor of the House. There was a report done by Acres on the Cat Arm development. They were called in after the Cat Arm development started and they were asked to do a report, do a study of the project, Acres Consultants. Now, Mr. Speaker, that report has never been made public, it has been covered up, it has been hidden down in Newfoundland Hydro. I am going to ask the administration now to bring that report before this House, or are they too cowardly to do it? Will they continue to cover up? Because that report, Mr. Speaker, is devastating. Let me give the House one example of what is in that report. One item in that report deals with the powerhouse that was located on the wrong part of the river and if it had been located on

MR. NEARY: the right part of the river it would have cost \$30 million less. Hydro could have saved \$27 million or \$30 million if the powerhouse had been built in a different part of the river than where they are putting it. That is only one example, Mr. Speaker. That report should be tabled in this House while we are carrying on the budget debate.

Mr. Speaker, it is getting near zero hour. I move the adjournment of the debate.

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

It being 5:30 a motion to adjourn is deemed to have been made and the motion is that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow at 10:00 A.M..

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

April 28, 1983

*Tabled by Mem of
Transp. 28 Apr.*

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 55 ASKED THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF
TRANSPORTATION BY THE MEMBER FOR BELLEVUE ON ORDER PAPER OF
MARCH 23, 1983.

In 1980 the Harmon Corporation and Buchans Action Committee jointly petitioned for construction of the road.

In 1981 Abitibi-Price inquired as to Government's intentions in order that they could plan their forest access road development.

In 1981 the Corner Brook Economic Development Corp. Ltd. strongly opposed the provision of the road.

In 1981 the Burgeo Chamber of Commerce urged construction of the road.

In 1981 the Town of Buchans requested urgent repairs to the bridge at Wiley's River to accommodate the hunters in the Dashwood Area.

In 1981 Mr. Gregory Head complained about the washouts on the forest access road.

In 1981 numerous Buchans' businessmen petitioned for repairs to the forest access road to enable prosecution of the annual moose hunt.

In 1983 the Corner Brook Council objected to the construction of the road.

Tabled by Hon. Min. of
Transp. 28 Apr. '83

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 65 ASKED THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER
OF TRANSPORTATION BY THE MEMBER FOR BELLEVUE ON ORDER PAPER
OF MARCH 25, 1983.

65 (a) Waldale, Ltd.

(b) Yes

(c) \$736,791.36

(d) Robert Neal, Ltd.

(e) 1976-77 \$189,941.05

1977-78 2,387.50

1978-79 5,447.46

1979-80 24,786.79

1980-81 32,309.28

1981-82 23,084.19

(f) Tender Bid too high.

(g) Tender Bid from Newfoundland Firm 58% higher than Waldale,
Ltd.

*1 added by 11-24-81, memo. of
Transp., 28 Apr, '83*

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 88 ASKED THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF
TRANSPORTATION BY THE MEMBER FOR BELLEVUE ON ORDER PAPER OF
May 26, 1982.

The estimated number of miles of roads to be paved in the fiscal
year 1982-83 - 107.3

The number of miles paved in the fiscal years 1979-80 and 1980-81
may be found in the Annual Reports of Department of Transportation
for those particular years.

The information is given for each Electoral District and includes
contracts let in dollars, as well as listing of competing bids.

The information for the fiscal year 1981-82 is currently being
compiled by officials of the Department for printing of Annual
Report. When Report ready, I shall have it tabled.

Tabled by Hon. Min. of
Transp. 28 Apr. '83

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 69 ASKED THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER
OF TRANSPORTATION BY THE MEMBER FOR BELLEVUE ON ORDER PAPER
OF MARCH 25, 1983.

Revenue collected for Vehicles and Drivers Licences:-

<u>FISCAL YEAR</u>	<u>VEHICLES</u>	<u>DRIVERS</u>
1975-76	\$ 8,237,961.00	\$ 830,261.63
1976-77	7,938,437.00	1,267,020.00
1977-78	9,105,815.00	1,480,964.00
1978-79	9,734,362.00	1,367,389.37
1979-80	12,303,041.00	1,864,951.00
1980-81	14,215,137.00	1,990,266.00
1981-82	12,143,570.00	2,413,913.00