

VOL. 2

NO. 30

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

FOR THE PERIOD

10:00 A.M - 1 P.M.

Friday April 29, 1983

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

MR. SPEAKER (Russell) Order, please!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, Government has been maintaining an ongoing liaison with Senior Executives of Petro Canada concerning the status of the Come-by-Chance Oil Refinery and the prospects for its reactivation. While the company is continually monitoring world energy developments as they may impact upon the commercial viability of Come-by-Chance, given the current excess refining capacity particularly in Eastern Canada and in areas supplying the North Eastern United States, there is no immediate prospect for the reactivation of the facility in the short term. The Company, therefore, will continue to mothball the Refinery for the foreseeable future.

Over the coming weeks and months Petro Canada have informed us that they will be taking a number of steps which will help them in part to defray the ongoing mothballing costs. None of the steps contemplated will in any way impair the ability of Petro Canada to rehabilitate the Come-by-Chance Refinery if it is determined that such a rehabilitation is commercially feasible or justifiable. These steps are as follows: (1) Removal of the catalyst from certain pressure vessels in the Refinery. In particular it is planned to remove the catalyst from the Platformer reactors and recover the metals contained therein. (2) The Refinery has a spare parts inventory that is well

DR. COLLINS: in excess of that required for an operating refinery and in some cases the inventory exceeds anticipated requirements for a five-year period. Petro Canada proposes to use the surplus spare parts inventory elsewhere in their operations. (3) The Company will be taking certain steps of a safety nature including the removal of temporary construction and start-up buildings that are no longer in a safe condition as well as the removal of insulation from certain storage tanks in cases where the insulation now constitutes a hazard.

The work relating to the foregoing will commence this month and will be carried out by local Newfoundland labour and equipment wherever possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would again emphasize that we have the written assurance of Petro Canada that these steps will in no way impair their ability to rehabilitate the Refinery in the future. Nevertheless,

DR. COLLINS: in view of the fact that they will be generating some activity at the refinery over the coming weeks, I felt it important to inform members of this hon. House and the public of the nature of the work to be undertaken.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to wonder when the hon. gentleman started his Ministerial Statement, why he resurrected the oil refinery to make a Ministerial Statement on Friday. I thought they were getting down to the bottom of the barrel but later on we discovered the reason why the hon. gentleman made his Ministerial Statement, it was because Petro-Canada is now starting to dismantle the oil refinery. Mr. Speaker, they can make all the apologies and excuses they want and all the statements they want about how easy it will be to rehabilitate the refinery, to put the parts back that they are removing, the catalyst, to put them back when the energy crisis is over and there is a demand for crude oil. Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister is not naive enough to believe that this is not the beginning of the end for the oil refinery. What should happen is that the minister should say, 'No.' This government should get a Telex off right away to the federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) and say, 'No, they are not to take a nut or a bolt out of that refinery or not tear down any of the buildings.' Because, Mr. Speaker, there have been interests of late in that refinery. They have been ongoing for some time. Now, the hon. the Premier and the administration may not take these interests seriously, Mr. Speaker, but it would cost the Government of Canada or the Government of this Province nothing to find out if that refinery can be

MR. NEARY: reactivated, Mr. Speaker, I have heard a number of statements over the last several months from the gentleman who built that refinery, that he would like to have the refinery back and reactivated. Well, it would cost the taxpayers nothing to find out what Petro-Canada wanted in the first place and our suspicions are now being confirmed, they wanted a dock down there and they wanted the storage tanks. That is all they wanted

MR. NEARY: as far as Come-By-Chance is concerned, Mr. Speaker, and they should not be allowed to remove a nut or a bolt from that refinery. Instead of the hon. gentleman getting up and agreeing with it, approving of it, he should get a Telex off to the Federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) objecting to it.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my Ministerial Statement yesterday afternoon, the contract for the Confederation Building Complex extension was awarded to Seaboard Construction - a Newfoundland company, A 100 per cent Newfoundland company. However the wisdom of the decision and the rationale for it was questioned by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). Hence, my statement this morning in answer to his questions.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the award was made on the basis of the Public Tender Act and the application of the Provincial Preference Policy.

The Provincial Preference Policy is designed to support, encourage and promote the effectiveness of Newfoundland industry and, admittedly, it is biased in awarding contracts for Public Work to local enterprises - and we make no apology for that bias.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: In application, the Provincial Preference Policy provides for an "overhead allowance" of up to a maximum of 10 per cent - an arbitrary but nonetheless reasonable figure - to eligible tenderers in accordance with the degree of their "presence" in the Province.

The criteria used in applying the "Overhead Allowance" attempts to elicit;

- (1) the amount of Provincial, Corporate and Newfoundland Municipal Taxes, if any, paid by the contractors;

MR. DINN: (2) the degree of corporate decision making that is done in the Province; (3) the degree of engineering and estimating work that is done in a Newfoundland office; (4) the amount of purchasing and procurement responsibility exercised at a Newfoundland office prior to tender; (5) the extent of the accounting and general administration carried out in a Newfoundland office.

As indicated, the basis for evaluation of all tenders to determine a Preferred Bidder is the Provincial Overhead Allowance factor assigned to each bidding firm.

MR. DINN: The Provincial Overhead Allowance is a percentage of a bidding firm's tender, up to a maximum of 10 per cent, that is applied to compare that firm's bid, with respect to Provincial Content, with that of others received. The Provincial Overhead Allowance for each firm is determined, by and in consultation with the Department of Development, through a questionnaire designed to assist corporate provincial content based on the firm's answers to a series of questions, each of which has a weighted proportion of a maximum of 10 per cent allowed. The content of the questionnaire is summarized in the five criteria above.

I am appending the working papers used by the Department of Public Works and Services to determine the preferred bidder.

I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, for the information of hon. members, that I received a call, and, as a matter of fact, a telegram from the Newfoundland and Labrador Building and Construction Trades Council, a council that represents 10,000 to 15,000 Newfoundland tradesmen who will eventually work, when the work gets underway, on this Confederation Building Complex, telling us of the unanimous support of the council for the way in which government has carried out this bid analysis.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any other clarification required by any member of this House of Assembly I attach all of the information from the Department of Public Works. And if there are further explanations required, the officials in the department are available to anyone who would like to enquire as to how the formula was done. But attached Appendix B indicates, for example, Seaboard Construction as one of the top companies getting 10 per cent of the assigned POA, down to a minimum of zero per cent for



MR. DINN: companies that are totally outside the Province and have absolutely no presence in the Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think if hon. members were to go through the different appendixes they would find that the procedure used by the department to recommend to government who the preferred bidder should be is very clear-cut. I think if they wanted to get into the technical detail they might have a problem and may need further explanation by the officials in the department. But I think it is fairly clear-cut, once hon. members review the different appendixes that I attached for tabling in the House this morning. And, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that government was able to announce that over \$20 million will be spent in the construction of the new Confederation Building Complex and that it should get underway very, very soon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not allowed under the rules to debate with the hon. gentleman as to the justification, the merits, of extending the Confederation Building at this time

MR. NEARY: and building our third House of Assembly since Confederation. My understanding is that when the extension is put on the building the House of Assembly will be down in the lobby. Now, Mr. Speaker, I only wish I could debate the hon. gentleman's priorities and if I did I would say is it any wonder they booed him off the stage the other night down at the meeting with the Parent/Teacher's Association?

Mr. Speaker, my colleague the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) commented on this matter yesterday and asked to have the documentation tabled. He did not disapprove.

MR. DINN: Oh yes he did.

MR. NEARY: I did not hear my colleague, as the hon. minister just inferred, my colleague did not say that he disapproved of the -

MR. MARSHALL: Read Hansard.

MR. NEARY: Read Hansard. Yes, I will. He did not disapprove of it but he merely asked some questions because we believe, Mr. Speaker, that when government does something out of the ordinary, when government does not follow the Public Tendering Act then every detail, every piece of correspondence, every telegram, every single detail should be laid on the table of the House for scrutiny. And that is all my colleague did yesterday, was to ask that that be done.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You have it there. Sit down.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Premier says we have that there. Well, maybe after we look it over we may ask for further documentation. I heard the Premier last night say that he was prepared to give the House every detail they wanted in connection with this.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No problem then, we are honest and open.

MR.NEARY: That is right. It should be put on the table of the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD: An open and honest government.

MR.NEARY: Well,I am glad to hear that Mr. Speaker, so we will have no problem at all getting further documentation if we request it. But we will look this over, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that it will be scrutinized by the other people who bid on that contract. And no doubt, Mr. Speaker, there will be threats of lawsuits and there will be legalwrangles but that is not for us to get involved in. Our main job is to see that justice is done, to see that the Public Tendering Act is followed to the letter. And, also, by the way, I might say that I have to commend the Auditor General who drew to the attention of the House some time ago that we are not paying enough attention to local preference. The Auditor General did that. So, Mr.Speaker, we will look over the documentation and if we need further information I am sure it will be forthcoming.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform hon. members with respect to the take-over of certain areas of policing by the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, the actual take-over of policing responsibilities in the Northeast part of the Avalon Peninsula, including Torbay, Pouch Cove, Portugal Cove, St. Phillips, St. Thomas, Paradise, Conception Bay South, Kilbride, Goulds, and Petty Harbour, and the policing of those areas will be taken over by the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary as of 12:01 A.M. May 2nd. of this year.

MR. NEARY: 12:01 when? May 2nd.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The only time you have is between 12:00 midnight and 12:01 in which to speed there.

These areas correspond to that area previously served, and served up until that time by the RCMP, Donovans detachment, except that the area will be extended to the actual boundary of Conception Bay South, therefore ending at Seal Cove Bridge.

So as of 12:01 A.M. Monday, May 2nd., that area of policing will no longer remain with the RCMP but will be part of the jurisdiction of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary and obviously any police matters should be referred to them.

I would wish to go on record as expressing the Department of Justice's and the government's appreciation to the RCMP who have policed that area under provincial contract since 1950, for the high level of professional police service they have given, and to assure the people in the area that the same high level of professional policing will continue with the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

At the same time, rather than sitting down and getting up again, on another matter but closely related I wish to inform the House of Assembly of certain changes in the organizational structure of the Constabulary to reflect the new role it is playing in policing the metropolitan area of St. John's, and, indeed, in time, as already announced,

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

other areas of the Province.

As hon. members are probably aware, new recruiting procedures have been implemented and cadets, men and women, have been trained at the Atlantic Police Academy as a result of co-operation and agreement between the Government of Canada, the Maritime Provinces, Holland College, of which the Atlantic Police Academy forms a part, the Newfoundland Public Service Commission and the Department of Justice. There was a programme of continuous in-service training of all personnel and during the past couple of years, a large number of senior members of the force have successfully completed specialized courses at the Canadian Police College in Ottawa.

The Criminal Investigation Division's role has been redefined and reorganized in an ongoing process to increase its effectiveness and to prepare for the expansion to areas of the Province already announced. A new planning section has been organized on the administrative side of the force to handle planning, prepare for expansion and to design and oversee future training.

A new internal Audit and Inspection Branch has also been formed to provide ongoing monitoring of various branches and to conduct internal investigations where appropriate.

In line with these, I am pleased to announce the creation of a new rank of Superintendent, which will fall between that of Deputy Chief and Inspector. This new rank has been assigned to the Criminal Investigation Division and the Planning Section.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: We are therefore, very pleased to announce the promotion of Detective Inspector P. S. Waterman and Inspector Francis E. Fleming to the rank of Superintendent, also, the promotion of Detective Lieutenants, William J. Taylor and Walter L. Bennett to the rank of Inspector. All promotions become effective May 2nd of this year.

Superintendent Waterman is currently head of the Criminal Investigation Division. He is forty-nine years of age, was born at Change Islands, Notre Dame Bay and has been a member of the Constabulary since 1958.

Superintendent Fleming is currently head of the Planning and Training Division. He is age forty-six, was born at St. Vincent's in St. Mary's Bay and has been a member of the Constabulary since 1955.

Inspector Taylor is currently head of the Internal Audit and Inspection branch. He is forty-nine years of age, was born in St. John's and has been a member of the Constabulary since 1959.

Inspector Bennett is currently seconded as a staff member of the Canadian Police College, Ottawa, and will soon complete his second year in that role. In other words, for the past two years, Inspector Bennett has been seconded at the request of the Canadian Police College in Ottawa and is teaching there. He is the first, to the best of my knowledge, Newfoundland Constabulary member who has given instruction on such a continuing basis at the Canadian Police College in Ottawa. He will be

MR. OTTENHEIMER: returning to the Province to take up a position in the Planning and Training Branch in the late Summer of this year. He is forty-four years old, was born on Bell Island and has been a member of the Constabulary since 1959. So, I know that all hon. members will join with me in congratulating these Newfoundlanders in the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary who will be receiving these promotions effective May 2, and I will have copies made and distributed of this material.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) gave us advance warning that one minute after midnight on May 2nd the areas around St. John's would be policed by the Newfoundland Constabulary. Because, Mr. Speaker, we have noticed increased activity of late in the area; police cars are patrolling the area night and day, but I am glad now to have that warning so I can watch out for tickets.

MR. SIMMS: Do you not always watch for tickets?

MR. NEARY: No, I get the odd one. I am like the former Premier of this Province, Mr. Moores, I get the odd ticket. One thing we had in common, the two of us, he liked a scuff, I like a scuff, he likes to put a heavy foot on the accelerator and so do I and I get the occasional ticket, Mr. Speaker, but the police are doing their job, I suppose. It is irritating at times. Mr. Speaker, any comments we made about the Newfoundland Constabulary in this House in the last few days is not a reflection on the members of the Constabulary, it is on the people who issue the instructions, especially the Minister of Justice. We certainly did not wish to cast any



MR. NEARY:                   aspersions on the members of the Newfoundland Constabulary, who we think are doing a fine job. I believe the morale of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary has improved considerably under this minister and I would attribute that, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the hon. gentleman does not interfere with the day to day workings of the Newfoundland Constabulary, he does not try to throw his weight around. He lets the Chief and the Deputy Chief run the show and that is the way it should be. Because in the past I had a feeling there was too much interference at a political level from Ministers of Justice. So I think the morale has improved considerably because we do not hear as many complaints as we used to hear from the Newfoundland Constabulary. There was period, Mr. Speaker, in this Province when you could hardly turn on your radio but you would hear complaints from the Police Brotherhood. We do not hear that anymore. It seems to have died down considerably.

MR. NEARY:

And we want to congratulate these members of the force who have been promoted, especially the gentleman from Bell Island who has been seconded by the Canadian Police College in Ottawa, has been instructing up there for some time, Mr. Speaker, a gentleman who, I would say, has a great future with the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

We are concerned a bit, however, about the priorities of this government. I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to find out how many courthouses and how many jails have been built in this Province since this administration took over? They are great hands to build courthouses and renovate jails and penitentiaries, Mr. Speaker, they spend all their time at it. And now they are going to give us another House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, they close up hospital beds, they lock the teachers and the children out of the schools, and they open up jails.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is certainly not being very relevant to the Ministerial Statement made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer).

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, also we are concerned about the cost of the expansion of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, the cost. Because the RCMP have done a good job in this Province, they have all kinds of modern technology and equipment, they have the vehicles, now all this equipment will have to be replaced.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

We pay the RCMP on a provincial contract. Now obviously that section is taken out and we will not pay the RCMP.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but we are going in a lot of instances - like the people of Corner Brook, for instance, do not want the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, they want -

PREMIER PECKFORD: The people of Corner Brook do not want them?

MR. NEARY: They want to keep the RCMP in Corner Brook.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are a few people concerned about that.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I would suggest to the government, and I am glad the Premier reacted to it, because I believe the people should have a say in whether they want the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, or the RCMP to continue servicing Corner Brook. A referendum in the City of Corner Brook should be held to determine which force they want.

But, Mr. Speaker, the cost of expanding the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary at this moment must be pretty big indeed. It must be pretty heavy, a heavy burden on the taxpayers and I am just wondering about the feasibility at this particular point in time. Are there other priorities that the government should be looking at rather than expanding the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary at this moment? Mr. Speaker, I am all for it. I have

MR. NEARY:

stated in this House on previous occasions that I am all for the Newfoundland Constabulary policing Newfoundland and Labrador. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it could have waited, there are other priorities that the government should have looked at before they started involving taxpayer money in expanding the Constabulary at this time.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table some correspondence which deals with the ongoing problems we have in the fishery that were addressed to some extent by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), in the Budget debate yesterday in this hon. House. I want to sort of go on record on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the other members of the Cabinet and the government, and for all members on this side of the House, to table and demonstrate our concern in the sort of hiatus period that we are in on this whole question of restructuring the East Coast offshore fishery.

On April 20, I wrote Mr. Johnston, the Minister of State for Economic and Regional Development, who is Chairman of the Federal Cabinet Committee who are supposed to be dealing with this matter. I would like to read into the record that letter and table the other two pieces of correspondence that go with it, his response to me when I wrote the letter and my response back. But I think the major part of it is the letter I wrote Mr. Johnston on April 20. 'I write to you to express my deep concern with the present situation of the offshore East Coast fishery. Particularly my concern centres on your government's present position on this important matter.

'The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador presented to your Committee the principles that

PREMIER PECKFORD: should guide a restructuring of the offshore fishery. That must be our goal. The restructuring of the the companies is a means to that goal. Furthermore, we are serious, While no one likes to see companies in trouble this does provide both governments with an opportunity to influence significant changes which, if handled properly, can improve this industry.

'After our proposal was presented, you wired me pointing out a number of areas in our proposal with which you and your Committee had concerns. I replied giving what I thought were rational answers to these concerns.

'Since then your Committee has met and apparently given Mr. Kirby a mandate to resolve the whole matter. As a follow up Mr. Kirby requested a meeting with representatives of the Newfoundland Government. They met in Halifax on April 12. We thought that this meeting would see a detailed response from your government on our proposal and a presentation on how your government felt the problems of the East Coast offshore fishery should be handled.

PREMIER PECKFORD: 'In fact, neither expectation was realized. Mr. Kirby and the other officials of the Federal Government, remained vague and general on the whole matter. The urgency that was so much a part of previous discussions was absent.

'The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador believes that the principles outlined in our proposal are valid. We do not believe that you or Mr. Kirby, in your statements, have been successful in rationally showing that our position is not valid.

'What we are saying is that we should make together a gargantuan effort to maximize economic opportunities in Newfoundland given the present configuration of the industry as reflected in the present location of fish plants. Perhaps it will not work! Perhaps it will work! Should we not try?

'Let us draw up then a plan for the next, say, three years. That is, the two governments, the union, the banks, together, using the principles that the Newfoundland Government have put forward. Now, perhaps amendments have to be made to some of these principles. But it seems the general thrust that we have put forward makes sense. All parties must be in full support of this approach - a half-hearted approach will not work.

'Crucial to the success of this approach is the full involvement of the Fishermen's Union, so that everybody is truly together and moving ahead with clear goals during that three year period.

PREMIER PECKFORD:                   'Some of the items in such  
an approach are: (A) A definition of the resource -  
existing exploited species and other species that are now  
not being exploited. What about the foreign allocation  
of fish under the European Treaty and will Canada make  
that fish available to Canadians? What about the fish  
that will become available after the French Treaty runs  
out in 1986? Will this be available to Canadians?  
I find

PREMIER PECKFORD: an attitude which says we cannot do anything on turbot which is available because we cannot catch it to be incomprehensible. That there is redfish available but there is no market. Yet many parts of the world are starving. Surely, if we can assist foreign nations in purchasing a Candu reactor something can be done to purchase redfish.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: (B) Sound regime for allocation of the resource to existing plants. This speaks for itself. (C) Separation of harvesting and processing sectors. There seems to be resistance to this concept. Why? The only reason advanced is you would need two management teams. So what? Is that impossible? Perhaps the separation has to be phased in. (D) A joint agreement by all for productivity and wage rates over the three year period. Here the union is critical. (E) Big is not by definition best. (F) Quality at all cost. (G) Marketing co-ordination.

'It seems that what is now happening is an attempt by your officials to work around the provincial government.

'If we are truly interested in Newfoundland and its present problems in the offshore fishery, then new approaches, creativity and innovation are urgently required. This it seems, is not what is happening.

'I am prepared to further discuss this with you at your earliest convenience.'

Now, Mr. Johnston came back and I will give this information to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and to the House, saying that Mr. Kirby is still going to be involved. And I understand, since I came up from the 8th floor at four minutes to ten, that there is another telex asking for a meeting of Mr.



PREMIER PECKFORD: Kirby and some people from our government. So we still do not seem to be getting the answers and know where we stand on the whole matter. But I want to table it in the House so that the members of the Opposition especially, and the press are available to peruse the latest developments on it. I invite the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) comments.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not have to invite me, it is my right under the rules of this House to comment. I do not need any invitation from the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker. He is making these remarks for the part-time reporters from CBC radio. That is why he is making these little comments.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that the Premier did not give me these letter in advance. Other ministers who made Ministerial

MR. NEARY:

Statements this morning did me the courtesy of giving me the statement in advance but the Premier does not act that way. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, likes to get up, read his Ministerial Statements and his correspondence and his letters which are very involved and very complicated and expects instant reaction from us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the letter that was just read by the Premier to Mr. Johnston has long-range ramifications and implications.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on!

MR. NEARY:

I was hoping that the Premier today - and I agree with many of the points that he raised, by the way. I think Mr. Kirby will be the target of the union, the provincial government, the Opposition, the plant workers in Burin and Ramea and all these other communities, Mr. Speaker. In the days and weeks and months ahead, Kirby will be held up as public enemy number one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Not Mr. Simmons?

MR. NEARY:

No, not Mr. Simmons and not Mr. De Bane or Mr. Morgan or Mr. Peckford. You just watch, Mr. Speaker, I will forecast right now, I will make a prediction for this House that all the criticism will be aimed at Kirby, and maybe justifiably so, I do not know.

MR. SIMMS:

Like you did yesterday, right?

MR. NEARY:

Like I did yesterday, of course. And, of course, I motivated the Premier yesterday to bring this letter into the House, because he wanted to climb aboard my bandwagon.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That was sent last week.

MR. NEARY:

I started the steam-roller going and the hon. gentleman, not to be outdone or upstaged by

MR. NEARY: the Leader of the Opposition,  
brought in this letter today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me give the hon. gentleman a piece of advice. There are five fish plants closed in this Province. Now, the hon. gentleman, instead of talking about allocations and quotas and separating the harvesting from the processing, things that have constitutional implications, jurisdictional problems that would take years to sort out, what the hon. gentleman should do if he wants to put the Government of Canada on the spot is to tell Mr. Johnston how far this Province is prepared to go financially to open these plants that are closed. Now, he should lay a plan out in this House. He should be able to say to Mr. Johnston, 'Look, Mr. Johnston, we will share the cost with you 50/50.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that would be something. That would put the Government of Canada and the MPs from Newfoundland who support the Government of Canada on the spot. That would put them in the hot seat. Because Mr. Johnston asked the hon. gentleman some time ago - one of his concerns was how far financially was this Province prepared to go in reopening plants that are not considered to be economically viable? Now, that is the real question. So

MR. NEARY:

let us hope that in the next few days in this House, before the Premier shuts the House down for the Summer, he will come in with a plan for reopening these plants, because that is the number one priority. Mr. Speaker, some of the things in here will take years to implement, but the urgent problem in the fishery in this Province is to get these plants in Ramea and Burin, in Harbour Breton and in Gaultois and in Fermeuse opened, That is the number one priority. I hope that the hon. gentleman will address himself to that problem the early part of next week when the House meets on Monday.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I heard the Premier tell one of the part-time reporters at CBC radio this morning that he is enjoying the little word play that goes back and forth across the Legislature here. Well, Mr. Speaker, he may be enjoying that sport but the children of this Province are still locked out of their schools by the hon. the Premier and the teachers are also locked out by the hon. gentleman. Now, yesterday in this House, Mr. Speaker, the Premier said that he could not enlarge on the teachers' dispute because there was some activity ongoing in that regard towards getting it resolved yet, Mr. Speaker, we are told by the President of the NTA that he is not aware of any activity. Would the Premier please tell this House now if he would like to retract what he said yesterday in his statement to the effect that there was activity, or, if he is not prepared to retract, would he please tell the House and tell the people of this Province what is happening?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

First of all, Mr. Speaker

I do not intend to take some of these allegations any longer. On the question of lockout, number one, the leadership of the NTA were given the legal opinion that it was a strike before the partial withdrawal of services took place. We were provided with a legal opinion from the Department of Justice, at the time that the NTA leadership were talking about a withdrawal of services, that it was a strike. I went through it with the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) the day or the day before the withdrawal of services occurred. It is a strike, the leadership of the NTA were informed it was a strike before they had their withdrawal of services, as I understand it, we were informed by good legal opinion that it was a strike. So the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) should not continue to indicate that because it is an erroneous statement. It is a strike! The legal advisors to the NTA told the NTA that, the legal advisors to the government told the government that. That is a fact. So it is not my fault that the students are out of school.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Secondly, one of the problems we have had in this--and some day the full story is going to be told like all full stories will be told - is I do not know why Mr. Noseworthy said what he said last night. I cannot be responsible for Mr. Noseworthy's statements. I met with several groups of parents over the last few days and tried to give them as much information as I could. I tried, honestly, straightforwardly in this House, whilst quite a few members of the NTA were in the galleries, and I repeat it here again this morning and they will have to go find out their own answers, and the Leader of the Opposition will have to ask the President of the NTA, but I indicated as much as I could indicate yesterday, in order to be honest and fair to let the best chance exist for a settlement. I, for the life of me, do not understand why Mr. Noseworthy said what he said. There was activity going on when I said there was activity going on, there was activity going on all through the night there is activity going on now and Mr. Noseworthy knows that. Mr. Noseworthy knew it when he said there was no activity going on. Now it is terrible for my word to have to be pitted against Mr. Noseworthy's or Mr. Mr. Noseworthy's be pitted against mine. That should not be. We have a very, very, serious situation on our hands, very, very, serious. I tried to be as fair and straightforward as I could yesterday and I went so far as to correct the Leader of the Opposition when he used the word 'development' or 'movement' so that I would be completely objective when I used the word 'activity'. And when I gave it and when I said it there was activity. Before I gave the statement, while I gave the statement, since I gave the statement and now there is activity ongoing. But it is terrible for me to have to get up in this hon. House this morning and to once again through a statement of mine somehow be inconsistent

PREMIER PECKFORD: with the statement from the President of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. All I can say - and it can be validated and it will be validated, in fact, after this is all over; it will be validated in fact - is that there is activity continuing, that we are trying our best to resolve and solve this thing, all day yesterday, all last night, this morning, right to this minute. Hopefully it can be resolved in the very near future. I appreciate the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) question. If I were the Leader of the Opposition I would have to ask the question that he just asked as well. I have just been handed a note. I have just been informed that the CEIC have ruled teachers involved in dispute do not qualify for unemployment insurance. There was a news report on about it at 9:30 this morning.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman now has created an air of mystery about all this. The negotiating team for the NTA know nothing about activity, the president and the executive know nothing about any activity, and yet the hon. gentleman stands in this House and says there is. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not asking the hon. gentleman to tell the House any details of things that may be happening. I do not want the details. I do not believe in bargaining.

MR. NEARY: I do not believe in bargaining, negotiating back and forth across the floor of the House. But there is nothing wrong with the hon. gentleman saying, "Well, look, what I was referring to yesterday was the meeting of the Federation of School Boards in Gander." Or, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with the hon. gentleman saying, "Well, this matter is being considered by Treasury Board, there is some activity in Treasury Board but there has been no approach to the NTA." There is nothing wrong with that.

There is nothing wrong with the hon. gentleman talking about the other option, "We are thinking about arbitration," "We are thinking about resuming mediation." "I am thinking about going down and resigning, calling an election over this." There is nothing wrong, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!  
The Leader of the Opposition is entering into the realm of debate and this thirty minute period is designed to ask questions.

MR. NEARY: Well, the question I want to put to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is could he be a little more specific because the NTA say they know nothing about activity? The Premier has said that there is activity. Could he be more specific? Steer us in the right direction. There will be nothing wrong with that. I am not asking the hon. gentleman to bargain across the floor of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, my word has been questioned by the President of the NTA. I feel at this moment that I have no choice, I do not want to do this, but I am going to have to, I am not going



PREMIER PECKFORD: to have my word challenged by the President of the NTA or anybody else. The mediator has been meeting with both sides over the past day to put together a package to try to resolve this dispute. He has been meeting with Mr. Wayne Russell of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, who has been meeting with Mr. Noseworthy and the other members of the negotiating team and the executive. We have even brought in other people, experts, to clarify certain matters on which they had some problems. Mr. Noseworthy knew that when he made the statement yesterday. As a matter of fact, if I am not mistaken, he was in on one of the meetings yesterday with the mediator.

DR. COLLINS: He was.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Noseworthy was, if I am not mistaken.

DR. COLLINS: That is my impression.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, it is mine too.

I remember the conversation. I had a Cabinet meeting at 6:00 last night to go through what the mediator has been putting to both sides over the last day or so, and they stopped at five-thirty this morning.

What time did I have lunch yesterday? I went down to the Newfoundland Hotel, and I left the Newfoundland Hotel and I came back here and met with our group of people through lunch until five to three, to go through what had

PREMIER PECKFORD:

come back from the mediator to us. He had met with the other side yesterday morning. So the mediator has been working now for over twenty-four hours, with a couple of hours sleep this morning from 5:30 until 8:30 or 8:45 on new ideas and new proposals and new packages to try to solve the thing. I have been personally involved, the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) has been personally involved, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), their officials from Treasury Board and Education and myself, we have been personally involved with it right on through, even before yesterday, on new ideas and new packages. All of Cabinet was involved in it last night for an hour, and two or three days ago at a Cabinet meeting that we held at six o'clock, and two or three nights ago we were at it for a few hours to try to put together new ideas.

Now if the President of NTA can come out and make statements like that, well, I just do not understand what the devil is going on.

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker we welcome the involvement of the mediator again in this dispute. The Premier could have told us that yesterday. We are not asking him for the details of the package or to bargain back and forth across the floor of the House. We are not asking that at all, Mr. Speaker. We are taking a very responsible position in this whole matter. We want to get the children back in school. I have two children in Grade IX out of school myself and I am anxious to get them back. I can stand here as a legislator and as a parent and I am anxious to get the teachers back

MR. NEARY: in the classroom, Mr. Speaker, Pretty soon we will be gone beyond the point of no return, so I hope now it will not develop into a controversy of who is right and who is wrong, that they will get on with the mediation.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!  
The hon. Leader of the Opposition is persisting in debating in Question Period. He must ask a question or I will have to rule him out of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to speak to that point of order too.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier on the point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now we have been pretty flexible in this hon. House as it relates to Question Period. Now the rules are clear and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and the Government House Leader yesterday got up a couple of times on points of order on this matter. The Question Period is an opportunity for the Opposition to ask questions and then for the ministry to answer. And the Leader of the Opposition, in my view, as I submit to Your Honour, has over the last number of days - and we have been fairly quiet on it, allowing flexibility - has abused his privileges and the rules of this House as it relates to Question Period, He is getting up in Question Period making detailed statements without any interrogation, without any hint that it is going to be a question. I would like for the rules of this House to be enforced so that the Opposition have their opportunity to ask questions and we, as a ministry and as a government, have the opportunity to answer.

May I further submit, Mr. Speaker, that it was this administration and this government

PREMIER PECKFORD: that brought in what we call the Late Show. In case there were times when the Opposition were not happy with the answers they got to questions, then on Thursday afternoon they had a half an hour in which they could debate each side for five minutes for each issue, the answers that they got from the ministry. In the last four Late Shows on Thursday afternoons they have done zero, they have not debated one answer that they got back from the ministry.

So there was their opportunity to debate. It is in the Late Show which they have not taken advantage of as an Opposition, and which was provided by this administration when we changed the rules.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: To that so-called point of order, Mr. Speaker. It really is not a point of order. The hon. gentleman just took advantage of the procedure

MR. NEARY: that is used under a point of order to get up and to give his views on certain matters. The hon. gentleman obviously is rather testy today. He is in a bad mood today, Mr. Speaker. So I say to the hon. gentleman, So what! The hon. gentleman should be in a good mood. He is in a bad mood, and the hon. gentleman is now trying to dictate to the Speaker. The 'A.' in his name now, I think they are calling him 'Adolf' around the Province. Now the hon. gentleman is trying to pick a fight - he has picked a fight with everybody else - he is trying to pick a fight with the Speaker, trying to dictate to the Speaker, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: A point of privilege arises. The hon. gentleman is abusing the privileges of this House by getting up and addressing the point of order and continuing on in the same type of refrain, using the same type of inflammatory statements that he uses from time to time on an issue that is most sensitive and would demand much more responsibility from an elected official, particularly one in the position of the hon. gentleman.

Now, my point of privilege is this, Mr. Speaker, that points of order are not to be used by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to make speeches. I mean, the hon. gentleman is not addressing the point of order, and if he is not, he should be invited to take his seat while Your Honour makes his ruling.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of privilege, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I do not think I have to tell Your Honour that the hon. gentleman who just spoke is abusing his privilege in this House by raising a point of privilege, because the only way that the hon. gentleman could stop me from continuing my few remarks on the point of order was to raise a point of privilege which takes precedence over a point of order.

MR. SIMMS: You were not making any remarks on the point of order. You never said a word on it.

MR. NEARY: But it was not a point of privilege, and I am sure Your Honour will rule against what the hon. gentleman says was a point of privilege. I have a feeling Your Honour will say, 'No, there was no point of privilege.' I have a feeling Your Honour will say to the Premier, 'No, there was no point of order, but the Leader of the Opposition should only make a brief preamble to his question.' Well, I might buy that, Mr. Speaker, I might agree with that, but I certainly was not out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: He might name you.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of privilege raised by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), I have to rule that it was not a valid point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: However, the point of order raised by the Premier was a valid point of order in that hon. members are not supposed to debate in the Question Period. In fact, Standing Order 31 (c) - and I will again remind the hon. the Leader of the Opposition of this one - states "In putting any oral questions, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): necessary to explain the same".

So the Chair has been more than generous with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and he should be very specific with his questions.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will be specific with this one about the sick leave. The Premier told this House a week ago that teachers would receive their sick leave payments, cheques. I believe there are twenty-two or twenty-three teachers off on sick leave. The word has not gone from the Premier's Office yet down to the Department of Education and these teachers have not received their sick leave pay. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House

MR. NEARY: when instructions will be given to the officials in the Department of Education to pay out the cheques to teachers who are off on sick leave?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is just insulting even to respond to the Leader of the Opposition.

The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has taken action on it. The word does not go down from the Premier's Office. It was decided upon by the Ministry of Education to recommend that to everybody in Cabinet. It does not start in the Premier's Office and go down, it starts in the Department of Education and comes up to Cabinet. Action has been taken and the reason they do not have their cheques is because of the change in they way payments go in the computer system. We are working as hard as we can to get those payments out as quickly as possible. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) knows that.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have recognized the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). There have been charges, Mr. Speaker, of contract stripping against the government particularly with regard to the issue of substitute teachers, so I would like the Minister of Finance to comment on that. I would also like him to comment on the estimated cost of the gap that now exists between what the NTA is requesting and what the government is prepared to grant.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for



DR. COLLINS: St. John's North (Mr. Carter) approached me some time ago to say that he would like to ask me this question in public. I asked him if he would be so kind as to delay asking the question. I said that I had given the substance of this issue previously in statements. I did not wish, at this particular time, to appear provocative in any way because there were certain matters, in the best interest of the children of this Province in particular, that should not be aired.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously, from the statement made by the hon. gentleman, this is something that was cooked up between him and the member for St. John's North and I think that is an abuse of the Question Period. They have made a deal, they have cooked it up. The hon. gentleman went and talked it over with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). He is a member of the caucus. The Minister of Finance could have given him the information out in the common room, but they decided to cook up a question to delay the Question Period, Mr. Speaker. That question is of such a general nature, as the Chair knows, that the minister can ramble on for hours, Mr. Speaker. That is an abuse of the Question Period in this House.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order, the hon.

the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the Question Period is for all non-members of the Ministry.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not.

MR. CARTER: And the use of it is that the government or a particular minister may clearly state and clearly bind the government in public. It is one thing for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to give me an answer in private but, I submit, it is quite another thing for him to give me an answer in public and this is what I now request him to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is no rule which states that a government backbencher cannot ask a question in the Question Period. This matter arose some time ago. While the Question Period is basically designed for members of the Opposition -

MR. NEARY: Right on. Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: - there is no rule which says that government backbenchers cannot be permitted to ask a question.

MR. NEARY: There is no rule but it is against the principle.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) did me the courtesy of informing me, as many times in the past Leaders of the Opposition have informed me that they were going to ask a certain question, and I appreciate such courtesies when an

DR. COLLINS: involved matter is concerned. I am grateful to the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) that he had similar courtesy in informing me that he was going to ask me about this complicated matter. As I was mentioning, I asked him to delay, or possibly even to desist, because it might not be in the best interest of the children of this Province. However, he has now brought up the matter again and I am only too glad to answer.

Mr. Speaker, when the new contract came up in the beginning, last August, government had just one major change we wanted to make. The NTA had many changes. The government had only one major change and that was in the area of substitute teachers' pay which everyone certainly everyone with any knowledge of the issue, knew it was seriously out of control and needed to be changed. We brought this up right at the beginning. Mr. Speaker, it was in our submission to the Conciliation Board and that was our one major point. Now, Mr. Speaker, the NTA President wrote a letter a

DR. COLLINS:

little while ago and I would like to quote a brief paragraph from it.

MR. NEARY:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! The hon.

Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Your Honour has been pretty good on the rules this morning. I believe one of the rules of this House is that answers have to be brief. What the hon. gentleman is saying now would be better made in a Ministerial Statement, Mr. Speaker. Obviously this is a cooked-up deal and I ask Your Honour to enforce the rules as far as answers are concerned. Your Honour has done well to enforce the rules as far as questions are concerned. Now will Your Honour enforce the rules of this House as far as brief answers to questions are concerned?

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. The

hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

First of all, how condescending and in breach of the rules the hon. gentleman is with his slather of inuendo that he constantly brings into this House with respect to the Chair and with respect to Your Honour. I will ignore that, Your Honour, but if Your Honour wishes to take any kind of exception to it this government will certainly back Your Honour and back the authority of the Chair in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

The fact of the matter is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is answering a question of great importance in this Province and he requires time to give the information. The Question Period in this House is for the private members

MR. MARSHALL: of this House. It is well known that in the House of Commons every day members on the government side get up and ask questions, and so they can here from time to time, Mr. Speaker, because the purpose of the Question Period is for the purpose of disseminating information of public interest to the people of this Province and that is precisely what is happening now as a result of the answer being given to the question asked by the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). as a result of the answer. What the hon. member gentleman wants to do is to monopolize this House with his inanities and his arcane type questions.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The Question Period is designed, as I said earlier, for hon. private members on either side of the House to ask questions of the ministry. It is correct that both questions and answers should be as brief as possible. However, there are times when, perhaps by the very nature of the question asked, the answer may have to be a little longer than perhaps is the usual practice. The Chair is prepared to permit the Hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to continue with his answer in the hope he will make it as brief as possible.

DR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am endeavouring to answer the question on this complex matter as quickly as possible. Mr. Speaker, as I was mentioning, the President of the NTA wrote a letter a short time ago and I would like to read one brief paragraph from it. That brief paragraph states, "Pay for substitute teachers was not an issue, since it had been previously agreed, in the presence of Mr. Blanchard, that the rate of pay for such teachers would not be reduced during the life of this agreement."

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that paragraph is not factually correct. That paragraph is a fabrication, that is not what happened. That paragraph was designed to give an impression, and indeed to appear to give information when no such impression should have been given. It was designed to mislead.

Mr. Speaker, the facts of the matters are that we had a substitute teacher pay question that troubled us. We put a proposal on the table early on, That proposal stated -

MR. NEARY: Why do we not just turn the place into a bear pit?

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the members of the House aware of my remarks, as is my privilege. but I am being interfered with by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour ruled that answers had to be as brief as possible although sometimes because of the nature of the question they may be a little longer. But Your Honour directed the minister to draw his remarks to a close, to be as brief as he could. Now how long more? The hon. member has been at it for ten minutes, Mr. Speaker, How long more is Your Honour going to allow the minister to break the rules of this House?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: The way the hon. gentleman rises on his point of order I want to say, you know, is geared to bring

MR. MARSHALL: down the dignity of this House and challenge the authority of Your Honour. Answers have to be as brief as possible. The hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is answering a complex question, he is answering it as briefly as possible -

MR. NEARY: A cooked-up question between him and the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

MR. MARSHALL: - and the information that is being given, Mr. Speaker, is information that is of vital importance to this most sensitive issue.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! There was no valid point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Do you mean to tell me that he can continue to break the rules?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Name him! Name him!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Is he allowed to break the rules?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If the hon. Leader of the Opposition persists in what may be an attempt to challenge the ruling of the Chair, then the Chair will have to take whatever action is required.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we cannot play forty-four against eight now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this really cannot continue. The hon. gentleman is challenging the integrity

MR. MARSHALL: of the Chair. It is not a case of forty-four against eight, Mr. Speaker. It is a case of parliamentary rules and parliamentary precedent. It is not a case of forty-four against one. It is against one person, Your Honour, who is in the Chair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is ample authority here in Beauchesne about the authority of the Speaker and the necessity of protecting the Speaker in the Chair, the necessity of all hon. members of this House respecting the position of the Chair and the rulings of the Chair. If we do not have that we



MR. MARSHALL: have complete anarchy, Mr. Speaker. These are rules that have been set down, not by forty-four to eight, but by the British Parliamentary System that has endured for centuries. What the hon. gentleman is doing in making these remarks is challenging your ruling, is derogating the authority of this House and, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman realizes the enormity of what the hon. gentleman is doing, but if the hon. gentleman persists in this and continues, the procedure is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, give me two minutes and I will give ample authority with respect to it, that the hon. gentleman should be asked to retract his remarks containing imputations against Your Honour and, if he fails to do that, there is an obvious procedure that pertains. Now, we would regret to see that obvious procedure used, but this government is not going to be intimidated by a Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who constantly says it is only eight to forty-four in this House and thus see the derogation of the system that has come down through centuries to us, a system that is going to be protected whether we are forty-four to eight or whether we are twenty-seven to twenty-five.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of privilege, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, that is just an opportunity the hon. gentleman used to make a personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition in this House in his usual nasty, narrow-minded, partisan way, Mr. Speaker. There is no inference on my part as far as the Chair is concerned. I am well aware of the rules, Mr. Speaker. If I want to challenge any of Your Honour's rulings, I am well aware of the procedure whereby I could do it. I am not using that procedure so I am not challenging the

MR. NEARY: Chair at this particular point in time, Mr. Speaker, and if I were I would know how to do it. I have nothing but the greatest of respect for the Speaker and for the Chair, Mr. Speaker. And I well aware of the rules. I do not have to be lectured by the hon. gentleman. There was certainly no intention on my part to embarrass the Chair in any way, shape or form, but that is what the hon. gentleman is attempting to convince Your Honour of, hoping that Your Honour will deal with me drastically. Well, the hon. gentleman is not going to muzzle the Opposition. The hon. gentleman does not own this House. Mr. Speaker, if they want to establish a dictatorship that is up to themselves, but we still have rights and privileges in this House and as long as we do things in this House within the realm of good taste, within the realm of the rules, then, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we have a democracy left in this Province although the Board of Trade told us in an editorial that they wrote in their magazine that they question whether freedom of speech is left, if we have anything left in this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit there is no point of privilege. It was just an opportunity for the hon. gentleman to squirt his venom and his poison.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman has now given me the opportunity. Now, this is not my statement, this is a statement from Beauchense, which is parliamentary procedure. I am going to read it for the hon. gentleman and the House as well. Page 38, paragraph 117, "The chief characteristics attached to the office of Speaker in the House of Commons are authority and impartiality. As a symbol of the authority

MR. MARSHALL: of the House, he is accompanied by the Mace which is carried before him by the Sergeant-at-Arms and is placed upon the Table when he is in the Chair. He calls upon Members to speak and in debate all speeches are addressed to him."

Paragraph (2) "The Presiding Officer" - that is the Speaker - "though entitled on all occasions to be treated with the greatest attention and respect by the individual Members, because the power, dignity, and honour of the House are officially embodied in his person, is yet but the servant of the House." There we go on, Mr. Speaker, and I refer you to May, page 441, with respect to it. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, that this House cannot exist unless there is complete and absolute authority of the Speaker. And further on in that same paragraph, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) was reading along and he has given it to me here, paragraph 117 (1), "Reflections upon the character or actions of the Speaker may be punished as breaches of privilege. His actions cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any form of proceeding except by way of a substantive motion. Confidence in the impartiality of the Speaker

MR. MARSHALL: 'is an indispensable condition of the successful working of procedure, and many conventions exist which have as their object, not only to ensure the impartiality of the Speaker but also, to ensure that his impartiality is generally recognized'. And so it goes on. Mr. Speaker, this is well known. This is not the fiat according to people who seem to disagree with the government, who seem to want to take the position that they are being dictators and the hon. gentleman makes the statement. But that, Mr. Speaker, once again, is a rule and regulation, it is precedent that is ingrained in British parliamentary tradition. What the hon. gentleman is doing is what he is accusing other members of doing - he is taking this House on the back. Mr. Speaker, no matter what he says and his cynical little smiles and grins, he is not, Mr. Speaker, going to take the House of Assembly, which is the House of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, on his back. As a first step towards us he can start respecting Your Honour because we intend to see that each and every member in this House, no matter what side of the House they come in on, respect the Chair and the presence of Your Honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CALLAN: To the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To the point of privilege, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious to anybody in this House, and perhaps to anybody anywhere, that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) stood and asked a very simple question - 'Was there contract stripping?' The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in his answer went back to last August and rambled on and so on.

MR. CALLAN: But all he had to do, which is what he finally did so, was read that one short paragraph from the four page letter from Mr. Noseworthy to the Premier, where it said that pay for substitute teachers was not an issue, and so on, it was previously agreed to. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) read that and then he said, 'That is a fabrication, this is not true'. In other words, he had answered the member for St. John's North's (Mr. Carter) question. Why he wanted to ramble on and waste the time of the House, and especially the Question Period which is designed mainly for Opposition members to ask questions, is the whole issue here. It has been happening more and more frequently, Mr. Speaker, where ministers are taking unfair advantage of Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The Chair has heard argument on this point of privilege from two speaker on each side. Some of the points raised in the point of privilege were well taken and the Chair will take the matter under advisement and make a ruling on it later.

The time for Question Period has now expired.

NOTICE OF MOTION

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that

I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution:

WHEREAS complaints concerning the high cost of food and food price differentials throughout Newfoundland and Labrador have been received from homemakers, town councils and the general public; and

WHEREAS monthly food price surveys conducted by the Consumer Affairs Division have indicated that food price differentials do exist throughout Newfoundland and Labrador; and

WHEREAS it appears desirable and expedient that an inquiry be held into the matter of the prices charged for food throughout the Province;

BE IT THEREFORE resolved that a Select Committee of the House of Assembly be appointed to examine food prices throughout the Province and, in particular,  
a) to inquire into the various factors affecting the prices of food throughout Newfoundland and Labrador and b) to make recommendations with respect to the reduction of food price differentials throughout Newfoundland and Labrador as well as the reduction of the cost of food in general.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the members of the Select Committee to be" - I should inform hon. members that the composition has been a matter of agreement

MR. OTTENHEIMER: between Opposition and government - are the hon. the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett), Chairman; the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), the hon. the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), the hon. the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

So that is the Notice of Motion with respect to that Committee. If the House is in agreement - it would only have to be with leave - we could pass the resolution now which would formally constitute the Committee and it could then start working whenever a meeting is held. That would be up to the House, if the House wishes to pass the resolution which would formally establish the Committee.

MR. NEARY: Can we do that now?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If the hon. gentleman agrees.

MR. NEARY: We agree, Mr. Speaker. Just to show you how helpful and co-operative we are on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, we will go along with the hon. gentleman. If he wants to pass it now, we will pass it and get the Select Committee of the House working.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

I therefore move the question.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Is the House ready for the question? All those in favour of the resolution, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against, 'Nay', carried.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

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

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, I want to present a petition this morning on behalf of 1,127 residents of the district of Naskaupi, which I have the pleasure to represent.



MR. GOUDIE:

The communities involved are the towns of Happy Valley/Goose Bay, the town of Mud Lake, the town of North West River, and the town of Sheshatshit. It relates to concerns of residents in that area, in terms of action being taken in relation to the hospital at North West River and I will read the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker: 'The undersigned urgently request the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to delay the decision to close the North West River Hospital until sufficient studies have been done on social impact and maintenance of adequate health-care for the Upper Lake Melville and the Coastal areas. We urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to consider, (1) Chronic care and hospital facilities for North West River; (2) Appropriate out-patients clinic with holding beds for North West River; (3) Appropriate upgrading of the Melville Hospital.' As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, there are 1,127 signatures representing constituents in the District of Naskaupi, from four towns. I ask that the petition be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition presented by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) on behalf of 1,127 of his constituents. I commend the hon. gentleman for presenting the petition, because last night there was a meeting in Torbay and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) was given a petition signed by 200 teachers and refused to present the



MR. NEARY: on two or three occasions that he did not find out that the hospital at North West River was closing until fifteen minutes before the Budget was read in this House.

Mr. Speaker, that is shameful. That is a shameful way for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Premier to treat their colleague in Cabinet. I believe him, by the way. I think he is telling the truth, I believe him. But, Mr. Speaker, if I were a member of the Cabinet and I was treated in a shabby way like that by the Minister of Finance or by the Premier, I know what I would do, I would not put up with it very long, Mr. Speaker. But the hon. gentleman apparently is prepared to stay in the Cabinet, to support the Cabinet that would not let him know they were closing a hospital in his district.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition and I hope that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) will do something for these people in North West River.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of approximately 400, I have not had a chance to verify the total number, but it is approximately 400 people, some of which came out this morning to express their desire to get the children of the Province back in the schools. And the prayer of the petition basically reads 'We the undersigned request that our children be returned to their classrooms immediately'.

I think it is everybody's wish in the Province, I think I can say it on behalf of every parent on this side and every member on this side and I am sure I speak for hon. members opposite, that it is the

MR. DINN: wish of everybody in this House of Assembly and outside this House of Assembly that the children get back in their schools as quickly as is humanly possible. And I place this petition on the table of the House to have it referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I support this petition signed by around 400 concerned parents, and it is a concern. The Women's Institute down in Labrador had their annual convention in L'anse au Loup last week, last Saturday and they passed a resolution - a petition is on the way - also stating that the teachers and the government should get back to the negotiating table.

We, the Opposition, only want to see the students back in their classrooms and the teachers given their collective right under the bargaining process and binding arbitration, if needed. And, of course, the government refuses to do this.

We were rather surprised that - as a member of the House of Assembly you have to present, as the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) just did, and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), you have to present petitions sometimes that you do not particularly agree with, but because of the democratic process you present them as a right of the people. I am rather surprised that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) last night refused the petition that was presented to him by 200 teachers to be tabled on the floor of this House. I am surprised that a minister of the Crown would deny the voters of this Province their right to petition the House, to ask that this grievance be settled.

MR. HISCOCK:

But I support the petition

which the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) presented,  
and we hope that this dispute will be settled soon. The  
government have saved almost \$20 million, maybe some of this  
money will go into

MR. HISCOCK:

into new construction for Grade XII, and maybe some will go into health costs. But we, the Opposition and, as I said, the general public, are getting rather concerned about the delay and the arrogant attitude of this administration in keeping the teachers out. So, Mr. Speaker, we support the petition and hope that there will be more parents throughout the Province, and students themselves, who will pressure government and the NTA to come to a satisfactory conclusion so that the students can go back to the classrooms.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, just a few brief words on that petition. I certainly, whole-heartedly, support any parents in this Province who wish the schools to be open. We have been working tooth and nail, day and night, to try to resolve this issue. We have put forward many methods by which it maybe resolved. I have spoken with many parents and I have told them about our methods, our approaches, in general terms that is. They have by and large, after I have discussed it with them and-of course, the Premier himself has said that he has met with various groups and explained our stance on things -by and large these groups have understood our position, They have felt that our positions were reasonable, they felt that our positions were often generous, they felt that our positions were sensitive to any legitimate concerns the NTA have, and particularly the professional teachers of this Province have. The only thing that we have at the present time is we have a stumbling block, and there is a stumbling block, I think, that is obvious to everyone in this Province now and I do whole-heartedly support parents who wish this issue to be resolved

DR. COLLINS:

and schools to be opened.

I hope the parents in this Province will keep up their activities. I hope that they will not feel that their activities are not helpful, they are helpful. The government is appreciative of them. We hope they will not tire. We hope they will keep the pressure on and I am sure that in time this issue will be resolved; it will be resolved hopefully, in an honourable fashion and it will be resolved so that the school system can begin to operate again for the benefit of the children.

000

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, just before we get to Orders of the Day-I do not think the hon. gentlemen opposite will object to this, I know they will wish to associate with it. It is not very often that this occurs but there is a milestone that has been reached in the family of the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House). Unfortunately, he is not here in his chair now, I think he is on his way to the celebration. This is the 100th birthday of his grandmother, Mrs. Pamela House, which is a real milestone in every family. I know that all members of the House wish to be associated in an expression of congratulations to Mrs House in achieving this milestone, and to the Minister of Health himself. He has a great prospect of longevity politically and I am sure this augers well for him for his own personal durability in the future. But excising from that the political considerations , Mr. Speaker, this is a significant event that is given to very few families to celebrate. The birthday occurs on Sunday, May 1st, and I know that all members of the House, I am quite sure, would wish to be associated in a message of congratulations to Mrs. Pamela House. And perhaps if the motion passes, Your Honour could arrange for an appropriate message to be forwarded to her so that Mrs House might receive it on her birthday from all members of the House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

We concur with that, Mr. Speaker.



ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Motion No. 1.

The debate was adjourned last day by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the Oral Question Period today we saw a typical example of the arrogance of this administration. We saw another example of how the administration are trying to do away with democratic government in this Province. Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of the exercise on points of order and points of privilege during the Oral Question Period today was so that members on the opposite side could use up the Question Period so that the Opposition could not ask penetrating questions of the Premier and of the administration while there was a large number of people in the Public Gallery.

MR. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order. The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER:

I was the one who asked the question from the government side as I have a perfect right to do and as it was established by the Chair that I had the right to do it. I pointed out that it is one thing for a minister to answer a question of mine in private, it is quite another thing for him to answer it in public. I certainly did him the courtesy of notifying him of what question or questions I would ask. And let the record show that the Leader of the Opposition because of his intransigence and his obstructiveness that question was only partially answered. I do not know when I will get a chance to ask it again. He is such a jack-in-the-box I would have to be very fleet on my feet to squeeze in between himself and Your Honour.

MR. NEARY:

An abuse of the rules again,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: I think that his charge is not only ridiculous, it is dangerous and damning and I am almost to the point of making it a question of privilege, because I feel that my privileges as a private member are seriously jeopardized by his attitude of trying to turn this whole House into a circus atmosphere. And any impartial observer who was in the gallery or was even in the confines of this House or even within earshot of the microphone, the electronic system we have, would realize that he was guilty of great obstruction and he is just trying to turn this House into a circus atmosphere and is bringing the whole structure into disrepute.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to belabour the point but Your Honour knows that is not a point of order. It is just another example of how members on the opposite side attempt to abuse the rules of this House to squirt out their venom and poison across the House.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order. The member took the opportunity to clarify statements that were made to him.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: If I may be permitted to carry on my few remarks, Mr. Speaker, uninterrupted, without members abusing the rules of this House as the hon. gentleman just did and Your Honour ruled again - it would be a very interesting exercise indeed to go back over Hansard and check and see how many points of order and points of privilege are raised by government members, by ministers and backbenchers on the government side of the House when Your Honour rules there is no point of order, there is no point of privilege. It is just time consuming and

MR. NEARY:                   wasting the time of the House, Mr. Speaker. Of course, that is the purpose for their doing it, I guess. They just want to obstruct members when they are speaking. They cannot stand criticism. When they are being embarrassed, then they try to use the Chair to cut off debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I started to say when I stood in my place, this morning we saw a typical example of the arrogance of this administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, last April 7th when people woke up - the morning after the election - I suppose the thing that concerned the people of Newfoundland and Labrador more than anything else about that election was the fact that the government had been given such a lopsided majority, that there were forty-four members on that side and eight members on this side of the House. That is what concerned people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, because they knew in their hearts that a government with a large majority - forty-four against eight - would in a very short time become arrogant, could misuse and abuse its authority and its power. And that is precisely what happened,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, and we saw it happen in this House again today. Now, they can try all they want, members there opposite can try as hard as they want to muzzle the Opposition, to stop us from asking questions, to play little games with their part-time reporters, Mr. Speaker, from C.B.C. radio, who had every opportunity to take a little dart at the Opposition when they see the Premier is on the ropes and the administration is on the ropes, the part-time reporters trying to worm their way in, I guess, trying to crawl in, no doubt in anticipation of favours in the future. They get their little flicks in, these part-time C.B.C. radio reporters, get in their little flicks that they think are smart, at the Opposition. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, they can carry on all the games they want. The fact of the matter is that we have a pretty tough job to do in this House. There are only eight of us against forty-four and, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of playing against forty-four and the referee at the same time. We have no intention of that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: You are playing against the referee, are you?

MR. NEARY: Well, that is right. We are not going to put up with that either, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: You do not play against the referee.

MR. NEARY: When you are out on the ice sometimes playing in a hockey game and you have forty-four over there and eight over here, sometimes you might have to play the referee too.

MR. SIMMS: In a hockey game?

MR. NEARY: That is right, in a hockey game.

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

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

MR. CARTER: I heard what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) just said and I regard that as a criticism of Your Honour's impartiality and I think he should be made to withdraw it unequivocally, immediately and forever.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: We had the interruption again. The hon. member is wrong again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to carry on uninterrupted. It is a fine day. You would have thought the hon. gentleman would be in his savory patch today where he usually is when the sun is shining, and not in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the third day of the Budget Debate. We are now debating the Budget. We have not finished the Throne Speech debate; I doubt very much if it will be called anymore this session. The Throne Speech Debate, which started about a month ago is only partly finished. The House will probably adjourn for the Summer. We will meet again next Fall and probably carry on

MR. NEARY:

on with the Throne Speech. So what we are doing now, we are having the Budget Debate. Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most important debate in this hon. House, the Budget Debate, the most important. It is more important than any other debate in this House and I would hope that before the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) adjourns the House, until next Fall, that every member of this House will have an opportunity to participate in the Budget debate, Mr. Speaker. The budget was brought down a couple of weeks ago, the Provincial Budget, and it was negative, it did not outline any plans for the development of the natural resources of this Province. All it did was ridicule and slander and criticize the Federal Government and the Government of Quebec, and everyone and everything in sight, Mr. Speaker. What it lacked was credibility. It lacked, Mr. Speaker, a positive stimulus for the economy; it showed great disregard for the concerns of industry and labour in this Province. There was nothing tangible in that Budget that would give the Newfoundland and Labrador economy the uplift that it so badly needs at this time. Mr. Speaker, last week, we saw the Federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) bring down a Budget in which he demonstrated that the Government of Canada is wide awake and is anxious to make progress on all fronts, when in that Budget, compared to our Provincial Budget, there were all kinds of constructive ideas and plans and suggestions for stimulating the Canadian economy, for helping business and industry, for helping labour and to help the financial community. So, Mr. Speaker, here in Newfoundland the Budget offered nothing, neither excitement or stimulus for the

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland and Labrador economy.

The Federal Budget provided job creation, assistance for Provinces, assistance for business and industry and provided all kinds of creative ideas to stimulate the Canadian economy. And, Mr. Speaker, instead of welcoming Mr. Lalonde's budget with open arms, this Province, where we have record unemployment, the highest taxes in Canada, where we have an economy that is on the brink of ruin, instead of welcoming the Federal Budget with open arms, Mr. Speaker, the administration, led by the hon. gentleman across the way, was very critical of that budget.

MR. NEARY: So is it any wonder then, Mr. Speaker, that we see announcements like we saw yesterday, like we heard yesterday, that \$51.8 million of federal money would be spent on a water-front development in Halifax? When I heard that, Mr. Speaker, I immediately asked myself the question, why not St. John's? Why could not that \$51.8 million for a water-front development in Halifax, why could it not have been spent in St. John's? Why could not the administration here welcome the federal budget with open arms and go after some of these projects, go after some of the \$3 billion or \$4 billion that is in there for public works projects? Why could not the administration here make suggestions to the Government of Canada, to the various ministers in Ottawa, present their plans and ideas for projects for this Province, Mr. Speaker, instead of condemning the federal budget forthright? Why did they not welcome it with open arms and put forward constructive ideas and plans and suggestions and recommendations for megaprojects in this Province, Mr. Speaker? That is what they should have done, instead of condemning and criticizing the budget right from the - even before Mr. Lalonde was finished his speech, I believe, the Premier was interviewed live on the federal budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe in this Province that we have probably a better opportunity for megaprojects, for make work projects, for public works, than any other province of Canada. I can give hon. gentlemen a few examples of what I mean. The Trans-Labrador Highway would be a real worthwhile project for this Province, Mr. Speaker, to undertake, in co-operation with the Government of Canada.

MR. DAWE: Number one on our list.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says number one on their list. It has been number one on their list for the last eleven years, Mr. Speaker. We saw the tunnel started





MR. NEARY: That list , Mr. Speaker, must be as long as your arm. What is the point of having these things on the list? As far as I am concerned, the number one priority in this Province right now is a Trans-Labrador highway. And, Mr. Speaker, I would say in spite of this Province that you are likely to see a start made on that this year as a result of a constructive federal Budget. I would not be at all surprised, Mr. Speaker, I would not be at all surprised but one of the projects on the drawing board, one of the one hundred would be the commencement of a Trans-Labrador highway.

MR. DAWE: The Premier told us that yesterday.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. DAWE: The Premier told us that yesterday.

MR. NEARY: Oh, he told you yesterday.  
I see.

Mr. Speaker, a Trans-Labrador highway would open up the vast territory of Labrador, give business and industry and the Province access to the great storehouse of wealth in Labrador. It would be a real boom for this Province, Mr. Speaker. And I am hoping, if I have anything to do with it, if I have any powers of persuasion over the federal authority, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will recommend and have recommended and will continue to recommend that the Trans-Labrador highway be one of the projects included in the hundred or so projects that were announced by the Federal Minister of Finance (Mr. LaLonde) last week when he brought down his Budget.

Mr. Speaker, it will not be because of lack of effort on the part of the Opposition that some of these things will not get started. We believe that there should be a plan of development for the Lower

MR. NEARY: Churchill, and, Mr. Speaker, I am rather concerned about contradictory statements that are being made about the Lower Churchill. The Premier told us in this House that to develop the Lower Churchill, the Muskrat Falls at this particular point in time was not feasible, unrealistic, told us that it would be put on hold for the next ten years or twenty years. The other day down before the Public Utilities Board, Mr. Young, cousin Vic, told the Public Utilities Board that the number one priority in the generating of electricity, new sources of electricity in this Province is the Lower Churchill and Muskrat Falls. and stated categorically that it was still feasible.

Now, who is right and who is wrong? Who can we believe, Mr. Speaker? The Premier, I do not know what is wrong with him these days. He makes all kinds of weird and strange statements that he cannot back up. We saw an example of that yesterday with the teachers' strike, the teachers' dispute. The hon. gentleman had to come in this morning and try to straighten it out. He will come in now in another day or two, after I have raised this matter about the Lower Churchill and what cousin Vic said about it in his statement, he will come back in and try to straighten that one out, Mr. Speaker. But who is right and who is wrong?

MR. NEARY: I am not convinced that the development of the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls cannot go ahead. I would have to see the documentation, I would have to see the evidence. Certainly the Premier has not convinced me in the few words that he said in this House about the Lower Churchill. Why should we take his word for it? He gets up and makes off-the-cuff statements. Why should we, Mr. Speaker, he has been wrong on everything else? He also stated that it would not be practical, it would not economically justifiable to develop the five rivers in Labrador, with their headwaters in Newfoundland and the rivers flowing into the Quebec part of Labrador. He said that would not be economically viable, justifiable. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that very much. Why would the Province of Quebec be so interested in entering into a joint agreement with the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador to develop these rivers? Are they all fools up there in Quebec Hydro? Do they not have the facts at their fingertips?

AN HON. MEMBER: They are (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. They are a different culture than we are so they do not know anything. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt but Quebec Hydro have sent out their experts, and they have sent out their engineers, and their economists and they have looked at these five rivers. They want to enter into a joint venture with Newfoundland on these five rivers and because of the stubbornness of the Premier of this Province and his inability to get along with anybody, they have not been able to make a deal. And that is what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker. A deal is a deal. You make a deal. That is what Quebec wants to do, make a deal with Newfoundland. They do not want to take anything away from us, they do not want to rob us of anything, they just want to make a deal. I released

MR. NEARY: a correspondence there some time ago on this matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, are they crazy in Quebec Hydro to want to go ahead with the development of these five rivers? Mr. Speaker, I ask you, who is right and who is wrong? I am not convinced that it is not feasible to go ahead with the development of these rivers and the development of the Lower Churchill. Quebec has suggested a package deal involving the reopening of the contract on the Upper Churchill. They said, 'We will reopen the contract on the Upper Churchill to give the Province of Newfoundland more generous revenue than they are getting now

MR. NEARY: and we will assist Newfoundland, we will put up the money to develop the five rivers. 'And if you want us to', Quebec says, 'we will also arrange your financing for the development of the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls. And we will allow you to transmit your power across the Province of Quebec', so they say, 'and you can market the power yourselves for whatever the going market price is for electricity and we will just charge you a fee for using our transmission lines.'

Mr. Speaker, you cannot be any more co-operative and helpful than that. It sounds to me like a pretty good deal. But this administration are unwilling or unable to deal, Mr. Speaker. They will not make a deal with anybody. They somehow or another are paranoid about the fact that they may give something away, Mr. Speaker. So we are going to continue our efforts to get these great developments underway. We are going to continue our efforts to get the administration and the Government of Canada back to the bargaining table on the offshore. We are going to continue. And they can get over there and they can try to belittle us all they want, they can attack our credibility, they can attack us personally, as we saw happen this morning by the ultimate in nastiness in this House and in this Province, the ultimate in nastiness -

MR. SIMMS:

That is not pertinent.

MR. NEARY: Well, I have to defend myself and when I want to defend myself, I will do it.

But, Mr. Speaker, we saw about the lowest personal attack in this House this morning that we have ever seen. And they get up, you know, and the part-time CBC radio reporters will go out and say, 'Oh, Neary obstructed again today, Neary tried to do this again today. The Leader of the Opposition was put in his place again today.' And I say to all of that that, so what? As long as we are doing our job, Mr. Speaker, that is all that counts.

MR. NEARY: They can manipulate now the little part-time reporters all they want and they can look up with calves' eyes and goo-goo at them, Mr. Speaker. I have been arguing, by the way, that the press gallery should be up here in the centre of the House.

MR. RIDEOUT: They did not want to go down there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they told me, everyone of them, that they would love to be able to move up there because -

MR. RIDEOUT: Who are the part-time reporters? I thought they were all full-time.

MR. NEARY: No, there are a couple of part-timers around here for CBC radio.

MR. RIDEOUT: CBC radio?

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, the CBC, they think so much about this House that they will not give us -

MR. RIDEOUT: Radio or television?

MR. NEARY: - radio I am talking about. CBC TV has full-time reporters here, but CBC radio

MR. NEARY: will not give us a full-time reporter, That is how much they think about the House.

MR. RIDEOUT: The young lady who does the Morning Show, she is full-time.

MR. NEARY: Is that right?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, she does not work at anything else. Budgell, she is full-time, is she not? She is with radio.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue our efforts and they can try to belittle our efforts all they want. We appreciate the efforts that have been put forward by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), Mr. Speaker, in this regard, in trying to get the parties back to the bargaining table. His stance on energy issues vividly contrast with the stubborn attitude of the Minister responsible for Energy in this Province (Mr. Marshall) and the Premier. The member for Mount Scio, Mr. Speaker, his concerns upon the NTA dispute and upon the delivery by the Province of education for our children,deserves complete support of members of this House. Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that the hon. gentleman's own party ignores his good sense. This, to me, is very sad indeed, Mr. Speaker. I am amazed that so many members on the opposite side can be lulled into complacency by the hon. the Premier who gives them almost daily assurances that everything will be alright by the time the next election is called. I am surprised that that attitude, Mr. Speaker, has created so much arrogance and political indifference on the part of members who support the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the member for Mount Scio will continue his good sense, that he will carry his good sense to a logical conclusion. But I hope that the hon. gentleman will not find himself



MR. NEARY: in the position that the late Winston Churchill described one time. To quote Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, when he was describing an hon. gentleman who was in a similar situation, he said that he hoped that the hon. gentleman was not crying ineffectively in a wilderness. He said, 'To do that is bad politics and self-defeating.' Crying ineffectively in a wilderness is bad politics and is self-defeating. Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that the hon. the member for Mount Scio's (Mr. Barry) ambitions ride far higher than that. We welcome his support, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. gentleman intends it or not to be support for our point of view.

MR. NEARY:

For the Opposition it certainly is support for our viewpoint. We welcome his support whether it is intended or not and we wish him well, Mr. Speaker, in his efforts to persuade his colleagues on the opposite side to change their course.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, before I ran out of time, I was dealing with a report that was submitted to the Public Utilities Board by a group of independent Chartered Accountants who were asked by the Public Utilities Board--because of the current application by Newfoundland Hydro before the Board for an increase in electricity rates in this Province, the Public Utilities Board in their wisdom decided to ask an independent firm of Chartered Accountants to do a study on four projects. The people who are sitting in the galleries should listen to this, because I have no doubt that they often wonder to themselves why we have such high electricity rates in this Province. Why is it that every time the Newfoundland Light and Power Company and the Newfoundland Hydro, which is owned by the Government, why is it that every time they appear before the Public Utilities Board, they just rubber stamp their application?-it is sent up to the Cabinet room here on the eighth floor of Confederation Building and the Premier and his colleagues just rubber stamp it? People have been asking that question for a long time. For a good many years they have been asking why are the applications for increases rubber stamped? Why did the House, why did the Tory Government not pay

MR. NEARY: any attention to the biggest petition that was ever presented, ever tabled in this House objecting to increases in electricity rates, from people all over the Province? Why, Mr. Speaker, why did the Tory administration not pay any attention to the people's wishes and the prayer of that petition objecting to increases in electricity rates? Well, now, Mr. Speaker, the cat was let out of the bag down at a hearing of the Public Utilities Board the other day when this report was tabled. I am going to go back over it again. Yesterday I started to review some of the items in there and I want the people in the galleries, householders, people who are concerned about the ever increasing electricity rates in this Province -

MR. MARSHALL: I hope you will read them the response as well.

MR. NEARY: I have the response and cousin Vic can try all he wants to weasel his way out of it with bad weather and -

MR. MARSHALL: When reason does not work (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, there was no justifiable reason, I have read his response. The hon. gentleman should read it.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, if that is the only response that we have, then I would say God help the consumers of electricity in this Province. It would have cost \$350,000 to do an on-the-ground survey of the road at Cat Arm, \$350,000. They did not do it and do hon. members know, are they aware of the mistake, the colossal blunder that was made in estimating the cost of that road? Well, I have it here in front of me. I will come to it shortly. Here, just listen to it, item number 4, page 21 of the report, "The permanent access road to Cat Arm was budgeted based upon aerial photographs and topographical maps, the actual cost to July 1982 was \$27 million, compared to the tendered price of \$11 million." In other words, Mr. Speaker, the tendered price was \$11 million, tendered by Lundrigans, and lo and behold, shortly after Newfoundland Hydro discovered they made a mistake of \$16 million. They made a mistake of \$16 million and all they had to do was spend \$350,000 to do the on-ground investigation for that road, and they would have saved the taxpayers of this Province millions piled upon millions of dollars. And then the people wonder why their electricity rates are going up. There is one of the reasons, an \$16 million mistake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, did heads roll down at Newfoundland Hydro because of that? No, they did not. Cousin Vic tried to justify the matter before the Public Utilities Board a couple of days ago. I have his statement, very, very weak, very weak indeed. There is no excuse for this. He was trying to defend the indefensible. But let me read a couple of more items from this report, done by a group of independent Chartered Accountants for the Public Utilities Board - and I hope the Public Utilities Board will not grant an increase through this current application before the Board. I hope they will turn it down. I know the

MR. NEARY: administration, the Premier and his Cabinet, do not have the courage to turn it down. But let us get a couple of more items on the table here.

"Item number 2, There was a cost overrun on poles as a result of design faults, survey inaccuracies, inferior quality of poles, and inadequate construction practices." Is that not something?

MR. HISCOCK: That is not weather.

MR. NEARY: What does that have to do with the weather, Mr. Speaker? It has to do with common sense and good judgement and good management. That is what it has to do with.

Let me read it again just in case hon. gentlemen did not get it the first time. "There was a cost overrun on poles as a result of design faults, survey inaccuracies, inferior quality of poles, and inadequate construction practices."

Now, who is responsible for that, Mr. Speaker? They are down there making their \$75,000 and \$80,000 salaries every year.

MR. NEARY: The highest paid people in this Province are the officials of Newfoundland Hydro. I thought we hired the best. Not according to this, Mr. Speaker. Incompetence and mismanagement! Taxpayer money, consumers of electricity paying for these blunders. If there was only two or three or four, but let us get another one, Mr. Speaker, just in case hon. members and the people listening think that I am exaggerating. I am quoting directly from a report that was submitted by Noseworthy, Keating, Howard and Kung, Chartered Accountants for the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities that was submitted on April 19 of this year, April 19, 1983. Now, remember this firm of Chartered Accountants were only asked to comment on four items.

Now, let us see what it says here, item number three: 'There was a cost overrun on conductors as a result of the budget being prepared based on outdated quotations.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

Come again?

MR. NEARY:

Come again, you say! Well, I will.

'There was a cost overrun on conductors as a result of the budget being prepared based on outdated quotations.'

What about these experts that the Premier tells us about down at hydro? What about them? Why did they not have their quotations up to date, Mr. Speaker? If we are paying for the best we should have the best. We should not have people who do sloppy work, who mismanage the affairs of Newfoundland Hydro, who are incompetent and inept, because it is the consumers of electricity who have to pay for these blunders.

Let us have a look at another item, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: As a courtesy to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), would the people in the Government Common Room and in the corridors listen instead of talking and interrupting his speech? Could we have a quorum in this House, all forty-four members, instead of people taking such a lackadaisical attitude towards it? Could we have a quorum?

MR. BAIRD: How come there were only three Liberals in the House all week?

MR. NEARY: It is the government's duty to keep a quorum in the House.

MR. BAIRD: Where are all your Liberal buddies?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please! A quorum is now present.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague rightly called a quorum because it is up to the government to maintain a quorum in this House and not the Opposition.

MR. SIMMS: The Opposition could not maintain a quorum.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Mr. Speaker, listen to this now. Here is another item that contributes to the high cost of electricity in this Province, another item. I did not make this up. I am not the one who is saying this. This is not Liberals versus Tories. This is a firm of independent Chartered Accountants doing a report for the Public Utilities Board. A good firm they are. They are all Chartered Accountants. So you cannot say it is partisan politics, it is Tory versus Liberal or NDP, or the Leader of the opposition criticizing the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) or vice versa. It has nothing to do with that, it has to do with a report. Now let us see what the other item is in the report. It says, "the construction camp services contract and the 69 KV transmission line at Cat Arm cost significantly more than budgeted for because of insufficient and inaccurate information when tendering commenced." Mr. Speaker, did they know what they were doing at all? Just listen, let me go through that again. I am not a construction man but certainly I would have thought that one of the first things that the government would have done before they started the Cat Arm project would be to do a little planning, to know where they are going to put the road, to know where they are going to put the dams, to know where they are going to put the power house, to know where they are going to put the bunk houses, to know where they are going to have their fuel storage tanks,





DR. COLLINS: Hydro carried out something without planning it?

MR. NEARY: Well, that is right. That is what they did in the case of Cat Arm.

DR. COLLINS: You are not sensible in saying that.

MR. NEARY: Well, now, let me run through it again just for the benefit of the hon. gentleman.

MR. BAIRD: Repetition, Mr. Speaker, repetition!

MR. NEARY: The construction camp services contract and the 69KV transmission line at Cat Arm cost significantly more than budgeted because of insufficient and inaccurate information when tendering commenced. In other words, they did not have the information, Mr. Speaker. When they called tenders for that 69kv transmission line and the camp services, they did not have enough information when they went to tender. Now, that is only a very simple part of that major development there at Cat Arm.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how much did these mistakes, these blunders, cost the consumers of electricity in this Province? We may never know. But what is more serious, Mr. Speaker, than what is in this report are the things that are not in this report, that we have been hearing about. We know there are claims against the government on the Upper Salmon and on the Cat Arm projects, claims that are not justified, contractors back looking for their thirty pieces of silver from the administration, \$8 million and \$10 million more than the contract was worth. They tendered on these contracts, they were awarded the contracts and now they are back looking for extras - buddies of the administration, pals, moneybags, the fund raisers for the administration.

MR. SIMMS: Who, Art Lundrigan?

MR. NEARY: The fund raisers, the bagmen for the Tory Party - the bagmen now back looking for extras on the Upper Salmon. Have they no concern about the consumers of electricity in this Province? Have they no concern?

Mr. Speaker, the general contract on the Upper Salmon was a firm contract and now, the contractor is back looking for another \$7 million or \$8 million that he is not entitled to have. And Newfoundland Hydro said no, and then they decided to bring the matter into the realm of politics. It was then brought to the minister to see if some influence could be used with the ministry to get this \$7 million or \$8 million rather than let the matter go to the courts, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: But what is even more serious than that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Auditor General is not allowed to audit the accounts of Newfoundland Hydro. The Auditor General has been barred by this administration from auditing the books, from looking over the records of Newfoundland Hydro - the Auditor General, the man who is a servant of this House. The Auditor General is not allowed, is barred by an act of this administration to bar the Auditor General from examining the records of Newfoundland Hydro, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: Did the Auditor General do it when you were in government.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, why would any administration not want to allow the Auditor General, who is a servant of this House, who is the watchdog of the Public Treasury, why is he not allowed to examine the records, the books, of Newfoundland Hydro? Why? Can they give us an answer? Can they give us a straight and honest answer over there, Mr. Speaker?

I will tell you why I think, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General is not allowed to examine the records of Newfoundland Hydro, they have too much to hide. That would be the only valid excuse, would it not, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, what I want to know now before I leave this subject, which I consider to be a very, very critical matter indeed, how many more items have been hidden in Hydro that we do not know about that have driven up the cost of electricity to consumers in this Province? How many more projects, Mr. Speaker, how many more mistakes and how many more blunders that we do not know about? Because I can tell hon. gentlemen right now that I had a chat recently with an individual who I will not name at this point in time, who informed me that a study was done by Acres Engineering on the Cat Arm project, a study was done by Acres



MR. NEARY: It is hard to believe, is it not?

MR. RIDEOUT: What are you getting on about now?

MR. NEARY: I am getting on about the incompetence and mismanagement down at Newfoundland Hydro. And if the hon. gentleman was interested in the consumers of electricity in his district, he would get up and support my request for an investigation into these matters. Because that is what I am asking for when I lay out the case. The hon. gentleman I know will not support my request for an investigation into Hydro.

MR. SIMMS: You will have to sit down first.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. gentleman support my request to have the study done by Acres Engineering tabled in this House? Will the hon. gentleman support that request? Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the hon. gentleman will not. The hon. gentleman will join with his colleagues in trying to continue this cover up of mismanagement and incompetence on the part of Newfoundland Hydro.

Now, let me just tell the House what I told the House a few moments ago, that Acres Engineering - my colleague for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) will be interested in this I am sure, because my colleague has been fighting against increases in electricity ever since he has been a member of this House. There was a study done for Newfoundland Hydro by Acres Engineering who were called in after the project got underway, and they were asked to do a study on the Upper Salmon and on Cat Arm. And one of the items that they commented on in their report to Newfoundland Hydro, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that if the powerhouse had been moved a short distance away from where it was it

MR. NEARY: would have saved the taxpayers of this Province \$27 million. Can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker. Then they have the gall and the face to make an application to the Public Utilities Board for an increase in electricity rates. The Public Utilities Board, no doubt acting on instructions from the administration, will rubber stamp the application, rubber stamp it, and then it will come up to the eighth floor of Confederation Building and the Premier and his ministers will rubber stamp it and the poor old consumer of electricity will get the gears put to him again.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is a wonder to me that we do not see this building here surrounded every minute of the day, by people who are disgruntled and fed up with the Tory Government, with the Tory Administration in this Province. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, that they are not up around this building every day demonstrating

MR. NEARY: and protesting. I am surprised that we have not seen a repeat of the march, back in the 1930s, on Colonial Building, with this sort of thing going on, Mr. Speaker, And what they will do, they will laugh it off over there, they will shrug it off. We are talking about millions piled up on millions of dollars and they shrug it off, laugh it off, stonewall, give us no information, refuse to table the reports. Mr. Speaker, how long more will the people of this Province put up with it without marching on this building? I am surprised they are not out there every day.

Well, we may be criticized and the hon. gentleman, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) may try to muzzle us, he may try to use all the parliamentary tricks and techniques he knows to try to stop us from bringing this information up into the light of day, as he tried today in the House during the Oral Question Period, attempting to manipulate the Chair, because that is what the Government House Leader was doing, attempting to manipulate the Speaker. How low can you get, Mr. Speaker, in this House? How low can you get? The Government House Leader using little parliamentary gimmicks to try to manipulate the Speaker, to try to turn the Speaker against the Opposition. Because that was what the exercise was all about.

MR. SIMMS: But you would never do that.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. SIMMS: You would never do that.

MR. NEARY: I certainly would not. I have more respect for the Chair than that.

DR. COLLINS: Would you go over that again, how all of this came about?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it all came about because I made the statement that we are not going to be muzzled.



MR. NEARY: We are going to continue to bring these matters up into the light of day which is our duty and our responsibility and they can interrupt and laugh and joke all they want. But it is no laughing matter when you are talking about children being locked out of the classrooms, when you are talking about teachers not allowed back into the classrooms, when you are talking about record unemployment in this Province, you are talking about the highest taxes in Canada, the electricity rates going up, squandering and wasting and mismanaging millions of taxpayer dollars. And they sit there day in and day out and stonewall. And the Premier then gets up during the Oral Question Period today and says, "Oh, we are running an honest government, an honest administration." But he puts his own definition on honesty.

MR. TOBIN: We should be all as pure as you.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have put the hon. gentleman to the test a few times. I have tested

MR. NEARY: his integrity and his honesty. When it is convenient and not embarrassing for the hon. the Premier he will pretend he is honest, pretend that everything is on the up and up-when it is convenient and not too embarrassing for him. Well, how honest will the hon. gentleman be when I ask him to give us the Acres Engineering Report on the Upper Salmon and the Cat Arm project? How honest? Will he level with the House then and level with the taxpayers and the consumers of electricity in this Province, Mr. Speaker? Will he? I know Your Honour cannot answer me. Your Honour probably would like to speak his mind on this matter. It is a pretty heavy item, Mr. Speaker. You are talking about millions, millions, millions of taxpayer dollars.

MR. CALLAN: They are laughing now. They will not be laughing in a few minutes.

MR. NEARY: No the smile will be on the other side of their face now. Ah, if they would only call an election now. What a time for an election. I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, they are a government on the run. The Premier is on the run.

MR. CALLAN: The member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) he will be gone.

MR. NEARY: They got forty-four, sure, they can dig in their heels and they can refuse to give me this information, the Acres Engineering Reports that were done for Newfoundland Hydro. They can refuse because they have forty-four members and we only have eight. It is like putting two hockey teams out on the ice, forty-four playing on one side, eight on the other. But sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it is not the quantity it is the quality that counts, and we intend to do our job whether the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) likes it or not.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabour this point any longer I have spent enough time on it.

MR. CALLAN: It is amazing.

MR. NEARY: It is amazing my colleague says.

Well, I will tell you what, let me give another couple of examples before I before I put the report down. Let me give a couple of more examples of why there should be a thorough investigation into Newfoundland Hydro, a commission of enquiry if you will. Two more items, I almost overlooked them. My colleague just brought them to my attention.

"The release of a 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." Now, Mr. Speaker, if it was not so serious it would really be funny. Mr. Speaker, the contractor had to pay a surety of \$268,000, a surety

MR. NEARY: to prove to the government that he was going to finish the contract. Halfway he had 56 per cent of the work done, the government gives him back his surety deposit of \$268,000, when he was 56 per cent completed, and then he went into receivership, bankruptcy and could not finish the job. Is that not something? It would break your heart, Mr. Speaker. It would break your heart. Here is another one: "The payment to three contractors for progress billings earlier than allowed for the contract which resulted in additional interest costs of \$278,025 from the first billing to November 30, 1981." In other words, Mr. Speaker, what happened was that Hydro with the authority of the Newfoundland government, borrowed the money so they could pay the contractors earlier than they were entitled to be paid so the consumers of electricity for that little gesture on the part of Hydro, the consumers of electricity had to cough up another \$278,000. And that is only peanuts compared to the blunder they made on the road down there. I will have to come back to that one again, because I can hardly believe that one myself. "The permanent access road at Cat Arm was budgeted based upon aerial photographs and topographical maps." In other words, they did not do any investigating on the ground at all. They just got an airplane, went over and took some photographs of the area and said, 'There it is.' You know, a little kindergarten student could have done it better, could have taken a piece of paper and drawn a road better. What they did was they flew over in an airplane, took some pictures and then they said, 'Here is the way to put the road in. Look, this way.' They just took a brush or a pen and they put the road on the map. And you know what that blunder cost, Mr. Speaker. After they did that they called tenders and contractors through-

MR.NEARY: out the Province and the Mainland tendered on the road to Cat Arm, the Hydro project, they tendered on it and the lowest bidder was \$11,977,000. That was the lowest bidder. He had no sooner started the job down there of building the road when he was back looking for another \$16 million. They were only \$16 million out in their tender, in their contract, an additional \$16 million.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely incredible, it is outrageous, and at the risk of repeating myself and boring the House, I am going to again ask for a Commission of Inquiry into the affairs of Newfoundland Hydro. Mr. Speaker, how many mistakes and how many blunders have they made that we do not know about?

I have appeared before the Public Utilities Board a few times on behalf of consumers of electricity in this Province, and I have argued, I made statements, you can call them accusations or charges, whatever you like. The hon. gentleman will put his own interpretation on them. The hon. gentleman will find some way to squirt a bit of poison back at me now - innuendo, the hon. gentleman will slander, libel through innuendo and guttersnipe politics the hon. gentleman is capable of.

MR. MARSHALL:

You are kidding us today.

MR. NEARY:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am quite serious today. I do not like these little snide remarks, Mr. Speaker, these editorial comments that are made by part-time reporters, that we seem to be enjoying things in this House. This is pretty serious business we are talking about. Unfortunately, the debates in the House do not get reported. The House may as well close down after Question Period.

Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most significant and important matter to come before this House this session, this report of the independent firm of Chartered Accountants. But, Mr. Speaker, how many mistakes and how many blunders are being covered up at Newfoundland Hydro? Do not the consumers of electricity and the taxpayers of this Province have a

MR. NEARY: right to know? Will they not be suspicious now as a result of these four items that were investigated? Will people now not be suspicious when they hear my statements today? Will it not create concern on the part of the consumers of electricity? Will they not come to the conclusion that they are being unjustifiably dealt with, that indeed, these increases that have been asked for in the past several years may or may not have been justified? They may not have been justified at all. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that these blunders of millions of dollars had a direct bearing on applications for increases in electrical rates in this Province. I hope members are not under any illusion about that. So the people have a right to know. Probably they will stonewall. They may stonewall. The minister who is responsible for Energy in this Province (Mr. Marshall) will stand up and he will say, 'Well, did you not read the little booklet that was tabled yesterday down at the Public Utilities Board?' I have it downstairs, I browsed through it, looked at it, underlined the pertinent parts. And, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that if that is justification for mismanaging the affairs of Newfoundland Hydro,

MR. NEARY: I say, God help the consumers of electricity in this Province, God help them. And, you know, I heard the statement made the other day too by cousin Vick, President of Newfoundland Hydro. 'We are sorry for our sins,' he said, 'we are sorry that this happened but we have taken steps to see that it does not happen again'. That is some assurance, Mr. Speaker. What kind of assurance is that? Because he says it? He had been placed in a position of trust by the people of this Province, and is paid \$75,000 or \$80,000 a year in a position of trust, and he knew that these blunders had been made and sat on the information and covered it up until this firm of Chartered Accounts brought it out. Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that there was any wrongdoing, I am not saying that. I am not asking for a commission of inquiry to investigate skulduggery or wrongdoing.

DR. COLLINS: You are certainly insinuating it.

MR. NEARY: I certainly am not insinuating it. I am accusing Hydro of mismanagement and incompetence at this point in time.

MR. SIMMS: Until you finish your research, right?

MR. NEARY: No. Mr. Speaker, the research is already done by the firm of Chartered Accountants. I do not have to do any more research. But I do know there is a report about moving powerhouses and so forth that we should have in this House.

MR. MARSHALL: What about if someone connected (inaudible) you are getting on with these reports?

MR. NEARY: Well, that is not fallacy. The hon. gentleman knows that is a fallacy. Your Honour, you know, are we going to hear more of this now, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman gets up to reply to me? As soon as I am finished, in a few minutes, the hon. gentleman will be up on his feet to reply.



MR. NEARY: I can tell you his argument. I will tell you the red herring he is going to drag into this now. I can read the hon. gentleman's mind. He has such a closed, buttoned-down, narrow mind and he is so partisan in his thinking, the hon. gentleman will get up and do you know what he is going to do? He is going to say, 'Well, if Joey had not given away the power on the Upper Churchill everything would have been all right'. He will drag in that red herring again. And that is a red herring, because it has nothing to do with what I am talking about, absolutely nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, will they or will they not set up a commission of inquiry to look into the affairs of Newfoundland Hydro based on the information we have and the information we do not have, reports that we are getting about colossal blunders in connection with the Upper Salmon and Cat Arm projects?

Mr. Speaker, why would they not agree to that? Why would the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) who portrays the image of lily-white, simon-pure, why would he not agree to this?

MR. SIMMS: He is something like snow-white.

MR. NEARY: Why would the hon. gentleman not support an inquiry into the affairs of Newfoundland Hydro? Why would the hon. gentleman not agree to let the Auditor General go in and take a look at the accounts?

MR. SIMMS: He is a good man. I hired him.

MR. NEARY: He is a good man. Well, why will not the government allow the Auditor General to take a look at the books? Why will they not do that? Is there any reason for it? Is there any reason for it?

MR. SIMMS: I would rather get you into it.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am asking the hon. gentleman a question. Why would the administration not allow the Auditor General to audit the accounts of Newfoundland Hydro?

MR. SIMMS: This is not Question Period.

MR. NEARY: 'It is not in Question Period', the hon. gentleman says. Well, he can interrupt me on other things, so why does he not just say, Well, I do not know, or maybe it is the reason or that is the reason. Why would the hon. gentleman in Cabinet vote to keep the Auditor General away from Newfoundland Hydro?

MR. BARID: Get your feet off the furniture.

MR. SIMMS: It is a Cabinet secret.

MR. NEARY: It is a Cabinet secret?

MR. SIMMS: You know that. What is wrong with you?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what are we talking about here? We are talking about blunders, we are talking about mistakes, we are talking about, I would say, anywhere from \$50 million to \$75 million worth of mistakes. As far as I can estimate, if you take into consideration the power-house which was put in the wrong place, \$27 million, take the road \$16 million, that is \$47 million right there.

MR. SIMMS: \$43 million.

MR. NEARY: There is \$40 million or \$50 million right there, just two items alone, Mr. Speaker. So you are talking somewhere in the vicinity -

MR. HISCOCK: And then the interest on it.

MR. NEARY: And then the interest on it, that is right. My colleague reminds me of the interest that has to be paid on that. The money has to be borrowed by the

MR. NEARY: government and the interest has to be paid by the taxpayers - faulty poles.

Listen, Mr. Speaker, you pay these men, these experts, these hotshots, you pay them \$75,000 and \$80,000 and you give them all kinds of fringe benefits, you give them insurance policies, you give them motor cars to drive around in, you give them an airplane compliments of the users of electricity - CFLCo has their own plane - you give an airplane - you give them a lodge down in Churchill Falls where they can go down and fish any time they want, They get aboard the plane here, they go down to McParland House down in Churchill Falls, the Premier and cousin Vic- away they go- they go down on little fishing expeditions, Mr. Speaker, would you not expect for all these privileges that are given these two gentlemen by the taxpayers of this Province -they are given these benefits and these privileges by the consumers of electricity and by the taxpayers, now would you not expect them, would not people who turn on their lights and who use electric heat in their homes, would they not expect this crowd, because they are being so well looked after, with their big fat salaries and their fringe benefits, would you not expect them then to protect the rights of the consumers of electricity in this Province? Would you not?

MR. NEARY: I do not mind them going down on their fishing trips to McParland House and taking the CFLCo plane.

MR. SIMMS: You were in McParland House once, were you not?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is quite a story! I guarantee you, that is quite a story! You talk about an embarrassing situation the representatives of Hydro found themselves in that day! I was the first Liberal inside of McParland House in eleven years.

MR. BAIRD: And you will probably be the last.

MR. NEARY: And I have to tell the House - this is really funny! - and the people who are listening. I have to tell them how I got in there. I was invited down to Churchill Falls by a number of people down there who were telling me by letter and by telephone that the morale of the residents of Churchill Falls was very low, that the union down there was having trouble with their employer - the two unions. So I promised the people, the first chance, I would run down to Churchill Falls. So I called up Hydro and I said, 'Now ' - because you have to remember, Churchill Falls is right out in the middle of nowhere and if you arrived in there without notifying Hydro, or if you did not know somebody in the town, you would find yourself standing at the airport out in the middle of nowhere, nobody to give you a drive or anything else, you would just be sitting there at the airport. So I decided to call up the public relations fellow down at Newfoundland Hydro and I said, 'I would like to go to Churchill Falls,' and, you know, 'Where do I stay when I am down there?' and so forth. And he said, "Well, I happen to be going down that day. I will probably be on the same plane that you are on."

MR. NEARY: "I will be going along," he said, "and I will give you the information aboard the plane." So when I got aboard the plane, Mr. Speaker, sure enough, Mr. Bursey, a very fine gentleman whom I have known for a good many years, came up to me and he said, "There will be somebody at the airport to pick you up and take you wherever you want to go and we will give you a tour of Churchill Falls." I had not seen it since I was there for the official opening.

Aboard the same plane was a representative of the Canadian High Commissioner's Office and his wife. Now, the representative from the Canadian High Commissioner's Office and I started talking. And he was very interested in politics, most English men and women are. So we started chatting. And he said, "Well, when we get to Churchill Falls, Mr. Neary, of course you will have lunch with me." And I said, "Well, now, Your Excellency," - I did not want to embarrass him - I said, "I believe they have other arrangements made for you, but I have other things to do anyway." "Oh, no," he said, "why do you not come with my wife and me and have lunch?" And I said, "Well, we will see." I did not want to embarrass the gentleman. And when we arrived at Churchill Falls, there was a mix-up in the transportation and I found myself in the same car with the representative of the British High Commissioner to Canada. So I had to go to McParland House while they were bringing he and his wife over. I was asked to step inside while they were getting me another car to take me to the hotel, where I was supposed to have dinner.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it that McParland House is one of the most beautiful lodges that I have ever seen in my life.

April 29, 1983

Tape 1592

EC - 3

MR. NEARY:

Overlooking the Churchill

River, it is beautiful.

So while I was waiting, I was looking around and I was checking the guest book there and seeing who was visiting - they forgot to hide the guest book when I went in, Mr. Speaker - seeing who was visiting

MR. NEARY:

there and so forth while I was waiting for my transportation to come. The representative of the British High Commissioner still wanted me to stay for lunch. And the next thing I knew there was some emergency meetings going on, some private confabs downstairs and upstairs and in the men's room and in the bedroom and finally the fellow from Hydro came to me and said, 'Mr. Neary, rather than go to the hotel, would you like to stay here and have lunch.' And I said, 'Well, I would not mind.' So I sat down, Mr. Speaker, and had lunch with the representative of the British High Commissioner and his wife and the Hydro officials and, I must say, I enjoyed the meal. Anyway, later on in the afternoon we went to the airport, the British High Commissioner was coming in, he was going on a fishing expedition, and by this time the representative from his office and myself had become real pals. So he said, 'I want you to meet the British High Commissioner when he gets off the plane.' So the plane arrived and he got off. I was rather taken back at the way the gentleman was dressed, he had something on like a big black cowboy hat and a cape. So this representative took me up and said, 'Your Excellency, I want you to meet the Leader of the Opposition in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.' Now, His Excellency, not knowing the difference, of course, thought that I was out to extend the official welcome for the Province. I said, 'Well, how are you, Your Excellency, welcome to Newfoundland and Labrador.' 'Ah, it is so nice of you,' he said, 'to come and meet me. Of course,' he said, 'you will be coming on the fishing trip with me.' And I said, 'I was lucky to get a meal today, Your Excellency.' So I thought it was really, really funny. I did not manage to get inside McParland House but it was by pure accident, Mr. Speaker. So when I was leaving

MR. NEARY: later in the afternoon, when I was getting aboard the plane the representative from the British High Commissioner's office came to me and he said, 'Thanks very much for having dinner with my wife and I. I know you had other things to do, you wanted to go to the hotel for lunch but,' he said, 'I persuaded the Hydro officials to invite you to have dinner with my wife and I and we want to thank you for joining us.' And then I found out how I got the invitation to lunch.

MR. SIMMS: I was up there the week after.

MR. NEARY: You were there the week after.

MR. SIMMS: Yes, and they told me the story.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

And the people in Churchill Falls, their morale might have been down when I got there but their morale came up five minutes after I stepped ashore, I am the first Liberal in ten years to see the inside of McParland House, that was built by a Liberal government, in Churchill Falls. Mr. Speaker, I met with the unions down there and I had a great chat with the people. I went around and met the people there.

MR. SIMMS: You were excited?

MR. NEARY: Yes, and I toured the operations, It is quite a site, there is no doubt about that. And, Mr. Speaker, I would say as a result of my visit, that the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) who always manages to win Churchill Falls somehow or other, that great Liberal town, Liberal project I would say if I were him I would be concerned. The first Liberal to see the inside of McParland House in ten years, can you imagine that? I was told by the people that Liberals just do not get invited, they are not allowed into McParland House.



MR. NEARY:

Everywhere I went that day they said, Is it true you were in McParland House? How did you get in? Iberals are not allowed in there. And that is an absolute fact, Mr. Speaker. Anyway, I got sidetracked I thought it was funny. I enjoyed it very much. I enjoyed it immensely. I must say that Mr. Bursey rose to the occasion, He did not seem to be a bit embarrassed over the whole thing, although he was very uncomfortable, I could tell. You could almost see the look of pity on his face, the look of frustration. He did not know what to do.

But, Mr. Speaker, getting back to Hydro and how I got sidetracked that time was we were talking, as you remember, about the great salaries we pay these people in the Churchill Falls Corporation and Newfoundland Hydro, and the one person occuies the presidency of both corporations, I believe, President of Newfoundland Hydro and President of Churchill Falls Corporation. We give them everything they want in this world,

MR. HISCOCK:

And more besides.

MR. NEARY:

And more besides. We pay them big, fat salaries. We give them all kinds of insurance coverage, early retirement, fishing expeditions, planes to go on shopping trips to Montreal, we provide all that for them. And, Mr. Speaker, in return you would expect these people to protect the interests of the consumers of electricity in this Province, and not make mistakes and blunders like we have seen in this report.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think for a minute that this administration can deny -

MR. HISCOCK:

The cannot.

April 29, 1983

Tape 1594

PK - 2

MR. NEARY:

That is right. I do not think they can deny my request or our request here, my colleagues and myself, they cannot deny our request for a Commission of Inquiry to look into the Cat Arm project and the Upper Salmon. They cannot deny that. They can stonewall, Mr. Speaker, they can sit on it, course, they have forty-four members. I suppose they could do anything they want. They are trying to remove democracy from this House. We see examples of that every day, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: The Question Period is the thing that is highlighted and reported most in this House. The poor old part-timers do not have time to cover anything else except the Question Period. Now, what members on the opposite side hope is that the debates will not get reported. So they do not mind letting us go on in debate, they do not mind that, because they figure, well, that is not going to be reported anyway. There will only be a handful of people sitting in the Public Gallery listening to it anyway. So, Mr. Speaker, they do not seem to be very concerned or very worried about the debates. It is the Question Period they are trying to suppress in this House. They are trying to stop us from asking penetrating and embarrassing questions of ministers and of the government.

MR. PATTERSON: Why do you not do it in the Late Show?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Late Show is a pure waste of time. We have put questions on the Late Show and they do not even get up to answer them, some of the ministers. They are just like useless lumps in their seats. They are limp over there. They are like zombies. They slink in their seats. They are beaten men. They are a government on the run. The Premier is on the run, let there be no doubt about that in this Province. The Premier and the government are on the run, Mr. Speaker, so what they are hoping is that this report will not get out to the people, that my request, and I think I have laid out a pretty strong case, Mr. Speaker, that my request for an inquiry into these items, these projects, the Upper Salmon and the Cat Arm project will fall on deaf ears. And they can do it. They have forty-four members and we only have eight. They can do it. Is it right for them to do it?

MR. NEARY:

Yesterday I showed what a fighter the Premier was when I challenged him to an election. He is a great fighter. I put it to him yesterday man-fashion. I said if he is a fighter let us see his courage, let us see his courage now or will he wait and hope, as he told the NTA, that everything will blow over as he tells his caucus, Do not worry, boys, by the time the election rolls around we will be alright, We will throw out a few dollars, we will improve our image, we will get a few projects going and everything will be alright. Look, boys, do not worry about it, do not worry about it at all, everything is going to be alright, everything will be alright two or three years from now. When you go back to the people we will have mended our fences,

MR. NEARY: everything, as he told the NTA, will have blown over. It will all blow over. He could not even agree with the button that the NTA had, 'We will remember'. And the little silk handkerchief that I sent over to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) the other day, with three elephants on it and a crest and down at the bottom, 'We will remember', why the Premier could not even agree - he had to try to pick a fight over that. He said, 'Naw, they will not remember, it will blow over'. 'That will all blow over', he said. 'As soon as we sign our agreement, throw out a few goodies, get the next collective agreement underway, it will all blow over, everything is going to blow over'.

MR. BAIRD: You are all buttons.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have the right people listening to me. The people who count in this Province are on that side of the House, they are not up over my shoulder, although I wish they would do a better job of reporting the House. These are the people who count, the taxpayers, the consumers of electricity, the teachers, the school children.

MR. SIMMS: They are all friends of Charlie Power.

MR. NEARY: 'They are all friends of Charlie Power', he says. Well, I hope these friends of the minister will -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, you cannot talk to the gallery.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am talking to Your Honour. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that these friends of the minister will say, 'Look, Mr. Minister, that case that was just laid out on the floor of the House by the Leader of the Opposition in connection with the Newfoundland Hydro deserves further investigation'. Lay aside partisan politics -

MR. MARSHALL: You padded your own (inaudible). They do not even want to listen to you for heavens sake.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is the kind of rudeness and nastiness you get from the hon. gentleman. He just went out and took another nasty pill, I suppose.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the matter of democracy, freedom of speech in this Province, as one of my colleagues pointed out this morning, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) was at a meeting last night in Torbay - 200 teachers from the general area, most of them from his own district. The Minister of Social Services, who is a veteran in this House, who should know better, was asked to bring in a petition today from 200 teachers who had signed it. Will you bring it to the House? Will you table it in the House? And he refused. The Minister of Social Services refused point blank to bring a petition into this House on behalf of his constituents. Mr. Speaker, is that right? Is that giving people their democratic right? They elected this gentleman to speak for them in the House. Whether he agrees with them or not he should have brought the petition into the House and did what the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) did this morning, and the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie). He should have brought the petition in, laid it on the table of the House, referred it to the department to which it relates. He denied the people in his riding, his district, their democratic right, the right to convey a message to this House through their member. He do not necessarily have to agree with them.

MR. SIMMS: Who is this, the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power)?

MR. NEARY: No, the Minister of Social Services, the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey), last night refused to bring a petition to this House on behalf of 200 teachers in his district and surrounding area. That is shameful, Mr. Speaker! It only goes to show what contempt the hon. gentleman has for this House and for his constituents.

MR. CALLAN: The member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) refused too.

MR. NEARY: The member for Conception Bay South did the same thing? I did not hear that.

MR. CALLAN: In Paradise.

MR. NEARY: In Paradise? - refused to bring a petition to the House?

MR. BUTT: No, I did not.

MR. NEARY: He says, 'No.' Well, I believe the hon. gentleman. I have no choice under the rules but to believe the hon. gentleman. My colleague must have been misinformed on that one.

MR. CALLAN: I was not misinformed, I do not think.

MR. NEARY: A petition on what, on the teachers' strike? No? The hon. gentleman was not asked?

MR. BUTT: As a matter of fact, I am going to be presenting one sometime after Sunday or Monday.

MR. NEARY: And the member will bring it to the House?

MR. BUTT: Of course.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is the proper thing to do. That is the right thing to do, that is the decent

MR. NEARY: thing to do. Do not follow the example of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), who did not think enough about his constituents to bring their message, their petition before this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hear hon. gentlemen's cries to adjourn over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. NEARY: No? Do we want to carry on? Does Your Honour not want to say anything? Your Honour may want to give a ruling. Is he ready to give the ruling now?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): No.

MR. NEARY: I see, okay.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can plow on until 1:00 P.M., there is no problem with that. I am not going to belabour that point anymore, Mr. Speaker.

Now, let us see where we are here. Mr. Speaker, I am about to embark into the matter now of record unemployment in this Province and that will take me another few minutes, I would say.

I wonder if it would be in order to move the adjournment of the debate now, Mr. Speaker, so that I can talk about unemployment when we come back on Monday?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 P.M.



April 29, 1983

Tape 1597

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL:

and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its

rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, May 2, 1983

at 3:00 P.M.