

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
MARCH 15, 1983
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement in relation to the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station. And I would like to report to the House that the hon. the Premier had occasion to send another communication to the Prime Minister today and I would like to read the contents of this telex.

It reads as follows: "To the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau: I have not to date received any reply to my Telexes on the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station. My latest Telex of March 11th indicated that the Province would be willing to operate the Station if the assets were turned over to us for a nominal sum. While I have not received a reply to that proposal, a press report in this mornings St. John's Daily News states you have turned it down.

"The Province feels that the continued operation and upgrading of the Shoe Cove Satellite Station is vital to research and development in the fishery, in offshore oil and gas exploration and development, and in the provision of valuable information relative to our on-land resources.

"In addition , the Province wishes to use this facility in educational matters, to train Newfoundlanders and Labradorians into the new technology needed to develop our Province. The replacement station

MR. MARSHALL: in Manitoba does not cover our area, and therefore the valuable work provided through such a facility to obtain valuable information in the fishery, off-shore oil and gas and on-land resources is no longer possible. The educational benefits would also be lost.

"For these reasons the Government of Newfoundland has made a number of proposals to you. In the first proposal, we proposed that both governments share in the operational cost of the Station, given that one of the reasons for its removal was budgetary. In the second proposal, because there was no answer to the first one, we proposed that the provincial government would be prepared to pay the full operational costs of the Station. We feel so strongly about this matter that the Government of Newfoundland is prepared to even go further. We are prepared to purchase the Shoe Cove Station outright. Will you now halt the dismantling of this facility until details for the purchase can be worked out with your appropriate department?"

"There can be no reason why you cannot agree with this proposal. You will thereby receive the money you need to go ahead with the Manitoba facility.

"I look forward to your agreement to this fair and reasonable proposal."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the next in the line of communications with respect to the satellite station, a communication that was forwarded by the Premier of this Province to the Prime Minister about a matter of great concern to this Province. And I would draw to the attention of the House the fact that, in accordance with the usual spirit of the way federal/provincial relations are carried on nowadays,

MR. MARSHALL: that the Premier has not yet received a response from the Prime Minister but has only received a response through The Daily News.

Now this is a very important facility for reasons that the hon. the Premier outlined in his more detailed statement before he went to Ottawa. It is imperative that it be preserved for the use of the people of this Province. It is noted that the station itself was constructed by the Americans and subsequently handed over by the Americans to the Canadians, it is rather unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the government in Ottawa, the Canadian Government, cannot hand it over to one of its constituent provinces, that is Newfoundland, which needs it so badly.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour, as I did the other day, that they are bringing in these Telexes and statements disguised as Ministerial Statements when in actual fact they are not Ministerial Statements. A Ministerial Statement must convey information and must not be argumentative. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that that Telex just read by the hon. gentleman could be the subject of an ongoing debate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we are starting out this week as we did last week, because I think the hon. members on the opposite side realize that they are losing the battle, that they are flogging a dead horse, that the satellite station is not a major political issue in this Province. I think they are beginning to realize that, that people are beginning to see that this is a red herring to distract from the real issues in this Province and the ongoing battle with Ottawa is not getting us anywhere, that people are getting fed up and they want to hear plans from this administration on what they propose to do about the real problems in this Province. The satellite station is not one of the real problems.

MR. NEARY: Now the hon. gentleman is saying they merely want to keep it for training purposes. They are softening their position considerably, Mr. Speaker, because I think they have realized that they acted on the spur of the moment, the Premier did, as he did with the Day of Mourning, as he did when he put the Newfoundland offshore case before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, acting on the spur of the moment, off the rocker type of politics and thinking that is not getting us anywhere in this Province, Mr. Speaker. So I hope that that is the end of this now, we will hear no more about it for the rest of this week, that the hon. gentleman will come in tomorrow and give us a statement on the fisheries, and then the next day a statement on the forestry, and then the next day a statement on unemployment, especially unemployment amongst young people, and then the next day the hon. gentleman will come in and talk about one industry towns.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is interesting as he always is, Mr. Speaker, but he also happens to be out of order as well. I mean, the hon. gentleman is debating a statement and he is not commenting on the text of the statement itself.

MR. NEARY: There is nothing in it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition was straying somewhat from the relevancy of the Ministerial Statement, but at the same time his time has expired.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. HODDER: Sir, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). As the minister is aware, National Sea has ceased operations at the Picadilly fish plant, which has thrown some 80 people out of work. In view of the fact that this is the only processing facility in the area - as a matter of fact it is the only industry in the area, and, of course, the minister realizes we have some 75 per cent unemployment in that particular district - could the minister tell me what he plans to do about the situation?

MR. TULK: No! He will refer that to his colleague, Mr. De Bane.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked a very serious question and I want it to be answered in a very serious manner without interruptions from the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, when any company decides to close down its operations in any part of the Province, of course, it is of major concern to the Department of Fisheries and, in this case, to the minister and the member for the area. In talking with National Sea, we called them in and they did discuss with us why they were not going to operate that plant. And they put in writing, upon my request, as well why they were not going to operate the plant this coming year. And, of course, by the fact the plant is owned by the Newfoundland government, we do indeed have some leverage. So I can inform the hon. gentleman that there will be no ifs, ands

MR.MORGAN: or but as far as we are concerned. I intend to cancel the licenses of all species. If they want to play a little game and just process certain species and buy a lucrative species and take it away from the community, that is not going to apply with us and myself as the minister. If they do not want to buy all the species from the fishermen that the fishermen catch in the area, they will buy none, just buy none, that is all. The plant is there and the plant is leased by the Newfoundland Department of Fisheries to the company, National Sea, and we will cancel that lease as well. So we will cancel the lease, we will cancel the licenses and then, in co-ordination with the member for the area and the fishermen's committee and the local development association, we hope to find somebody else who indeed will go in and buy the fish and will also process in the plant that we own.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR.HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to go along with the minister when he says that he will

MR. HODDER: not grant them either lobster or herring licences because my understanding is that the company has sort of indicated that they would like to go in for the lucrative species but to leave the fishermen alone and not to take the groundfish. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say here that I think that the actions of National Sea is immoral, particularly in light of the fact that they left it until just at the beginning of the season. The season is just about to start there now and I believe that they did it so that perhaps they would be able to still get the more lucrative species, which are lobster and the herring.

But I should point out that some of the fishermen have already started fishing and with seasonal weather on the West Coast as it is, the season should be in full swing in the next couple of weeks. Can the minister suggest some way to ensure that the fishermen themselves, outside of the plant workers, the fishermen themselves will have a market or a buyer for their fish?

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

MR. MORGAN: Of course, as mentioned in the preamble to the question, the existing company still wants to buy from fishermen some of the species, and we have to make a decision with regard to what effect it would have on the fishermen by saying to that same company, 'If you do not want to buy all the species, you do not buy any.' But we are inclined to go that route, as I just mentioned.

But I am confident that we will be able to find markets for the fishermen and I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that we will also be successful in finding an operator for that plant. Because there are a number of companies, as I think that hon. gentlemen are aware, in the Western part of the

MR. MORGAN: Province who are indeed looking for more fish, looking for a greater supply of fish. We will be contacting these companies. I am hoping the local initiative through the fishermen's committees and the Development Association will follow up as well to contact these other companies and say, 'Here is a chance for you to move in and take over a plant and we will give you the licences despite the fact there is a freeze on all licences in the Province.' If National Sea are not going to operate they are not going to hold the licence, it is as simple as that. So will cancel their licences and I am confident we will find in this case the two aspects, buyers of the products that had not been processed in Piccadilly, but more importantly in this case regarding the plant in finding someone to go in and take over the lease from National Sea, to take over in this case - not take over, but they will be issued new licences for the process and I think we will probably be successful in attracting some of the existing companies now operating in the Province to the Western part of the Province.

MR. J. HODDER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important one.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: In light of the fact that the government owns this plant, I would just like to ask the minister is there any possibility, with such an early startup time, and due to the fact that the expertise of running that plant is there in place, would the minister consider perhaps that the provincial government might open the plant for the interim to ensure that those eighty plant workers would get employment? I know the minister operates a couple of plants on the Labrador Coast. Would the minister consider, in the short term, operating that plant, because we are talking about two weeks?

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, we are very reluctant in getting involved in operations of plants ourselves and the only exception now is the plants we have in Labrador. In fact, we are making efforts now to divest ourselves of those plants as well. We are of the opinion that it is not the role of government to be in the fishing industry with regards to operating and running plants, in the processing end, or in fact operating and running trawlers in the harvesting end. What I will assure the hon. gentleman on behalf of his constituents is that we will leave no stone unturned in finding someone to move into that plant as quickly as possible. In fact, as of this past Thursday, when the notification was given us in writing by National Sea, I have already assigned people in the Department of Fisheries, some of the officials, to get moving on taking

MR. J. MORGAN: the necessary steps to find someone else to move in and take over the plant from National Sea and to arrange to take away the licence that is now being held by that company, National Sea.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board (Dr. J. Collins) and it is concerning one of the largest and most important groups of government employees, namely the teachers. I want to ask the minister what is the status of the present contract dispute between the government and the teachers - I was going to say negotiations, Mr. Speaker, but there are no negotiations - and I am just wondering whether the minister is attempting to get both sides together or whether they are going to carry on negotiating with the teachers in the same way that the government negotiates with everybody else, by press conferences and by Telex and other forms, Mr. Speaker, not compatible with good, sound, sensible negotiations.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is reading different newspapers than I am reading. My reading tells me that it is the NTA that has statements and presentations and accusations and pictures and so

DR. COLLINS:

on and so forth. We have been extremely modest and sparing in the amounts of coverage we give to the media. We just give them the facts as they arise. We are not taking on the NTA in terms of any campaign or whatever. I am a little bit surprised that the hon. member thinks that we are doing so when it seems to be in the reverse direction.

As far as the negotiations are going at the present time, we put a new item forward-or put an item forward, it is not a new item-we put an item forward for their consideration and we are expecting to hear back from the NTA hopefully quite soon. But I think the next move is up to them in regards to that item.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I refer to the Ministerial Statement made by the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) on March 8. There are two things about that statement that I find strange and find funny, for the want of better descriptive words, and I will refer to one of these items first. The statement started off with, "I am pleased to reaffirm government's commitment to lower the pupil/teacher ratio for the next school year to twenty-three to one". Now it is my understanding that this was one of the controversial issues in the contract and this statement came out just a day or so before the teachers were to vote on their contract. That is a little strange indeed that the statement came out just a couple of days before the teachers were to vote on their contract.

But I understand that this, as I said before, was one of the controversial points, the one of lowering the pupil/teacher ratio. And it is my understanding that the government would not initial that part of the contract. Yet through a public announcement here in the House the minister said that the government were now

MR. LUSH: going to honour that commitment that they made sometime in 1981. The question, Sir, is in view of the fact that the government would not initial this item in their contract previously, can we take it now that the government are indeed committed to lowering the pupil/teacher ratio in the Province? And is it now negotiated or is it now initialled by both sides, this major item that the government previously would not initial?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, my relationships with the NTA is over collective bargaining in my role as President of the Treasury Board. I do not have any responsibility for matters in education per se and the pupil/teacher ratio is an educational matter. The pupil/teacher ratio was never in the collective bargaining agreement or contract.

Now hon. members opposite
have very strange

DR. COLLINS:

ideas sometimes and this is because they do not understand issues and they do not listen to explanations. The pupil/teacher ratio has nothing to do with the collective bargaining agreement. It was never in the contract. The NTA would like, I am sure, to have it in the contract. Our position was that we do not consider this part of a collective bargaining instrument. That was our position all along and it is still as far as we are concerned; it is not a collective bargaining matter.

Now if the hon. member wishes to go into the issue of pupil/teacher ratio, I am afraid I would have to suggest he direct his question to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated that he does not know what the major issues are with respect to negotiating with the teachers because this, certainly, was the major controversial issue, the one of lowering the pupil/teacher ratio. And I say again that the government, in contract negotiations, would not initial that item of the contract.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in announcing that they had intended to keep their commitment, not at the bargaining table but outside, here in this House, on top of that the government took four measures, four steps, to reduce costs. The one I want to ask the minister about is the fourth measure, which was the one to reduce spending on salaries for substitute teachers. Now it is my understanding that both parties had initialled this particular item.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, here we had in the one instance one that the government would not initial, and now here in this House they changed the contract, one might say. They came out and said that they were going to reduce spending for substitute teachers in an item that both sides had initialled. Quite irregular, Mr. Speaker, quite a strange thing to do with respect to collective bargaining.

So, Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister now is what has this particular measure done to the teachers' contract? Does this mean now that the contract is null and void because the government changed an item which both sides had initialled?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I should explain the process there. There is a contract in effect with the NTA at the present time. It was negotiated something like two and a half years or three years ago, whatever that was. Now the term of that contract should have been up last August, and we have been endeavouring to put into place a new contract with the NTA ever since the old one was due to expire. That new contract has not

DR. COLLINS:

been put in place. There is no new contract. Until such time as a new contract goes in place, the old contract persists. In the old contracts there is nothing about pupil/teacher ratio. In our position in the new contract, there will be nothing about the pupil/teacher issue because it has nothing to do with collective bargaining. It is purely an educational matter. It has no place and, in government's view, it never will have a place in the collective bargaining end because it is not a collective bargaining point. So that is one thing I just want to make clear.

Flowing out of what I have said, that there is no new contract signed with the NTA, this means that any items that will go into a proposed new contract are open for negotiation. Now I think what the hon. member is saying is that because one issue was tentatively looked at, and some tentative decisions made about it at one stage, that nothing can be done on that item any longer. I have to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member that there are quite a number of issues that come up that are tentatively discussed and some decision made about them and they do come up again. One in particular; for instance, the NTA wish to have a new contract with a term of one year on it and, of course, our position was that the term of the contract should be two years. So the NTA subsequently took their issue off the table, their one year issue off the table, and then they put back another one, they put back a nineteen month contract. We said, no, we want the two year contract. I do not know whether they are going to take this nineteen month contract off now and put it back again, so there are issues that go on the table, that

DR. COLLINS: come off the table, they can go back on again and so on and so forth. As far as initialling goes, I have initialled nothing. It is my responsibility to put my name on behalf of government to whatever is finally agreed to. I have initialled nothing, I have signed nothing and I will not do so until we have come up with a contract that is mutually acceptable and agreeable to both sides.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister is just skating around the question. The question is a simple one, Mr. Speaker. The NTA are saying, and they have said publicly, that this part of the contract, this item in the contract dealing with substitute teachers, was initialled by both sides. The question to the minister is very simple: Was this initialled by both sides or not? It did not have to be the minister's initial, it could have been his negotiator's. So the question is simple, Mr. Speaker; Was this item initialled or not by both sides,

MR. LUSH: by the government and by the NTA?
because the NTA has said publicly that it was an issue.
So the question is simple, Mr. Speaker, yes or no.

MR. TULK: You can answer in one word, yes or no.

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

DR. COLLINS: The hon. gentleman wishes me to answer
yes or no and I suppose if he wants me to answer yes or no
I will answer yes or no. What the hon. member is asking
as far as I am concerned is totally irrelevant. There is no
contract in place until it is accepted by government, and
government signs the contract, or at least I sign the
contract on behalf of government.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman
saying in answer to my colleague that certain clauses are
not initialled by both sides when they come to an agreement,
when they are working for an overall agreement, that clauses
are not initialled by the minister or anybody on the
government's negotiating team? Is that what the hon. gentleman
is saying, that none of these clauses had been initialled by
anybody?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: No.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman saying that
clauses have been initialled by both sides and gotten off
the table? Is the hon. gentleman saying that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: No.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman care to tell the House what it is he is saying?

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

DR. COLLINS: What I am saying is that on behalf of government I have not signed and entered into a new contract with the NTA.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the NTA are on record as saying that with respect to this Ministerial Statement, one, the government came up with an issue which they would not initial during the negotiations when they were at the bargaining table. In addition to that, they say they have changed an article. Now the minister is saying that there is nothing signed, there is no initialling on anything. So will the minister say now, can the minister indicate to the House whether all of the points negotiated by the NTA up to this point in time, whether all the things that they have dealt with, whether all these things are now open, all of them now are open to change? Can the minister indicate that? If there is nothing, everything now is all open to change, all of the things that they have agreed to up to this point in time since they have been negotiating some time back in August up to this point in time when the government broke off negotiations and started negotiating by press conference, does this mean now that everything is all open, there is nothing agreed to?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I can only speak for the government side, and we have no intention of opening

DR. COLLINS:

many items that we have no concern about. I cannot speak for the NTA, I do not know if they want to open things, close things or not. They undoubtedly will do what they wish to do and there is nothing much I can do about it, nor anything I would want to do about it. All I can say is that there are many items that will ultimately, or should ultimately go into a new contract that we do not wish to engage in discussion over because we have no problem with it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said some time ago that in his opinion the teachers - he accused them actually of being dishonest, that they were not polling their membership to find out the feelings of their membership on these issues. Does the hon. gentleman still stand by that statement that he made publicly, accusing the teachers of being dishonest and not knowing how to handle the membership as far as the negotiations are concerned?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I will hold to any statement if I have not seen it. If the hon. member will pass over the statement I am purported to have made, I will read it and let him know if I still have the same view of it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I saw the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman on T.V. and I heard his voice myself. Well, will the hon. gentleman tell us if he was interviewed on television, whether he was asked that question and what answer he gave to the person who was interviewing him? Did not the hon. gentleman say that the teachers were not polling their membership, that they should have a vote amongst the teachers, and accusing the teachers of being dishonest? Was that not what the hon. gentleman said in effect in his television interview that he had about ten days ago on this matter?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give so many television interviews I cannot remember them all. If the hon. member will pass me over some statement I am supposed to have made and I read it, I will be able to respond to his question.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister mentioned there were only some items that he was concerned about in the contract. Now, I do not know whether he is concerned about this one with the substitute teachers or not, I do not know whose concern this is, whether it is his or whether it is the concern of the NTA, but the question is this: If the minister is only concerned about some items, does this mean now that all of the items which the government were concerned about and have initialled are now open to change, the ones with

MR. LUSH: which he is concerned and the government are concerned? Does this mean now that all of these are open to change even though they have initialled them, that the minister can open these up because they are the items which he is concerned or the government are concerned, whichever way you want to put it?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, our position in regard to a new contract is well known to the NTA. Our final position on all the points that we were concerned about was transmitted to them, I think, back in December or some time like that. But anyway, it is well known, we have reiterated our position any number of times. They are in no doubt as to what our position is. The only thing that was changed recently was the method or the way that substitute teachers had to be paid. That is the only issue that we have brought up since last December, and the NTA knows our position on all of the other points.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it certainly does not appear that the NTA is familiar with what is going on, because here we have dealt with two major items, one which the government would not initial and the one that they have initialled. So I am sure if you do that with any group in the Province they do not know where they stand.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, as a final question to the minister, with respect to the reducing of spending on the salaries for substitute teachers, I wonder if the minister can indicate whether or not the government have developed any kind of system for the reduction of the salaries, because, as the minister is aware, this whole area of substitute teaching is a complex one, an involved one. So I

MR. LUSH: am wondering whether at this point in time the government have come up with any system to inform the NTA of how this reduction is going to take place? Presently substitute teachers are paid according to their qualifications. How is it going to work now? Will they be paid according to qualifications or will it be related to time? Just how will the system work?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the member's questions are very prolix. But having said that, all I can say is that we have a position in regard to substitute teachers. We want to sit down with the NTA and discuss our position with them.

DR. J. COLLINS: We have made a formal request to them to sit down on that issue and when they agree to meeting us on that issue, we will lay out in detail what our methods are.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. the gentleman now saying, in reply to my hon. colleague, that the substitute teacher question was not the subject of prior negotiations before the minister made her Ministerial Statement here in the House and that it was not initialled by both parties? And now that the minister has made her statement unilaterally, the chief negotiator for the government is going back to the teachers to ask them now to negotiate it again after it was initialled, and after a statement made in this House by the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) now going back to the teachers again and asking to have it renegotiated? Is that the position now of Treasury Board and the negotiating team?

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that we have a position in regard to substitute teachers that we wish to discuss with the NTA and we have made that request to them and we will sit down with them and work out the details.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I find this difficult to understand what the minister is talking about with respect to whether this was a point of negotiations or whether it was initialled or not. but, as I have said again, the NTA have said publicly, they have said it over and over again,

MR. T. LUSH: that this item was initialled by both sides. Let me ask the minister this: If this were the case, if both sides had initialled a particular item in a contract and then one party decides to break that, decides to doublecross one party or the other, does the minister consider this to be bargaining in bad faith, if one side or the other would break an item already initialled? Does the minister not consider this bargaining in bad faith?

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member is starting from a false premise and then he goes on to say that this is bad faith. The point of the matter is that in negotiations certain positions are arrived at, and when both sides are satisfied that they are now ready to write a contract, then someone sits down and writes up the packet. The packet then is reviewed by both sides and, if both sides are then agreeable to the language in the packet, then it

DR. COLLINS: comes for final signature and final agreement. Until such time as there is the signing of the agreement, a new agreement has not been concluded.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman now saying then that the NTA were incorrect, that they actually lied when they made public statements at news conferences and press releases that that item had been initialled earlier before the Minister of Education (Ms Verge)- if she would only stop yawning for a minute - made her statement in this hon. House? Is the hon. gentleman saying that the NTA made an incorrect statement, that they lied? Apart from the teachers being dishonest, according to the hon. gentleman, the hon. gentleman is now accusing them of being liars. Now how can the hon. gentleman reconcile these things?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is just putting words out in a sense that they are coming from my mouth. I have not made any comment on the teachers being liars. You know, this is a comment that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is making. And I hope, I sincerely hope, that someone in the press gallery does not somehow or other get the message turned around and says that the hon. Minister of Finance says teachers are liars. Please, everyone understand I am not saying the teachers are liars. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that teachers are liars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
has expired.

The time for Question Period

000

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Could I have leave to present

a report?

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. WARREN:

As long as it is a true one.

DR. COLLINS:

Thank you very much. It is a

very true report.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

This is the 1982 Annual Report
of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means to consider the raising of supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

I also give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of supply to Her Majesty.

And I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting Pension Benefits".

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Public Service Commission Act, 1973," and also ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Pippy Park Commission Act".

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Fishing Ships Bounties Act".

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I would like to present the following resolution.

WHEREAS the federal government has seen fit to dismantle the radar station at Shoe Cove, which monitored a large area of our Continental Shelf; and

WHEREAS this area is subject to sudden storms and dangerous ice conditions, especially at this time of year; and

WHEREAS there seems to be little prospect of the federal government changing their minds on this matter, and

WHEREAS there is a Russian fishing fleet nearby harvesting a generous quota of our fish and also enjoying the use of our port and repair facilities, and that they are equally concerned with climatic conditions on our Continental Shelf and must by now have a comprehensive monitoring and reporting facility set up for the safety of their own vessels;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House ask our administration to look seriously into the possibility of obtaining vital weather and ice reports on our Continental Shelf from the aforementioned Russian fleet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not know the Second World War is over.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Premier, I give notice I will on tomorrow -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Status Of Women Advisory Council Act,"

March 15, 1983

Tape No. 311

NM - 3

MR. MARSHALL: and I give notice that I will
on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An
Act To Amend The Leaseholds In St. John's Act".

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any other notices of
motion?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an answer to a foolish question asked by the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). The question was concerning the sound system and recording system in the House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, this was put on public tender in January, 1982 and closed on January 21, 1982.

The tender was awarded to the lowest bidder. That is it, Mr. Speaker. If they had been listening instead of reading newspapers they would have found it all out then.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other answers to questions for which notice has been given?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Regulation Of Mines Act," carried. (Bill No. 17)

On motion, Bill No. 17 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Occupational Health And Safety Act," carried. (Bill No. 16)

On motion, Bill No. 16 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977," carried. (Bill No. 15)

On motion, Bill No. 15 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Repeal Certain Obsolete And Spent Statutes," carried. (Bill No. 27)

On motion, Bill No. 27 read
a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of
Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The
Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation Act,"
carried. (Bill No. 4).

On motion, Bill No. 4 read
a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting Dentistry And Dental Surgery In The Province ," carried. (Bill No. 26).

On motion, Bill No. 26 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Pharmaceutical Association Act," carried. (Bill No. 9).

On motion, Bill No. 9 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural , Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Health) Act," carried. (Bill No. 22).

On motion, Bill No. 22 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 23)

On motion, Bill No. 23 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Co-Operative Societies Act," carried. (Bill No. 24).

March 15, 1983

Tape No. 313

ah-2

On motion, Bill No. 24
read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister
of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The
Criminal Injuries Compensation Act," carried. (Bill No.13)

On motion, Bill No. 13, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act", carried.(Bill No. 28).

On motion, Bill No. 28 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fire Prevention Act", carried.(Bill No. 12)

On motion, Bill No. 12 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Accident And Sickness Insurance Act, 1971", carried.(Bill No. 14).

On motion, Bill No. 14 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act", carried.(Bill No.10).

On motion, Bill No. 10 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Education Act", carried.(Bill No. 5).

On motion, Bill No. 5 read a first time,ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act", carried,(Bill No. 6).

On motion, Bill No. 6 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order 1, Address in Reply.

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

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, just to refresh hon. members memories as to what we are debating here, we are debating a motion of non-confidence in the administration.

MR. NEARY: If this vote is carried, why, of course, the administration would fall and the Premier would have no choice but to go down to the Governor and pass in his resignation. Then the Lieutenant-Governor would decide whether or not somebody on the other side would be invited to form a government or if somebody in the opposition would be invited to form a government, or call a Provincial general election. That is the way, Mr. Speaker, the system works. However, Mr. Speaker, there are forty-four members on that side of the House, there are only eight over here, and barring unforeseen circumstances it is very unlikely that the Motion of non-confidence will win the day, unless the member for Mt. Scio (Mr. Barry) in his wisdom votes in favor of the motion and he can persuade a number of his colleagues on the government benches to follow his lead and vote for this motion of non-confidence in the Administration, then the motion is likely to be defeated.

The reason I singled out the hon. member for Mt. Scio is that the hon. gentleman has been very vocal in making recommendations and suggestions to the administration; the hon. gentleman has gone against the party line, has made some very worthwhile suggestions and recommendations that, if followed by the Premier and the administration, could very easily lead to a resolution of the offshore problem. And so, if the Premier and the administration continue on their course of failure, on their disaster course, then I would expect the hon. gentleman to have the courage of his convictions and vote in favor of this motion, Mr. Speaker, because the member for Mt. Scio, a former Minister of Energy, has spoken out, has vented his feelings on what he thinks the administration should do to get the offshore problem settled. The hon. gentleman in one of his statements suggested that the Premier and the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall)

MR. NEARY: should go up and camp on the doorstep of Mr. Chretien and not leave until they have an agreement. The other day the hon. gentleman was kind enough to let me have a copy of his press release and the letter that he had written to Mr. Chretien asking about the possibility of getting back to the negotiating table -

MR. LUSH: Sound advice.

MR. NEARY: Yes, very sound.

MR. WARREN: And in good faith.

MR. NEARY: - to get back to the bargaining table and try to negotiate a settlement.

Mr. Speaker, there are an awful lot of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who agree with the hon. gentleman's point of view. Now, Mr. Speaker, because the member for Mt. Scio (Mr. Barry), who sits on the government benches, is recommending that the administration attempt to negotiate a settlement on the offshore,

MR. S. NEARY: does that make the hon. gentleman any less a Newfoundlander than it does the Premier of this Province? Does that make the hon. gentleman a traitor to his country because he would like to see the offshore problems straightened out, resolved, in the best interest of Newfoundland and of Canada? Does that make the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) any less a Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, than any other member sitting on that side of the House? Well, if it does not, if the answer is, no, it does not make him a traitor, if the answer is, no, it does not make him any less a Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, then the answer would be the same for anybody on this side of the House. Because the former Minister of Energy, the member for Mount Scio, who is a very strong member of the Tory caucus, is espousing the same argument, principle that we have been putting on the table for the last several years.

MR. G. TOBIN: Why does Chretien not sign the agreement that is there? You know why? Because he has your support and a few more people like you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are three things in this world that make very strange and weird noises.

MR. TOBIN: You are one of them.

MR. NEARY: There is a goose, there is a snake and there is a fool, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he stand up and identify himself so we can put him one of these categories.

MR. TOBIN: You sit down and I will stand up and I will tell you why the agreement is not signed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is trying to live by his wits and that is why he has such a pathetic look on his face, I would say.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Mount Scio has a good point of view. It so happens that it coincides with the point of view that we have been

MR. S. NEARY: putting forward in this Province for the last several years and we welcome the hon. gentleman aboard. We have not been able to persuade the administration to negotiate an agreement on the offshore, but we hope the hon. gentleman will be able to persuade the Premier and his colleagues to get back to the negotiating table and get this matter straightened out before the whole economy of this Province collapses,

MR. NEARY: get it straightened out so the administration can go on and deal with the crisis in the fishing industry, so that the Province can deal with the problem in the pulp and paper industry and the forest industry, so that they can look at things that can be done for one-industry towns - in mining towns where the mining industry is in trouble - so that the administration can look at record unemployment in this Province, especially among young people. Mr. Speaker, 50 per cent of the unemployed in this Province -

MR. TOBIN: There is an agreement.

MR. WARREN: There is no agreement.

MR. NEARY: If I were the hon. gentleman I would not waste my time talking to the hon. gentleman over there.

MR. TOBIN: Is that right?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has problems enough of his own down in Burin. He has run away from Burin and their problems; He has run away from St. Lawrence, he has run away from Grand Bank and he can try to bluff all he wants, he can try to pawn things off on the Kirby Task Force all he wants, he can continue his bluff, but the people have his number, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: He wants to see settlements ruined.

MR. TOBIN: Do not you be caught in Marystown after your statements on Friday morning.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman took to CKCF - is it not? - in Marystown the other day and made some kind of a convoluted statement about oil rigs, and they laughed at him down there. They could not believe what they were hearing from such a buttoned-down mind, such a narrowed-minded bigoted, low-down, low class individual. They could not believe it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: You should hear what they said about you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I was the hon. gentleman I would obey the rules of this House and I would stop interrupting people who are making speeches, because all the hon. gentleman is doing is showing a further display of his arrogance and ignorance.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is correct. We hope that he can persuade the administration to do what he wants them to do. I do not expect the hon. gentleman will bolt the Party. I do not expect that the member for Mount Scio will come over and join us here, although I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, that we would be more than delighted to have him. He would be welcomed, he would get the red carpet treatment from this side of the House. And, Mr. Speaker, he would certainly make a good candidate for the leadership on either side of the House, either party. And, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that that is the reason the Premier got clear of him when he was Minister of Energy. The Premier was afraid of him. He was becoming a threat to the Premier. He was getting too much publicity. He had too much common sense for the Premier, and so the Premier had to get rid of him and he was forced to give up his Energy portfolio. But I am not trying to embarrass the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, Far be it from me

MR. NEARY: to try to get the hon. gentleman in hot water with his colleagues. I would think he is in enough hot water now with the Premier as a result of his public pronouncements about trying to get this offshore matter resolved. But there is room on this side of the House. If the hon. gentleman wanted to slide his seat over into the corner there and sit down by himself, well then I am sure that the hon. gentleman is capable of doing that. If he wanted to move his seat over across the House and join the eight of us, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would be more than welcome. But that is not the point that I am making, that is just sort of thinking out loud, an afterthought. I am sure the hon. gentleman has no intention of doing that and I am sure that the Premier and his colleagues will walk very gingerly with the hon. gentleman because they know if they lose him, if they force him to do anything drastic that, Mr. Speaker, would be the end. They are in trouble enough now. Their image has been so severely battered and bruised in the last several months that now we have the Premier telling his caucus and telling the supporters, 'Boys, do not get upset, do not get uptight. Do not do anything drastic, because the way politics works is that you are down in a valley one day and the next day you are up on top of the mountain. That is the way it works.' And the Premier is now propping up his caucus by telling them not to worry because they have three or four years to go before the next election so there is nothing to worry about. Mr. Speaker, the word coming out of the caucus these days -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have order for one second, please.

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

MR. NEARY: The word coming out of the caucus is that the Premier is telling his caucus -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I submit that you enforce the rules of the House or name the members who are continuously interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I would like to remind hon. members that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the word that is coming out of the caucus is that the Premier is trying to boost the morale of his troops by telling them, 'Do not worry, boys, We have three or four years to go and we will make all the hard decisions, we will make all the unpopular decisions, we will do all the unpopular things now and after three or four years we will open up the purse strings and start doing things and we will be alright again.'
Mr. Speaker, how cruel and callous can you get?

MR. NEARY: How cruel, Mr. Speaker, can you get when you will put politics and your party before the interests and the welfare of the people of this Province. Because that is what they are doing, Mr. Speaker. They are putting their party and they are putting politics above the interests of the ordinary people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, they are wrecking the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador. They are driving the Province to financial ruin. They have no plans for the fishery, for young people who are unemployed. They have no plans to deal with high electricity rates in this Province. They have no plans to deal with high unemployment amongst construction workers. They have no plans to do anything, Mr. Speaker, they are only interested in one thing, and that one thing is to play political games, is to play politics, and put their party and the National Tory Party Leadership before the people of this Province, before the welfare recipients, before the sick, before the unemployed.

MR. TULK: Before the fish plants.

MR. NEARY: Before the fish plants, and I will be dealing with that shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the sealers.

MR. NEARY: They are putting politics and their own party before everything else in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and that is callous and cruel and is only likely to lead to disaster in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it might be worthwhile, before I get away from the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) and his most recent suggestions about negotiating an agreement on the offshore, it might be well -

MR. TULK: Then the Premier comes in and says he did not have all the facts.

MR. NEARY: That is right. The Premier said he did not have the facts. The hon. gentleman only happened to be Minister of Energy in this Province at the most crucial time, by the way, in our history. And the hon. Premier says the member for Mount Scio does not have all the facts.

Now, before I get away from the matter of the offshore and negotiations, perhaps it might be well to review the situation, to review just in case somebody listening to me has forgotten the sequence of events, have forgotten -

MR. BAIRD: There is nobody listening to you, boy, There is nobody listening to you.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker, just in case -

MR. TULK: He just got up then.

MR. NEARY: - somebody listening has forgotten the scenario, that somebody has forgotten what transpired in the last few years in this Province, in case there is somebody let me refresh their memories.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all the administration, led by the Premier, took the position a few years ago in this House, when he was Minister of Energy, that there would be no negotiations at all, that the provincial government would not sit down to a bargaining table with anybody, Ottawa or anybody else, unless they conceded that Newfoundland owned the offshore.

MR. TULK: Total ownership.

MR. NEARY: Total ownership. That was the condition under which the present Premier and the administration would go to the bargaining table: If Ottawa would not concede that the Province owned the offshore in total and had total control, that there would be no negotiations. Well they did a flip flop on that, Mr. Speaker. August 1980 they did a complete reversal on that and then they started talking the way that we have been talking on this side of the House. They said, 'Well, maybe we will sit down and bargain if the ownership question is set aside forever.' Now, remember what they said first; they said, 'Total ownership or no talk.' Now they are saying in August 1980, 'Let us sit down and talk, but put the ownership question aside forever, indefinitely.' Then, Mr. Speaker, what was the next episode that happened in this sad history of events on the offshore? Well, let me tell the House, Mr. Speaker, something that I have never told the House before, that the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) no doubt can confirm, and it is this; that a dispute arose in this Province over who had the jurisdiction on the offshore service vessels as far as the unions were concerned. Mr. Crosbie, in cahoots with the present Minister of Labour and Manpower, said, Mr. Speaker, that he would not recognize the Seafarer's International Union, even though the Seafarer's International Union had jurisdiction all over North America,

MR. S. NEARY: as far as workers on ships and service vessels were concerned, Mr. Crosbie dug in his heels in and said, 'We are not recognizing the SIU', and he was aided and abetted by the present Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn). Do you know why he was aided and abetted by the present Minister of Labour and Manpower? Well, I will tell the hon. gentlemen. Because there would be union hall hiring. The hiring would be done in the union hall and the hon. gentleman would not be able to have his fingers into the hiring. He was arguing that the local preference could not be enforced because the SIU had written into their contract, union hall hiring. And so between the jigs and the reels they got Crosbie to take a firm stand, Crosbie's Offshore, and Crosbie's Offshore invited the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Clerks in to

MR. NEARY: organize the workers on these service vessels. In other words, the company union, The company invited the union in.

MR. DINN: You heard that from John, did you? You get most of your information from John.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not get it from the President of the Newfoundland Telephone Company, I can tell the hon. gentleman that. I am not on the payroll of the telephone company.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the SIU were blocked. Every turn they were blocked by the hon. gentleman who was rude and insulted the international representative of the SIU, in his office, was very insulting and rude. And as a result - Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go into any more details about that because I think I have made the point. As a result a vote was taken on a number of occasions amongst the workers on the offshore vessels as to who should represent the workers and, Mr. Speaker, would you believe that the ballots were put in a box and never counted? The ballots were never counted.

MR. TULK: Sure, that is typical of this crowd.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the ballots were there for over a year before the matter went to the federal courts.

MR. DINN: Why did they go federal?

MR. NEARY: That is the point. That is exactly the point, Sir. I am coming to that.

MR. DINN: Very good.

MR. NEARY: If you like, Mr. Speaker, you can almost point the finger at Crosbie's Offshore and

MR. NEARY: the Minister of Manpower
(Mr. Dinn) for forcing - not almost, you can blame. If
there is any blame you can point the finger at the Minister
of Manpower and at Crosbie's Offshore for forcing the
SIU to take the matter to the Supreme Court to ask for
a determination, an opinion as to who owned the jurisdiction,
whether it was federal or provincial.

MR. DINN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Now, the hon. gentleman says that is right. Well, now, who was it who forced the SIU to do that? Mr. Speaker, I can tell you without fear of contradiction, and I have documentation to prove it, that the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, was one of the instigators, that the SIU tried every avenue, explored every avenue to make their peace with the hon. gentleman. They appeared before the Labour Relations Board time and time again. I cannot say whether the hon. gentleman influenced the decision of the Labour Relations Board, I would not go as far as to say that, but, Mr. Speaker, according to the documentation that we tabled in this House before I would not be at all surprised but the hon. gentleman had a hand in that decision.

So here we are now, Mr. Speaker, with Crosbie's Offshore and the minister in the same bed together fighting the SIU. And what would you expect the SIU to do? Fight back. And they fought back with the only tool, the only weapon they had. They argued that the workers on the offshore vessels, because they were in international waters on ships, did not come under provincial jurisdiction. And so they took the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. HODDER: And that is where she started.

MR. NEARY: And that is where it started, Mr. Speaker. That is where the trouble started.

Mr. Speaker, the SIU were only asking the Supreme Court to express an opinion as to whose jurisdiction this was as far as the union was concerned. Was it federal jurisdiction? Did it come under the Federal Labour Department, or did it come under the Provincial Labour Department?

MR. NEARY: And when they put that before the court a reference was made by the Government of Canada as to the ownership and as to the jurisdiction. And, Mr. Speaker, to this day this administration have stated publicly that the Government of Canada, the Minister of Justice, could have ignored that reference to the court by the SIU. Mr. Speaker, that is untrue, that is incorrect. The Government of Canada could not ignore it. When a jurisdictional problem arises anywhere in Canada, it does not make any difference where it is, the Government of Canada, the Minister of Justice in Canada has to be notified. And he was notified about the jurisdictional dispute over the workers on the service vessels and the Government of Canada intervened.

And then what happened, Mr. Speaker? After starting up negotiations with the Federal Department of Energy, the Provincial Government immediately broke off negotiations, back in October, 1982-or 1981 rather. That was October, 1981. They broke off negotiations, this administration, because their feelings were hurt, they were upset.

MR. NEARY: Now, remember, they had been telling us about the strong ease they had.

MR. TULK: Do you know what Cabot says about him sometimes?

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. TULK: Cabot says that sometimes the Minister without Portfolio over there acts without thinking.

MR. NEARY: They act without thinking. Well, he certainly acted without thinking in this case. Well, let me get the facts on the record. They broke off negotiations in October, 1981. They squirted their poison at Ottawa, they played their little political games. And then what happened in February, 1982? What happened, Mr. Speaker, in February, 1982? The administration put the ownership question before the Newfoundland Appeals Court. According to their advisors they thought that the decision of the Newfoundland court would be in their favour. Some how or other they felt because you had three Newfoundland judges sitting on the Bench, that they would forget the law and they would let their hearts influence their decision; they would let the Premier's emotional issues sway them, persuade them - their patriotism, they would let that push the rule of law into the background and they would decide in Newfoundland's favour. Well, what a kick in the rear they got, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: Look at the money that case cost them.

MR. NEARY: And look at the money it cost them. Oh, I will come to that when I am talking about other things.

So, Mr. Speaker, they put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, the very first government - it was not the federal government, it was not Mr. Lalonde or Mr. Chretien, it was this administration

MR. NEARY: that put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court and asked for a ruling as to who owned the offshore. Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened to the SIU case that was going on up in Ottawa? Well, you know what happened, Mr. Speaker, Just in case Your Honour has forgotten, the Supreme Court of Ontario kicked out the federal government's intervention. They said to the federal government, 'You have no right to intervene in this case. This is a matter involving the SIU and, therefore, you have no right to intervene in it.' So they kicked out their intervention and ruled in favour of the SIU.

MR. TULK: They never thought that might happen either.

MR. NEARY: They never thought that would ever happen either, but that is exactly what happened. That is all a matter of history.

MR. MARSHALL: You are right happy are you not?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not right happy, I am rather sad.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: I am coming to the hon. gentleman. I have a few minutes left yet.

Mr. Speaker, so the Supreme Court of Ontario said no to the Government of Canada, you should not have intervened, you do not have a case. So the SIU won their case and the federal government's intervention was kicked out. Now, Mr. Speaker, did this government, this administration then go to the Newfoundland Appeals Court and withdraw their case? Did they? No, they did not. They let it continue on, thinking in their hearts and in their minds that they were going to win.

MR. NEARY: And what happened, Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago? Three Newfoundland judges, all born and bred in this Province, Newfoundlanders, were unanimous in their decision that the offshore belonged to Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they can talk all they want over there about the Upper Churchill Falls contract. The Upper Churchill Falls contract is only for sixty-five years.

MR. MARSHALL: A giveaway.

MR. NEARY: A giveaway, they say. Well, who gave away our treasure offshore? Who put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court and gambled with our future, the only opportunity we had left for full prosperity in this Province? Who was it that did that? Whose name will go down in the history books in this Province as making the greatest, the most colossal blunder in Newfoundland's 500 year history? Will it be Mr. Smallwood? Will it be Mr. Trudeau?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, it will be the present Premier of this Province.

MR. TULK: A. Brian Peckford.

MR. NEARY: A. Brian's name will go into the history books as the man who gambled and lost - and is still gambling. The hon. gentleman, when he lost with a whole string of failures behind him, one failure after another, you would almost need an adding machine to add up the failures that he has had. He cannot point to one success in this Province, not one success, one failure after another - waves his arms and his legs and his tongue after the court case and says, 'We are going to continue to fight for Newfoundland. We are going to continue to

MR. NEARY: fight, even though,' he says, 'I know the risk, the political risk. But I am prepared to gamble. I am prepared to take my chances and the political risks. I have failed. I cannot now go out and try to negotiate an agreement that I should have been doing all along.'

MR. TULK: He did not talk about the economic risk, did he?

MR. NEARY: No, he did not talk about the risks. And then, Mr. Speaker, he says, 'I cannot sleep. I cannot sleep at night.'

MR. TULK: Is that what he said?

MR. NEARY: Yes. When the rigs were out there - after the court case, when they took this decision to bring the rigs ashore, they issued an order to bring the rigs ashore even though they had been stripped of their authority a couple of weeks before that by the Newfoundland court; they had no authority left - the Newfoundland court said the ownership belongs to Ottawa, the people of Canada - they then took a unilateral decision to order the rigs in even though they had approved, in November, of Winter drilling.

MR. TULK: They forgot about the telephone.

MR. NEARY: They forgot they had approved Winter drilling.

MR. TULK: They forgot about the invention of the telephone.

MR. NEARY: That is right. And they forgot about all the telexes. We have telexes here every day.

MR. TULK: Who is it says, 'War by Telex'?

MR. NEARY: This is a new weapon they have in this Province now, telexes. They forgot all about that and took a unilateral decision, and then the Premier said he could not sleep at night.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say the reason he could not sleep at night had nothing to do with offshore. But when he thought about welfare recipients in this Province, the way that they have had the screws put to them by the administration, the ordinary people who are unemployed at the present time through no fault of their own, the unwed mothers, the crippled, the halt and the lame and the blind, the screws put to them by the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), no wonder he could not sleep at night. And then when he thinks about all the unemployed that are out there, and I am not talking about your ordinary construction worker who is seasonal, I am talking now about middle-class people, ordinary Newfoundlanders unemployed today, because the unemployment has gone heavily into the middle-class people, people who were never unemployed in their lives. No wonder he cannot sleep at night, thinking about all the poor children that are going to school in this Province ill-clad and poorly fed as a result of the failures and the disaster course that this administration has been on in the last several years, the ego trip, Mr. Speaker. No wonder he cannot sleep at night, when he thinks of 750 being laid off in Corner Brook, No wonder the hon. gentleman cannot sleep at night, when he thinks of all the unemployment in Labrador West, Wabush and Labrador City. No wonder he cannot sleep, when he has ignored the situation in Buchans and Happy Valley/Goose Bay and Bell Island and all the other communities on the misery list. No wonder he cannot sleep at night, when the people down in Burin have been manning the picket lines - for how long? -

MR. CALLAN:

Three months.

MR. NEARY: - three months ,Mr. Speaker -
manning the picket lines in Burin for three months. No
wonder he cannot sleep at night, when the hon. gentleman
can lead a demonstration down to try and save an obsolete
tracking station in Shoe Cove for training purposes.
Today now he is talking about - they have softened
their position now, they want to keep it for training
purposes. He can lead a demonstration of picketers down
to Shoe Cove. I did not see the hon. gentleman leading
a demonstration down to Burin. They have a job to get
their member down there let alone the Premier or the
minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, no wonder he cannot sleep at night with the people down there manning the picket lines, Mr. Speaker, carrying on their fight to save their community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if you do not mind. Because we are on a very serious topic, that the hon. gentleman would not understand. It is bad enough for him to be interrupting me, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. gentleman is not in his seat. And if the hon. gentleman wants to continue to lower the decorum of the House, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Nobody has done that any better than you did.

MR. NEARY: - then I think the only alternative for the Chair is to name the hon. gentleman, have him removed from the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! I would like to remind members on both sides that the hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, no wonder the hon. gentleman cannot sleep at night, when the people of Burin are down there day in and day out, round the clock, twenty-four hours, trying to save their community, trying to save a way of life, trying to save a heritage in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I hope that nobody in this House is gullible or naive enough to think that the fight that is going on in Burin today is just a fight to save the community of Burin. I hope nobody is naive enough in this House to think that is the case.

What Burin is fighting for,

Mr. Speaker -

MR. TOBIN: Is survival.

MR. NEARY: - Burin is fighting for a way of life. Burin is fighting to save a culture and a heritage built around the fishery in this Province. That is what they are fighting for, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: That is right. Right on.

MR. NEARY: It is too bad the hon. gentleman does not realize that and could influence the Cabinet to do something about it.

Because, Mr. Speaker, the fish plant in Burin, like the other ones, and I will deal with the other communities shortly, the fish plant in Burin, the processing sector falls under provincial jurisdiction. It is not a matter for the Government of Canada, it is not a matter for the Government of Russia, or Germany, or France, or the Government of Quebec or Nova Scotia -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have silence, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I am asking Your Honour again.

MR. TOBIN: The member for Fogo is interrupting.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is out of his seat, in the first instance, and he is not allowed to interrupt. The hon. gentleman, does he think he is down in a bar or a tavern somewhere? The hon. gentleman is in the people's

MR. NEARY: House, he may not realize that,
where people have a right to be heard -

MR. TOBIN: Do you not own a club?

MR. NEARY: - where people have a right to
express their views, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the club you own.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker,
is not in a tavern, or a bar -

MR. TOBIN: I do not own either tavern or bar.

MR. NEARY: - he is in the people's House, and I wonder if your Honour would remind the hon. gentleman so that I can carry on my few remarks.

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

MR. NEARY: That is four times now Mr. Speaker. I do not know how often I have to ask Your Honour to silence the hon. gentleman. I do not know how often, but I will keep doing it. And perhaps Your Honour could check Beauchesne or check -

MR. TOBIN: It is the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) who is interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: I am not saying a word.

MR. Speaker: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is five times for the member for Burin (Mr. Tobin). Mr. Speaker, if the people of Burin could only come in to this House, and they will be in, by the way. Do not worry, they will be here and see their member, Mr. Speaker, just to see him. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, what they are fighting for down in Burin is the survival of the deep-sea fishery in this province, and the inshore fishery to a large degree. That is what they are fighting for.

MR. TULK: How about the Grand Bank fishery?

MR. NEARY: I am coming to Grand Bank, do not worry about that. I will deal with each community on its own merits. I want to deal with Burin first, Mr. Speaker, because my colleague and I had the honour and the privilege to meet with the Concerned Citizens Committee in Burin, and we met with the clergy -

MR. TOBIN: How much money did you pass out?

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman wants to know how much money I passed out, Mr. Speaker, they needed some coffee there and my colleague and I contributed, personally, out of own pockets \$20.00 for coffee and tea.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman thinks he is going to score points by bringing that up he should go and talk to the Concerned Citizens Committee and the people who are picketing, who very much appreciated that little gesture on our part. That is more than we can say for the hon. gentleman.

MR. TOBIN: That is now what I heard.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, anytime he wants to he can stand in this House and he can get up and say what he heard, but he must be prepared to suffer the consequences.

MR. WARREN: That is seven times.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have silence from the hon. gentleman.

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

MR. NEARY: That is seven times, Mr. Speaker. We are keeping a tally here now. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Burin are determined that they are going to win their battle. And I can tell the people of Burin right now that every man on this side of the House is behind them. We are behind them. We support their cause, we support their objectives and what they are fighting for, in spite of the fact that they have been ignored by the provincial government, in spite of the fact that their member keeps telling them that Ottawa is going to restructure, that the Kirby Task Force is going to solve their problems. In spite of all that, Mr. Speaker,

MR. S. NEARY: they will win, and I guarantee you they will win without any help from this government. The matter of the fish plant in Burin is a provincial matter, it is not a federal matter. It has nothing to do with Mr. Kirby, it has nothing to do with Mr. De Bane, it is a provincial matter. Where are the ministers who were down in Shoe Cove picketing? Mr. Speaker, they cannot argue on that side of the House that there is no fish. This is the time of year when you have an abundance of fish, and the plant is closed and has been closed since November. How can the member for the area and the members stand up and have the gall to say that the reason the plants are closed is because of federal policies, they have no fish. This is the time of year when they fish, this is the time of year when you have an abundance of fish. And the real question, Mr. Speaker, is, and this is the question for the administration to answer, would Fishery Products keep Burin open even if they had a supply of fish?

MR. G. TOBIN: I would have my doubts.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the hon. gentleman has his doubts. Well, why does he not tell that to the Premier and to the administration that he supports?

MR. TOBIN: If the federal government said to Fishery Products here is your quota, here are your trawlers, do not you worry where the processing plant is coming from, and if the federal government guaranteed us that there would be no further fuel hikes -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have silence from the hon. gentleman?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is eight times.

MR. TULK: Nine.

MR. NEARY: Nine, is it? My hon. colleague says nine times.

MR. S. NEARY: The fact of the matter is that the hon. administration, Mr. Speaker, have no intention of coming to the rescue of the people in Burin and in the other communities where you have fish plants closed or in the process of closing, Mr. Speaker, that is why I am stressing Burin.

MR. G. TOBIN: Ask Mayor Bailey where I stand.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Bailey knows where the hon. gentleman stands, and the hon. gentleman knows where Mayor Bailey stands.

MR. TOBIN: That is right. We know each other rather well.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. gentlemen, they know each other well, Mr. Speaker, and I would say that the only thing that is keeping a lid on now is that fact that the hon. gentleman just mentioned.

MR. NEARY: The only thing that is keeping the lid on.

MR. TOBIN: Keeping the lid on what?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the people of Burin have been let down by this administration.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Simmons is finished down there. He will never go back there anymore.

MR. NEARY: Could I have silence, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is ten times. Now how often more? Mr. Speaker, how often more is the hon. gentleman going to be allowed to interrupt me from somebody else's seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
If the hon. Leader of the Opposition was not answering or asking questions of the hon. member it might discourage him from interrupting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Well, now, Sir, I will plow on, and from now on I want to be protected by the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will protect every speaker in this House.

MR. NEARY: All right, Sir.
Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Burin are fighting for a heritage and a culture and a way of life in this Province that we have had for 500 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: A culture and a life that is built around the fishery. And for the provincial government, the administration, the present administration, to allow Fishery Products to close that plant, Mr. Speaker, could only be termed as resettlement through the backdoor, because that is what it will be. And it will

MR. NEARY: be the ruination, the beginning of the end for a good many communities like Burin, in this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to state now categorically, and I do not care who hears me say it or who likes it - anybody who does not like it, they can lump it - that we on this side of the House, the eight of us on this side of the House say to the whole world and I hope the message gets down to the Burin Peninsula - Mr. Speaker, we will send our Hansard down, we will get the hon. gentleman's interruptions recorded in Hansard and we will send it down to his constituents.

MR. TOBIN: Do you want me to answer that again.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we -

MR. TOBIN: He is started again, Look, there he goes.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: There was no question asked of you.

MR. NEARY: - state categorically that we are for the re-opening of every fish plant in Newfoundland that is closed at the present time.

MR. WARREN: That is more than the member can say.

MR. NEARY: Without reservation, Mr. Speaker, we are for the re-opening of all of these plants. And let me repeat it again just in case anybody does not hear what I am saying, we are not for leaving Fermeuse closed, leaving Burin closed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are for the opening of all of these plants. And what I said in the House, in case the hon. gentleman does not remember, was you can

March 15, 1983

Tape No. 329

SD-3

MR. NEARY: let Nickersons go bankrupt
and they would not be missed in this Province but they may
be missed in Nova Scotia.. That is what I said.

MR. MORGAN: What about Fishery Products?

MR. NEARY: I said that Fishery Products
was a different matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker. Fishery Products, Lakes-

MR. TOBIN: I will circulate it in my district, that is all he mentioned.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman - my speech today will be circulated widely in Burin district, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the people of Burin asking? What are they asking?

MR. TOBIN: They are asking for the same as the rest of the Province.

MR. NEARY: They are not. Mr. Speaker, the people of Burin are asking for less actually than other parts of the Province. Here is the message coming from Burin to the administration, the present administration of this Province. Here is the message, loud and clear, They are saying to the administration, 'Take over the plant, take it away from Fishery Products and give it to us to run'. That is what they are saying. I have not heard the hon. gentleman get up in the House and support that cry, that plea from the workers, from the plant workers, and from the dragger crews in Burin. The very first time that that has been supported in this House is right now when I said it.

You can walk on egg shells, you can walk on glass, you can walk gingerly so you will not offend anybody in the administration. You can try to keep in good and try to pretend you are doing something for your district at the same time, you can try to worm your way into the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, but the time comes in every man's life when he has to stand on his own two feet, he has to take a decision, he has to show he is a man and not a mouse. He has to show, Mr. Speaker, that he has the courage of his convictions. He has to show his constituents and the people

MR. NEARY: of this Province that he means what he says, and show the people where he stands, And he is not going to be mealy mouthed about the whole thing, he is not going to talk out of both corners of his mouth. He is not going to say I support the people of Burin, and I support the administration who is ignoring them. You cannot say that, Mr. Speaker, you cannot say that.

MR. DINN: Sure you did it on Bell Island.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Thank you That is twelve times, Mr. Speaker, And I do not believe I mentioned the hon. gentleman in my remarks.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh! Be quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting is that we have reached a point in our history in this Province when we have to take some pretty hard decisions, some pretty drastic decisions, some pretty dramatic decisions with regard to the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, with regard to -

MR. TOBIN: The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) (inaudible) the other day. I must say -

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, I believe

I am being interrupted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is thirteen times, Your Honour. How many violations of the rules before you get into the penalty box, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): There is no penalty box in this House as far as I am aware.

MR. NEARY: Well, before you get named, how many times can you break the rules?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no specific rule to say that there is an amount or number of infractions that you would be reprimanded for.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have to make some drastic and dramatic decisions in this Province and we have to have courage. We have to pioneer and break new ground in this Province, with all due respect to Mr. Kirby and his task force. I will give him credit for this, he did produce a fishery plan for Canada. We have an agricultural policy in Canada, now we have a fishery policy - well and good, we needed it. But, Mr. Speaker, anybody in this House who publicly states that restructuring of the processing sector is Mr. Kirby's responsibility is misleading the people of this Province. The processing sector is a provincial jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier went up to Ottawa a few weeks ago and saw Mr. De Bane and they had a discussion prior to the release of the Kirby Task Force report. And Mr. Peckford left - the Premier left; I am not supposed to refer to him by his name. The Premier left. The media waited for him outside the door. They said, 'Mr. Premier, what did you discuss with Mr. De Bane?' He said, 'Well, we discussed the release of the Kirby Task Force report and we discussed the various options and that was it.' Now, the interviewer did not say, 'Well, the processing sector, is that not your jurisdiction?' No. Did the Premier say he had brought plans to Mr. De Bane to restructure the processing sector? No.

MR. NEARY: Did he bring any plans to Mr. De Bane? Well, we learned later that he did not.

MR. CARTER: Pronounce his name correctly now.

MR. NEARY: He did not bring any plans to Ottawa, he just went up on a flying visit, had their little chat, and a cup of tea, and the only thing the Premier said, the only thing he said, and he has admitted it in this House, he admitted it the other day to a question I put to him, the only thing he said to the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) was that he would not go along with nationalization of the industry. He is a private entrepreneur, he believes in private enterprise. And that was the only definite statement he made to the Federal Minister of Fisheries, "I will not go along with nationalization."

MR. CALLAN: My, oh my, oh my, oh my, oh my.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder then that I stand in this House today and condemn the administration for dereliction of duty, for not paying any attention to the processing sector which comes under their jurisdiction? It is sad, Mr. Speaker, it is very sad. And that is why I believe the fight in Burin is going to be a long, drawn-out affair. The fight in Burin will determine what will happen in Fermeuse, what will happen at Harbour Breton, what will happen in Gaultois, what will happen in Ramea, what will happen in St. Lawrence, what will happen in Grand Bank. The fight in Burin, Mr. Speaker, is one of the most important, gigantic struggles in our whole history as far as the fishery is concerned. If the people of Burin lose the battle, the people of Fermeuse, the people of Trepassay, probably, the people in Harbour Breton, the people in Gaultois, the people in Ramea, the people in St. Lawrence, the people in Grand Bank, the people in Piccadilly, they will all lose the battle, Mr. Speaker. Once Fishery Products makes the point, if they win, if the provincial government has not

MR. NEARY: got the courage to strip them of their licences, or to retaliate against Fishery Products, or allow them to get away with leaving Burin shut down -

MR. STAGG: All we hear is Lady Kirby.

MR. NEARY: That is right. If they allow Fishery Products to win the battle in Burin, Mr. Speaker, you can kiss a way of life in this Province good-bye. You can kiss a tradition and a heritage based on the fishery, on the deep-sea fishery, and the inshore fishery, you can kiss that good-bye, Mr. Speaker, that will be the beginning of the end.

MR. S. NEARY:

And that is why the battle in Burin is so important to fishing communities in this Province. Mr. Speaker, the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) may as well shut his door. All they are doing there now is sending out Telexes and making Ministerial Statements. They have no master plan for their restructuring and redevelopment of the processing sector of the fishery. They are laying back, Mr. Speaker, on their oars and waiting to see what the federal government is going to do. And if the federal government does not do enough, then they will get back to their old tricks of blaming Ottawa again. That is the kind of a game they are playing right now. But as I said in the beginning, that is rather cruel and callous - hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, and downright cruel. I grant it they can argue, I suppose, they can argue that, 'Well, we did not get elected or we did not get a mandate to look after the fishery.' I suppose they could argue that. They are a one-issue administration, the one issue being offshore oil. Mr. Speaker, they were given a strong mandate to negotiate an agreement offshore and they have neglected and ignored every other industry and natural resource in this Province. They have put all their eggs in one basket much to the dismay of the Newfoundland people. They have not even attempted to carry out the mandate they were given to negotiate an offshore agreement, Mr. Speaker, and so they have failed. They have failed miserably. The Premier's name will go into the history books as a failure, as a flop and as a disaster. Mr. Speaker, I do not hate the hon. gentleman. I do not think anybody on this side hates the Premier, I do not believe anybody in this Province hates the Premier, Mr. Speaker, but what they are saying about him is that the job is too big for him, he cannot handle the job. They do not hate him, Newfoundlanders like a fighter,

MR. S. NEARY: and he means well, Mr. Speaker, but you can be as well meaning as you want, if you have not got what it takes to govern this Province, to run this Province, then, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we are in for some pretty hard times. And the hon. gentleman still wants to stay on that disaster course. 'I am going to continue', he said, 'I am going to continue to gamble immaterial of the political consequences: and the hon. gentleman says in the next breath, 'I am only going to be here two terms and I am gone.'

MR. NEARY: By that time he will have wrecked the economy of this Province, wrecked it completely. And hon. gentlemen sit over there day in and day out squirting their poison and criticizing Ottawa. How many times in this session of the House have we heard members stand up in their place and honestly, honestly now, man fashion, discuss the real problems that are facing our people? We have had a number of spokesmen on the government benches so far who have spoken. The only one that I have heard, although he has not spoken, he made a statement outside the House, was the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) who criticized the administration for their policy on the offshore. How many members have I heard stand in their place and, Mr. Speaker, tell us what plans the administration have for the fishery?

MR. TULK: Did you hear that? He said the member for Mount Scio did not understand.

MR. NEARY: The member for Mount Scio did not understand. Mr. Speaker, I would rather listen to the member for Mount Scio any day in the week, any hour in the day, than listen to the hon. gentleman. I would rather listen to the member for St John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) who, I am sure, has very strong views on these matters that I am talking about in my few remarks. Nobody in his right mind believes that this administration is on the right course, unless you are off your rocker. Mr. Speaker, how could you agree with the policies of this administration? One failure after another. Go right back, as I said, to the beginning of the offshore negotiations, go back ten years, turn back the hands of time, turn back the hands of the clock and see what has happened. One blunder, one failure after another, and yet they

MR. NEARY: follow their leader.

MR. CALLAN: Which one?

MR. NEARY: They follow their leader.

And, Mr. Speaker, they are following their leader into the valley of death and they have not got the courage, not one of them except the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), have the courage to stand up and say so. And then they stand over there and anybody who does not toe the Tory party line, anybody who does not do what the Tories want done, the Tory policy, the Tory line is a traitor and is less than a Newfoundlander. Mr. Speaker, that is why, as I said earlier, I am glad to see at least one

MR. NEARY:

hon. gentleman over there speaking out. They have put all their eggs in one basket. While they are squabbling and arguing about the offshore - and I know, Mr. Speaker, they heard all this before, they will hear it all again. It is only history repeating itself in this Province, Mr. Speaker. During the Munroe administration - anybody who knows anything about Newfoundland history will tell you that Monroe got elected on the platform of 'clean her up and keep her clean'. That was Monroe's philosophy. And he got elected on that. And no doubt about it, he did a good job of keeping her clean. But, Mr. Speaker, his administration soon fell apart. And do you know why it fell apart? Because the backbenchers got disillusioned and became very disgruntled because the administration was not doing anything. The administration had no money to spend. And there was a rebellion in the ranks, Mr. Speaker. Dry rot set in, that is what happened to the Monroe administration, and they got kicked out.

I do not know if we have reached the point in the life of this administration that dry rot has set in. If it has not it should. How can you blindly follow a leader who is leading you on a course of disaster? How can they do that, Mr. Speaker? You know, I have heard it said that the present Premier could be compared to a former Premier, Mr. Smallwood. I have heard that said.

MR. YOUNG: There is nobody like 'Joey', for the love of God.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, as far as the physical motions are concerned maybe that is true. But that is where it ends. That is where the comparison ends. Because, Mr. Speaker, there is no comparison between the former Premier, Mr. Smallwood, and the present Premier.

MR. TOBIN: That is for sure.

MR. NEARY: The former Premier was a builder. He was a builder, Mr. Speaker. There are monuments from one end of this Province to the other, monuments to the man. This very building we are sitting in - this House of Assembly, and this very building is a monument to Mr. Smallwood. The university that we can look down on right here, Memorial University, is a tribute to Mr. Smallwood.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Every hospital built in this Province since Confederation is a monument to Mr. Smallwood.

MR. BAIRD: How about the Liberal Party?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, 95 per cent of the fish plants in this Province - a monument to Mr. Smallwood. The Trans-Canada Highway, rural electrification, senior citizens' homes, eighteen vocational training schools,

MR. NEARY: the College of Fisheries, the College of Trades and Technology, Ultramar, Eastern Provincial Airlines. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on.

MR. TOBIN: The linerboard mill.

MR. CARTER: Come By Chance.

MR. NEARY: I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentlemen can vilify the hon. gentleman all they want, but, Mr. Speaker, the comparison ends with the arm waving of the present Premier, there is no comparison after that. Mr. Smallwood was a builder and will be going down in the history books -

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible) on Roaches Line.

MR. NEARY: His name will go into the history books, Mr. Speaker, as a builder. And the Premier of this Province, his name will go into the history books -

MR. HISCOCK: As a rabbit hunter.

MR. NEARY: No, it will go in as a gentleman who created a state of emergency in this Province. His name will stink like rotten fish in Newfoundland history. The present Premier 's name will stink like rotten fish, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this Province as compared to the other gentleman whose name they keep bringing up over there. You could go on and on. You could talk about all of the roads that were built, Marystown Shipyard, Marystown Fish Plant, built by a Liberal Administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask hon. gentlemen a very simple question; When they are comparing the present Premier to Mr. Smallwood, and I do not have to list all the accomplishments of Mr. Smallwood and his administration, a successful administration, I do not have to do that, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to ask hon. gentleman a simple question, In eleven years of Toryism in this Province, name me one success story on that side of the

MR. NEARY: House, Name me one.

MR. TOBIN: April 6th.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, April 6.

I see, politics is more important, Mr. Speaker. Politics. Winning at the polls, and duping the people, and deceiving the people, and misleading the people is more important than accomplishments. Name me one accomplishment of that administration, of a Tory Government in this Province for eleven years.

MR. CARTER: Are you going to stay here all night?

MR. NEARY: Name me one major accomplishment, one new idea, one new development, Mr. Speaker, I challenge them, I challenge hon. gentlemen to stand in their places in this House and name me one accomplishment

MR. NEARY:

in eleven years of the two Tory administrations that we have had.

MR. TOBIN:

You named the Marystown fish plant and the Marystown shipyard, why did you not name the Marystown dance floor?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman now, Mr. Speaker, has moved down to another seat and I do not believe I was sparring with the hon. gentleman. Could I ask for the protection of the Chair again?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

There is silence here in the House now, there is nobody interrupting.

MR. NEARY:

Well, that is fifteen times now I had to do that, Your Honour. We are keeping a tally. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we be allowed to express our views in this House freely and openly without interruption. I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, and then I will come back to the fishery and the offshore again; I am not just jumping from one topic to another, I am coming back to the two main issues that I spoke about. But I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the thing that worried Newfoundlanders, after April 6th last year, the one matter that concerned Newfoundlanders and Labradorians -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Could I have silence, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

That is seventeen times,
Your Honour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the one matter that concerned the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador

MR. NEARY: following the April 6th election last year was the large majority that the Tory Party had received, forty-four members compared to eight. And the thing that concerned residents of Newfoundland and Labrador more than anything else, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the matter that concerned Newfoundlanders and Labradorians more than anything else was the fact that with such a large majority, lopsided majority in the House the administration might have a tendency to become dictatorial and arrogant and they might do things that were not in the best interest of the people who elected them. That was the big concern, and it is the big concern today. Mr. Speaker, you could talk to anybody in the street today, anybody out there, and they will tell you that the thing that concerns them most is the arrogance of this administration, how arrogant they have become in a short time.

Let me give you a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker, of the arrogance of this administration, this administration that was going to be clean and aboveboard and open

MR. NEARY: and give the people of Newfoundland the honest facts.

MR. MORGAN: The reason why it was turned down -

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, here is how arrogant the administration has become. We shamed the Premier into giving up Mount Scio House. We shamed him into that. But after we shamed him into it, Mr. Speaker, what did the hon. gentleman do? What did he do? He asked his colleagues to provide him with a rent free apartment. He asked his colleagues to use taxpayer money, without the authority of this Legislature, to pay \$10,600 a year for an apartment for him over at Tiffany Place. In case hon. gentlemen are not familiar with Tiffany, Tiffany is the big jeweller in New York.

MR. TOBIN: Roaches Line cost more than that for the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with Roaches Line. The hon. gentleman need not worry, I will deal with that.

MR. CARTER: By leave, tell us all about Roaches Line.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with Tiffany Place first. It is called after the big merchant, the big jewellery conglomerate in New York?

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you sure of that now?

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman would not live in a Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation apartment. He would not live in one of the apartments that is owned by the government. No. He wanted nothing but the best, Tiffany Place.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few things about that. I am just showing how arrogant the administration have become in a short time. The first thing they did - they had no authority, the administration has no authority to rent a private apartment for the Premier, no authority, even though the other day the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in answering a question told me that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) had the authority to go out and rent space.

MR. TOBIN: Sure.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I now challenge the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) to lay on the table of this House -

MR. TOBIN: The Mifflin Report.

MR. NEARY: - the authority that was given by this House to rent a private apartment for the Premier. They cannot do it, Mr. Speaker. They cannot do it.

MR. NEARY:

The Premier thinks that because he gave an explanation, he said, 'Well, I am going to come clean, I am going to confess, I am moving out of Mt. Scio House and I am going to clarify my position with the Newfoundland people,' that makes everything right and aboveboard. Mr. Speaker, only today I was checking with the other provinces of Canada on this matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: Raking up more dirt.

MR. NEARY: No it is not dirt, it happens to be taxpayers' money, \$10,600 of taxpayers' money, and the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, have every right to know how their money is being spent.

MR. TULK: Come over here to your seat and tell us about Burin.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is supporting this kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker.

Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario do not provide a private apartment for their Premier, or a house or anything else. It is unheard of, it is unprecedented in this Province.

MR. BAIRD: Quebec never (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I am coming to Quebec. Quebec has an apartment, but not for the Premier. The Quebec government has an apartment that can be used by the Premier if he wants to stay there overnight. The Premier has his own home in Quebec City, the hon. gentleman knows that. If they have a stormy night, Mr. Levesque may use it, a minister may use it.

MR. DINN: In Quebec the Liberal leader lived in it.

MR. NEARY: And he paid rent. They may use, Mr. Speaker, visitors who are guests of the Quebec government may use it. But, Mr. Speaker, there is not a province in

MR. NEARY:

Canada - and I only wish that this message would get through - not a province in Canada which provides the Premier with a private apartment, not one. What gives them the right? That is the question. What gives them the right, forty-four members against eight?

MR. NEARY: Their arrogance? He has no more right to a private apartment than any other member of this House or any other person in this Province, no more right to it. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no legislative authority -

MR. MORGAN: Why did we pay Joey all the years for his accommodations, the taxpayers of the Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know Your Honour was not in the Chair, but I believe that is eighteen times the Chair had to ask for order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Nineteen times, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has no right to a private apartment paid for by the taxpayers. And Treasury Board and the Cabinet has no right, without the approval of this House, to give him an apartment.

MR. MORGAN: Who gave him the right to govern? Not you.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, that has nothing to do with government, that has to do with private privileges and patronage. It has nothing to do with government. The private apartment that was given to the Premier has nothing to do with governing this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, they will rue the day that they took that kind of a decision. And now they are riding roughshod over the House, they are riding roughshod over everybody and they are saying, "Oh, yes, you are getting personal." If you talk about the Premier leeching off the public, leeching off the taxpayers, scrounging off the taxpayers, you are getting personal. Well, I presume the Premier

MR. NEARY: is a person, and I cannot see how we could talk about the hon. gentleman without getting personal. I presume he is a person. Sometimes there are people who have grave doubts about him. But he is a person, Mr. Speaker, and how can you talk about the hon. gentleman without getting personal? And he is scrounging off the taxpayers, leeching off the taxpayers of this Province. The only place in Canada, the only time in Newfoundland's history that the taxpayers paid for an apartment for the Premier. It is unprecedented. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) gets up and tells us the other day the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) has the authority to rent space. The Minister of Public Works has no authority to rent space for the Premier for a private apartment. Mr. Speaker, not only that, but if the government did decide in their wisdom to have an apartment for government use, not for the private use of the Premier but for government use, they would have had to call tenders for it. Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous. And again I

MR. NEARY:

heard somebody on the other side comparing what Mr. Smallwood had to what the present Premier gets, somebody compared that. Well, I already set the record straight in this House on Mr. Smallwood's house on Roaches Line and maybe I should set the record straight again. I will say it for the benefit of the newer members.

Mr. Speaker, the house on Roaches Line was not built by taxpayer money. Mr. Smallwood did not ask Cabinet or Treasury Board to build him a house or give him a rent free apartment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the house on Roaches Line was built by Mr. Smallwood himself - not with his own hands but he -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the house on Roaches Line never cost the taxpayers one penny.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Now, if the hon. gentleman has a charge to make let him stand in his place and make the charge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the public record speaks for itself. Mr. Smallwood built the house, had a mortgage on the house and owned the house. And then what did Mr. Smallwood do but, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. YOUNG: He got 400,000 acres of land.

MR. NEARY: Should I try for twenty times,
Mr. Speaker? Could I have the protection of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is twenty times, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Could I have the protection
of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Twenty-one times.

Mr. Speaker, what did Mr.
Smallwood do after he built the house, financed it himself,
what did he do with the house then? What did he do with
it, Mr. Speaker? Well, I will tell the House what he did
with it. He turned it over to the Newfoundland people for
one dollar. Gave it to the Newfoundland people as a gift,
for one dollar. Now, Mr. Speaker, how does that compare
with the present Premier?

MR. YOUNG: Who paid his oil bill and his
light bill?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how does that
compare -

MR. YOUNG: Who paid his oil bill and
his light bill, I am asking you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how does that
compare with the present Premier?

MR. NEARY: Well, here is how it compares with the present Premier; Mr. Moores managed to get control of Mt. Scio house from the University, because the University did not want it. Mr. Moores was probably about the worst Premier we have ever had up to that time in Newfoundland's history. Mr. Moores was a playboy Premier but did Mr. Moores establish a new precedent? Did Mr. Moores ask for Mt. Scio house rent free? No, As bad as Mr. Moores was, and as low-down as that crowd over there thinks he was, and the way they put the knife to him when he retired, the way they started their witch hunts and the way they went after him, you would almost say he was a Liberal. But, did he go into that House rent free? No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Moores went in and paid \$650. a month rent right up to the time he left Mt. Scio house, and it was paid to date because I checked on it.

MR. WARREN: How much did the Premier pay?

MR. NEARY: He paid the University.

Now, what did the present Premier do when he took over? He moved into Mt. Scio house and he said, "I am not paying any rent". No rent, rent free. Then we shamed him into leaving it after he spent a couple of hundred thousand dollars fixing it up to suit himself, new furniture, and had it decorated to his own taste, to his own liking, put a barbed wire fence around it with a gate where you push an electronic device to let you in and out, new silverware, new china, all kinds of security guards, Mr. Speaker, all kinds of luxurious items at the expense of the taxpayer; a couple of hundred thousand dollars worth we were told, according to the Public Accounts. It cost half a million dollars to operate the house and to equip it and fix it up when the Premier was living in it Now, all of a sudden, he moves out and

MR. NEARY: your \$200,000 or \$300,000 that was spent on china and decorations and paintings, that is all gone, that is all lost to the taxpayers. But does he leave then and go and hang his head in shame and say, "I was wrong by scrounging off the taxpayers, by leeching off the taxpayers? Was I wrong?" No, he goes and moves out and asks the taxpayers to pay rent for an apartment in a brand-new posh apartment building. The first time in Newfoundland's history, and the first time it has ever been done in Canada.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I hear the Tories, the open-line brigade, the Tory open-line brigade once in a while coming to his defence. You see the Tories - I do not know if you are aware of it, Mr. Speaker, but the Tories have what they call a letter writing brigade, those who write letters to the editor, and they have the open-line brigade, and any time a controversial issue comes on the open-lines, the commander of the open-line brigade will make calls around and say, "You had better get on the radio this morning because Brian is on, or one of the ministers is on, or there is an issue on that is embarrassing to us." So you hear the open-line brigade once in a while coming on and saying, "Did you hear that, Neary? Did you hear him again yesterday criticizing the Premier for his apartment over in Tiffany Place? How low and personal can you get." And then another argument they use, "Oh, the Premier is entitled to an apartment because look at all the entertaining he does. He is entitled to a house." This is what the Tory open-line brigade says, "Why should we not give him a house? Because he is entitled to it." He is no more entitled to it, Mr. Speaker, than you are, or I am, or any other individual in this Province is entitled to it. And they can

March 15, 1983

Tape No. 343

NM - 2

MR. NEARY: try to offset the criticism,
they can try to offset it all they like, they will not be
successful.

MR. MORGAN: Is the Governor entitled to
live on the taxpayers?

MR. NEARY: Well, now, Mr. Speaker, are we
putting the Premier up now in the same category as the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: You are downgrading the position,
not the man.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in most provinces of Canada the Lieutenant-Governor is not given a house by the taxpayers. It has been the tradition in this Province, but is the hon. gentleman putting the Premier now in the same category as the Queen's representative?

MR. MORGAN: Why not?

MR. NEARY: The Premier when he was living in Mount Scio House had his bodyguards. The bodyguards have gone. He put himself in the same category as the President of the United States, as the Pope. The bodyguards are gone, the chain link fence is still there, the \$200,000 worth of china and silverware and paper and decorations and paintings, all that is gone, lost to the taxpayers, but now the open-line brigade are trying to save face by saying, 'Well, the Premier is entitled. Look at all the people he entertains.' Mr. Speaker, if the government wanted to maintain an apartment to entertain people, which they do not have to do, they would not do it in the name of a private apartment for the Premier or anybody else, they would do like they do in Quebec, they would say this is a government apartment.

MR. STAGG: They do not have to pay for that, do they?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this government has running out of ears, apartments. Newfoundland and Labrador Housing have thousands piled upon thousands of apartments in this city. They have the bachelor apartments over at Churchill Square, they have Newfoundland Drive, they have -

MR. YOUNG: Elizabeth Towers.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they Elizabeth Towers. Mr. Moores lived in that. Some of the ministers lived in Elizabeth Towers and they paid their rent, they did not welch off the taxpayers. They did not suck the taxpayers

March 15, 1983

Tape No. 344

MJ - 2

MR. S. NEARY:

blood.

MR. YOUNG:

No like hell they did not.

MR. NEARY:

They paid their rent.

MR. HISCOCK:

Well, you have been there twelve years and did not straighten it up.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason I get sidetracked off the fishery and off the offshore, which I am coming back to if I get an opportunity before

MR. NEARY:

my time runs out - Mr. Speaker, if I can get an opportunity I will come back to these two issues.

Mr. Speaker, I got sidetracked off on that to show the arrogance of the administration. That is one example of what people were concerned about in this Province after the big majority of April 6th, was how arrogant and how dictatorial the administration could become.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me give you another example. That is one example of how the Premier is sucking off the taxpayers in this Province. These are hard words, Mr. Speaker, and, as I said earlier, I do not hate the hon. gentleman but I do not like a bloodsucker. I do not like somebody who would suck the blood of the taxpayers of this Province, Mr. Speaker, because that is what is going on. And hon. gentlemen can get highly indignant about it all they want, or they can take to the Open Lines all they want and they can try to slander and smear and twist and turn, but the fact of the matter is that the Premier of this Province is leeching off the taxpayers for the first time in Newfoundland's history.

Now, what is another example of arrogance on the part of this administration, Mr. Speaker? What is another example of arrogance? How arrogant this administration have become in a short time. Well, we saw an example in the Auditor General's Report released in this House last week, tabled in this House last week. The Auditor General's Report which reported - he reported it for about the third or fourth time, I might say - that he was dissatisfied with the reporting and the information that was given to the people, the taxpayers, on the use of government aircraft and on the use of government helicopters. And everybody knows the Auditor General is a servant of this House. He is non-partisan, non-political,

MR. NEARY: a servant of this House who gives it to us straight, who tells it as it is, who has no reason to try to shelter anybody or hide the facts from anybody. The Auditor General said in his report that was tabled in this House last week, "I am not satisfied", he said, "with the information being given to the taxpayers and to the House about the use of government aircraft and helicopters and who is using the aircraft and who is using the helicopters". Is that what the Auditor General said? Can anybody deny that is what he said?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take it a step further. After the Auditor General reported that he was dissatisfied with that, that there was no policy covering it, what happened after that? Well, the Cabinet got together down on the eighth floor and the Cabinet says, 'If we have no policy on this, what are we going to do?'. And, I presume, on a recommendation of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) the Cabinet decided and ordered the Department of Transportation - now, listen to this now, it will show you the arrogance of this administration - the Cabinet decided through Order in Council, Minute in Council, that they would order the Department of Transportation not to

MR. NEARY: release any information on the use of government aircraft or helicopters or who used them. That was done by an Order in Cabinet.

MR. WARREN: Say that again.

MR. NEARY: An Order in Cabinet. In other words, the Cabinet decided they are going to withhold information on how taxpayer money is spent. I am checking it out to see if it is legal, to see if it is constitutional.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the Public Accounts you had hearings on now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we also have another servant of this House who is the Comptroller of the Treasury, who is established under an act of this House. It is up to that gentleman to see that there is full disclosure of public money that is spent, of taxpayer money, full disclosure. Well, that is what the system is all about. The main purpose of the functions of this House, Mr. Speaker, is to pass Estimates, to approve of government spending. The taxpayers have a right, through this House, to know how every red cent of their money is spent, Mr. Speaker. That is basic, that is fundamental. Even a kindergarten student knows that. That is the main function of this House, to pass Estimates, to approve of government spending, because if the House did not have that control, you would have the Premier and ministers doing what they like. You would have every minister getting an apartment or a house free, and their buddies and their friends. Where is it going to end, Mr. Speaker? Where does it end? But for the Cabinet to order a department not to give the House, not to give the taxpayers who pay the bills information on how their money is being spent, Mr. Speaker, is outrageous! Did I make that up? Is that me talking as Leader of the Liberal Party, as Leader of the Opposition? Is that me?

MR. TOBIN: You were appointed.

MR. NEARY: No, not appointed, elected,
in case the hon. gentleman, in his simplicity, does not know.

Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous
and that item has to be stricken from the public record
quickly. Surely the administration, surely the House
is not going to ignore the recommendations of the Auditor
General. The Auditor General is the watchdog of the public
treasury. He is the only safety valve, the only safeguard
that we have against abuse of taxpayer money,

MR. NEARY: an abuse of power by the administration. The Auditor General and the Comptroller of the Treasury are the only ones we have to rely on, that the taxpayers can depend on to report misuse and abuse of public funds. And the Cabinet, flying in the face of the Financial Administration Act, say to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), You are not to give any information on the use of the aircraft and on the use of the helicopters, and you are not to tell the taxpayers who is using them, even though the taxpayers are paying the bills. Did you ever hear of anything like that in your life, Mr. Speaker? I know Your Honour cannot answer me. But I certainly have not. I have not and I doubt if anybody else has who knows anything about the system and the way it works. Mr. Speaker, in any other place, I would say, under the British Parliamentary system, that very one act alone would be sufficient to bring about the resignation of the head of that administration.

MR. YOUNG: That is what the Mifflin Report said.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that one item alone - just take that one item by itself, in isolation, that one item alone is sufficient to bring about the downfall of the head of that administration, and certainly a minister or two would go down with him, Mr. Speaker.

It is outrageous. I cannot say whether it is illegal, I am having it checked. If it is illegal, I will guarantee you that it will be followed up, it will not be like the spending during the election. It will not be like the spending, Mr. Speaker, during the election, when the government spent money after the end of the fiscal year without authority of this House. And the two top Constitutional experts in Canada said the government was wrong. They had broken the Financial Administration Act, they had broken with tradition,

MR. NEARY: they were wrong. The way the system works , Mr. Speaker, -

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have silence from the lapdog.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is twenty-three times, Mr. Speaker. I do not know how often Your Honour has to bring him to order before disciplinary action is taken. Perhaps Your Honour might research that and give us a report sometime.

MR. NEARY: So these are two examples of how arrogant this administration has become in a short time. I could go on and on and show you other examples of the arrogance of this administration, but I think I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, to show these are two very serious items. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was wrong the other day, the hon. gentleman was wrong when he told me and told the House and told the people that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) had the right to rent a private apartment for the Premier. The hon. gentleman was wrong and I ask the hon. gentleman now to table the authority in this House, the authority to the Minister of Public Works to spend taxpayer's money on a private apartment. I ask the hon. gentleman to do it now, to do it tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS: It is in the budget.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

DR. COLLINS: It is in the budget.

MR. NEARY: In the Budget? Mr. Speaker,

the apartment has already been leased, the lease is signed on the apartment and now the hon. gentleman is leaking out a subhead in the Budget. He is telling me it is in the new Budget. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance knows full well that you cannot commit the new Budget to a private apartment for the Premier without the approval of this House. It is a new policy. It has to be done in this House. The hon. gentleman is now changing his tune. I asked him yesterday what authority the government had for renting this private apartment and he told me the Minister of Public Works had the authority. Now he is telling me the authority is going to be provided in the new Budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what the hon. gentleman just said.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, getting back to where I started, when I talked about the arrogance of this administration this is the thing -

MR. TOBIN: Go on back to where you came from.

MR. NEARY: The Premier got himself in trouble by making that kind of a statement, by the way, another example of his arrogance. When he could not answer, when he lost his cool, went off his rocker again, he insulted the people of Bell Island, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the people are right when they say that they are concerned about the arrogance of this administration. And they have every right to be concerned about it, and worried about it, because it is a fact, it is a fact of life today in this Province. And the people are saying that the administration is not listening, they have off the rocker policies, that they are making rash and irresponsible statements, that they do not have any plans.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they have no plans as to how to cope with the problems that are facing the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the complete turnaround of this administration in the last year or so. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his little cavalry over there were riding around this Province, Mr. Speaker, making statements like this: 'We shall have our day in the sun.' 'Prosperity will be ours.'

MR. G. TOBIN: And we shall.

MR. NEARY: Listen to the kind of statements.

The member for Eagle River (Mr. E. Hiscock), does the hon. gentleman remember last year the kind of statements the Premier was making in this Province? Here was the kind of statements he was making. 'We shall have our day in the sun.' 'Prosperity will be ours.' 'Have-not will be no more!' What he meant by that 'have-not will be no more,' was that have-not would be no more for himself, he would help himself to the Public Treasury. And here is the last one of his quotes, listen to this, 'The offshore battle will be won.' Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at last week's Throne Speech. Now let me repeat again, just for the benefit of the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. W. Matthews) who may not grasp it the first time, just in case the hon. gentleman is a bit slow on the uptake. I will use four quotes again: Last year we heard it day in and day out, press conference after press conference, newspapers, buying expensive ads in the newspapers and radio, television to take to the airway. Listen, here is what the four statements were. 'We shall have our day in the sun.' 'Prosperity will be ours.' 'Have-not will be no more.' 'The offshore battle will be won.' Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see what was in last week's Throne Speech and let me quote from it and see now if these words

March 15, 1983

Tape No. 349

MJ - 2

MR. S. NEARY: I just talked about were not the words of a crackie running around this Province with his tail between his legs. Here is what last week's Throne Speech said about the Holy War, Mr. Speaker, that has been going on with Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me give you one quote now - you have heard the four that sounded like a broken record in this Province, just like a broken record you heard them so often - but here is what the Throne Speech said, And remember, the Throne Speech, just in case anybody has any delusions, has any other idea about the Throne Speech other than its being a statement of government policy. It comes through the lips of the Lieutenant-Governor, the Queen's representative, but I hope members are not under any illusion that it is not a statement of government policy.

MR. TOBIN: It certainly is.

MR. NEARY: Of course it is. And here is what it says, Mr. Speaker. 'Newfoundland and Labrador's long march to prosperity is once again frustrated'. That was last week's statement. Now how does that compare to last year's Throne Speech. Listen to this now, 'A painful journey is ahead of us and without the certainty of success'.

MR. TULK: Oh, there is doubt! There is some doubt!

MR. NEARY: Oh, there is some doubt here now, Mr. Speaker, 'without the certainty of success'. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was the tone and the trend of a speech that is supposed to lay out government plans and government policies for coping with the fisheries, telling us how they are going to deal with the offshore, telling us how they are going to deal with a one-industry community, how they are going to deal with high unemployment, especially among young people, how they are going to handle applications for electricity rates.

MR. TULK: Read that again.

MR. NEARY: Let me read it again. Compare this now to what was said a year ago. 'Newfoundland and Labrador's long march to prosperity is once again

MR. NEARY: frustrated . A painful journey is ahead of us and without the certainty of success'. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what was in the speech. Last year, and in fact right up until the Supreme Court of Newfoundland decided that the offshore belonged to the Canadian people, the Premier was saying, 'We shall win. We will win'.

MR. TOBIN: That made you happy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are not gloating about this. I am rather sad. Mr. Speaker, I am rather sad.

MR. HISCOCK: The consumption of liquor and beer since 1979 has gone up by 15 to 20 per cent.

MR. NEARY: My hon. colleague reminds me that the consumption of liquor and beer in this Province went up drastically in 1982 over 1979, Mr. Speaker. There must be a reason for it.

Do you notice now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: the cocky bravado that was going around saying, 'We shall win'. 'We shall overcome'. 'Have-not will be no more' -

MR. TOBIN: We shall in the next federal election.

MR. NEARY: - is now saying, 'A painful journey is ahead of us and without the certainty of success.'

MR. TULK: They are not sure now.

MR. NEARY: No, not sure.

MR. TOBIN: You can be sure, with John Crosbie as Prime Minister and the Liberals wiped out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Hope springs eternal.

MR. TOBIN: You predicted thirty-five seats a year ago. Look what you got.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We do not hear these cocky statements now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: You have a job too. You do not know that, do you?

MR. NEARY: I wonder, Your Honour -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - for the twenty-fourth time, could I have order? That is twenty-four times now Your Honour has asked for order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: No more cocky talk about 'the offshore is ours'.

MR. TULK: You are some glad.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not glad, I am rather sad. We could have had a deal. We could have had -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have order?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is twenty-five times,
Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the government were running an immense bluff.

MR. TOBIN: You are gloating about it.

MR. NEARY: They ran an immense bluff. They told the people of this Province they had a strong case. They put the matter to the Newfoundland Appeals Court. Three Newfoundland judges were unanimous in their decision.

MR. TOBIN: And you are unanimous in your decision too.

MR. NEARY: - that the offshore belongs to Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are so happy about it.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not happy. I am sad, Mr. Speaker, because we could have had an agreement.

MR. TOBIN: Did you read the Mifflin Report?

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that when the hon. gentleman the other day gave an order to have the oil rigs come ashore, the drilling companies thumbed their nose at him, they realized that the hon. gentleman had no authority. The hon. gentleman was stripped of his authority by the Newfoundland Appeals Court.

MR. TOBIN: The oil rigs would be in Marystown today only for the Liberals.

MR. NEARY: The Iron Ore Company of Canada showed they had no respect for the administration when they made their decision to have further layoffs in Labrador City. Mobil has no respect for the administration, Mr. Speaker.

March 15, 1983

Tape no. 351

NM - 3

MR. TOBIN:
on the Grand Banks?

Why do you think Mobil are

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now the hon. gentleman does not know where the oil rigs are. It reminds me of the song, "Where have all the oil rigs gone? Chretien took them every one. When will they ever learn?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now they are sitting over there day in and day out, Mr. Speaker, wondering where the oil rigs are gone. Are they still on the high seas? Are they headed for Nova Scotia? Are they headed for Mulgrave or are they headed for Halifax? The hon. gentleman does not know.

MR. MARSHALL: Why do you not ask your buddies?

MR. NEARY: Why do I not ask my buddies, Mr. Speaker? I happen to be a member of the Newfoundland Legislature like my colleagues, elected in an electoral district in this Province to serve in this House and, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the minister responsible, the minister without portfolio, where the rigs are gone. 'Where have all the rigs gone?' I say to him. He says, 'I do not know where they are gone.'

MR. TOBIN: I can tell you where they are.

MR. NEARY: Well, I know one thing; they are not down in Marystown where they should be.

MR. TOBIN: Because of the Liberals they are not down there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the member who represents Marystown Shipyard tonight take to the air waves in Marystown, will he take to the air waves again tonight and apologize to his constituents and say, 'I am sorry for the statement I made the other day. It was not true'? The rigs would be in Marystown today -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. NEARY:

That is twenty-eight times.

The rigs would be in Marystown

today -

MR. TOBIN:

Except for you and a few more

of your colleagues.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Twenty-seven.

The rigs would be in Marystown

today and in Newfoundland waters except for the administration.

Mr. Speaker, one thing the

Newfoundland Appeals Court established.

MR. TOBIN:

You are foolish. You are childish.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, could I have

silence, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Twenty-eight times.

Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland

Appeals Court established a three mile limit around

Newfoundland. They conceded that Newfoundland had control

three miles out from our coast. Mr. Speaker, I have heard

rumours to the effect

MR. NEARY: I have heard rumours, and the rumours are rampant in this Province, that the reason Mobil will not bring their rigs into Marystown -

MR. TOBIN: Because Chretien will not permit it.

MR. NEARY: Oh, is that so, Mr. Speaker?

The reason they will not bring them in is because they are afraid, with the policy of this administration going off their rocker as they do, declaring Days of Mourning, putting Newfoundland's case before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, that kind of rash decision -

MR. TOBIN: You are a dope!

MR. NEARY: - off-the-rocker policies, Mobil are afraid to bring their rigs inside the three mile limit.

MR. TULK: Why?

MR. NEARY: Why? Because they are afraid that the Premier and the minister responsible may go off their rockers and have the rigs arrested.

MR. TOBIN: I can tell you who conceived that story.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that rumour, by the way, was repeated by their policy advisor. It reached our ears from their policy advisor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as I say, that may or may not be true. But there is certainly speculation to indicate that the administration, to get their revenge, Mr. Speaker, and to hit back at Mobil for thumbing their noses at them, for making them look like school boys, for while they are in this House yap, yap, yapping every day, the drills were still turning.

MR. BAIRD: I heard a rumour you were vaccinated with a gramophone needle. Is that right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And the day, Mr. Speaker, they sent the minister into the House, he was suppose to remain cool that day, he was told by his advisors, 'Be cool now and take the high ground'.

MR. TULK: That is right!

MR. NEARY: He was doing great until I got up and asked him, Could you tell us where the rigs are going? Then he lost his cool, he went berserk, he squirted more venmon and poison at Mr. Chretien in Ottawa, but he did not answer my question. It was a little innocent question, a simple little innocent question asked by me as a result of a Ministerial Statement made by the hon. gentleman. He was the one who brought it up, I did not bring it up, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman brought it up..

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I said, that is fine. You talked to Mr. Mason of Mobil on the phone, the rigs are coming in, and the obvious question that was leaping out to be asked, the obvious question was, 'Well fine, that is great now, we are all glad to hear they are coming in, but would you tell us where they are going? If we could only have a replay in this House! The hon. gentleman just went off of his rocker

MR. NEARY: and made all kinds of accusations and then when he went out -

MR. TULK: And the policy advisor said that he was not supposed to do that.

MR. NEARY: That is right. His policy advisor, having told him to keep his cool and keep the high ground, then said to him, 'Look, you were not supposed to do that. You know, how come you behaved like that? 'Neary' was not supposed to ask you that question and you were not supposed to lose your cool.'

So I were the member representing Marystown Shipyard workers, I believe I would go to my constituents on bended knee and I would say, 'Please forgive me for supporting an administration that has created such a bad atmosphere, has created such bad blood' -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have order for the twenty-ninth time -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - twenty-nine trying for thirty? Mr. Speaker, this administration has created -

MR. TOBIN: You supported Chretien and you will never be forgiven in Marystown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this administration with their off-the-rocker policies have driven industry away from this Province. They have created bad blood between themselves and the oil companies and Nova Scotia and Quebec

MR. NEARY: and Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder then that the question is being asked, 'Should we take a chance on bringing our oil rigs into Marystown?' And that is the question.

MR. TOBIN: Oh, come on, boy! Why should they not go to Marystown? Give it up, will you?

MR. NEARY: They should. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is thirty-one times, Mr. Speaker. I believe it is time to name that member. What I am saying is that the rigs should go to Marystown, but is it any wonder that because of the attitude and the off-the-rocker policy of this administration that the question is being asked, 'Should we take a chance on bringing our rigs inside the three mile limit and have them seized and arrested by an off-the-rocker administration?'

MR. CARTER: Very weak that.

MR. MORGAN: What a clown.

MR. TULK: He is quoting the policy advisor.

MR. NEARY: I am quoting the policy advisor. Mr. Speaker, as a result of their errors and blunders and their failures, what happened now in the Throne Speech that we heard last week - and this is the closest the administration has come to eating crow, to eating their own words, Mr. Speaker - 'Newfoundlands' and Labradorians' long march to prosperity is once again frustrated. A painful journey is ahead of us and without the certainty of success'.

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, this is another oversight in that sentence as well. That sentence says, 'A painful journey is ahead of us'.

MR. S. NEARY: I say the underlying paragraph left out is that the painful hourney is behind us as well.

And so, Mr. Speaker, on that note I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. J. MORGAN: What? It is only five minutes to six.

MR. NEARY: Well, do you want me to carry on? The Speaker will have to leave the Chair and come back at eight o'clock tonight.

MR. MOGAN: It is not six o'clock.

MR. NEARY: Well, I just moved the adjournment, and if the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) does not like it - you are not the House Leader, you know -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

It is noted that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has adjourned the debate.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: We could not be more delighted to have him adjourn the debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock. I do now leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow, Wednesday.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

March 15, 1983

ORDER PAPER 4/83 MARCH 10, 1983

QUESTION NO. 9 BY M.H.A. FOR TERRA NOVA (MR. LUSH)

QUESTION: DETAILS IN CONNECTION WITH THE TOTAL COST
OF INSTALLING A NEW SOUND SYSTEM AND RECORDING
SYSTEM IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

ANSWER: TENDERS FOR THE PROJECT WERE CALLED BY PUBLIC
TENDER, ADVERTISED IN THE NEWSPAPERS, DURING
JANUARY 1982. TENDERS CLOSED ON JANUARY 27, 1982.

AS A RESULT OF THE PUBLIC TENDER CALL, FOUR
TENDERS WERE RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS:

G. R. SQUIRES LIMITED	\$71,000.00
EMBERLEY ELECTRIC LIMITED	74,994.00
DINN & KENNEL ELECTRICAL/ MECHANICAL CONSTRUCTION	91,980.00
EMT ELECTRIC LIMITED	102,000.00

TENDERS WERE AWARDED TO THE LOW BIDDER -
G. R. SQUIRES LIMITED ON FEBRUARY 2, 1982.

Vol. 2

No. 7

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
MARCH 15, 1983
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement in relation to the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station. And I would like to report to the House that the hon. the Premier had occasion to send another communication to the Prime Minister today and I would like to read the contents of this telex.

It reads as follows: "To the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau: I have not to date received any reply to my Telexes on the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station. My latest Telex of March 11th indicated that the Province would be willing to operate the Station if the assets were turned over to us for a nominal sum. While I have not received a reply to that proposal, a press report in this morning's St. John's Daily News states you have turned it down.

"The Province feels that the continued operation and upgrading of the Shoe Cove Satellite Station is vital to research and development in the fishery, in offshore oil and gas exploration and development, and in the provision of valuable information relative to our on-land resources.

"In addition, the Province wishes to use this facility in educational matters, to train Newfoundlanders and Labradorians into the new technology needed to develop our Province. The replacement station

MR. MARSHALL: in Manitoba does not cover our area, and therefore the valuable work provided through such a facility to obtain valuable information in the fishery, off-shore oil and gas and on-land resources is no longer possible. The educational benefits would also be lost.

"For these reasons the Government of Newfoundland has made a number of proposals to you. In the first proposal, we proposed that both governments share in the operational cost of the Station, given that one of the reasons for its removal was budgetary. In the second proposal, because there was no answer to the first one, we proposed that the provincial government would be prepared to pay the full operational costs of the Station. We feel so strongly about this matter that the Government of Newfoundland is prepared to even go further. We are prepared to purchase the Shoe Cove Station outright. Will you now halt the dismantling of this facility until details for the purchase can be worked out with your appropriate department?"

"There can be no reason why you cannot agree with this proposal. You will thereby receive the money you need to go ahead with the Manitoba facility.

"I look forward to your agreement to this fair and reasonable proposal."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the next in the line of communications with respect to the satellite station, a communication that was forwarded by the Premier of this Province to the Prime Minister about a matter of great concern to this Province. And I would draw to the attention of the House the fact that, in accordance with the usual spirit of the way federal/provincial relations are carried on nowadays,

MR. MARSHALL: that the Premier has not yet received a response from the Prime Minister but has only received a response through The Daily News.

Now this is a very important facility for reasons that the hon. the Premier outlined in his more detailed statement before he went to Ottawa. It is imperative that it be preserved for the use of the people of this Province. It is noted that the station itself was constructed by the Americans and subsequently handed over by the Americans to the Canadians, it is rather unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the government in Ottawa, the Canadian Government, cannot hand it over to one of its constituent provinces, that is Newfoundland, which needs it so badly.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour, as I did the other day, that they are bringing in these Telexes and statements disguised as Ministerial Statements when in actual fact they are not Ministerial Statements. A Ministerial Statement must convey information and must not be argumentative. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that that Telex just read by the hon. gentleman could be the subject of an ongoing debate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we are starting out this week as we did last week, because I think the hon. members on the opposite side realize that they are losing the battle, that they are flogging a dead horse, that the satellite station is not a major political issue in this Province. I think they are beginning to realize that, that people are beginning to see that this is a red herring to distract from the real issues in this Province and the ongoing battle with Ottawa is not getting us anywhere, that people are getting fed up and they want to hear plans from this administration on what they propose to do about the real problems in this Province. The satellite station is not one of the real problems.

MR. NEARY: Now the hon. gentleman is saying they merely want to keep it for training purposes. They are softening their position considerably, Mr. Speaker, because I think they have realized that they acted on the spur of the moment, the Premier did, as he did with the Day of Mourning, as he did when he put the Newfoundland offshore case before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, acting on the spur of the moment, off the rocker type of politics and thinking that is not getting us anywhere in this Province, Mr. Speaker. So I hope that that is the end of this now, we will hear no more about it for the rest of this week, that the hon. gentleman will come in tomorrow and give us a statement on the fisheries, and then the next day a statement on the forestry, and then the next day a statement on unemployment, especially unemployment amongst young people, and then the next day the hon. gentleman will come in and talk about one industry towns.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is interesting as he always is, Mr. Speaker, but he also happens to be out of order as well. I mean, the hon. gentleman is debating a statement and he is not commenting on the text of the statement itself.

MR. NEARY: There is nothing in it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition was straying somewhat from the relevancy of the Ministerial Statement, but at the same time his time has expired.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. HODDER: Sir, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). As the minister is aware, National Sea has ceased operations at the Picadilly fish plant, which has thrown some 80 people out of work. In view of the fact that this is the only processing facility in the area - as a matter of fact it is the only industry in the area, and, of course, the minister realizes we have some 75 per cent unemployment in that particular district - could the minister tell me what he plans to do about the situation?

MR. TULK: No! He will refer that to his colleague, Mr. De Bane.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked a very serious question and I want it to be answered in a very serious manner without interruptions from the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, when any company decides to close down its operations in any part of the Province, of course, it is of major concern to the Department of Fisheries and, in this case, to the minister and the member for the area. In talking with National Sea, we called them in and they did discuss with us why they were not going to operate that plant. And they put in writing, upon my request, as well why they were not going to operate the plant this coming year. And, of course, by the fact the plant is owned by the Newfoundland government, we do indeed have some leverage. So I can inform the hon. gentleman that there will be no ifs, ands

MR.MORGAN: or but as far as we are concerned. I intend to cancel the licenses of all species. If they want to play a little game and just process certain species and buy a lucrative species and take it away from the community, that is not going to apply with us and myself as the minister. If they do not want to buy all the species from the fishermen that the fishermen catch in the area, they will buy none, just buy none, that is all. The plant is there and the plant is leased by the Newfoundland Department of Fisheries to the company, National Sea, and we will cancel that lease as well. So we will cancel the lease, we will cancel the licenses and then, in co-ordination with the member for the area and the fishermen's committee and the local development association, we hope to find somebody else who indeed will go in and buy the fish and will also process in the plant that we own.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR.HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to go along with the minister when he says that he will

MR. HODDER: not grant them either lobster or herring licences because my understanding is that the company has sort of indicated that they would like to go in for the lucrative species but to leave the fishermen alone and not to take the groundfish. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say here that I think that the actions of National Sea is immoral, particularly in light of the fact that they left it until just at the beginning of the season. The season is just about to start there now and I believe that they did it so that perhaps they would be able to still get the more lucrative species, which are lobster and the herring.

But I should point out that some of the fishermen have already started fishing and with seasonal weather on the West Coast as it is, the season should be in full swing in the next couple of weeks. Can the minister suggest some way to ensure that the fishermen themselves, outside of the plant workers, the fishermen themselves will have a market or a buyer for their fish?

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

MR. MORGAN: Of course, as mentioned in the preamble to the question, the existing company still wants to buy from fishermen some of the species, and we have to make a decision with regard to what effect it would have on the fishermen by saying to that same company, 'If you do not want to buy all the species, you do not buy any.' But we are inclined to go that route, as I just mentioned.

But I am confident that we will be able to find markets for the fishermen and I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that we will also be successful in finding an operator for that plant. Because there are a number of companies, as I think that hon. gentlemen are aware, in the Western part of the

MR. MORGAN: Province who are indeed looking for more fish, looking for a greater supply of fish. We will be contacting these companies. I am hoping the local initiative through the fishermen's committees and the Development Association will follow up as well to contact these other companies and say, 'Here is a chance for you to move in and take over a plant and we will give you the licences despite the fact there is a freeze on all licences in the Province.' If National Sea are not going to operate they are not going to hold the licence, it is as simple as that. So will cancel their licences and I am confident we will find in this case the two aspects, buyers of the products that had not been processed in Piccadilly, but more importantly in this case regarding the plant in finding someone to go in and take over the lease from National Sea, to take over in this case - not take over, but they will be issued new licences for the process and I think we will probably be successful in attracting some of the existing companies now operating in the Province to the Western part of the Province.

MR. J. HODDER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important one.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: In light of the fact that the government owns this plant, I would just like to ask the minister is there any possibility, with such an early startup time, and due to the fact that the expertise of running that plant is there in place, would the minister consider perhaps that the provincial government might open the plant for the interim to ensure that those eighty plant workers would get employment? I know the minister operates a couple of plants on the Labrador Coast. Would the minister consider, in the short term, operating that plant, because we are talking about two weeks?

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, we are very reluctant in getting involved in operations of plants ourselves and the only exception now is the plants we have in Labrador. In fact, we are making efforts now to divest ourselves of those plants as well. We are of the opinion that it is not the role of government to be in the fishing industry with regards to operating and running plants, in the processing end, or in fact operating and running trawlers in the harvesting end. What I will assure the hon. gentleman on behalf of his constituents is that we will leave no stone unturned in finding someone to move into that plant as quickly as possible. In fact, as of this past Thursday, when the notification was given us in writing by National Sea, I have already assigned people in the Department of Fisheries, some of the officials, to get moving on taking

MR. J. MORGAN: the necessary steps to find someone else to move in and take over the plant from National Sea and to arrange to take away the licence that is now being held by that company, National Sea.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board (Dr. J. Collins) and it is concerning one of the largest and most important groups of government employees, namely the teachers. I want to ask the minister what is the status of the present contract dispute between the government and the teachers - I was going to say negotiations, Mr. Speaker, but there are no negotiations - and I am just wondering whether the minister is attempting to get both sides together or whether they are going to carry on negotiating with the teachers in the same way that the government negotiates with everybody else, by press conferences and by Telex and other forms, Mr. Speaker, not compatible with good, sound, sensible negotiations.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is reading different newspapers than I am reading. My reading tells me that it is the NTA that has statements and presentations and accusations and pictures and so

DR. COLLINS:

on and so forth. We have been extremely modest and sparing in the amounts of coverage we give to the media. We just give them the facts as they arise. We are not taking on the NTA in terms of any campaign or whatever. I am a little bit surprised that the hon. member thinks that we are doing so when it seems to be in the reverse direction.

As far as the negotiations are going at the present time, we put a new item forward-or put an item forward, it is not a new item- we put an item forward for their consideration and we are expecting to hear back from the NTA hopefully quite soon. But I think the next move is up to them in regards to that item.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I refer to the Ministerial Statement made by the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) on March 8. There are two things about that statement that I find strange and find funny, for the want of better descriptive words, and I will refer to one of these items first. The statement started off with, "I am pleased to reaffirm government's commitment to lower the pupil/teacher ratio for the next school year to twenty-three to one". Now it is my understanding that this was one of the controversial issues in the contract and this statement came out just a day or so before the teachers were to vote on their contract. That is a little strange indeed that the statement came out just a couple of days before the teachers were to vote on their contract.

But I understand that this, as I said before, was one of the controversial points, the one of lowering the pupil/teacher ratio. And it is my understanding that the government would not initial that part of the contract. Yet through a public announcement here in the House the minister said that the government were now

MR. LUSH: going to honour that commitment that they made sometime in 1981. The question, Sir, is in view of the fact that the government would not initial this item in their contract previously, can we take it now that the government are indeed committed to lowering the pupil/teacher ratio in the Province? And is it now negotiated or is it now initialled by both sides, this major item that the government previously would not initial?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, my relationships with the NTA is over collective bargaining in my role as President of the Treasury Board. I do not have any responsibility for matters in education per se and the pupil/teacher ratio is an educational matter. The pupil/teacher ratio was never in the collective bargaining agreement or contract.

Now hon. members opposite
have very strange

DR. COLLINS:

ideas sometimes and this is because they do not understand issues and they do not listen to explanations. The pupil/teacher ratio has nothing to do with the collective bargaining agreement. It was never in the contract. The NTA would like, I am sure, to have it in the contract. Our position was that we do not consider this part of a collective bargaining instrument. That was our position all along and it is still as far as we are concerned; it is not a collective bargaining matter.

Now if the hon. member wishes to go into the issue of pupil/teacher ratio, I am afraid I would have to suggest he direct his question to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated that he does not know what the major issues are with respect to negotiating with the teachers because this, certainly, was the major controversial issue, the one of lowering the pupil/teacher ratio. And I say again that the government, in contract negotiations, would not initial that item of the contract.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in announcing that they had intended to keep their commitment, not at the bargaining table but outside, here in this House, on top of that the government took four measures, four steps, to reduce costs. The one I want to ask the minister about is the fourth measure, which was the one to reduce spending on salaries for substitute teachers. Now it is my understanding that both parties had initialled this particular item.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, here we had in the one instance one that the government would not initial, and now here in this House they changed the contract, one might say. They came out and said that they were going to reduce spending for substitute teachers in an item that both sides had initialled. Quite irregular, Mr. Speaker, quite a strange thing to do with respect to collective bargaining.

So, Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister now is what has this particular measure done to the teachers' contract? Does this mean now that the contract is null and void because the government changed an item which both sides had initialled?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I should explain the process there. There is a contract in effect with the NTA at the present time. It was negotiated something like two and a half years or three years ago, whatever that was. Now the term of that contract should have been up last August, and we have been endeavouring to put into place a new contract with the NTA ever since the old one was due to expire. That new contract has not

DR. COLLINS:

been put in place. There is no new contract. Until such time as a new contract goes in place, the old contract persists. In the old contracts there is nothing about pupil/teacher ratio. In our position in the new contract, there will be nothing about the pupil/teacher issue because it has nothing to do with collective bargaining. It is purely an educational matter. It has no place and, in government's view, it never will have a place in the collective bargaining end because it is not a collective bargaining point. So that is one thing I just want to make clear.

Flowing out of what I have said, that there is no new contract signed with the NTA, this means that any items that will go into a proposed new contract are open for negotiation. Now I think what the hon. member is saying is that because one issue was tentatively looked at, and some tentative decisions made about it at one stage, that nothing can be done on that item any longer. I have to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member that there are quite a number of issues that come up that are tentatively discussed and some decision made about them and they do come up again. One in particular; for instance, the NTA wish to have a new contract with a term of one year on it and, of course, our position was that the term of the contract should be two years. So the NTA subsequently took their issue off the table, their one year issue off the table, and then they put back another one, they put back a nineteen month contract. We said, no, we want the two year contract. I do not know whether they are going to take this nineteen month contract off now and put it back again, so there are issues that go on the table, that

DR. COLLINS: come off the table, they can go back on again and so on and so forth. As far as initialling goes, I have initialled nothing. It is my responsibility to put my name on behalf of government to whatever is finally agreed to. I have initialled nothing, I have signed nothing and I will not do so until we have come up with a contract that is mutually acceptable and agreeable to both sides.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister is just skating around the question. The question is a simple one, Mr. Speaker. The NTA are saying, and they have said publicly, that this part of the contract, this item in the contract dealing with substitute teachers, was initialled by both sides. The question to the minister is very simple: Was this initialled by both sides or not? It did not have to be the minister's initial, it could have been his negotiator's. So the question is simple, Mr. Speaker: Was this item initialled or not by both sides,

MR. LUSH: by the government and by the NTA?
because the NTA has said publicly that it was an issue.
So the question is simple, Mr. Speaker, yes or no.

MR. TULK: You can answer in one word, yes or no.

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

DR. COLLINS: The hon. gentleman wishes me to answer
yes or no and I suppose if he wants me to answer yes or no
I will answer yes or no. What the hon. member is asking
as far as I am concerned is totally irrelevant. There is no
contract in place until it is accepted by government, and
government signs the contract, or at least I sign the
contract on behalf of government.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman
saying in answer to my colleague that certain clauses are
not initialled by both sides when they come to an agreement,
when they are working for an overall agreement, that clauses
are not initialled by the minister or anybody on the
government's negotiating team? Is that what the hon. gentleman
is saying, that none of these clauses had been initialled by
anybody?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: No.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman saying that
clauses have been initialled by both sides and gotten off
the table? Is the hon. gentleman saying that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: No.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman care to tell the House what it is he is saying?

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

DR. COLLINS: What I am saying is that on behalf of government I have not signed and entered into a new contract with the NTA.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the NTA are on record as saying that with respect to this Ministerial Statement, one, the government came up with an issue which they would not initial during the negotiations when they were at the bargaining table. In addition to that, they say they have changed an article. Now the minister is saying that there is nothing signed, there is no initialling on anything. So will the minister say now, can the minister indicate to the House whether all of the points negotiated by the NTA up to this point in time, whether all the things that they have dealt with, whether all these things are now open, all of them now are open to change? Can the minister indicate that? If there is nothing, everything now is all open to change, all of the things that they have agreed to up to this point in time since they have been negotiating some time back in August up to this point in time when the government broke off negotiations and started negotiating by press conference, does this mean now that everything is all open, there is nothing agreed to?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I can only speak for the government side, and we have no intention of opening

DR. COLLINS:

many items that we have no concern about. I cannot speak for the NTA, I do not know if they want to open things, close things or not. They undoubtedly will do what they wish to do and there is nothing much I can do about it, nor anything I would want to do about it. All I can say is that there are many items that will ultimately, or should ultimately go into a new contract that we do not wish to engage in discussion over because we have no problem with it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said some time ago that in his opinion the teachers - he accused them actually of being dishonest, that they were not polling their membership to find out the feelings of their membership on these issues. Does the hon. gentleman still stand by that statement that he made publicly, accusing the teachers of being dishonest and not knowing how to handle the membership as far as the negotiations are concerned?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I will hold to any statement if I have not seen it. If the hon. member will pass over the statement I am purported to have made, I will read it and let him know if I still have the same view of it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I saw the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman on T.V. and I heard his voice myself. Well, will the hon. gentleman tell us if he was interviewed on television, whether he was asked that question and what answer he gave to the person who was interviewing him? Did not the hon. gentleman say that the teachers were not polling their membership, that they should have a vote amongst the teachers, and accusing the teachers of being dishonest? Was that not what the hon. gentleman said in effect in his television interview that he had about ten days ago on this matter?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give so many television interviews I cannot remember them all. If the hon. member will pass me over some statement I am supposed to have made and I read it, I will be able to respond to his question.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister mentioned there were only some items that he was concerned about in the contract. Now, I do not know whether he is concerned about this one with the substitute teachers or not, I do not know whose concern this is, whether it is his or whether it is the concern of the NTA, but the question is this: If the minister is only concerned about some items, does this mean now that all of the items which the government were concerned about and have initialled are now open to change, the ones with

MR. LUSH: which he is concerned and the government are concerned? Does this mean now that all of these are open to change even though they have initialled them, that the minister can open these up because they are the items which he is concerned or the government are concerned, whichever way you want to put it?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, our position in regard to a new contract is well known to the NTA. Our final position on all the points that we were concerned about was transmitted to them, I think, back in December or some time like that. But anyway, it is well known, we have reiterated our position any number of times. They are in no doubt as to what our position is. The only thing that was changed recently was the method or the way that substitute teachers had to be paid. That is the only issue that we have brought up since last December, and the NTA knows our position on all of the other points.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it certainly does not appear that the NTA is familiar with what is going on, because here we have dealt with two major items, one which the government would not initial and the one that they have initialled. So I am sure if you do that with any group in the Province they do not know where they stand.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, as a final question to the minister, with respect to the reducing of spending on the salaries for substitute teachers, I wonder if the minister can indicate whether or not the government have developed any kind of system for the reduction of the salaries, because, as the minister is aware, this whole area of substitute teaching is a complex one, an involved one, so I

MR. LUSH: am wondering whether at this point in time the government have come up with any system to inform the NTA of how this reduction is going to take place? Presently substitute teachers are paid according to their qualifications. How is it going to work now? Will they be paid according to qualifications or will it be related to time? Just how will the system work?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the member's questions are very prolix. But having said that, all I can say is that we have a position in regard to substitute teachers. We want to sit down with the NTA and discuss our position with them.

DR. J. COLLINS: We have made a formal request to them to sit down on that issue and when they agree to meeting us on that issue, we will lay out in detail what our methods are.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. the gentleman now saying, in reply to my hon. colleague, that the substitute teacher question was not the subject of prior negotiations before the minister made her Ministerial Statement here in the House and that it was not initialled by both parties? And now that the minister has made her statement unilaterally, the chief negotiator for the government is going back to the teachers to ask them now to negotiate it again after it was initialled, and after a statement made in this House by the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) now going back to the teachers again and asking to have it renegotiated? Is that the position now of Treasury Board and the negotiating team?

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that we have a position in regard to substitute teachers that we wish to discuss with the NTA and we have made that request to them and we will sit down with them and work out the details.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I find this difficult to understand what the minister is talking about with respect to whether this was a point of negotiations or whether it was initialled or not. but, as I have said again, the NTA have said publicly, they have said it over and over again,

MR. T. LESH: that this item was initialled by both sides. Let me ask the minister this: If this were the case, if both sides had initialled a particular item in a contract and then one party decides to break that, decides to doublecross one party or the other, does the minister consider this to be bargaining in bad faith, if one side or the other would break an item already initialled? Does the minister not consider this bargaining in bad faith?

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member is starting from a false premise and then he goes on to say that this is bad faith. The point of the matter is that in negotiations certain positions are arrived at, and when both sides are satisfied that they are now ready to write a contract, then someone sits down and writes up the packet. The packet then is reviewed by both sides and, if both sides are then agreeable to the language in the packet, then it

DR. COLLINS: comes for final signature and final agreement. Until such time as there is the signing of the agreement, a new agreement has not been concluded.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman now saying then that the NTA were incorrect, that they actually lied when they made public statements at news conferences and press releases that that item had been initialled earlier before the Minister of Education (Ms Verge)- if she would only stop yawning for a minute - made her statement in this hon. House? Is the hon. gentleman saying that the NTA made an incorrect statement, that they lied? Apart from the teachers being dishonest, according to the hon. gentleman, the hon. gentleman is now accusing them of being liars. Now how can the hon. gentleman reconcile these things?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is just putting words out in a sense that they are coming from my mouth. I have not made any comment on the teachers being liars. You know, this is a comment that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is making. And I hope, I sincerely hope, that someone in the press gallery does not somehow or other get the message turned around and says that the hon. Minister of Finance says teachers are liars. Please, everyone understand I am not saying the teachers are liars. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that teachers are liars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

March 15, 1983

Tape No. 310

SD - 1

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
has expired.

The time for Question Period

000

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Could I have leave to present

a report?

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. WARREN:

As long as it is a true one.

DR. COLLINS:

Thank you very much. It is a

very true report.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

This is the 1982 Annual Report

of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means to consider the raising of supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

I also give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of supply to Her Majesty.

And I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting Pension Benefits".

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Public Service Commission Act, 1973," and also ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Pippy Park Commission Act".

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Fishing Ships Bounties Act".

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I would like to present the following resolution.

WHEREAS the federal government has seen fit to dismantle the radar station at Shoe Cove, which monitored a large area of our Continental Shelf; and

WHEREAS this area is subject to sudden storms and dangerous ice conditions, especially at this time of year; and

WHEREAS there seems to be little prospect of the federal government changing their minds on this matter, and

WHEREAS there is a Russian fishing fleet nearby harvesting a generous quota of our fish and also enjoying the use of our port and repair facilities, and that they are equally concerned with climatic conditions on our Continental Shelf and must by now have a comprehensive monitoring and reporting facility set up for the safety of their own vessels;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House ask our administration to look seriously into the possibility of obtaining vital weather and ice reports on our Continental Shelf from the aforementioned Russian fleet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not know the Second World War is over.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Premier, I give notice I will on tomorrow -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Status Of Women Advisory Council Act,"

MR. MARSHALL: and I give notice that I will
on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An
Act To Amend The Leaseholds In St. John's Act".

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any other notices of
motion?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an answer to a foolish question asked by the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). The question was concerning the sound system and recording system in the House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, this was put on public tender in January, 1982 and closed on January 21, 1982.

The tender was awarded to the lowest bidder. That is it, Mr. Speaker. If they had been listening instead of reading newspapers they would have found it all out then.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other answers to questions for which notice has been given?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Regulation Of Mines Act," carried. (Bill No. 17)

On motion, Bill No. 17 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Occupational Health And Safety Act," carried. (Bill No. 16)

On motion, Bill No. 16 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977," carried. (Bill No. 15)

On motion, Bill No. 15 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Repeal Certain Obsolete And Spent Statutes," carried. (Bill No. 27)

On motion, Bill No. 27 read
a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of
Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The
Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation Act,"
carried. (Bill No. 4).

On motion, Bill No. 4 read
a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting Dentistry And Dental Surgery In The Province ," carried. (Bill No. 26).

On motion, Bill No. 26 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Pharmaceutical Association Act," carried. (Bill No. 9).

On motion, Bill No. 9 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural , Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Health) Act," carried. (Bill No. 22).

On motion, Bill No. 22 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 23)

On motion, Bill No. 23 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Co-Operative Societies Act," carried. (Bill No. 24).

March 15, 1983

Tape No. 313

ah-2

On motion, Bill No. 24
read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister
of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The
Criminal Injuries Compensation Act," carried. (Bill No.13)

On motion, Bill No. 13, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act", carried.(Bill No. 28).

On motion, Bill No. 28 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fire Prevention Act", carried.(Bill No. 12)

On motion, Bill No. 12 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Accident And Sickness Insurance Act, 1971", carried.(Bill No. 14).

On motion, Bill No. 14 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act", carried.(Bill No.10).

On motion, Bill No. 10 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Education Act", carried.(Bill No. 5).

On motion, Bill No. 5 read a first time,ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act", carried,(Bill No. 6).

On motion, Bill No. 6 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order 1, Address in Reply.

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

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, just to refresh hon. members memories as to what we are debating here, we are debating a motion of non-confidence in the administration.

MR. NEARY: If this vote is carried, why, of course, the administration would fall and the Premier would have no choice but to go down to the Governor and pass in his resignation. Then the Lieutenant-Governor would decide whether or not somebody on the other side would be invited to form a government or if somebody in the opposition would be invited to form a government, or call a Provincial general election. That is the way, Mr. Speaker, the system works. However, Mr. Speaker, there are forty-four members on that side of the House, there are only eight over here, and barring unforeseen circumstances it is very unlikely that the Motion of non-confidence will win the day. Unless the member for Mt. Scio (Mr. Barry) in his wisdom votes in favor of the motion and he can persuade a number of his colleagues on the government benches to follow his lead and vote for this motion of non-confidence in the Administration, then the motion is likely to be defeated.

The reason I singled out the hon. member for Mt. Scio is that the hon. gentleman has been very vocal in making recommendations and suggestions to the administration; the hon. gentleman has gone against the party line, has made some very worthwhile suggestions and recommendations that, if followed by the Premier and the administration, could very easily lead to a resolution of the offshore problem. And so, if the Premier and the administration continue on their course of failure, on their disaster course, then I would expect the hon. gentleman to have the courage of his convictions and vote in favor of this motion, Mr. Speaker, because the member for Mt. Scio, a former Minister of Energy, has spoken out, has vented his feelings on what he thinks the administration should do to get the offshore problem settled. The hon. gentleman in one of his statements suggested that the Premier and the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall)

MR. NEARY: should go up and camp on the doorstep of Mr. Chretien and not leave until they have an agreement. The other day the hon. gentleman was kind enough to let me have a copy of his press release and the letter that he had written to Mr. Chretien asking about the possibility of getting back to the negotiating table -

MR. LUSH: Sound advice.

MR. NEARY: Yes, very sound.

MR. WARREN: And in good faith.

MR. NEARY: - to get back to the bargaining table and try to negotiate a settlement.

Mr. Speaker, there are an awful lot of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who agree with the hon. gentleman's point of view. Now, Mr. Speaker, because the member for Mt. Scio (Mr. Barry), who sits on the government benches, is recommending that the administration attempt to negotiate a settlement on the offshore,

MR. S. NEARY: does that make the hon. gentleman any less a Newfoundlander than it does the Premier of this Province? Does that make the hon. gentleman a traitor to his country because he would like to see the offshore problems straightened out, resolved, in the best interest of Newfoundland and of Canada? Does that make the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) any less a Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, than any other member sitting on that side of the House? Well, if it does not, if the answer is, no, it does not make him a traitor, if the answer is, no, it does not make him any less a Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, then the answer would be the same for anybody on this side of the House. Because the former Minister of Energy, the member for Mount Scio, who is a very strong member of the Tory caucus, is espousing the same argument, principle that we have been putting on the table for the last several years.

MR. G. TOBIN: Why does Chretien not sign the agreement that is there? You know why? Because he has your support and a few more people like you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are three things in this world that make very strange and weird noises.

MR. TOBIN: You are one of them.

MR. NEARY: There is a goose, there is a snake and there is a fool, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he stand up and identify himself so we can put him one of these categories.

MR. TOBIN: You sit down and I will stand up and I will tell you why the agreement is not signed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is trying to live by his wits and that is why he has such a pathetic look on his face, I would say.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Mount Scio has a good point of view. It so happens that it coincides with the point of view that we have been

MR. S. NEARY: putting forward in this Province for the last several years and we welcome the hon. gentleman aboard. We have not been able to persuade the administration to negotiate an agreement on the offshore, but we hope the hon. gentleman will be able to persuade the Premier and his colleagues to get back to the negotiating table and get this matter straightened out before the whole economy of this Province collapses,

MR. NEARY: get it straightened out so the administration can go on and deal with the crisis in the fishing industry, so that the Province can deal with the problem in the pulp and paper industry and the forest industry, so that they can look at things that can be done for one-industry towns - in mining towns where the mining industry is in trouble - so that the administration can look at record unemployment in this Province, especially among young people. Mr. Speaker, 50 per cent of the unemployed in this Province -

MR. TOBIN: There is an agreement.

MR. WARREN: There is no agreement.

MR. NEARY: If I were the hon. gentleman I would not waste my time talking to the hon. gentleman over there.

MR. TOBIN: Is that right?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has problems enough of his own down in Burin. He has run away from Burin and their problems; He has run away from St. Lawrence, he has run away from Grand Bank and he can try to bluff all he wants, he can try to pawn things off on the Kirby Task Force all he wants, he can continue his bluff, but the people have his number, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: He wants to see settlements ruined.

MR. TOBIN: Do not you be caught in Marystown after your statements on Friday morning.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman took to CKCF - is it not? - in Marystown the other day and made some kind of a convoluted statement about oil rigs, and they laughed at him down there. They could not believe what they were hearing from such a buttoned-down mind, such a narrowed-minded bigoted, low-down, low class individual, They could not believe it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: You should hear what they said about you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I was the hon. gentleman I would obey the rules of this House and I would stop interrupting people who are making speeches, because all the hon. gentleman is doing is showing a further display of his arrogance and ignorance.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is correct. We hope that he can persuade the administration to do what he wants them to do. I do not expect the hon. gentleman will bolt the Party. I do not expect that the member for Mount Scio will come over and join us here, although I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, that we would be more than delighted to have him. He would be welcomed, he would get the red carpet treatment from this side of the House. And, Mr. Speaker, he would certainly make a good candidate for the leadership on either side of the House, either party. And, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that that is the reason the Premier got clear of him when he was Minister of Energy. The Premier was afraid of him. He was becoming a threat to the Premier. He was getting too much publicity. He had too much common sense for the Premier, and so the Premier had to get rid of him and he was forced to give up his Energy portfolio. But I am not trying to embarrass the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, Far be it from me

MR. NEARY: to try to get the hon. gentleman in hot water with his colleagues. I would think he is in enough hot water now with the Premier as a result of his public pronouncements about trying to get this offshore matter resolved. But there is room on this side of the House. If the hon. gentleman wanted to slide his seat over into the corner there and sit down by himself, well then I am sure that the hon. gentleman is capable of doing that. If he wanted to move his seat over across the House and join the eight of us, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would be more than welcome. But that is not the point that I am making, that is just sort of thinking out loud, an afterthought. I am sure the hon. gentleman has no intention of doing that and I am sure that the Premier and his colleagues will walk very gingerly with the hon. gentleman because they know if they lose him, if they force him to do anything drastic that, Mr. Speaker, would be the end. They are in trouble enough now. Their image has been so severely battered and bruised in the last several months that now we have the Premier telling his caucus and telling the supporters, 'Boys, do not get upset, do not get uptight. Do not do anything drastic, because the way politics works is that you are down in a valley one day and the next day you are up on top of the mountain. That is the way it works.' And the Premier is now propping up his caucus by telling them not to worry because they have three or four years to go before the next election so there is nothing to worry about. Mr. Speaker, the word coming out of the caucus these days -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have order for one second, please.

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

MR. NEARY: The word coming out of the caucus is that the Premier is telling his caucus -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I submit that you enforce the rules of the House or name the members who are continuously interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I would like to remind hon. members that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the word that is coming out of the caucus is that the Premier is trying to boost the morale of his troops by telling them, 'Do not worry, boys, We have three or four years to go and we will make all the hard decisions, we will make all the unpopular decisions, we will do all the unpopular things now and after three or four years we will open up the purse strings and start doing things and we will be alright again.'
Mr. Speaker, how cruel and callous can you get?

MR. NEARY: How cruel, Mr. Speaker, can you get when you will put politics and your party before the interests and the welfare of the people of this Province. Because that is what they are doing, Mr. Speaker. They are putting their party and they are putting politics above the interests of the ordinary people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, they are wrecking the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador. They are driving the Province to financial ruin. They have no plans for the fishery, for young people who are unemployed. They have no plans to deal with high electricity rates in this Province. They have no plans to deal with high unemployment amongst construction workers. They have no plans to do anything, Mr. Speaker, they are only interested in one thing, and that one thing is to play political games, is to play politics, and put their party and the National Tory Party Leadership before the people of this Province, before the welfare recipients, before the sick, before the unemployed.

MR. TULK: Before the fish plants.

MR. NEARY: Before the fish plants, and I will be dealing with that shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the sealers.

MR. NEARY: They are putting politics and their own party before everything else in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and that is callous and cruel and is only likely to lead to disaster in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it might be worthwhile, before I get away from the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) and his most recent suggestions about negotiating an agreement on the offshore, it might be well -

MR. TULK: Then the Premier comes in and says he did not have all the facts.

MR. NEARY: That is right. The Premier said he did not have the facts. The hon. gentleman only happened to be Minister of Energy in this Province at the most crucial time, by the way, in our history. And the hon. Premier says the member for Mount Scio does not have all the facts.

Now, before I get away from the matter of the offshore and negotiations, perhaps it might be well to review the situation, to review just in case somebody listening to me has forgotten the sequence of events, have forgotten -

MR. BAIRD: There is nobody listening to you, boy. There is nobody listening to you.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker, just in case -

MR. TULK: He just got up then.

MR. NEARY: - somebody listening has forgotten the scenario, that somebody has forgotten what transpired in the last few years in this Province, in case there is somebody let me refresh their memories.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all the administration, led by the Premier, took the position a few years ago in this House, when he was Minister of Energy, that there would be no negotiations at all, that the provincial government would not sit down to a bargaining table with anybody, Ottawa or anybody else, unless they conceded that Newfoundland owned the offshore.

MR. TULK: Total ownership.

MR. NEARY: Total ownership. That was the condition under which the present Premier and the administration would go to the bargaining table: If Ottawa would not concede that the Province owned the offshore in total and had total control, that there would be no negotiations. Well they did a flip flop on that, Mr. Speaker. August 1980 they did a complete reversal on that and then they started talking the way that we have been talking on this side of the House. They said, 'Well, maybe we will sit down and bargain if the ownership question is set aside forever.' Now, remember what they said first; they said, 'Total ownership or no talk.' Now they are saying in August 1980, 'Let us sit down and talk, but put the ownership question aside forever, indefinitely.' Then, Mr. Speaker, what was the next episode that happened in this sad history of events on the offshore? Well, let me tell the House, Mr. Speaker, something that I have never told the House before, that the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) no doubt can confirm, and it is this; that a dispute arose in this Province over who had the jurisdiction on the offshore service vessels as far as the unions were concerned. Mr. Crosbie, in cahoots with the present Minister of Labour and Manpower, said, Mr. Speaker, that he would not recognize the Seafarer's International Union, even though the Seafarer's International Union had jurisdiction all over North America,

MR. S. NEARY: as far as workers on ships and service vessels were concerned, Mr. Crosbie dug in his heels in and said, 'We are not recognizing the SIU', and he was aided and abetted by the present Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn). Do you know why he was aided and abetted by the present Minister of Labour and Manpower? Well, I will tell the hon. gentlemen. Because there would be union hall hiring. The hiring would be done in the union hall and the hon. gentleman would not be able to have his fingers into the hiring. He was arguing that the local preference could not be enforced because the SIU had written into their contract, union hall hiring. And so between the jigs and the reels they got Crosbie to take a firm stand, Crosbie's Offshore, and Crosbie's Offshore invited the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Clerks in to

MR. NEARY: organize the workers on these service vessels. In other words, the company union, The company invited the union in.

MR. DINN: You heard that from John, did you? You get most of your information from John.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not get it from the President of the Newfoundland Telephone Company, I can tell the hon. gentleman that. I am not on the payroll of the telephone company.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the SIU were blocked. Every turn they were blocked by the hon. gentleman who was rude and insulted the international representative of the SIU, in his office, was very insulting and rude. And as a result - Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go into any more details about that because I think I have made the point. As a result a vote was taken on a number of occasions amongst the workers on the offshore vessels as to who should represent the workers and, Mr. Speaker, would you believe that the ballots were put in a box and never counted? The ballots were never counted.

MR. TULK: Sure, that is typical of this crowd.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the ballots were there for over a year before the matter went to the federal courts.

MR. DINN: Why did they go federal?

MR. NEARY: That is the point. That is exactly the point, Sir. I am coming to that.

MR. DINN: Very good.

MR. NEARY: If you like, Mr. Speaker, you can almost point the finger at Crosbie's Offshore and

MR. NEARY:

the Minister of Manpower
(Mr. Dinn) for forcing - not almost, you can blame. If
there is any blame you can point the finger at the Minister
of Manpower and at Crosbie's Offshore for forcing the
SIU to take the matter to the Supreme Court to ask for
a determination, an opinion as to who owned the jurisdiction,
whether it was federal or provincial.

MR. DINN:

That is right.

MR. NEARY: Now, the hon. gentleman says that is right. Well, now, who was it who forced the SIU to do that? Mr. Speaker, I can tell you without fear of contradiction, and I have documentation to prove it, that the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, was one of the instigators, that the SIU tried every avenue, explored every avenue to make their peace with the hon. gentleman. They appeared before the Labour Relations Board time and time again. I cannot say whether the hon. gentleman influenced the decision of the Labour Relations Board, I would not go as far as to say that, but, Mr. Speaker, according to the documentation that we tabled in this House before I would not be at all surprised but the hon. gentleman had a hand in that decision.

So here we are now, Mr. Speaker, with Crosbie's Offshore and the minister in the same bed together fighting the SIU. And what would you expect the SIU to do? Fight back. And they fought back with the only tool, the only weapon they had. They argued that the workers on the offshore vessels, because they were in international waters on ships, did not come under provincial jurisdiction. And so they took the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. HODDER: And that is where she started.

MR. NEARY: And that is where it started, Mr. Speaker. That is where the trouble started.

Mr. Speaker, the SIU were only asking the Supreme Court to express an opinion as to whose jurisdiction this was as far as the union was concerned. Was it federal jurisdiction? Did it come under the Federal Labour Department, or did it come under the Provincial Labour Department?

MR. NEARY: And when they put that before the court a reference was made by the Government of Canada as to the ownership and as to the jurisdiction. And, Mr. Speaker, to this day this administration have stated publicly that the Government of Canada, the Minister of Justice, could have ignored that reference to the court by the SIU. Mr. Speaker, that is untrue, that is incorrect. The Government of Canada could not ignore it. When a jurisdictional problem arises anywhere in Canada, it does not make any difference where it is, the Government of Canada, the Minister of Justice in Canada has to be notified. And he was notified about the jurisdictional dispute over the workers on the service vessels and the Government of Canada intervened.

And then what happened, Mr. Speaker? After starting up negotiations with the Federal Department of Energy, the Provincial Government immediately broke off negotiations, back in October, 1982-or 1981 rather. That was October, 1981. They broke off negotiations, this administration, because their feelings were hurt, they were upset.

MR. NEARY: Now, remember, they had been telling us about the strong case they had.

MR. TULK: Do you know what Cabot says about him sometimes?

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. TULK: Cabot says that sometimes the Minister without Portfolio over there acts without thinking.

MR. NEARY: They act without thinking. Well, he certainly acted without thinking in this case. Well, let me get the facts on the record. They broke off negotiations in October, 1981. They squirted their poison at Ottawa, they played their little political games. And then what happened in February, 1982? What happened, Mr. Speaker, in February, 1982? The administration put the ownership question before the Newfoundland Appeals Court. According to their advisors they thought that the decision of the Newfoundland court would be in their favour. Some how or other they felt because you had three Newfoundland judges sitting on the Bench, that they would forget the law and they would let their hearts influence their decision; they would let the Premier's emotional issues sway them, persuade them - their patriotism, they would let that push the rule of law into the background and they would decide in Newfoundland's favour. Well, what a kick in the rear they got, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: Look at the money that case cost them.

MR. NEARY: And look at the money it cost them. Oh, I will come to that when I am talking about other things.

So, Mr. Speaker, they put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, the very first government - it was not the federal government, it was not Mr. Lalonde or Mr. Chretien, it was this administration

MR. NEARY: that put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court and asked for a ruling as to who owned the offshore. Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened to the SIU case that was going on up in Ottawa? Well, you know what happened, Mr. Speaker, Just in case Your Honour has forgotten, the Supreme Court of Ontario kicked out the federal government's intervention. They said to the federal government, 'You have no right to intervene in this case. This is a matter involving the SIU and, therefore, you have no right to intervene in it.' So they kicked out their intervention and ruled in favour of the SIU.

MR. TULK: They never thought that might happen either.

MR. NEARY: They never thought that would ever happen either, but that is exactly what happened. That is all a matter of history.

MR. MARSHALL: You are right happy are you not?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not right happy, I am rather sad.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: I am coming to the hon. gentleman. I have a few minutes left yet.

Mr. Speaker, so the Supreme Court of Ontario said no to the Government of Canada, you should not have intervened, you do not have a case. So the SIU won their case and the federal government's intervention was kicked out. Now, Mr. Speaker, did this government, this administration then go to the Newfoundland Appeals Court and withdraw their case? Did they? No, they did not. They let it continue on, thinking in their hearts and in their minds that they were going to win.

MR. NEARY: And what happened, Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago? Three Newfoundland judges, all born and bred in this Province, Newfoundlanders, were unanimous in their decision that the offshore belonged to Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they can talk all they want over there about the Upper Churchill Falls contract. The Upper Churchill Falls contract is only for sixty-five years.

MR. MARSHALL: A giveaway.

MR. NEARY: A giveaway, they say. Well, who gave away our treasure offshore? Who put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court and gambled with our future, the only opportunity we had left for full prosperity in this Province? Who was it that did that? Whose name will go down in the history books in this Province as making the greatest, the most colossal blunder in Newfoundland's 500 year history? Will it be Mr. Smallwood? Will it be Mr. Trudeau?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, it will be the present Premier of this Province.

MR. TULK: A. Brian Peckford.

MR. NEARY: A. Brian's name will go into the history books as the man who gambled and lost - and is still gambling. The hon. gentleman, when he lost with a whole string of failures behind him, one failure after another, you would almost need an adding machine to add up the failures that he has had. He cannot point to one success in this Province, not one success, one failure after another - waves his arms and his legs and his tongue after the court case and says, 'We are going to continue to fight for Newfoundland. We are going to continue to

MR. NEARY: fight, even though,' he says, 'I know the risk, the political risk. But I am prepared to gamble. I am prepared to take my chances and the political risks. I have failed. I cannot now go out and try to negotiate an agreement that I should have been doing all along.'

MR. TULK: He did not talk about the economic risk, did he?

MR. NEARY: No, he did not talk about the risks. And then, Mr. Speaker, he says, 'I cannot sleep. I cannot sleep at night.'

MR. TULK: Is that what he said?

MR. NEARY: Yes. When the rigs were out there - after the court case, when they took this decision to bring the rigs ashore, they issued an order to bring the rigs ashore even though they had been stripped of their authority a couple of weeks before that by the Newfoundland court; they had no authority left - the Newfoundland court said the ownership belongs to Ottawa, the people of Canada - they then took a unilateral decision to order the rigs in even though they had approved, in November, of Winter drilling.

MR. TULK: They forgot about the telephone.

MR. NEARY: They forgot they had approved Winter drilling.

MR. TULK: They forgot about the invention of the telephone.

MR. NEARY: That is right. And they forgot about all the telexes. We have telexes here every day.

MR. TULK: Who is it says, 'War by Telex'?

MR. NEARY: This is a new weapon they have in this Province now, telexes. They forgot all about that and took a unilateral decision, and then the Premier said he could not sleep at night.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say the reason he could not sleep at night had nothing to do with offshore. But when he thought about welfare recipients in this Province, the way that they have had the screws put to them by the administration, the ordinary people who are unemployed at the present time through no fault of their own, the unwed mothers, the crippled, the halt and the lame and the blind, the screws put to them by the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), no wonder he could not sleep at night. And then when he thinks about all the unemployed that are out there, and I am not talking about your ordinary construction worker who is seasonal, I am talking now about middle-class people, ordinary Newfoundlanders unemployed today, because the unemployment has gone heavily into the middle-class people, people who were never unemployed in their lives. No wonder he cannot sleep at night, thinking about all the poor children that are going to school in this Province ill-clad and poorly fed as a result of the failures and the disaster course that this administration has been on in the last several years, the ego trip, Mr. Speaker. No wonder he cannot sleep at night, when he thinks of 750 being laid off in Corner Brook, No wonder the hon. gentleman cannot sleep at night, when he thinks of all the unemployment in Labrador West, Wabush and Labrador City, No wonder he cannot sleep, when he has ignored the situation in Buchans and Happy Valley/Goose Bay and Bell Island and all the other communities on the misery list. No wonder he cannot sleep at night, when the people down in Burin have been manning the picket lines - for how long? -

MR. CALLAN:

Three months.

MR. NEARY: - three months ,Mr. Speaker -
manning the picket lines in Burin for three months. No
wonder he cannot sleep at night, when the hon. gentleman
can lead a demonstration down to try and save an obsolete
tracking station in Shoe Cove for training purposes.
Today now he is talking about - they have softened
their position now, they want to keep it for training
purposes. He can lead a demonstration of picketers down
to Shoe Cove. I did not see the hon. gentleman leading
a demonstration down to Burin. They have a job to get
their member down there let alone the Premier or the
minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, no wonder he cannot sleep at night with the people down there manning the picket lines, Mr. Speaker, carrying on their fight to save their community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if you do not mind. Because we are on a very serious topic, that the hon. gentleman would not understand. It is bad enough for him to be interrupting me, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. gentleman is not in his seat. And if the hon. gentleman wants to continue to lower the decorum of the House, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Nobody has done that any better than you did.

MR. NEARY: - then I think the only alternative for the Chair is to name the hon. gentleman, have him removed from the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! I would like to remind members on both sides that the hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, no wonder the hon. gentleman cannot sleep at night, when the people of Burin are down there day in and day out, round the clock, twenty-four hours, trying to save their community, trying to save a way of life, trying to save a heritage in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I hope that nobody in this House is gullible or naive enough to think that the fight that is going on in Burin today is just a fight to save the community of Burin. I hope nobody is naive enough in this House to think that is the case.

What Burin is fighting for,

Mr. Speaker -

MR. TOBIN: Is survival.

MR. NEARY: - Burin is fighting for a way of life. Burin is fighting to save a culture and a heritage built around the fishery in this Province. That is what they are fighting for, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: That is right. Right on.

MR. NEARY: It is too bad the hon. gentleman does not realize that and could influence the Cabinet to do something about it.

Because, Mr. Speaker, the fish plant in Burin, like the other ones, and I will deal with the other communities shortly, the fish plant in Burin, the processing sector falls under provincial jurisdiction. It is not a matter for the Government of Canada, it is not a matter for the Government of Russia, or Germany, or France, or the Government of Quebec or Nova Scotia -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have silence, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I am asking Your Honour again.

MR. TOBIN: The member for Fogo is interrupting.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is out of his seat, in the first instance, and he is not allowed to interrupt. The hon. gentleman, does he think he is down in a bar or a tavern somewhere? The hon. gentleman is in the people's

MR. NEARY: House, he may not realize that, where people have a right to be heard -

MR. TOBIN: Do you not own a club?

MR. NEARY: - where people have a right to express their views, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the club you own.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is not in a tavern, or a bar -

MR. TOBIN: I do not own either tavern or bar.

MR. NEARY: - he is in the people's House, and
I wonder if your Honour would remind the hon. gentleman so that
I can carry on my few remarks.

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

MR. NEARY: That is four times now Mr. Speaker.
I do not know how often I have to ask Your Honour to
silence the hon. gentleman. I do not know how often,
but I will keep doing it. And perhaps Your Honour could check
Beauchesne or check -

MR. TOBIN: It is the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) who is
interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: I am not saying a word.

MR. Speaker: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is five times for the member for
Burin (Mr. Tobin). Mr. Speaker, if the people of Burin could
only come in to this House, and they will be in, by the way.
Do not worry, they will be here and see their member,
Mr. Speaker, just to see him. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, what they
are fighting for down in Burin is the survival of the deep-sea
fishery in this province, and the inshore fishery to a large
degree. That is what they are fighting for.

MR. TULK: How about the Grand Bank fishery?

MR. NEARY: I am coming to Grand Bank, do not worry
about that. I will deal with each community on its own merits.
I want to deal with Burin first, Mr. Speaker, because my
colleague and I had the honour and the privilege to meet with
the Concerned Citizens Committee in Burin, and we met with the
clergy -

MR. TOBIN: How much money did you pass out?

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman wants to know
how much money I passed out, Mr. Speaker, they needed some coffee
there and my colleague and I contributed, personally, out of
own pockets \$20.00 for coffee and tea.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman thinks he is going to score points by bringing that up he should go and talk to the Concerned Citizens Committee and the people who are picketing, who very much appreciated that little gesture on our part. That is more than we can say for the hon. gentleman.

MR. TOBIN: That is now what I heard.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, anytime he wants to he can stand in this House and he can get up and say what he heard, but he must be prepared to suffer the consequences.

MR. WARREN: That is seven times.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have silence from the hon. gentleman.

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

MR. NEARY: That is seven times, Mr. Speaker. We are keeping a tally here now. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Burin are determined that they are going to win their battle. And I can tell the people of Burin right now that every man on this side of the House is behind them. We are behind them. We support their cause, we support their objectives and what they are fighting for, in spite of the fact that they have been ignored by the provincial government, in spite of the fact that their member keeps telling them that Ottawa is going to restructure, that the Kirby Task Force is going to solve their problems. In spite of all that, Mr. Speaker,

MR. S. NEARY: they will win, and I guarantee you they will win without any help from this government. The matter of the fish plant in Burin is a provincial matter, it is not a federal matter. It has nothing to do with Mr. Kirby, it has nothing to do with Mr. De Bane, it is a provincial matter. Where are the ministers who were down in Shoe Cove picketing? Mr. Speaker, they cannot argue on that side of the House that there is no fish. This is the time of year when you have an abundance of fish, and the plant is closed and has been closed since November. How can the member for the area and the members stand up and have the gall to say that the reason the plants are closed is because of federal policies, they have no fish. This is the time of year when they fish, this is the time of year when you have an abundance of fish. And the real question, Mr. Speaker, is, and this is the question for the administration to answer, would Fishery Products keep Burin open even if they had a supply of fish?

MR. G. TOBIN: I would have my doubts.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the hon. gentleman has his doubts. Well, why does he not tell that to the Premier and to the administration that he supports?

MR. TOBIN: If the federal government said to Fishery Products here is your quota, here are your trawlers, do not you worry where the processing plant is coming from, and if the federal government guaranteed us that there would be no further fuel hikes -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have silence from the hon. gentleman?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is eight times.

MR. TULK: Nine.

MR. NEARY: Nine, is it? My hon. colleague says nine times.

MR. S. NEARY: The fact of the matter is that the hon. administration, Mr. Speaker, have no intention of coming to the rescue of the people in Burin and in the other communities where you have fish plants closed or in the process of closing, Mr. Speaker, that is why I am stressing Burin.

MR. G. TOBIN: Ask Mayor Bailey where I stand.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Bailey knows where the hon. gentleman stands, and the hon. gentleman knows where Mayor Bailey stands.

MR. TOBIN: That is right. We know each other rather well.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. gentlemen, they know each other well, Mr. Speaker, and I would say that the only thing that is keeping a lid on now is that fact that the hon. gentleman just mentioned.

MR. NEARY: The only thing that is keeping the lid on.

MR. TOBIN: Keeping the lid on what?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the people of Burin have been let down by this administration.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Simmons is finished down there. He will never go back there anymore.

MR. NEARY: Could I have silence, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is ten times. Now how often more? Mr. Speaker, how often more is the hon. gentleman going to be allowed to interrupt me from somebody else's seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
If the hon. Leader of the Opposition was not answering or asking questions of the hon. member it might discourage him from interrupting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Well, now, Sir, I will plow on, and from now on I want to be protected by the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will protect every speaker in this House.

MR. NEARY: All right, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Burin are fighting for a heritage and a culture and a way of life in this Province that we have had for 500 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: A culture and a life that is built around the fishery. And for the provincial government, the administration, the present administration, to allow Fishery Products to close that plant, Mr. Speaker, could only be termed as resettlement through the backdoor, because that is what it will be. And it will

MR. NEARY: be the ruination, the beginning of the end for a good many communities like Burin, in this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to state now categorically, and I do not care who hears me say it or who likes it - anybody who does not like it, they can lump it - that we on this side of the House, the eight of us on this side of the House say to the whole world and I hope the message gets down to the Burin Peninsula - Mr. Speaker, we will send our Hansard down, we will get the hon. gentleman's interruptions recorded in Hansard and we will send it down to his constituents.

MR. TOBIN: Do you want me to answer that again.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we -

MR. TOBIN: He is started again, Look, there he goes.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: There was no question asked of you.

MR. NEARY: - state categorically that we are for the re-opening of every fish plant in Newfoundland that is closed at the present time.

MR. WARREN: That is more than the member can say.

MR. NEARY: Without reservation, Mr. Speaker, we are for the re-opening of all of these plants. And let me repeat it again just in case anybody does not hear what I am saying, we are not for leaving Fermeuse closed, leaving Burin closed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are for the opening of all of these plants. And what I said in the House, in case the hon. gentleman does not remember, was you can

MR. NEARY: let Nickersons go bankrupt
and they would not be missed in this Province but they may
be missed in Nova Scotia. That is what I said.

MR. MORGAN: What about Fishery Products?

MR. NEARY: I said that Fishery Products
was a different matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker. Fishery Products, Lakes-

MR. TOBIN: I will circulate it in my district, that is all he mentioned.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman - my speech today will be circulated widely in Burin district, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the people of Burin asking? What are they asking?

MR. TOBIN: They are asking for the same as the rest of the Province.

MR. NEARY: They are not. Mr. Speaker, the people of Burin are asking for less actually than other parts of the Province. Here is the message coming from Burin to the administration, the present administration of this Province. Here is the message, loud and clear, They are saying to the administration, 'Take over the plant, take it away from Fishery Products and give it to us to run'. That is what they are saying. I have not heard the hon. gentleman get up in the House and support that cry, that plea from the workers, from the plant workers, and from the dragger crews in Burin. The very first time that that has been supported in this House is right now when I said it.

You can walk on egg shells, you can walk on glass , you can walk gingerly so you will not offend anybody in the administration. You can try to keep in good and try to pretend you are doing something for your district at the same time, you can try to worm your way into the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, but the time comes in every man's life when he has to stand on his own two feet, he has to take a decision, he has to show he is a man and not a mouse. He has to show, Mr. Speaker, that he has the courage of his convictions. He has to show his constituents and the people

MR. NEARY: of this Province that he means what he says, and show the people where he stands, And he is not going to be mealy mouthed about the whole thing, he is not going to talk out of both corners of his mouth, He is not going to say I support the people of Burin, and I support the administration who is ignoring them. You cannot say that, Mr. Speaker, you cannot say that.

MR. DINN: Sure you did it on Bell Island.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Thank you That is twelve times, Mr. Speaker, And I do not believe I mentioned the hon. gentleman in my remarks.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh! Be quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting is that we have reached a point in our history in this Province when we have to take some pretty hard decisions, some pretty drastic decisions, some pretty dramatic decisions with regard to the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, with regard to -

MR. TOBIN: The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) (inaudible) the other day. I must say -

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, I believe I am being interrupted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is thirteen times, Your Honour, How many violations of the rules before you get into the penalty box, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): There is no penalty box in this House as far as I am aware.

MR. NEARY: Well, before you get named, how many times can you break the rules?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no specific rule to say that there is an amount or number of infractions that you would be reprimanded for.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have to make some drastic and dramatic decisions in this Province and we have to have courage. We have to pioneer and break new ground in this Province, with all due respect to Mr. Kirby and his task force. I will give him credit for this, he did produce a fishery plan for Canada. We have an agricultural policy in Canada, now we have a fishery policy - well and good, we needed it. But, Mr. Speaker, anybody in this House who publicly states that restructuring of the processing sector is Mr. Kirby's responsibility is misleading the people of this Province. The processing sector is a provincial jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier went up to Ottawa a few weeks ago and saw Mr. De Bane and they had a discussion prior to the release of the Kirby Task Force report. And Mr. Peckford left - the Premier left; I am not supposed to refer to him by his name. The Premier left. The media waited for him outside the door. They said, 'Mr. Premier, what did you discuss with Mr. De Bane?' He said, 'Well, we discussed the release of the Kirby Task Force report and we discussed the various options and that was it.' Now, the interviewer did not say, 'Well, the processing sector, is that not your jurisdiction?' No. Did the Premier say he had brought plans to Mr. De Bane to restructure the processing sector? No.

MR. NEARY: Did he bring any plans to

Mr. De Bane? Well, we learned later that he did not.

MR. CARTER: Pronounce his name correctly now.

MR. NEARY: He did not bring any plans to Ottawa, he just went up on a flying visit, had their little chat, and a cup of tea, and the only thing the Premier said, the only thing he said, and he has admitted it in this House, he admitted it the other day to a question I put to him, the only thing he said to the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) was that he would not go along with nationalization of the industry. He is a private entrepreneur, he believes in private enterprise. And that was the only definite statement he made to the Federal Minister of Fisheries, "I will not go along with nationalization."

MR. CALLAN: My, oh my, oh my, oh my, oh my.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder then that I stand in this House today and condemn the administration for dereliction of duty, for not paying any attention to the processing sector which comes under their jurisdiction? It is sad, Mr. Speaker, it is very sad. And that is why I believe the fight in Burin is going to be a long, drawn-out affair. The fight in Burin will determine what will happen in Fermeuse, what will happen at Harbour Breton, what will happen in Gaultois, what will happen in Ramea, what will happen in St. Lawrence, what will happen in Grand Bank. The fight in Burin, Mr. Speaker, is one of the most important, gigantic struggles in our whole history as far as the fishery is concerned. If the people of Burin lose the battle, the people of Fermeuse, the people of Trepassay, probably, the people in Harbour Breton, the people in Gaultois, the people in Ramea, the people in St. Lawrence, the people in Grand Bank, the people in Piccadilly, they will all lose the battle, Mr. Speaker. Once Fishery Products makes the point, if they win, if the provincial government has not

MR. NEARY: got the courage to strip them of their licences, or to retaliate against Fishery Products, or allow them to get away with leaving Burin shut down -

MR. STAGG: All we hear is Lady Kirby.

MR. NEARY: That is right. If they allow Fishery Products to win the battle in Burin, Mr. Speaker, you can kiss a way of life in this Province good-bye. You can kiss a tradition and a heritage based on the fishery, on the deep-sea fishery, and the inshore fishery, you can kiss that good-bye, Mr. Speaker, that will be the beginning of the end.

MR. S. NEARY:

And that is why the battle in Burin is so important to fishing communities in this Province. Mr. Speaker, the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) may as well shut his door. All they are doing there now is sending out Telexes and making Ministerial Statements. They have no master plan for their restructuring and redevelopment of the processing sector of the fishery. They are laying back, Mr. Speaker, on their oars and waiting to see what the federal government is going to do. And if the federal government does not do enough, then they will get back to their old tricks of blaming Ottawa again. That is the kind of a game they are playing right now. But as I said in the beginning, that is rather cruel and callous - hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, and downright cruel. I grant it they can argue, I suppose, they can argue that, 'Well, we did not get elected or we did not get a mandate to look after the fishery.' I suppose they could argue that. They are a one-issue administration, the one issue being offshore oil. Mr. Speaker, they were given a strong mandate to negotiate an agreement offshore and they have neglected and ignored every other industry and natural resource in this Province. They have put all their eggs in one basket much to the dismay of the Newfoundland people. They have not even attempted to carry out the mandate they were given to negotiate an offshore agreement, Mr. Speaker, and so they have failed. They have failed miserably. The Premier's name will go into the history books as a failure, as a flop and as a disaster. Mr. Speaker, I do not hate the hon. gentleman. I do not think anybody on this side hates the Premier, I do not believe anybody in this Province hates the Premier, Mr. Speaker, but what they are saying about him is that the job is too big for him, he cannot handle the job. They do not hate him, Newfoundlanders like a fighter,

MR. S. NEARY: and he means well, Mr. Speaker, but you can be as well meaning as you want, if you have not got what it takes to govern this Province, to run this Province, then, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we are in for some pretty hard times. And the hon. gentleman still wants to stay on that disaster course. 'I am going to continue', he said, 'I am going to continue to gamble immaterial of the political consequences: and the hon. gentleman says in the next breath, 'I am only going to be here two terms and I am gone.'

MR. NEARY: By that time he will have wrecked the economy of this Province, wrecked it completely. And hon. gentlemen sit over there day in and day out squirting their poison and criticizing Ottawa. How many times in this session of the House have we heard members stand up in their place and honestly, honestly now, man fashion, discuss the real problems that are facing our people? We have had a number of spokesmen on the government benches so far who have spoken. The only one that I have heard, although he has not spoken, he made a statement outside the House, was the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) who criticized the administration for their policy on the offshore. How many members have I heard stand in their place and, Mr. Speaker, tell us what plans the administration have for the fishery?

MR. TULK: Did you hear that? He said the member for Mount Scio did not understand.

MR. NEARY: The member for Mount Scio did not understand. Mr. Speaker, I would rather listen to the member for Mount Scio any day in the week, any hour in the day, than listen to the hon. gentleman. I would rather listen to the member for St John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) who, I am sure, has very strong views on these matters that I am talking about in my few remarks. Nobody in his right mind believes that this administration is on the right course, unless you are off your rocker. Mr. Speaker, how could you agree with the policies of this administration? One failure after another. Go right back, as I said, to the beginning of the offshore negotiations, go back ten years, turn back the hands of time, turn back the hands of the clock and see what has happened. One blunder, one failure after another, and yet they

MR. NEARY: follow their leader.

MR. CALLAN: Which one?

MR. NEARY: They follow their leader.

And, Mr. Speaker, they are following their leader into the valley of death and they have not got the courage, not one of them except the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), have the courage to stand up and say so. And then they stand over there and anybody who does not toe the Tory party line, anybody who does not do what the Tories want done, the Tory policy, the Tory line is a traitor and is less than a Newfoundlander. Mr. Speaker, that is why, as I said earlier, I am glad to see at least one

MR. NEARY:

hon. gentleman over there speaking out. They have put all their eggs in one basket. While they are squabbling and arguing about the offshore - and I know, Mr. Speaker, they heard all this before, they will hear it all again. It is only history repeating itself in this Province, Mr. Speaker. During the Munroe administration - anybody who knows anything about Newfoundland history will tell you that Monroe got elected on the platform of 'clean her up and keep her clean'. That was Monroe's philosophy. And he got elected on that. And no doubt about it, he did a good job of keeping her clean. But, Mr. Speaker, his administration soon fell apart. And do you know why it fell apart? Because the backbenchers got disillusioned and became very disgruntled because the administration was not doing anything. The administration had no money to spend. And there was a rebellion in the ranks, Mr. Speaker. Dry rot set in, that is what happened to the Monroe administration, and they got kicked out.

I do not know if we have reached the point in the life of this administration that dry rot has set in. If it has not it should. How can you blindly follow a leader who is leading you on a course of disaster? How can they do that, Mr. Speaker? You know, I have heard it said that the present Premier could be compared to a former Premier, Mr. Smallwood. I have heard that said.

MR. YOUNG:

There is nobody like 'Joey', for the love of God.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as far as the physical motions are concerned maybe that is true. But that is where it ends. That is where the comparison ends. Because, Mr. Speaker, there is no comparison between the former Premier, Mr. Smallwood, and the present Premier.

MR. TOBIN:

That is for sure.

MR. NEARY: The former Premier was a builder. He was a builder, Mr. Speaker. There are monuments from one end of this Province to the other, monuments to the man. This very building we are sitting in - this House of Assembly, and this very building is a monument to Mr. Smallwood. The university that we can look down on right here, Memorial University, is a tribute to Mr. Smallwood.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Every hospital built in this Province since Confederation is a monument to Mr. Smallwood.

MR. BAIRD: How about the Liberal Party?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, 95 per cent of the fish plants in this Province - a monument to Mr. Smallwood. The Trans-Canada Highway, rural electrification, senior citizens' homes, eighteen vocational training schools,

MR. NEARY: the College of Fisheries, the College of Trades and Technology, Ultramar, Eastern Provincial Airlines. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on.

MR. TOBIN: The linerboard mill.

MR. CARTER: Come By Chance.

MR. NEARY: I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentlemen can vilify the hon. gentleman all they want, but, Mr. Speaker, the comparison ends with the arm waving of the present Premier, there is no comparison after that. Mr. Smallwood was a builder and will be going down in the history books -

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible) on Roaches Line.

MR. NEARY: His name will go into the history books, Mr. Speaker, as a builder. And the Premier of this Province, his name will go into the history books -

MR. HISCOCK: As a rabbit hunter.

MR. NEARY: No, it will go in as a gentleman who created a state of emergency in this Province. His name will stink like rotten fish in Newfoundland history. The present Premier 's name will stink like rotten fish, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this Province as compared to the other gentleman whose name they keep bringing up over there. You could go on and on. You could talk about all of the roads that were built, Marystown Shipyard, Marystown Fish Plant, built by a Liberal Administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask hon. gentlemen a very simple question; When they are comparing the present Premier to Mr. Smallwood, and I do not have to list all the accomplishments of Mr. Smallwood and his administration, a successful administration, I do not have to do that, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to ask hon. gentleman a simple question, In eleven years of Toryism in this Province, name me one success story on that side of the

MR. NEARY: House, Name me one.

MR. TOBIN: April 6th.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, April 6.

I see, politics is more important, Mr. Speaker. Politics. Winning at the polls, and duping the people, and deceiving the people, and misleading the people is more important than accomplishments. Name me one accomplishment of that administration, of a Tory Government in this Province for eleven years.

MR. CARTER: Are you going to stay here all night?

MR. NEARY: Name me one major accomplishment, one new idea, one new development, Mr. Speaker, I challenge them, I challenge hon. gentlemen to stand in their places in this House and name me one accomplishment

MR. NEARY:

in eleven years of the two Tory administrations that we have had.

MR. TOBIN:

You named the Marystown fish plant and the Marystown shipyard, why did you not name the Marystown dance floor?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman now, Mr. Speaker, has moved down to another seat and I do not believe I was sparring with the hon. gentleman. Could I ask for the protection of the Chair again?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

There is silence here in the House now, there is nobody interrupting.

MR. NEARY:

Well, that is fifteen times now I had to do that, Your Honour. We are keeping a tally. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we be allowed to express our views in this House freely and openly without interruption. I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, and then I will come back to the fishery and the offshore again; I am not just jumping from one topic to another, I am coming back to the two main issues that I spoke about. But I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the thing that worried Newfoundlanders, after April 6th last year, the one matter that concerned Newfoundlanders and Labradorians -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Could I have silence, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

That is seventeen times,
Your Honour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the one matter that concerned the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador

MR. NEARY: following the April 6th election last year was the large majority that the Tory Party had received, forty-four members compared to eight. And the thing that concerned residents of Newfoundland and Labrador more than anything else, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the matter that concerned Newfoundlanders and Labradorians more than anything else was the fact that with such a large majority, lopsided majority in the House the administration might have a tendency to become dictatorial and arrogant and they might do things that were not in the best interest of the people who elected them. That was the big concern, and it is the big concern today. Mr. Speaker, you could talk to anybody in the street today, anybody out there, and they will tell you that the thing that concerns them most is the arrogance of this administration, how arrogant they have become in a short time.

Let me give you a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker, of the arrogance of this administration, this administration that was going to be clean and aboveboard and open

MR. NEARY: and give the people of Newfoundland the honest facts.

MR. MORGAN: The reason why it was turned down -

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, here is how arrogant the administration has become. We shamed the Premier into giving up Mount Scio House. We shamed him into that. But after we shamed him into it, Mr. Speaker, what did the hon. gentleman do? What did he do? He asked his colleagues to provide him with a rent free apartment. He asked his colleagues to use taxpayer money, without the authority of this Legislature, to pay \$10,600 a year for an apartment for him over at Tiffany Place. In case hon. gentlemen are not familiar with Tiffany, Tiffany is the big jeweller in New York.

MR. TOBIN: Roaches Line cost more than that for the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with Roaches Line. The hon. gentleman need not worry, I will deal with that.

MR. CARTER: By leave, tell us all about Roaches Line.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with Tiffany Place first. It is called after the big merchant, the big jewellery conglomerate in New York?

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you sure of that now?

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman would not live in a Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation apartment. He would not live in one of the apartments that is owned by the government. No. He wanted nothing but the best, Tiffany Place.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few things about that. I am just showing how arrogant the administration have become in a short time. The first thing they did - they had no authority, the administration has no authority to rent a private apartment for the Premier, no authority, even though the other day the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in answering a question told me that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) had the authority to go out and rent space.

MR. TOBIN: Sure.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I now challenge the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) to lay on the table of this House -

MR. TOBIN: The Mifflin Report.

MR. NEARY: - the authority that was given by this House to rent a private apartment for the Premier. They cannot do it, Mr. Speaker. They cannot do it.

MR. NEARY:

The Premier thinks that because he gave an explanation, he said, 'Well, I am going to come clean, I am going to confess, I am moving out of Mt. Scio House and I am going to clarify my position with the Newfoundland people,' that makes everything right and aboveboard. Mr. Speaker, only today I was checking with the other provinces of Canada on this matter.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Raking up more dirt.

MR. NEARY:

No it is not dirt, it happens to be taxpayers' money, \$10,600 of taxpayers' money, and the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, have every right to know how their money is being spent.

MR. TULK:

Come over here to your seat and tell us about Burin.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman is supporting this kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker.

Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario do not provide a private apartment for their Premier, or a house or anything else. It is unheard of, it is unprecedented in this Province.

MR. BAIRD:

Quebec never (inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

I am coming to Quebec. Quebec has an apartment, but not for the Premier. The Quebec government has an apartment that can be used by the Premier if he wants to stay there overnight. The Premier has his own home in Quebec City, the hon. gentleman knows that. If they have a stormy night, Mr. Levesque may use it, a minister may use it.

MR. DINN:

In Quebec the Liberal leader lived in it.

MR. NEARY:

And he paid rent. They may use, Mr. Speaker, visitors who are guests of the Quebec government may use it. But, Mr. Speaker, there is not a province in

MR. NEARY:

Canada - and I only wish that this message would get through -
not a province in Canada which provides the Premier with a
private apartment, not one. What gives them the right?
That is the question. What gives them the right, forty-four
members against eight?

MR. NEARY: Their arrogance? He has no more right to a private apartment than any other member of this House or any other person in this Province, no more right to it. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no legislative authority -

MR. MORGAN: Why did we pay Joey all the years for his accommodations, the taxpayers of the Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know Your Honour was not in the Chair, but I believe that is eighteen times the Chair had to ask for order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Nineteen times, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has no right to a private apartment paid for by the taxpayers. And Treasury Board and the Cabinet has no right, without the approval of this House, to give him an apartment.

MR. MORGAN: Who gave him the right to govern? Not you.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, that has nothing to do with government, that has to do with private privileges and patronage. It has nothing to do with government. The private apartment that was given to the Premier has nothing to do with governing this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, they will rue the day that they took that kind of a decision. And now they are riding roughshod over the House, they are riding roughshod over everybody and they are saying, "Oh, yes, you are getting personal." If you talk about the Premier leeching off the public, leeching off the taxpayers, scrounging off the taxpayers, you are getting personal. Well, I presume the Premier

MR. NEARY: is a person, and I cannot see how we could talk about the hon. gentleman without getting personal. I presume he is a person. Sometimes there are people who have grave doubts about him. But he is a person, Mr. Speaker, and how can you talk about the hon. gentleman without getting personal? And he is scrounging off the taxpayers, leeching off the taxpayers of this Province. The only place in Canada, the only time in Newfoundland's history that the taxpayers paid for an apartment for the Premier. It is unprecedented. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) gets up and tells us the other day the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) has the authority to rent space. The Minister of Public Works has no authority to rent space for the Premier for a private apartment. Mr. Speaker, not only that, but if the government did decide in their wisdom to have an apartment for government use, not for the private use of the Premier but for government use, they would have had to call tenders for it. Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous. And again I

MR. NEARY:

heard somebody on the other side comparing what Mr. Smallwood had to what the present Premier gets, somebody compared that. Well, I already set the record straight in this House on Mr. Smallwood's house on Roaches Line and maybe I should set the record straight again. I will say it for the benefit of the newer members.

Mr. Speaker, the house on Roaches Line was not built by taxpayer money. Mr. Smallwood did not ask Cabinet or Treasury Board to build him a house or give him a rent free apartment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the house on Roaches Line was built by Mr. Smallwood himself - not with his own hands but he -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the house on Roaches Line never cost the taxpayers one penny.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Now, if the hon. gentleman has a charge to make let him stand in his place and make the charge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the public record speaks for itself. Mr. Smallwood built the house, had a mortgage on the house and owned the house. And then what did Mr. Smallwood do but, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. YOUNG: He got 400,000 acres of land.

MR. NEARY: Should I try for twenty times,
Mr. Speaker? Could I have the protection of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is twenty times, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Could I have the protection
of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Twenty-one times.

Mr. Speaker, what did Mr.
Smallwood do after he built the house, financed it himself,
what did he do with the house then? What did he do with
it, Mr. Speaker? Well, I will tell the House what he did
with it. He turned it over to the Newfoundland people for
one dollar. Gave it to the Newfoundland people as a gift,
for one dollar. Now, Mr. Speaker, how does that compare
with the present Premier?

MR. YOUNG: Who paid his oil bill and his
light bill?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how does that
compare -

MR. YOUNG: Who paid his oil bill and
his light bill, I am asking you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how does that
compare with the present Premier?

MR. NEARY: Well, here is how it compares with the present Premier; Mr. Moores managed to get control of Mt. Scio house from the University, because the University did not want it. Mr. Moores was probably about the worst Premier we have ever had up to that time in Newfoundland's history. Mr. Moores was a playboy Premier but did Mr. Moores establish a new precedent? Did Mr. Moores ask for Mt. Scio house rent free? No, As bad as Mr. Moores was, and as low-down as that crowd over there thinks he was, and the way they put the knife to him when he retired, the way they started their witch hunts and the way they went after him, you would almost say he was a Liberal. But, did he go into that House rent free? No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Moores went in and paid \$650. a month rent right up to the time he left Mt. Scio house, and it was paid to date because I checked on it.

MR. WARREN: How much did the Premier pay?

MR. NEARY: He paid the University.

Now, what did the present Premier do when he took over? He moved into Mt. Scio house and he said, "I am not paying any rent". No rent, rent free. Then we shamed him into leaving it after he spent a couple of hundred thousand dollars fixing it up to suit himself, new furniture, and had it decorated to his own taste, to his own liking, put a barbed wire fence around it with a gate where you push an electronic device to let you in and out, new silverware, new china, all kinds of security guards, Mr. Speaker, all kinds of luxurious items at the expense of the taxpayer; a couple of hundred thousand dollars worth. we were told, according to the Public Accounts. It cost half a million dollars to operate the house and to equip it and fix it up when the Premier was living in it Now, all of a sudden, he moves out and

MR. NEARY: your \$200,000 or \$300,000 that was spent on china and decorations and paintings, that is all gone, that is all lost to the taxpayers. But does he leave then and go and hang his head in shame and say, "I was wrong by scrounging off the taxpayers, by leeching off the taxpayers? Was I wrong?" No, he goes and moves out and asks the taxpayers to pay rent for an apartment in a brand-new posh apartment building. The first time in Newfoundland's history, and the first time it has ever been done in Canada.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I hear the Tories, the open-line brigade, the Tory open-line brigade once in a while coming to his defence. You see the Tories - I do not know if you are aware of it, Mr. Speaker, but the Tories have what they call a letter writing brigade, those who write letters to the editor, and they have the open-line brigade, and any time a controversial issue comes on the open-lines, the commander of the open-line brigade will make calls around and say, "You had better get on the radio this morning because Brian is on, or one of the ministers is on, or there is an issue on that is embarrassing to us". So you hear the open-line brigade once in a while coming on and saying, "Did you hear that, Neary? Did you hear him again yesterday criticizing the Premier for his apartment over in Tiffany Place? How low and personal can you get." And then another argument they use, "Oh, the Premier is entitled to an apartment because look at all the entertaining he does. He is entitled to a house." This is what the Tory open-line brigade says, "Why should we not give him a house? Because he is entitled to it." He is no more entitled to it, Mr. Speaker, that you are, or I am, or any other individual in this Province is entitled to it. And they can

MR. NEARY: try to offset the criticism,
they can try to offset it all they like, they will not be
successful.

MR. MORGAN: Is the Governor entitled to
live on the taxpayers?

MR. NEARY: Well, now, Mr. Speaker, are we
putting the Premier up now in the same category as the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: You are downgrading the position,
not the man.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in most provinces of Canada the Lieutenant-Governor is not given a house by the taxpayers. It has been the tradition in this Province, but is the hon. gentleman putting the Premier now in the same category as the Queen's representative?

MR. MORGAN: Why not?

MR. NEARY: The Premier when he was living in Mount Scio House had his bodyguards. The bodyguards have gone. He put himself in the same category as the President of the United States, as the Pope. The bodyguards are gone, the chain link fence is still there, the \$200,000 worth of china and silverware and paper and decorations and paintings, all that is gone, lost to the taxpayers, but now the open-line brigade are trying to save face by saying, 'Well, the Premier is entitled. Look at all the people he entertains.' Mr. Speaker, if the government wanted to maintain an apartment to entertain people, which they do not have to do, they would not do it in the name of a private apartment for the Premier or anybody else, they would do like they do in Quebec, they would say this is a government apartment.

MR. STAGG: They do not have to pay for that, do they?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this government has running out of ears, apartments. Newfoundland and Labrador Housing have thousands piled upon thousands of apartments in this city. They have the bachelor apartments over at Churchill Square, they have Newfoundland Drive, they have -

MR. YOUNG: Elizabeth Towers.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they Elizabeth Towers. Mr. Moores lived in that. Some of the ministers lived in Elizabeth Towers and they paid their rent, they did not welch off the taxpayers. They did not suck the taxpayers

March 15, 1983

Tape No. 344

MJ - 2

MR. S. NEARY:

blood.

MR. YOUNG:

No like hell they did not.

MR. NEARY:

They paid their rent.

MR. HISCOCK:

Well, you have been there twelve years and did not straighten it up.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason I get sidetracked off the fishery and off the offshore, which I am coming back to if I get an opportunity before

MR. NEARY:

my time runs out - Mr. Speaker, if I can get an opportunity I will come back to these two issues.

Mr. Speaker, I got sidetracked off on that to show the arrogance of the administration. That is one example of what people were concerned about in this Province after the big majority of April 6th, was how arrogant and how dictatorial the administration could become.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me give you another example. That is one example of how the Premier is sucking off the taxpayers in this Province. These are hard words, Mr. Speaker, and, as I said earlier, I do not hate the hon. gentleman but I do not like a bloodsucker. I do not like somebody who would suck the blood of the taxpayers of this Province, Mr. Speaker, because that is what is going on. And hon. gentlemen can get highly indignant about it all they want, or they can take to the Open Lines all they want and they can try to slander and smear and twist and turn, but the fact of the matter is that the Premier of this Province is leeching off the taxpayers for the first time in Newfoundland's history.

Now, what is another example of arrogance on the part of this administration, Mr. Speaker? What is another example of arrogance? How arrogant this administration have become in a short time. Well, we saw an example in the Auditor General's Report released in this House last week, tabled in this House last week. The Auditor General's Report which reported - he reported it for about the third or fourth time, I might say - that he was dissatisfied with the reporting and the information that was given to the people, the taxpayers, on the use of government aircraft and on the use of government helicopters. And everybody knows the Auditor General is a servant of this House. He is non-partisan, non-political,

MR. NEARY: a servant of this House who gives it to us straight, who tells it as it is, who has no reason to try to shelter anybody or hide the facts from anybody. The Auditor General said in his report that was tabled in this House last week, "I am not satisfied", he said, "with the information being given to the taxpayers and to the House about the use of government aircraft and helicopters and who is using the aircraft and who is using the helicopters". Is that what the Auditor General said? Can anybody deny that is what he said?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take it a step further. After the Auditor General reported that he was dissatisfied with that, that there was no policy covering it, what happened after that? Well, the Cabinet got together down on the eighth floor and the Cabinet says, 'If we have no policy on this, what are we going to do?'. And, I presume, on a recommendation of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) the Cabinet decided and ordered the Department of Transportation - now, listen to this now, it will show you the arrogance of this administration - the Cabinet decided through Order in Council, Minute in Council, that they would order the Department of Transportation not to

MR. NEARY: release any information on the use of government aircraft or helicopters or who used them. That was done by an Order in Cabinet.

MR. WARREN: Say that again.

MR. NEARY: An Order in Cabinet. In other words, the Cabinet decided they are going to withhold information on how taxpayer money is spent. I am checking it out to see if it is legal, to see if it is constitutional.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the Public Accounts you had hearings on now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we also have another servant of this House who is the Comptroller of the Treasury, who is established under an act of this House. It is up to that gentleman to see that there is full disclosure of public money that is spent, of taxpayer money, full disclosure. Well, that is what the system is all about. The main purpose of the functions of this House, Mr. Speaker, is to pass Estimates, to approve of government spending. The taxpayers have a right, through this House, to know how every red cent of their money is spent, Mr. Speaker. That is basic, that is fundamental. Even a kindergarten student knows that. That is the main function of this House, to pass Estimates, to approve of government spending, because if the House did not have that control, you would have the Premier and ministers doing what they like. You would have every minister getting an apartment or a house free, and their buddies and their friends. Where is it going to end, Mr. Speaker? Where does it end? But for the Cabinet to order a department not to give the House, not to give the taxpayers who pay the bills information on how their money is being spent, Mr. Speaker, is outrageous! Did I make that up? Is that me talking as Leader of the Liberal Party, as Leader of the Opposition? Is that me?

MR. TOBIN: You were appointed.

MR. NEARY: No, not appointed, elected,
in case the hon. gentleman, in his simplicity, does not know.

Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous
and that item has to be stricken from the public record
quickly. Surely the administration, surely the House
is not going to ignore the recommendations of the Auditor
General. The Auditor General is the watchdog of the public
treasury. He is the only safety valve, the only safeguard
that we have against abuse of taxpayer money,

MR. NEARY: an abuse of power by the administration. The Auditor General and the Comptroller of the Treasury are the only ones we have to rely on, that the taxpayers can depend on to report misuse and abuse of public funds. And the Cabinet, flying in the face of the Financial Administration Act, say to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), You are not to give any information on the use of the aircraft and on the use of the helicopters, and you are not to tell the taxpayers who is using them, even though the taxpayers are paying the bills. Did you ever hear of anything like that in your life, Mr. Speaker? I know Your Honour cannot answer me. But I certainly have not. I have not and I doubt if anybody else has who knows anything about the system and the way it works. Mr. Speaker, in any other place, I would say, under the British Parliamentary system, that very one act alone would be sufficient to bring about the resignation of the head of that administration.

MR. YOUNG: That is what the Mifflin Report said.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that one item alone - just take that one item by itself, in isolation, that one item alone is sufficient to bring about the downfall of the head of that administration, and certainly a minister or two would go down with him, Mr. Speaker.

It is outrageous. I cannot say whether it is illegal, I am having it checked. If it is illegal, I will guarantee you that it will be followed up, it will not be like the spending during the election. It will not be like the spending, Mr. Speaker, during the election, when the government spent money after the end of the fiscal year without authority of this House. And the two top Constitutional experts in Canada said the government was wrong. They had broken the Financial Administration Act, they had broken with tradition,

MR. NEARY: they were wrong. The way the system works , Mr. Speaker, -

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have silence from the lapdog.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is twenty-three times, Mr. Speaker. I do not know how often Your Honour has to bring him to order before disciplinary action is taken. Perhaps Your Honour might research that and give us a report sometime.

MR. NEARY: So these are two examples of how arrogant this administration has become in a short time. I could go on and on and show you other examples of the arrogance of this administration, but I think I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, to show these are two very serious items. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was wrong the other day, the hon. gentleman was wrong when he told me and told the House and told the people that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) had the right to rent a private apartment for the Premier. The hon. gentleman was wrong and I ask the hon. gentleman now to table the authority in this House, the authority to the Minister of Public Works to spend taxpayer's money on a private apartment. I ask the hon. gentleman to do it now, to do it tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS: It is in the budget.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

DR. COLLINS: It is in the budget.

MR. NEARY: In the Budget? Mr. Speaker,

the apartment has already been leased, the lease is signed on the apartment and now the hon. gentleman is leaking out a subhead in the Budget. He is telling me it is in the new Budget. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance knows full well that you cannot commit the new Budget to a private apartment for the Premier without the approval of this House. It is a new policy. It has to be done in this House. The hon. gentleman is now changing his tune. I asked him yesterday what authority the government had for renting this private apartment and he told me the Minister of Public Works had the authority. Now he is telling me the authority is going to be provided in the new Budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what the hon. gentleman just said.

MR.NEARY: So, Mr.Speaker, getting back to where I started,when I talked about the arrogance of this administration this is the thing -

MR.TOBIN: Go on back to where you came from.

MR.NEARY: The Premier got himself in trouble by making that kind of a statement,by the way, another example of his arrogance. When he could not answer , when he lost his cool , went of his rocker again, he insulted the people of Bell Island, Mr.Speaker.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.NEARY: So, Mr.Speaker, I think that the people are right when they say that they are concerned about the arrogance of this administration. And they have every right to be concerned about it,and worried about it. Because it is a fact, it is a fact of life today in this Province. And the people are saying that the administration is not listening, they have off the rocker policies, that they are making rash and irresponsible statements , that they do not have any plans.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they have no plans as to how to cope with the problems that are facing the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the complete turnaround of this administration in the last year or so. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his little cavalry over there were riding around this Province, Mr. Speaker, making statements like this: 'We shall have our day in the sun.' 'Prosperity will be ours.'

MR. G. TOBIN: And we shall.

MR. NEARY: Listen to the kind of statements.

The member for Eagle River (Mr. E. Hiscock), does the hon. gentleman remember last year the kind of statements the Premier was making in this Province? Here was the kind of statements he was making. 'We shall have our day in the sun.' 'Prosperity will be ours.' 'Have-not will be no more.' What he meant by that 'have-not will be no more,' was that have-not would be no more for himself, he would help himself to the Public Treasury. And here is the last one of his quotes, listen to this, 'The offshore battle will be won.' Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at last week's Throne Speech. Now let me repeat again, just for the benefit of the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. W. Matthews) who may not grasp it the first time, just in case the hon. gentleman is a bit slow on the uptake. I will use four quotes again: Last year we heard it day in and day out, press conference after press conference, newspapers, buying expensive ads in the newspapers and radio, television to take to the airway. Listen, here is what the four statements were. 'We shall have our day in the sun.' 'Prosperity will be ours.' 'Have-not will be no more.' 'The offshore battle will be won.' Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see what was in last week's Throne Speech and let me quote from it and see now if these words

MR. S. NEARY: I just talked about were not the words of a crackie running around this Province with his tail between his legs. Here is what last week's Throne Speech said about the Holy War, Mr. Speaker, that has been going on with Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me give you one quote now - you have heard the four that sounded like a broken record in this Province, just like a broken record you heard them so often - but here is what the Throne Speech said, And remember, the Throne Speech, just in case anybody has any delusions, has any other idea about the Throne Speech other than its being a statement of government policy. It comes through the lips of the Lieutenant-Governor, the Queen's representative, but I hope members are not under any illusion that it is not a statement of government policy.

MR. TOBIN: It certainly is.

MR. NEARY: Of course it is. And here is what it says, Mr. Speaker. 'Newfoundland and Labrador's long march to prosperity is once again frustrated'. That was last week's statement. Now how does that compare to last year's Throne Speech. Listen to this now, 'A painful journey is ahead of us and without the certainty of success'.

MR. TULK: Oh, there is doubt! There is some doubt!

MR. NEARY: Oh, there is some doubt here now, Mr. Speaker, 'without the certainty of success'. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was the tone and the trend of a speech that is supposed to lay out government plans and government policies for coping with the fisheries, telling us how they are going to deal with the offshore, telling us how they are going to deal with a one-industry community, how they are going to deal with high unemployment, especially among young people, how they are going to handle applications for electricity rates.

MR. TULK: Read that again.

MR. NEARY: Let me read it again. Compare this now to what was said a year ago. 'Newfoundland and Labrador's long march to prosperity is once again

MR. NEARY: frustrated . A painful journey is ahead of us and without the certainty of success'. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what was in the speech. Last year, and in fact right up until the Supreme Court of Newfoundland decided that the offshore belonged to the Canadian people, the Premier was saying, 'We shall win. We will win'.

MR. TOBIN: That made you happy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are not gloating about this. I am rather sad. Mr. Speaker, I am rather sad.

MR. HISCOCK: The consumption of liquor and beer since 1979 has gone up by 15 to 20 per cent.

MR. NEARY: My hon. colleague reminds me that the consumption of liquor and beer in this Province went up drastically in 1982 over 1979, Mr. Speaker. There must be a reason for it.

Do you notice now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: the cocky bravado that was going around saying, 'We shall win'. 'We shall overcome'. 'Have-not will be no more' -

MR. TOBIN: We shall in the next federal election.

MR. NEARY: - is now saying, 'A painful journey is ahead of us and without the certainty of success.'

MR. TULK: They are not sure now.

MR. NEARY: No, not sure.

MR. TOBIN: You can be sure, with John Crosbie as Prime Minister and the Liberals wiped out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Hope springs eternal.

MR. TOBIN: You predicted thirty-five seats a year ago. Look what you got.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We do not hear these cocky statements now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: You have a job too. You do not know that, do you?

MR. NEARY: I wonder, Your Honour -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - for the twenty-fourth time, could I have order? That is twenty-four times now Your Honour has asked for order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: No more cocky talk about 'the offshore is ours'.

MR. TULK: You are some glad.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not glad, I am rather sad. We could have had a deal. We could have had -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have order?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is twenty-five times,
Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the government were running an immense bluff.

MR. TOBIN: You are gloating about it.

MR. NEARY: They ran an immense bluff. They told the people of this Province they had a strong case. They put the matter to the Newfoundland Appeals Court. Three Newfoundland judges were unanimous in their decision.

MR. TOBIN: And you are unanimous in your decision too.

MR. NEARY: - that the offshore belongs to Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are so happy about it.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not happy. I am sad, Mr. Speaker, because we could have had an agreement.

MR. TOBIN: Did you read the Mifflin Report?

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that when the hon. gentleman the other day gave an order to have the oil rigs come ashore, the drilling companies thumbed their nose at him, they realized that the hon. gentleman had no authority. The hon. gentleman was stripped of his authority by the Newfoundland Appeals Court.

MR. TOBIN: The oil rigs would be in Marystown today only for the Liberals.

MR. NEARY: The Iron Ore Company of Canada showed they had no respect for the administration when they made their decision to have further layoffs in Labrador City. Mobil has no respect for the administration, Mr. Speaker.

March 15, 1983

Tape no. 351

NM - 3

MR. TOBIN:

on the Grand Banks?

Why do you think Mobil are

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now the hon. gentleman does not know where the oil rigs are. It reminds me of the song, "Where have all the oil rigs gone? Chretien took them every one. When will they ever learn?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now they are sitting over there day in and day out, Mr. Speaker, wondering where the oil rigs are gone. Are they still on the high seas? Are they headed for Nova Scotia? Are they headed for Mulgrave or are they headed for Halifax? The hon. gentleman does not know.

MR. MARSHALL: Why do you not ask your buddies?

MR. NEARY: Why do I not ask my buddies, Mr. Speaker? I happen to be a member of the Newfoundland Legislature like my colleagues, elected in an electoral district in this Province to serve in this House and, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the minister responsible, the minister without portfolio, where the rigs are gone. 'Where have all the rigs gone?' I say to him. He says, 'I do not know where they are gone.'

MR. TOBIN: I can tell you where they are.

MR. NEARY: Well, I know one thing; they are not down in Marystown where they should be.

MR. TOBIN: Because of the Liberals they are not down there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the member who represents Marystown Shipyard tonight take to the air waves in Marystown, will he take to the air waves again tonight and apologize to his constituents and say, 'I am sorry for the statement I made the other day. It was not true'? The rigs would be in Marystown today -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. NEARY:

That is twenty-eight times.

The rigs would be in Marystown

today -

MR. TOBIN:

Except for you and a few more

of your colleagues.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Twenty-seven.

The rigs would be in Marystown

today and in Newfoundland waters except for the administration.

Mr. Speaker, one thing the

Newfoundland Appeals Court established.

MR. TOBIN:

You are foolish. You are childish.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, could I have

silence, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Twenty-eight times.

Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland

Appeals Court established a three mile limit around

Newfoundland. They conceded that Newfoundland had control

three miles out from our coast. Mr. Speaker, I have heard

rumours to the effect

MR. NEARY: I have heard rumours, and the rumours are rampant in this Province, that the reason Mobil will not bring their rigs into Marystown -

MR. TOBIN: Because Chretien will not permit it.

MR. NEARY: Oh, is that so, Mr. Speaker?

The reason they will not bring them in is because they are afraid, with the policy of this administration going off their rocker as they do, declaring Days of Mourning, putting Newfoundland's case before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, that kind of rash decision -

MR. TOBIN: You are a dope!

MR. NEARY: - off-the-rocker policies, Mobil are afraid to bring their rigs inside the three mile limit.

MR. TULK: Why?

MR. NEARY: Why? Because they are afraid that the Premier and the minister responsible may go off their rockers and have the rigs arrested.

MR. TOBIN: I can tell you who conceived that story.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that rumour, by the way, was repeated by their policy advisor. It reached our ears from their policy advisor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as I say, that may or may not be true. But there is certainly speculation to indicate that the administration, to get their revenge, Mr. Speaker, and to hit back at Mobil for thumbing their noses at them, for making them look like school boys, for while they are in this House yap, yap, yapping every day, the drills were still turning.

MR. BAIRD: I heard a rumour you were vaccinated with a gramophone needle. Is that right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And the day, Mr. Speaker, they sent the minister into the House, he was suppose to remain cool that day, he was told by his advisors, 'Be cool now and take the high ground'.

MR. TULK: That is right!

MR. NEARY: He was doing great until I got up and asked him, Could you tell us where the rigs are going? Then he lost his cool, he went berserk, he squirted more venom and poison at Mr. Chretien in Ottawa, but he did not answer my question. It was a little innocent question, a simple little innocent question asked by me as a result of a Ministerial Statement made by the hon. gentleman. He was the one who brought it up, I did not bring it up, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman brought it up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I said, that is fine. You talked to Mr. Mason of Mobil on the phone, the rigs are coming in, and the obvious question that was leaping out to be asked, the obvious question was, 'Well fine, that is great now, we are all glad to hear they are coming in, but would you tell us where they are going? If we could only have a replay in this House! The hon. gentleman just went off of his rocker

MR. NEARY: and made all kinds of accusations and then when he went out -

MR. TULK: And the policy advisor said that he was not supposed to do that.

MR. NEARY: That is right. His policy advisor, having told him to keep his cool and keep the high ground, then said to him, 'Look, you were not supposed to do that. You know, how come you behaved like that? 'Neary' was not supposed to ask you that question and you were not supposed to lose your cool.'

So I were the member representing Marystown Shipyard workers, I believe I would go to my constituents on bended knee and I would say, 'Please forgive me for supporting an administration that has created such a bad atmosphere, has created such bad blood' -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have order for the twenty-ninth time -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - twenty-nine trying for thirty? Mr. Speaker, this administration has created -

MR. TOBIN: You supported Chretien and you will never be forgiven in Marystown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this administration with their off-the-rocker policies have driven industry away from this Province. They have created bad blood between themselves and the oil companies and Nova Scotia and Quebec

MR. NEARY: and Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder then that the question is being asked, 'Should we take a chance on bringing our oil rigs into Marystown?' And that is the question.

MR. TOBIN: Oh, come on, boy! Why should they not go to Marystown? Give it up, will you?

MR. NEARY: They should. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is thirty-one times, Mr. Speaker. I believe it is time to name that member. What I am saying is that the rigs should go to Marystown, but is it any wonder that because of the attitude and the off-the-rocker policy of this administration that the question is being asked, 'Should we take a chance on bringing our rigs inside the three mile limit and have them seized and arrested by an off-the-rocker administration?'

MR. CARTER: Very weak that.

MR. MORGAN: What a clown.

MR. TULK: He is quoting the policy advisor.

MR. NEARY: I am quoting the policy advisor. Mr. Speaker, as a result of their errors and blunders and their failures, what happened now in the Throne Speech that we heard last week - and this is the closest the administration has come to eating crow, to eating their own words, Mr. Speaker - 'Newfoundlands' and Labradorians' long march to prosperity is once again frustrated. A painful journey is ahead of us and without the certainty of success'.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, this is another oversight in that sentence as well. That sentence says, 'A painful journey is ahead of us'.

MR. S. NEARY: I say the underlying paragraph left out is that the painful hourney is behind us as well.

And so, Mr. Speaker, on that note I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. J. MORGAN: What? It is only five minutes to six.

MR. NEARY: Well, do you want me to carry on? The Speaker will have to leave the Chair and come back at eight o'clock tonight.

MR. MORGAN: It is not six o'clock.

MR. NEARY: Well, I just moved the adjournment, and if the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) does not like it - you are not the House Leader, you know -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

It is noted that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has adjourned the debate.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: We could not be more delighted to have him adjourn the debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock. I do now leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow, Wednesday.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

March 15, 1983

ORDER PAPER 4/83 MARCH 10, 1983

QUESTION NO. 9 BY M.H.A. FOR TERRA NOVA (MR. LUSH)

QUESTION: DETAILS IN CONNECTION WITH THE TOTAL COST
 OF INSTALLING A NEW SOUND SYSTEM AND RECORDING
 SYSTEM IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

ANSWER: TENDERS FOR THE PROJECT WERE CALLED BY PUBLIC
 TENDER, ADVERTISED IN THE NEWSPAPERS, DURING
 JANUARY 1982. TENDERS CLOSED ON JANUARY 27, 1982.

AS A RESULT OF THE PUBLIC TENDER CALL, FOUR
TENDERS WERE RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS:

G. R. SQUIRES LIMITED	\$71,000.00
EMBERLEY ELECTRIC LIMITED	74,994.00
DINN & KENNEL ELECTRICAL/ MECHANICAL CONSTRUCTION	91,980.00
EMT ELECTRIC LIMITED	102,000.00

TENDERS WERE AWARDED TO THE LOW BIDDER -
G. R. SQUIRES LIMITED ON FEBRUARY 2, 1982.