

VOL. 2

NO. 13

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.  
THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P. M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

Before we proceed it is a pleasure for me to welcome to the galleries today twenty-six students from Carins Junior High School of North Battleford, Saskatchewan here on an open house Canada Exchange programme with Bishop Abraham Junior High School with two chaperones, Connie Ballance and Walter Kostyna and I welcome you to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise hon. members that a tentative agreement has been reached between government and the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees with respect to approximately 650 instructors employed with the Province's vocational schools, the College of Trades and Technology and the Bay St. George community College.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Negotiations for a revised collective agreement concluded late Tuesday and a memorandum of agreement was signed earlier today. The union will be recommending acceptance of the tentative settlement in meetings to be held with their local presidents within the next two weeks. Voting by the general membership is expected shortly after these meetings.

This tentative settlement is the first to be reached with our three educational bargaining groups. The other two groups in this sector are the NTA and the College of Fisheries Faculty Association.

DR. COLLINS:                   The tentative agreement with the instructors contains a salary package consistent with government's wage restraint program and it was reached without the aid of the conciliation process. Government commends the instructors' negotiating committee for their recognition of the need for wage restraint and looks forward to the ratification of this agreement by the membership within the next few weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:           Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I expect this is a first in this Legislature, the first time since we brought in collective bargaining that a minister made a Ministerial Statement about a tentative agreement. Mr. Speaker, I think it demonstrates how unsuccessful this government has been in negotiating with all of the workers in the public service, Mr. Speaker, that they have to come in and announce a tentative agreement.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are delighted that at least the minister can announce a tentative agreement. We hope that it stays intact long enough and that it will become a permanent agreement. Certainly we welcome any successful negotiations by this government, if anything closely resembles success then we are certainly very proud. We are proud that we have one group at least about to reach a settlement, and, as I said before, if I were these workers and the union I would get a signature on it as quickly as possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Before recognizing another hon. minister, I would also like to welcome to the galleries today twenty-three university students from North West River on the Northern Coast of Labrador who are attending Memorial University and who are in the galleries with us today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister for Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will remember a week or so ago in this House we indicated our disappointment and dismay at the announcement by the Iron Ore Company of Canada that they would be laying off an additional 110 workers effective May 8. Subsequent to that announcement,

MR. DAWE: of course, the Premier has carried on a number of telephone conversations and personal discussions with the President and with other officials of the Iron Ore Company of Canada. As late as this morning he received a response to government's request that the Iron Ore Company not lay off those 110 workers and that in light of the adverse affect that would have on the Labrador City area,

MR. DAWE: combined with the layoffs of some months ago, that that was completely unacceptable and that they should reinstate the workers. And I would like to table for this hon. House a telegram that was sent to Mr. Robert Anderson, the Chairman of the Board of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, after a conversation the Premier had with him this morning. And it reads as follows: 'Pursuant to our telephone conversation of this morning, I understand that your company is prepared to do the following relevant to your latest layoff announcement in Labrador City. Number one, the company is prepared to reduce the layoff number from 110 to seventy-eight; and two, that the seventy-eight layoffs would not be effective until late May rather than early May. You indicated that your company is not prepared to do more on this matter.

'While the Newfoundland Government appreciates the reduction from 110 to seventy-eight, we must continue to insist that such ongoing reductions in your operation at Labrador City are creating an atmosphere of uncertainty and we continue to maintain that all 110 jobs should be reinstated. I had proposed to you that your company reinstate all 110 and if it was necessary to reduce production then to have an appropriate shutdown.'

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table that telegram.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I ever saw an example of a hollow victory, we just heard one announced by the Minister of Mines and Energy. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that seventy-eight more employees of the Iron Ore Company of Canada are going to

MR. NEARY: be laid off in Labrador City. The situation in Labrador West is already desperate. They have invited the Premier to come down and hold a public meeting down there to discuss with the people plans and proposals to try to cushion the blow of all of these layoffs and the setbacks that they have had in Labrador City in the last couple of years. And up to now the Premier has declined to accept the invitation from the people in Labrador West to go down and discuss these matters.

The thing that worries me, and I think worried everybody about the announcement in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that the Iron Ore Company of Canada went ahead with this announcement without any prior consultation with the administration. Now we have two big companies doing business in this Province thumbing their noses at the administration - Mobil Oil will not listen to a word the administration says, they are just treating them like school kids. They can yap, yap all they want and they pay no attention to them. And the same way now with the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, oh, the mighty have fallen. Nobody pays any attention to the administration anymore, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Neither should they.

MR. NEARY: And as my colleague says, neither should they. We are rather concerned about this, Mr. Speaker, that companies like the Iron Ore Company of Canada have no respect, or no regard, or no concern for the Peckford Administration. Companies now announce close-downs and layoffs, and I suppose after the Corner Brook experience, Mr. Speaker, and the cover-up that took place after they held discussions with the Premier and with his colleagues, that they feel that it is useless to approach the administration because all they will do is sit on the information and cover it up anyway.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!  
The time for the hon. Leader of the Opposition has expired.

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I wish to bring to the attention of all hon. members of this House of Assembly the changes being made in our Province's student aid plan which are now the subject of public discussion.

The changes will put the Newfoundland and Labrador student aid plan on a par with a majority of provinces of Canada and will leave our plan a little better than some.

The changes being made in our student aid scheme will have no effect on the most needy students who all along qualified for the maximum loans and grants. One-third of Newfoundland and Labrador students receiving student aid fall into this most needy category and presently draw the maximum loans as well as receive the maximum grants.



MS. VERGE: Loans are provided by the federal government under the Canada Student Loan Programme. Outright grants or allowances are paid entirely by the provincial government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MS. VERGE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Until now Newfoundland and Labrador have had the most generous student aid scheme in all of Canada. According to the report of the federal/provincial implementation task force on student assistance dated October, 1982, Mr. Speaker, of the nine provinces participating in the Canada Student Loan Programme Newfoundland and Labrador provided by far the highest percentage of aid as outright grants and the lowest percentage of aid as Canada student loans. Also our Province paid the highest average grant, \$1,544 compared to \$1,350 for Nova Scotia; \$1,258 for Ontario; and \$881 for Saskatchewan. Our visitors from Saskatchewan today may be interested in knowing that. The average grant in Newfoundland was almost twice as high as it was in Saskatchewan.

MS. VERGE: Unfortunately, because of our Province's poor economic circumstances we have had to tighten our Student Aid Programme. It is unreasonable to expect the number ten province in Canada, with our economic problems worsened by the current recession and mistreatment by the federal government, to continue to have the number one Student Aid Plan in the country. As much as the provincial government would like to keep a superior Student Aid Plan, it is just no longer realistic. The major change being made in our Student Aid Plan does not diminish the total dollars available to students. It simply requires students to borrow more from the Canada Student Loan Programme before they qualify for a provincial grant. Provincial grants of \$1000 a semester for single students and \$1250 for married will continue to be available. The other changes being implemented in our Student Aid Plan affect criteria for eligibility. These changes are based on common sense and stand on their own. The changes are as follows: (1) Independent single students living at home with their parents will no longer be able to claim expenses for board and lodgings. (2) Students employed in the Summer or at any period before studies will be required to make a contribution to the cost of their studies of 45 per cent of actual earnings or 45 per cent of the minimum wage, whichever is greater. Before such students had to make a contribution of 45 per cent of the minimum wage -

SOME HOM.MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR.SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MS.VERGE:

Thank you , Mr.Speaker.

MS.VERGE:

Before such students had to make a contribution of 45 per cent of the minimum wage regardless of what they actually earned even if they earned more than the minimum wage. (3) Students taking a programme outside our Province that is available here in Newfoundland will no longer qualify for provincial government allowances. These students will continue to be eligible for Canada Student Loans. (4) Mr. Speaker, students will no longer be able to receive provincial government grants for more than eight years of post secondary study.

Even with these changes in the eligibility criteria, the criteria here will not be as tough as those in some other provinces.

MS VERGE: I wish to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that these changes will have no effect whatsoever on the most needy students. Before, students in this category first borrowed \$575, then received a \$1,000 outright grant and, third, borrowed \$325 more, making a grand total of \$1,900 in aid for a semester, of which \$1,000 was a grant. After the changes, the same student will have to borrow \$900 before receiving the \$1,000 grant, making the same aid total of \$1,900 and the same grant amount of \$1,000.

At a meeting with representatives of the Memorial University Council of the Students' Union Executive Monday evening when we met for over an hour I told them I am available for follow-up discussions with them or any small group representing the CSU. I told them, Mr. Speaker, that while government has to sit by the bottom line estimate for spending on student aid next year, we will consider modifications to the eligibility criteria changes announced.

I declined an invitation to speak at a large gathering of Memorial University students at the Thompson Student Centre yesterday, contrary to incorrect news reports. I said to the CSU president that I do not feel meaningful or productive communication could take place between me and thousands of students gathered together. "Instead," I said, "I prefer to meet with the duly elected representatives of the student body and communicate to the majority of students and the general public through the news media," if they can hear me, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it that in this Province since this government have assumed office that we have gone full circle with respect to education, from a free education, Mr. Speaker, from a philosophy that believed in the right to an education by all, to educational opportunity for all, we have gone from that, Mr. Speaker, now to the belief in an education for just a few, for the rich, for the wealthy, Mr. Speaker, and for the elite. That is where we have come from, Mr. Speaker. We have gone full circle. We have gone from a philosophy of believing that education is the right for all. Now education is just the right for the few, the wealthy and the rich. That is where we have gone.

What we are now doing is forcing our students to go head and ears in debt. That is what we are forcing the students to do by increasing the amount that a student has to borrow from \$575 to \$900 the first semester, increasing the amount that they have to borrow before they qualify for provincial grants. Mr. Speaker, we have increased the amount by almost 60 per cent, from \$575 to \$900, and there is nobody in this hon. House that will not say that that is going to have a disastrous effect on education in this Province, on accessibility to education. We are cutting off, Mr. Speaker, a number of

MR. T. LUSH: students who ordinarily would be able to pursue an education at the university. By this move, Mr. Speaker, we have imposed a tremendous financial burden on the students of this Province. Now, the minister talks about the fact that until now we had the most generous Student Aid Scheme in all of Canada, and so we should, Mr. Speaker. And we should continue to have the most generous aid programme in this country because, Mr. Speaker, we have the lowest participation rate in post secondary institutions in all of Canada. We have the lowest participation rate, fewer students, Mr. Speaker, from this Province embark on a post secondary education than in any other province in Canada. So it is for that reason that we must keep the Student Aid Programme fairly attractive to our students and not make it less attractive. Mr. Speaker, secondly, our students have the highest cost of living in all of Canada and thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we have the highest rate of unemployment so there is every economic factor why we should be making our Student Aid Programme more attractive and not less attractive. This is one area, Mr. Speaker, where we should not try to get to the Canadian average. This is one area, Mr. Speaker, we must not equal the other the other provinces but that we must do better. Mr. Speaker, this measure of increasing the ceiling for the student loans is going to have a disasterous affect on education in this Province. It is going to affect accessibility and the educational opportunity and the right to an education for all of the students of this Province. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day, sad for the students and sad for all of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.C. POWER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. C. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce a new government policy with reference to the issuance of grants to Crown Land for recreational cottage lots.

Effective immediately, Mr. Speaker, anyone in possession of a Summer Cottage Lease issued by the department, who has complied with the development conditions of the lease is

MR. POWER: eligible to receive a grant.  
For lessees who have complied with the terms and conditions of their lease and submit an application prior to March 31st, 1984, consideration will be \$1,500 less any rentals previously paid. After March 31st, 1984, the consideration for eligible lessees will be \$2,500. In addition to the above considerations, the normal application and title preparation fees will apply.

Notwithstanding this new policy, Mr. Speaker, I must also emphasize government's continued concern of our cottage areas developing into residential areas and the land, once granted, being subdivided and/or developed for purposes other than for cottages. To offset this problem the grants, when issued, will contain the condition that the land cannot be subdivided or used for purposes other than a cottage. Any violation of this condition will render the grant null and void.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the government will be exploring alternative measures for controlling undesirable development and preventing conflicting land use within established cottage areas. In order to expedite the processing of applications for grants it will be the responsibility of the applicant to provide initial proof that the conditions of the lease have been complied with. This will be followed by an inspection by a departmental official. This policy applies only to cottage owners who have obtained a cottage lease from the Crown and who have complied with the terms and conditions of that lease. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 2,700 outstanding cottage leases of which approximately 2,000 have complied with the development conditions and are thus immediately eligible to receive a grant under



MR. POWER: this policy. The remainder of the lessees, plus the recipients of new leases issued in the future will be eligible for a grant as the development conditions of their lease are complied with.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that this new policy simply gives lease holders the option of getting either a grant or continuing with the lease system that they now have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let me say that it is good to see government for once bringing in the good Liberal philosophy of every person having the right to own his own property.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: And a salmon cabin, do not forget that.

MR. TULK: It is a good thing to see this kind of thing happening. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister, I think this is the first Ministerial Statement he has given this year since the House opened, is this his top priority? Is this the top priority that this minister has? Why does he not, Mr. Speaker, go out and look at the development plan that has been given to him for the Gander River? Why does he not make some decisions? Why does he not, perhaps, instead of coming in with this cosmetic little thing, why is he not out looking at Bowaters to see if Corner Brook has a future.

MR. ROBERTS: He cannot do anything about Bowaters.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is debating the statement. He is talking about general governmental, general forestry, and agriculture. The statement was with respect to cottage lots and I suggest he should be confined to it.

MR. ROBERTS: Come on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I mentioned yesterday the rule of relevancy is a little bit difficult to make a ruling on. The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) seems to be straying a little from the topic, but he may continue.

MR. TOBIN: He is not straying, he is lost.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, all I am doing is asking a few questions that arise out of this kind of statement.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! It is well within the rules.

MR. TULK: Why does not the minister do some meaningful things that have to be done in this Province rather than throwing us out this little piece of paper. I think it is the first statement that I have seen from him since sometime in November. Let us have some real action from the minister.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! Well said.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have several questions to the Minister of Health (Mr. House). I understand that there is going to be a meeting in North West River this Saturday coming. I am just wondering, has the minister received an invitation to attend this meeting?

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

MR. HOUSE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I received a message, I think it was yesterday.

MR. ROBERTS: Wrapped around a rock, no doubt.

MR. HOUSE: I received an invitation to attend a meeting on Saturday afternoon at two o'clock.

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

MR. WARREN: Will the minister be attending the meeting? And if not, could he give some reasons why he is not attending such an important meeting for the people of North West River?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have advised the people - I believe it is the Health Committee in North West River - that I am not able to attend the meeting and I gave them reasons for not attending. The meeting is taking place Saturday. I am not available to go Saturday. Besides that, I feel that my time would be better served by getting a date that is appropriate. And I have advised them that I will attend the meeting following the week beginning the 10th. of April.

MR. ROBERTS: The day the hospital will close.

MR. HOUSE: The hospital, Mr. Speaker, is not closing the 10th. of April. The hospital will be closing from three to six months following that.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my next question

MR. WARREN: to the Minister of Health,  
seeing he will not be attending the meeting, will his  
deputy minister be attending? And also in the same question,  
did the members on the Grenfell Health Board who were  
appointed by this government some two years ago, did any  
of those members know that the hospital was closing down  
in North West River before the Budget was announced?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I guess to get it straight for everybody, it is the government decides to build hospitals, and it is the government who decides to close hospitals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: Now, Mr. Speaker, not only that, we have been assessing hospital situations. We have a responsibility to give the most efficient health care delivery service to the Province. We have discussed the whole hospital system with the Grenfell Board. There is no question about it, we have got statistics from them and information. But I will say that they did not know it was going to be specifically mentioned in this Budget. No, they did not. There was no way for them to know. But the point of the matter is, with all the information we have, the discussions we have held with them over the years, we have come to the conclusion that the best possible health service can be given is the programme that we are going to be putting into place in the future.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, another question to the Minister of Health is that I understood him on Monday in the House to say that one of the reasons the hospital is closing down is because it is not up to fire standards. If this is one of the reasons why the hospital is closing down, would he take the federal government up on their offer when the hon. William Rompkey made an announcement today saying there is money available from the federal government to bring the building up to fire safety standards? Would the minister take money from Ottawa to bring the building up

MR. WARREN: federal standards and also  
would he reverse his decision?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that is a very  
interesting observation. We may have \$7 million or \$8 million  
or \$10 million worth of buildings that need to be brought  
up to standard, I wonder if the federal government will  
help us do that?

MR. WARREN: I am asking about the hospital  
in North West River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that is not the basic  
reason for closing the hospital. It is one of the reasons  
why it would be frivolous for us to keep it open because  
we would have to spend so much money in putting it into  
shape. The reason, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that here we  
have two hospital facilities in a radius of about thirty  
miles maximum

MR. W. HOUSE: One of the hospitals has a 50 per cent occupancy the other has a 39 per cent occupancy. Now the 50 per cent occupancy is at Melville and the 39 per cent at North West River. The hospital at North West River is a very, very primary care institution. For instance, there is no surgery done there whatsoever. Only about 10 per cent of the deliveries is done there. I believe there was only eight or nine deliveries done there last year. So basically it is not really an adjunct to the health care system. What we want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to upgrade the hospital at Melville to give a better primary and secondary care to the whole area. That can be done and it will be done, and it will serve the purpose of the people of the area much better much more cheaply and efficiently.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, another question to the minister and probably a little bit of information. There have been twenty-one deliveries since January 1 in the North West River Hospital, for his information.

My next question to the minister is now that the minister has told us that within three to six months the hospital will close down in North West River, could the minister outline what consultation and planning has gone into the decision of the closing of the North West River Hospital, and what measures have been taken to upgrade the services of the Melville Hospital in Happy Valley - Goose Bay to maintain at least the present standard of health care in Labrador? The minister should realize that the building in Happy Valley - Goose Bay is in worse shape than the building in North West River.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the information we have got - and of course the information we have got we got through the board and we got through other people, experts, engineering studies and so on - is that the hospital is in reasonably good shape. The fact of the matter is that when it was determined to use that hospital after the Americans had no more use for it, or had limited use for it, it was predicated on the fact that the building was in good structural shape. Now, getting back, of course, Mr. Speaker, to the first part of his statement, that there was twenty-one deliveries since January, I have not got that statistic. The one I have got is the total of eleven last year.



MR. HOUSE: Now he is coming up with twenty-one since January. I would have to question that particular statistic. It is, I suppose, the kind of a thing that would happen, but most of the deliveries in that area have been taking place at Goose Bay, 90 per cent of them in the last year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned to the hon. member in this House that we have looked at the use of the buildings, the needs of the area, and we are given the idea that the Melville Hospital can be adapted to have more beds that it has, incidentally, The building is now under-utilized. Even it had full occupancy it would still be under-utilized because we have more space for adding more beds. So we will be in the process in the next period to put in place the necessary planning and the necessary functions that are going to take care of the problem. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, the current building and the current hospital in North West River for a \$2 million expenditure is not providing what we call efficient health service.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my final question to the minister is. I understand a member of the Grenfell board did a paper on using the hospital as a chronic patient hospital. Now does the minister have this report in his hands or know the contents of this report? And I understand from the media this morning, listening to a tape that the minister had with CBC in Goose Bay, that the minister was interviewed before the Budget was brought down, and he was interviewed after the Budget was brought down, which was this morning, so is the minister saying that the people in North West River, in coastal Labrador, do not need the hospital

MR. WARREN: at North West River?

Is the minister saying that the Lake Melville Hospital will better serve North West River and the coast of Labrador?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have stated that there is a paved road between North West River and Melville Hospital. I do not know the distance but the time it takes to get there going at the ordinary speed limit is thirty-two minutes. There is a bridge across the river there now that used to separate the community, and we are saying that, yes, we can provide a better service in Melville Hospital than we can at North West River. Regarding

MR. HOUSE:

the pre-Budget statement that I made, somebody phoned me from the CBC and asked me were we going to say in the Budget that the hospital was closing. And I said, 'Well, you know, I am not going to say that the hospital is closing. You will have to wait for the Budget.' But I did say that if it did not say it was closing, I would make a statement that following day. But it said it was closing and it precluded the necessary for me to make a statement.

Now, chronic care, the other thing about the chronic care. Now, there are, I think, seven people in that hospital who are chronic care patients. Now, Mr. Speaker, the most inefficient place to keep a chronic care patient is in an acute care hospital. It is costly. It is running about \$280 per day, incidentally, in North West River, and in our chronic care institutions it is much cheaper. And I believe we have one, and this comes under the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. I believe there are ten or twelve vacancies in that particular chronic care institution now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten.

MR. HOUSE: Ten, Mr. Speaker, I have information recently of the press, there are ten.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, today the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) took a real summersault.

Back a couple of days ago, the minister came into the House with a Ministerial Statement, inviting everybody to join in the Class for '83, inviting everybody to come back to post-secondary institutions in

MR. LUSH: view of the fact that we were not going to have a Grade XI class, a graduating class going into these post-secondary institutions next year, so we brought in this great statement asking them to join the Class for '83.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Today she tells them they are going to have to pay through the nose for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering how the minister can rationalize these two positions, in the one case, inviting everybody to join the class and then, the next day, jacking up the fees and increasing the loan ceiling? Mr. Speaker, how can she rationalize and justify these two positions? Does she not honestly believe, sincerely believe that the measures taken by the government in the last few days with respect to increase in fees and the increase in the loan ceiling are certainly going to discourage a lot of these people from going into these post-secondary institutions who otherwise might have gone?

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

MS. VERGE: The revised fees, tuition fees and residence fees for Memorial University and our Province's colleges and vocational schools are still lower than those for institutions in the Maritime Provinces and most other places in Canada. Memorial University, even with its recently announced 5 per cent increase in tuition fees for next year, will have fees a lot lower than those at Dalhousie University in Halifax and several other universities in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the changes in our Province's student aid plan will not diminish in any way the grants and loans that will be made available to the approximately one-third of our students receiving aid who are in the most needy category, and who have been drawing the maximum loans and getting the maximum grants. Those most needy students will not be affected. They will continue to be able to borrow \$900 a semester and get \$1,000 a semester in an outright grant, free provincial money that does not have to be repaid per semester.

The other changes that will affect the less needy students will put them in no worse a position than their counterparts in other provinces of Canada and will leave them in some respects better off than their fellow students elsewhere in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, enrollment in our Province's post-secondary institutions continues to climb as our participation rate improves. Granted, it is still not as high as we would like, but it is improving by leaps and bounds.

This September, September of 1982, first year enrollment at Memorial University was up 20 per cent over last year. In fact, there was more than a 20 per cent

MS. VERGE:                                   increase at the Grenfell College Campus in Corner Brook and, similiarly, our college and vocational school enrollments were up this academic year compared to last year.

  There does seem to be a correlation between the high unemployment rate and the participation rate in higher education, not only here in Newfoundland but elsewhere in Canada.

  And, Mr. Speaker, in the provinces like Nova Scotia, which earlier had to revert to the measures which we are only now instituting, there have been no noticeable affects on the participation rate. In Nova Scotia, which last year reduced below where we are now going, enrollments swelled in the Fall of 1982.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the trend, which is a trend of older people, mature students, attending university, colleges and vocational schools, which we have noticed here in our Province will be expected to accelerate next year especially when there will be so many opportunities with no people fresh out of high school going into those institutions. There has been the same momentum across North America of older people in greater and greater numbers attending university and colleges. And the 'Join the Class of '83 Programme' is well designed to reach out to a lot of these older students. And they will all be able to qualify for the full student aid benefits - the \$1,000 a semester in outright grants or \$1,250 if they are married. And also, those people will qualify for federal government allowances through the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TULK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister likes to, in this particular instance, make comparison with the student aid programme in other parts of Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, in view of the low participation rate in this Province with respect to post-secondary institutions having the lowest participation rate in all of Canada, in view of the cost of living, Mr. Speaker, the high cost of living, in view of the record levels of unemployment in this Province, does the minister not believe that these are sufficient reasons to increase our student aid programme not to decrease it? Is this not reason enough, Mr. Speaker, to make our student aid programme more attractive rather than less attractive?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the very economic problems to which the member opposite refers - the fact that we do have severe economic troubles, the fact that our private sector is experiencing difficulty, the fact that we have had such rough and unfair treatment from the federal government are the very reasons why we can no longer afford to keep the most generous student aid plan in all of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MS. VERGE: What does the member opposite expect us to pay for all of this with? - buttons. I mean, we do have to generate the money somehow. It has to either come from the federal government or come from our provincial taxpayers. And, Mr. Speaker, the federal government is cutting back its contribution to post-secondary education. The federal government has said through their minister, through Mr. Lalonde and others, that it is time to cut back federal government contributions to higher educations. They are restricting us to a 6 per cent increase in established programme financing when the cost of maintaining our programmes is way more than that. How are we expected to come up with the difference, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we do not understand, and the students and the people of this Province do not understand why, when the government finds itself in periods of restraint, welfare recipients, sick people and students are asked to make the sacrifice, Mr. Speaker. This does not make any sense.



MR. NEARY: These are the people the administration thinks cannot defend themselves, that they are vulnerable and cannot defend themselves. Now the minister knows full well that for the first time in Newfoundland's history we will have no high school students to keep up the enrollment at the post-secondary institutions this year. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the minister announced an advertising programme here last week or the week before last, 'Join the Class of '83,' she said.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman, in coming to the rescue of the hon. gentleman for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), in asking a supplementary question is making a speech, Mr. Speaker. This is the Question Period, the time for questions not for speeches.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition did rise on a supplementary question, and I am sure he can refer to Beauchesne, which says, "Supplementary questions should not need a preamble."

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister how the minister expects people from the general population to Join the Class Of '83, the big publicity campaign that the provincial government is now carrying on to try to encourage enrollment at the post-secondary institutions to take up the slack because there will be no graduates from high schools this year going into the University and into the College of Trades and so forth, how can she justify that publicly programme on the one hand and then cut student allowances on the other hand to discourage students coming from the general population to get a post-secondary education in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I have to repeat that the provincial government student allowances, student grants, for the most needy students have not been reduced, have not been affected in any way. The most needy students, if they are single, for one semester of study will have to borrow \$900 and then they will qualify for the full provincial government grant of \$1,000 for total aid of \$1,900. Before it was exactly the same except that they did it in different stages, it was loan, \$575; grant \$1,000, and then another loan of \$325. But the bottom line is no different for the most needy students. And remember, Mr. Speaker, that mature people can often qualify for CEIC, commonly called Manpower Allowances to enable them to take training programme in vocational schools and colleges. There will be lots of good opportunities

MS. VERGE:

in our Province's vocational schools, colleges and Memorial Univeristy for people who have been out of school for a while or for people who previously applied for a few of the high demand programmes for which they were not accepted because there were too many applicants.

So I repeat my call to older people, to people who have been out of school for a few years, to mature people, to enroll in a post-secondary programme in September and to Join the Class of '83.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Those who Join the Class of '83 will put themselves in debt \$1,800 in their first year, Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly the point that we are making. There is no encouragement to increase the enrollment at the post-secondary institutions. As a matter of fact, the programme that has been announced by the minister in the Budget contradicts what she has been trying to do in her Class of '83.

Mr. Speaker, now the minister also mentioned during the Budget Speech, or following the Budget Speech, about students finding employment, that they would now have to contribute more of their income during the Summer holidays when they are working towards their education. Now the minister knows fulls well making that kind of a statement, Mr. Speaker, that we have record un-employment in Newfoundland amongst students. 50 per cent of the unemployed in this Province are young people between

MR. NEARY: the ages of sixteen and twenty-five.

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

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

MR. SIMMS: Ask questions.

MR. MARSHALL: He keeps on going, Mr. Speaker, on and on. I mean, he is making a speech again. Your Honour has called the hon. member to order once; this is the second time. Perhaps Your Honour should name the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Again I must repeat that in supplementary question there really should not be a need for a preamble, there is only about five minutes left in the Question Period. Maybe other hon. members might like to ask some questions.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister where she expects the students to find employment during the vacation period when last year we had, I believe, it was over 20 per cent unemployment amongst students across Canada, and it was much higher in this Province. Would the hon. minister care to tell the House where the students are going to find employment this Summer and Fall?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the change in the eligibility criteria for student aid to which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) refers actually works to the benefit of students who are unfortunate enough not to be able to get a job in the Summer,

MS. L. VERGE: in not discriminating against them. The change says that students who are in the opposite situation, who are lucky enough to get a job, now have to contribute 45 per cent of their actual earnings or 45 per cent of the minimum wage, whichever is greater. Before any student fortunate enough to have a job before entering post-secondary study, simply had to report and contribute on the application for Student Aid 45 per cent of the minimum wage. Surely, nobody can complain about that, Mr. Speaker. It just makes common sense. Now, for students who cannot find employment, then, of course, they report no such contribution and, more likely, than not, they will qualify for the maximum benefits. They will be in that most needy category who will not be hurt, will not be affected, will not receive any less provincial government grants after the changes.

MR. T. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, would the minister not agree that increasing the loan ceiling from \$575 per semester to \$900 that this measure pushes a student further in debt before qualifying for a provincial grant? Does that not push a student further in the hole? And if it does, how can we classify this as an incentive to go to a post-secondary institution? It is a strange incentive to me, Mr. Speaker.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: The change in the loan/grant split brings our Province's plan in line with the majority of provinces of Canada. Now, in Nova Scotia, in P.E.I., in New Brunswick, in Manitoba and Alberta students have to borrow

MS. L. VERGE: \$900 a semester before they qualify for any provincial free money. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said several times before, the most needy students, the ones who all along were getting the maximum in grants and borrowing the maximum, are not affected. Before, a single student in that category borrowed \$575, got the \$1,000, and then borrowed another \$325 for total aid in a semester of \$1,900 and \$1,000 was a grant. After the change, the same student will have to borrow the \$900 off the top and then go on to collect the \$1,000 grant for the same total \$1,900 aid and \$1,000 grant. So, no change for the most needy, no change for the one-third of our students who are in that category. The change will come about for students who are in a less needy position who, granted, will have to borrow more before they qualify for any free provincial money, for any provincial allowance, the same as their fellow students in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Manitoba and Alberta, provinces which are richer than ours and which can better afford to have student assistance than we can. It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that we have had to revert to this position, but the pressure of our economic problems has really left us no realistic alternative.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): This will be the final question for the Question Period, The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I still have not got the answer. I am just asking simply, does this measure now, does this step, by increasing the loan ceiling, does this cause a student to have to go more in debt than under the previous arrangement? Does this cause a student to have to borrow more money than in the first instance, that \$575? Because a loan ceiling at \$575, Mr. Speaker, seems lower to me that having to borrow \$900.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the answer is 'No' for the most needy students, who, all along, were borrowing the maximum and getting the maximum in grants. 'No', the most needy students will not have to borrow any more. The most needy students will borrow the same to get the maximum grant. The answer is 'Yes' for students with less need who formerly and after will not qualify for the maximum grant. They will have to borrow more before becoming entitled to any provincial grant allowance or free money.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the question period has expired.

#### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Financial Administration Act, I table copies of six special warrants, Finance, Development, Health, Municipal Affairs, and Justice.

#### NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give Notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend The Election Act."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

MR. WINDSOR: I will give an answer to Question No. 13 placed on Order Paper No. 5 by the hon. member from Bellevue (Mr. Callan). It also relates to an Oral Question from the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) just a couple of days ago in relation to the progress of Government's proposal to convert Lake Melville, Labrador, into a major port. I would like to read the rather brief answer.

The Department of Development remains confident that a year-round shipping corridor to a deep-water port in the Western end of Lake Melville is most technically and economically viable. This conclusion is based on a number of studies, including icebreaker probes carried out in 1980, 1981 and 1982 in which access by modern icebreakers was confirmed. In 1982, a study of the incremental cost of maintaining such an operation indicated that ice conditions would not increase cost to a level which would create a barrier to the development of the area. This is particularly true. The Canadian Coastguard continued to provide icebreaker service at no cost to commercial shipping. In the 1982-83 program, studies continue into the assessment of ice management techniques and technological advances. An oceanographic and ice-measurement programme is being carried out in the area of the proposed dock to determine operational difficulties. The revised cost estimate for heavy industrial work at Northwest Point now shows cost in excess of \$100,000 primarily because of poor soil conditions in the area.

Ice conditions within the lake itself have been found to be particularly severe this year. A survey of these conditions using side-looking airborne radar and conventional survey techniques have identified ridges of up to twelve meters in some areas.



MR. WINDSOR: a routing has been selected however which would avoid areas of most severe ridging. This is shown on the attached sketch. Ice thickness measurements along this route show ridging of three to four meters which is considered navigable by an icebreaker. An icebreaker probe by the CCGS Sir John Franklyn was scheduled for March but had to be cancelled because of the heavy pack ice conditions prevailing off the Newfoundland coast. We hope to carry out this probe in April if the icebreaker can be made available and if funding arrangements can be made.

As the technical and economic viability of year round access is becoming apparent, efforts in the future can be greatly reduced. Studies will continue into technological advances which could improve access and reduce costs. Major initiatives such as more icebreaker probes will not be carried out unless particularly severe conditions occur which could test Winter access, or in support of confirmed industrial development in the area.

The Department of Development is presently involved in feasibility studies into an aluminum smelter project and development of the forestry potential of the area. Only when industry expresses a strong interest in development in this area would it be appropriate to consider further financial support.

MR. NEARY: You are only wasting time.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Leader of the Opposition is not interested in Labrador, but I am sure these fine students from North West River certainly are.

MR. WINDSOR: Only when industry expresses a strong interest in development in this area would it be appropriate to consider further financial support in the provision of the necessary facilities. Of the considerable infrastructure required to support such development we feel port facilities and icebreaker support would be likely candidates for federal assistance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a question asked by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) on the Order Paper, No. 5, dated March 11th. In three parts, (a) The number of boys and girls who left the training homes at Whitbourne and St. John's without permission since January 1, 1982? The answer is 83. (b) The number of boys and girls who left the training homes who were involved in vandalism or crime which resulted in further court action since January 1, 1982? The answer is 41. (c) The total cost to the department for vandalism, damage and crime committed by boys and girls who left the training homes since January 1, 1982? The answer is \$12,771.52. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that 50 per cent of this amount can be attributed to two persons.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table answers to questions 14 and 25 which were asked by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

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

MR.YOUNG:                               Mr. Speaker, I would  
like to table the answers to questions asked by the hon. member  
for LaPoile (Mr.Neary). The number of pictures of the  
Premier distributed to public institutions around the  
Province. I did not distribute any pictures of the  
Premier to public institutions around the Province but  
I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the demand is very, very,  
great and I cannot do it.

MR. ROBERTS: Who paid for them?

MR. YOUNG: That is not the question at all. Mr. Speaker, I am answering the question that was asked. I do not know who paid for them but the Department of Public Works did not.

Mr. Speaker, the question on the Order Paper, No. 48, asked by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock): The number of helicopter trips taken by me during the fiscal year 1981 and 1982. During the two years in question, Mr. Speaker, I used the helicopter service to facilitate government business on one occasion only. This was to transport myself and departmental officials from Goose Bay to Rigolet, Postville and Makkovik, and return, for the official opening of the medical clinics in these communities. I was accompanied by an engineer and project manager from my department. Most of the meals, Mr. Speaker, were provided to me freely by the people we visited and I thanked them for their hospitality.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Presenting Petitions.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to table a document?

MR. SPEAKER: Can the hon. minister have leave to table a document?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a statistical document relating to the use of the Newfoundland and Labrador Provincial Parks in 1982.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition I wish to present today. It is on behalf of twenty-three post-secondary students who are here attending Memorial University. Those students are from Central and Coastal Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I will read the prayer of the petition. The prayer of the petition is: 'We the following post-secondary students from Coastal and Central Labrador disagree with the decision of the provincial government to reduce the health care services for Labrador. We feel the closing down of the North West River hospital without adequate planning for the upgrading of the Melville hospital in Happy Valley - Goose Bay is an irresponsible move.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Health (Mr. House), since he became the Minister of Health in this government, has one aim and that aim is to cause hardship and suffering to the sick people in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. WARREN: Last year, Mr. Speaker, he took the opportunity of closing down the Markland Cottage Hospital and this has caused an uproar on the Avalon Peninsula and it has caused much suffering. And to this present day there are people waiting to enter hospitals in St. John's, in different hospitals. It is because of the attitude of the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read a telegram that came from the Mayor of Makkovik, The contents of the telegram are as follows:

MR. WARREN: 'Our government's plan to close the hospital at North West River will have a devastating effect in Northern Labrador. St. Anthony, nor Melville can give the North Coast the type of self-service that we have become accustomed to from North West River over the years, just another example of our government's attitude towards the people of Labrador and a reminder of our native rights.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, how far can we go? How far can the Minister of Health go? How much more suffering is the minister going to place on the backs of the Labrador people and not only that, the Newfoundland people also, Mr. Speaker?

Last year in the Melville Hospital there were 6,842 patient days, and of these - Mr. Speaker, the minister said earlier there was no surgery done in North West River - there were 881 surgical days in the North West River Hospital. And, Mr. Speaker, also the hospital at North West River is presently averaging seven pediatrics a day, seven a day and the hospital at Melville can only, even with revision, even with modification, can only handle six. What is going to happen to the daily care that the hospital in North West River is providing.

Mr. Speaker, just to reiterate, the kind of attitude that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) toward the Labrador people, here is what he said in an interview he had with CBC this morning: The minister said, number one, the Grenfell Health Board did not know that the hospital was going to be closed down. Furthermore, one of the reasons the Minister of Health is not going into North West River this weekend is because he has other commitments, fine and dandy, but he said there are no flights on Saturdays. He said this on the radio this morning, there are no flights on

MR. WARREN: Saturday, and he has to wait to get more answers for them. He has to wait to get more answers for the people before he goes into North West River.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, the minister - this has happened now for the last four years, since the minister became the Minister of Health - minister should not only be thrown out of the Cabinet, he should be thrown out of this House. The way the minister is acting, he should be thrown out of this House. And, Mr. Speaker, the minister, in my estimation and in the estimation of the people in Coastal Labrador, and Central Labrador, the minister deliberately misled, deceived and fooled the people of North West River and Coastal Labrador. The minister has been dishonest with the people and he has acted in a most inhumane manner, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned the minister has completely misled, he has completely deceived the people of Labrador, and he has been dishonest with the people of Labrador, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: He has deliberately misled the House.

MR. WARREN: He has deliberately misled the people of Labrador. And, in fact, in his answer today, as far as I am concerned, he has deliberately -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS: He forgot to say it until his leader told him to say it.

March 24, 1983

Tape No. 598

NM - 3

MR. MARSHALL:                   The hon. gentleman is entitled to make his points but he has to make them in a parliamentary manner, Mr. Speaker, and he has been skirting that. You know, to talk about the hon. minister deliberately misleading and being dishonest,



MR. MARSHALL: the tenor of his remarks is completely and absolutely out of order. As I said, the hon. gentleman can make his point and he is entitled to make his point, but within the framework of the rules.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Port au Port, on that point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the section in Beauchesne, Section 320, Page 104 lists the words which can be used in the House and the word 'deceive' has been ruled unparliamentary. But, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, a little farther along, since 1968, the word 'deceive' has been ruled parliamentary. So Beauchesne is unclear as to whether the word 'deceive' would be - and by the way, Mr. Speaker, the member did not say that the minister deceived the House, he said he deceived the people of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Chair did not hear the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) say that the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House) deliberately misled the members of this House or misled the House.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains has about one minute left.

MR. WARREN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I only hope that the minister will get up in his place and defend the people in Labrador, the people of coastal Labrador and North West River and Goose Bay and try to act like a Minister of Health should act, and think about the sick and suffering people in this Province, try to act like a human being.

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE:

If I may speak for just a couple of minutes in relation to the petition just presented by the hon. gentleman on behalf of, I think he said, twenty-three post-secondary students, who obviously have some very strong concerns about action which is being taken by this government in relation to the hospital at North West River. I fully support the concerns that they have. As a matter of fact, I did that by attending a meeting last Saturday afternoon, an impromptu meeting, I might add, in North West River, at which time I met with about 150 or so of the residents plus the Health Care Committee after that particular meeting. And I will be travelling to Labrador tomorrow

MR. GOUDIE: to attend the meeting set up for two o'clock Saturday afternoon in North West River. At that time I will be making information available to the meeting, the public meeting based on a great series of questions which were directed at government, through me, last weekend in North West River, and I suspect that not all of the answers that I have are going to be satisfactory. I think they could be construed as being dissatisfactory to a great number of people.

The only thing that I can differ with, or the point that the hon. gentleman made, and this is just based on my understanding of comments made by my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. House), relates to the reason why he is not going to North West River to attend that meeting on Saturday. It is not because there is no flight on Saturday, but it was rather short notice and I understand he has some commitments, but there was a counter proposal made by the minister to the Health Care Committee, specifically Katherine Bakie Pottle who is heading up that Committee, and that is that around the middle of April it would be a much more appropriate time for him to meet with the public of North West River, and it is quite possible, depending on what the conclusions are drawn at the meeting on Saturday, it is quite possible there will be a second meeting at that time. But I think we all share the concerns of these twenty-three students and all of the people of North West River and Coastal Labrador in relation to that particular facility. And I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that I think there is an incorrect terminology being used in that the hospital is not closing, the hospital is being phased down, or the decision has been made to phase it down to a clinic status not close it.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may say a few words with respect to the petition, let me first of all deal with a point or two made by my friend for Naskaupi district (Mr. Goudie). I think we all appreciate the courage which he is showing in dealing with this matter. I think we all know how distasteful it must be for him to be part of an administration which has acted for purely financial reasons, I suggest, in making changes in the health care field which are not merited for any reason other than for financial, and I am not saying they are merited for financial reasons. But, you know, we have a Cabinet that has sacrificed health care on the expediency of the almighty dollar, and that is the first time to my recollection, ever in the history of Newfoundland, other than the Dirty Thirties when they actually cut the education vote by 10 per cent, the first time that a government has ever closed hospitals simply to try to save a buck. And that is what they are doing, of course.

MR. HOUSE:

That is an unfair statement.

MR. ROBERTS:

I am sorry?

DR. COLLINS:

That is very unfair.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I will listen to the minister if he has something to say but not to the Yahoo. What did the minister say?

MR. W. HOUSE: It is unfair that you are making that kind of a statement.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister may think it is unfair but it is not untrue.

MR. HOUSE: It is untrue, we are not cutting back.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has been conspicuous by his silence throughout this. I have my own reasons for believing why he will not go to Labrador this weekend and I will leave it at that, But what I was speaking of was the courage of his colleague the Minister of whatever it is, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), who, in my opinion, is being hung out on the line and left to dry by his colleagues in Cabinet. Now, what I do want to say is this, the trouble with the decision - oh, let me say as well that it is a little inexact to say the hospital is not being closed, it is being phased down into a clinic. My understanding from the Budget Speech is that the government propose to close all of the beds in the hospital, there may be an emergency bed or two left. What will be left is a doctor's office or two and what will be left is maybe an X-ray machine or maybe not, I have not even heard that, but it will be a clinic and not a hospital. It will cease to function in any way comparable to that which it has functioned since Dr. Harry Paddon went there about 1900. North West River is not only one of the oldest settlements in this Province but the hospital at North West River is one of the oldest medical facilities in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:                      Seventy-one years.

MR. ROBERTS:    My friend says seventy-ones years. I had thought that the North West River Hospital was built before 1912. I stand to be corrected. My understanding was that it was about the turn of the century that Grenfell and Dr. Cluny Macpherson went to Battle Harbour and Indian Harbour. In fact, my great uncle served with them for a while down there, my father's uncle. And then Dr. Paddon came out from England and went into what was then and is now North West River and settled there and made his home there.

MR. BARRETT:                      The history is superb.

MR. ROBERTS:                      Yes, the history is superb and so is the logic. Unfortunately, it is the government's reasoning that is bad I would say to my friend from St. John's West (Mr. Barrett).

The problem is, Mr. Speaker, and the government are going to run into this as they close, because North West River is not the last to go. Buchans is going to go and Botwood is going to go and Placentia is going to go and I defy the Minister of Health (Mr. House) to challenge that statement. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is the dishonesty with which this administration approached the whole subject. If they would come out and say that here is the situation. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) spoke in his Budget of a study to be made. Maybe there will be such a study and yet here we have a case of the door being locked after the horse is gone out of it. Mr. Speaker, the problem is the dishonesty with which this administration are approaching the questions of health care in this Province. The only reason that North West River is being closed as a hospital is financial. If the government have some other reason they have not given it. If there is some other reason it has not been made public. I draw the conclusion there is no other

MR. ROBERTS:

reason. That is why it was announced in a Budget Speech. This was not a health care measure, this was a budgetary measure And I will say again because my time is nearly up, Mr. Speaker --I will have time again in the debate later today or in the morning. And we are going to be on Interim Supply until the seventy-five hours run out. You know the government are not going to see Interim Supply short of the seventy-five hours, or whatever is left after the guillotine is down, runs out. So we will have lots of time to talk about it. The problem with this whole approach is that it is purely a financial thing, and the reason why North West River is being closed is to try to save the almighty buck. And the principles of health care have now been subverted to the financial dictates, the financial expediency caused by the mismanagement of this government and those who have gone before, if you wish, on both sides, on both sides if you want to say that. What I will say, Mr. Speaker, is that the government and the Minister of Health (Mr. House) in approaching this have looked only at financial considerations. And I say in closing to my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) that I feel right from the heart, I feel a deep sorrow for him because he is being hung out to dry. He is going to get no support from his colleagues. He is going to have to answer for this to his constituents. He will do his best and he is going to get no support. He deserves it because what he is doing is expressing a government decision in which he had a part for which he is fully responsible, but not one which he himself took.

I support the petition, Sir.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!  
The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it looks to me now from the strategy being used by the Government House Leader -

MR. ANDREWS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order.

MR CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Could the gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) control his intemperate remarks as best he can? I do not mind him being rude and vulgar.

MR. ANDREWS: I was not talking to you.

MR. ROBERTS: I know he was not talking to me, Mr. Chairman, but when we can hear him on this side -

MR. ANDREWS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: There he goes again, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: When we can hear him on this side of the House being vulgar and intemperate surely, Sir, that is out of order and he should be called to order.

MR. BAIRD: The hon. member was over there bugging him.



March 24, 1983

Tape No. 602

ah-3

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

To that point of order.

The Chair did not hear any remark but I will take it

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): under consideration  
and rule on it later.

The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition.

MR. NEARY: It looks to us on this side of  
the House, Mr. Chairman, as if the government now, with the  
strategy that we have seen in the House in the last several  
days, intend to go for a short session of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: They have nothing to talk about.

MR. NEARY: That is right. They have really  
nothing on the agenda worthwhile. We have the Throne Speech,  
the Budget Speech and the Interim Supply Bill all before the  
House at the same time and the strategy seems to be,  
Mr. Chairman, that once the Interim Supply Bill is finished  
then we go straight into the Budget Speech and as soon as  
the Budget Speech ends then you can kiss this part of  
this session of the House good-bye. I think that is  
shameful, Mr. Chairman. It is beneath contempt. Here we  
are, almost two weeks now in session, and there has not  
been a word from the government benches, from the ministers,  
not a word about plans for dealing with record unemployment  
in this Province, especially record unemployment among  
students, young people between the ages of sixteen and  
twenty-five, not a word, Mr. Chairman, not a peep about  
the crisis in the fishery, not a word about the ever-  
increasing cost of electricity rates in this Province,  
not a word about how they propose to deal with the  
communities on the misery list, Fermeuse, Burin, St. Lawrence,  
Gaultois, Grand Bank, Ramea, Harbour Breton, Piccadilly,  
Happy Valley - Goose Bay, North West River, Labrador West,  
Wabush, Bell Island and all the other communities on the  
misery list; not a word, not a peep out of the government  
on how they intend to cope with the problems in these

March 24, 1983

Tape 603

EC - 2

MR. NEARY: regions of the Province and  
in these communities. The Premier is up in Ottawa today,

MR. NEARY:

himself and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), at the last minute, coming in at the last minute. He has had a whole year now to lay out plans for the fishery but he is up in Ottawa now at the last minute. Just as the Cabinet Committee of the federal government are on the verge of making a decision on restructuring, the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries from this Province rush in with an ill-conceived, very poorly put together plan at the last minute, the eleventh hour, that now, Mr. Chairman, will only muddy up the water. Muddy up the water, that is all it will do.

We told the government last Fall that one of the - as a matter of fact, we said it in our presentation to the Kirby Task Force, that if the fishery is going to survive and prosper in this Province the changes that would have to be made would have to be drastic and dramatic, and one of the changes we recommended was separating the trawler fleet from the processing sector.

MR. DINN:

Well, obviously if that happens you will agree with that.

MR. NEARY:

That is our philosophy. That is our proposal. We made that proposal. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, at this point in time that the federal government will go along with it. Separate the trawler fleet - separate the harvesting from the processing sector. In other words, Mr. Chairman, that is a part of our ideology over here. We put that proposition forward a year ago, just the same as we suggested that the terms of reference of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation -

MR. DINN:

That sounds like a sensible idea, why would they not go along with it?

MR. NEARY: Because, Mr. Chairman, when the provincial government had the opportunity to propose that, when it was on the table, they would not go along with it.

MR. TOBIN: Squirm. Squirm.

MR. NEARY: Now, at the last minute, they are rushing in with a plan -

MR. TOBIN: Squirm, snail.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: At the eleventh hour the Province rushes in with a plan; and we do not know what is in that plan. But they have had an opportunity for the last year to put any ideas or suggestions or recommendation they had, to lay them on the table.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the House have been advocating separating the harvesting from the processing sector for the past year, and our appeal has fallen on deaf ears. And to do it now at this particular point in time, all it will do is muddy up the water. It will have to be done somewhere down the line. It will have to be done and it will be done. But to rush in now, just on the eve of making a decision on restructuring, will only delay the reopening -

MR. TOBIN: You can squirm all you like.

MR. NEARY: - will only delay the reopening of the plant in Burin, and the plant in Ramea, and the plant in Gaultois, because, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced - not only am I convinced but it is part of our ideology, our philosophy, that all these plants should reopen.

MR. DINN: What other things -

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. DINN: I did not read what you sent in to the Kirby Task Force.

MR. NEARY:

Well, I will not tell the hon. gentleman, I will let my hon. colleague deal with it. But, Mr. Chairman, somewhere down the line - now to nationalize the harvesting sector of the fishing industry is a major and dramatic reform in the fishing industry, there is no question about it, but it is something that you cannot do overnight. We cannot delay any longer the reopening of these plants. Let us get the plants reopened and then let us talk about nationalizing the harvesting sector. Get the plants open first, get the restructuring done, and then deal with the harvesting, Mr. Chairman, of the stock.

MR. TOBIN: You seem to be embarrassed, what is the problem?

MR. NEARY: Embarrassed? We are trying to push our point. This is a plank in our platform and we are trying to push it. We are trying to convince hon. gentlemen to nationalize, to go along with us.

MR. ANDREWS: Are you saying Kirby will not go along with you?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. DINN: Kirby will not go along with you.

MR. NEARY: No. What we are saying is the provincial government will not go along with us. When they had an opportunity to have input into the Kirby Task Force, and when they were invited to attend the Cabinet meetings in Ottawa they did not put forward this suggestion. Now they may do it at the last minute. They may do it at the last minute, I do not know. But the last minute is too late.

There were three

options on the table. The three options were - the second option was to nationalize the industry, to nationalize it, and the provincial government would not go along with that.

MR. NEARY: The Premier went up to Ottawa and said, he would have nothing to do with nationalization. Nothing to do with it.

MR. DINN: Do you agree with that?

MR. NEARY: I do not agree with the Premier, no. I think the fleet has to be nationalized.

MR. BARRETT: You are a socialist anyway.

MR. NEARY: Well, in that regard I am.

MR. BARRETT: You are in every regard.

MR. NEARY: Oh, listen! Oh, listen to holier than thou over there! At least I have a social conscience.. I have a social conscience, that is more I can say -

MR. TOBIN: Is that a sin?

MR. NEARY: Is it a sin to have a social conscience?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, somewhere down the line we will have to nationalize the harvesting sector of the fishing industry.

Now it is not a new idea. Two previous governments almost nationalized the trawler fleet. Mr. Chairman, two previous administrations, the Smallwood administration -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - and the Moores administration almost nationalized the harvesting sector of the fishing industry.

MR. BARRETT: They would nationalize anything.

MR. NEARY: They almost did it, Mr. Chairman, and I have no doubt that somewhere down the line it is going to have to happen. The sooner the better,

MR. DINN: I only have two points.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. DINN: I only have two points,  
nationalize (inaudible) the harvesting part of it.

MR. NEARY: And the marketing. Do not forget  
the marketing. To expand the Terms of Reference of the  
Canadian Salfish Corporation to handle marketing of all  
the produce of the sea, that is a part of our policy, our  
platform.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where did you get that?

MR. NEARY: Where did we get it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we got it from  
the real success story since Confederation, in this Province,  
is the Canadian Salfish Corporation.



MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. HISCOCK. I would like to say a few words, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Budget that was brought down and what many people have said in this House. Within the next three or four months we will see the electing of a new leader of the national Conservative Party and his PC caucus and government here are going to support the favourite son. I would like to go on record as saying that I wish Mr. Crosbie the best, and hopefully he will make a good showing. Who knows, he may become the next Prime Minister. But I would like to ask, in what direction is the Conservative Party here in Newfoundland going? We know the Premier and the caucus are going to be supporting Mr. Crosbie, we know the Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development is supporting Mr. Mulroney, and the former Premier is going to be supporting Mr. Mulroney, I would assume, while the member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) is on record as supporting Mr. Clark. So we have the Conservative Party in Newfoundland going in three different directions.

MR. BAIRD: Are you supporting Mr. Trudeau?

MR. HISCOCK: Yes, I am and always will.

With regard to that I was just wondering the other day as I was driving out, when Mr. Crosbie announced his candidacy, if he does become the next Leader of the PC Party and the Prime Minister of Canada will that mean that he will move the capital of Canada from Ottawa to St. John's? I wonder if it means that. I wonder, also, will he move the shoemaking industry from Quebec

MR. E. HISCOCK: and bring it down to Newfoundland and get into producing mukluks? These are some things I was wondering. Also, I would love to know, if he ever is the Prime Minister of Canada, will he agree with what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is saying, that the Northern Cod should not go to Nova Scotia, not go to New Brunswick, not go to Quebec or P.E.I. but must stay in Newfoundland? I would like for the day to come when we would see a Conservative Prime Minister of Canada from Newfoundland, and if it should happen I am sure the Liberals here on this side would welcome it more than ever, more so than the Conservatives, because then both governments, in Newfoundland and in Ottawa, would live up to their commitments and our people in St. John's and other areas of our Province would find out that there is such a thing as national interest and provincial interest. But just by having a Newfoundlander as head of the PC Party, and maybe Prime Minister, does not necessarily mean that he is going to give Newfoundland everything that we want. Mr. Peckford thinks we would get the offshore, Mr. Morgan thinks we would get the Northern Cod and some other people think we should get the shoemaking industry and have our mukluks produced here in St. John's. In conclusion I will just say I wanted to make one comment, I wish Mr. Crosbie well but it is going to put the Conservative caucus and the Conservative Party here in Newfoundland in a difficult situation, whether they will support Mr. Mulroney, or whether they will support Mr. Crosbie, or support Mr. Clark. Some of them may even decide to support other candidates. But as a favourite son I suppose we

MR. HISCOCK: have to congratulate him, that he feels he has the ego to go after the top job. And for my part I wish him well and I look forward to doing battle with him some day, maybe, in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa, or, who knows, maybe as our Prime Minister.

But I would like to go back to the budget with regard to the student aid. The student aid programme is something that is very, very dear to me because if it was not for student aid many members on both sides would not be into post-secondary education, would not be in the different professions we are in. Financial aid was given to us by a Liberal government, under Mr. Smallwood. If I may go back, and I have said this in the House before, the first Minister of Education in this Province, in 1909, was in a Liberal administration under Sir Robert Bond. And that Minister of Education was Dr. Arthur Barnes who is an ancestor of mine, a great grand uncle. The question was put to him, and, as a matter of fact, it is on record, whether they would have free education in St. John's. Well, that was the decision the Cabinet made. He fought in Cabinet and ended up saying, 'No, we will not have free education in St. John's, we will extend it to the coves and the inlets and the bays and other areas of the Province.' Dr. Arthur Barnes - and I am sure the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) knows of him, in the sense that he is buried in Bay Roberts - Mr. Chairman, made that choice realizing that our greatest resource was and is and always will be our people. We are going to be and always will be unless things change dramatically, being an Island, an exporter of people. In the best of times and in the worst of times we will

MR. HISCOCK: be an exporter of people  
because we will have people who will want to get away and  
see what else is in the world. And I, for one, Mr. Chairman,  
feel that if we educate our people and they want to go to  
Africa, or the United States, or South America, or Europe,

MR. HISCOCK:

or other parts of Canada then more power to them, Mr. Chairman. And if we educate them and they take their experience to other countries and then they decide to come back, I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that we would welcome them with open arms and not take the mental attitude taken by many of our people, 'Oh, you have been away now, you think you know it all and you have come back telling us how to run the place' - as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said to a person who came to this Province with the idea of helping to build up this Province. What did he say to him? He called him a 'mainlander' with only two years of residence in this Province. And what did the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) call a professor from the university?

Mr. Chairman, if this is how we are going to treat people who are coming to our Province - and I would assume that the Memorial University Board of Regents hiring practice is second to none and they are not going to have anybody come into this Province and to this great university of ours unless he is of top international calibre, and I would say international, not provincial.

We have seen now, Mr. Chairman, in the process of student aid, the idea that education is a right - we have the highest illiteracy rate in Canada, definitely in the Atlantic Provinces, we have the lowest per capita student enrolment in post-secondary education, those who are going on to post-secondary education in Canada, and yet, here we are now claiming - and I am a little amazed at it and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is also, that here is the Premier, who champions the cause of our young people and the development of Hibernia so that Newfoundlanders can make maximum use of it, the unemployment. None of our

MR. HISCOCK: industries are around anymore,  
now he is putting the boots to our students so that they  
also will not be around, and we will have to bring in  
people from other parts and then we will have the

MR. HISCOCK:

Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) saying the same thing, 'They are from outside,' instead of training our people. And if Hibernia, Mr. Chairman, is supposed to come the way it is supposed to come, then I, for one, feel that we should not build the Arts and Culture Centre in Labrador West, we should not build the Confederation Building, we should not get on talking about the Shoe Cove station, we should not get on talking about expansion of the various ministers' departments, museums, etc., we should be taking that money, in the next three or four years, and putting it into post-secondary education and saying to our students, 'We got four or five years to prepare for Hibernia and we are going to make sure that everyone of our students who want to avail of this will. And I would go as far as to say, Mr. Chairman the federal government, under its reallocation of post-secondary education, are bringing in changes which will see the weekly allowance increase from \$56.25 to \$100.00, that they are eligible for. Interest free loans will be extended from a six month period to an eighteen month period because they realize in these hard economic times students are not finding jobs, and why should they be burdened with paying back loans after six months when they cannot get jobs. So they have extended that to an eighteen month period. And also part-time students, those students who find that they can get a part-time job, who do not want to get into high loans, now find that they can qualify.

So these are some of the things that the federal government are bringing in. And what is the provincial government bringing in? Independent students living at home will no longer be able to claim room and board. They will not longer be able to claim room and board. Not only

MR. HISCOCK: that but they will have to borrow \$900 each semester. Also the students' contribution; calculations will be changed from 45 per cent of the minimum wage earnings to 45 per cent of the actual earnings, or 45 per cent of the minimum wage, whichever is greater, Not whatever is left, whichever is greater, Mr. Chairman.

So now we find Newfoundland with the lowest standard of living and the highest cost of living.

MR. DINN: The lowest standard of living?

MR. HISCOCK: The lowest standard of living, yes. I am quoting here from the Muse. "Newfoundland has the lowest standard of living, the highest cost of living and the highest rate of unemployment, and also the lowest rate of students going on to post-secondary education." But here is the Premier, who is the champion of our younger people in this Province, -and I would go as far as to say that 98.9 per cent of those of voting age in the last election probably rooted for the Premier, and for this government, because they wanted to see the resource of Hibernia controlled and developed for the maximum benefit of Newfoundlanders, and now they find themselves in a situation Mr. Chairman, where education is a little bit more expensive and many of them have to think twice.

I am sure there is not a member in this House of Assembly who, each September, has



MR. HISCOCK:

several students coming to him or her saying, 'We do not have enough, we have to re-apply to student aid for an appeal because we cannot live on this'. And we also have other people, Mr. Chairman, in our Province who cannot go to university because, number one, they are married, they have a wife and children and they cannot get by getting into debt. And as bad as their position has been in the past couple of years, now it is going to be even more so.

I kept asking the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), at the Committee meetings, if the provincial government was going to bring in any special programme for students over and above -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for St. John's West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Chairman, I thought

I would have a couple of words this afternoon for a few minutes on this budget that has been presented by the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and in particular probably dwell for a couple of minutes on the allocation for the Department of Education.

Mr. Chairman, this government has recognized, since this administration has taken office, its responsibility to the education of the students of this Province. I think this is reflected in the amount of money that is allocated for this particular department.

The Department of Education accounts for just about 25 per cent of all of the funding that is provided to all sectors of the Province by this

MR. BARRETT: provincial government. That is a pretty significant bite of the total available dollars - \$525 million allocated for the providing of all aspects of education in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, one of the major components of this amount of

MR. BARRETT:

money is the \$268 million allocation for teaching services. As you are aware, government has been negotiating now for some months with the executive and the bargaining arm of the NTA. One would think, from hearing some of the rhetoric coming from that branch of the Teachers' Association, that government are totally insensitive to the teachers of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, in 1982-83 the amount paid to teachers was some \$242 million. The present Budget addresses itself to increasing this amount to \$268 million. Now that is a fairly significant increase just on the salary issues alone in a time of restraint, I think, when all levels of the public sector have recognized the need of restraint in salaries, wages and other employee benefits. I think one of the things that was evidenced by this very fact was the announcement by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) today of the tentative agreement with a segment of the teaching profession that normally are not the first people to sign an agreement on wage issues, but normally would follow what is done by the NTA on behalf of the larger body of the teaching profession. It is obvious that these people feel that the initiatives that are made by the NTA and the bargaining unit are totally unrealistic, and it would appear that they have certainly changed direction and have taken a very realistic and creditable stand in their settlement.

MR. H. BARRETT: It might be interesting to reflect on some of the numbers, and these are some of the things which people probably tend to forget and maybe chose to forget and not pay any attention to. The average salary for a teacher in this Province amounts to \$30,000 a year. For that \$30,000 a year the average teacher works an average work day of six to seven hours per day for a five day week. But not only that, Mr. Chairman, the number of days a year worked are 185 days per year at an average hourly rate of twenty-seven dollars an hour. Now, in the best of times or in the worst of times that is a pretty good number, for 185 working days a year an average wage of twenty-seven dollars an hour.

MR. T. LUSH: What professional people get paid less?

MR. BARRETT: What professional people? Nurses. Nurses get paid significantly less if wanted to ask, I am glad you raised the question. The nurses get an average wage of fifteen dollars an hour as compared to twenty-seven dollars an hour.

MR. LUSH: Compare the training.

MR. BARRETT: Compare the training. Yes, As as a matter of fact, the nurses are more extensive in a great number of cases. However, the numbers themselves, I think, suggest that in this time of restraint the teachers are very well looked after by this administration.

MR. LUSH: Those people will love you.

MR. BARRETT: Well, I am not particularly looking for the love of anybody let alone a teacher. I have my hands full now. I have my wife's permission to say that.

There is no question that everybody needs to be cognizant of the cost of living, trying to better

MR. H. BARRETT:            their station in life but I think there has to be some realism attached to these goals and I think that the treatment of the teachers in this Province, by this government, has been very creditable. I think it is necessary to highlight the fact that the average teacher is not unduly upset with what has been offered by government. I speak with quite a number of teachers who live in my district.

MR. BARRETT: The average teacher is not at all upset. The average teacher is quite prepared to recognize the commitment and the dedication that is necessary on their part and to receive an amount which is probably in other times, other financial times, less than one would expect but given our circumstances today - I am fully informed by the people who I speak with that they are quite prepared to accept this, that the problem here is the Executive of the NTA. The problem here is not the average teacher, the problem is the executive and the negotiating team and that seems to be the whole problem, this mess that seems to be prevailing. If they get their way, this NTA Executive are not at all concerned, the least bit concerned, about what is going to happen to the students approaching examination time, when it is necessary that the school work is completed, that the term is completed to allow these students to write proper examinations, to properly address the curriculum for the year. And, it is unfortunate that the majority of the teachers of this Province are being asked by their executive to choose a course which is going to be totally disruptive to the school year and totally out of character with these people as professionals. And I think that if they think of themselves as professionals, as they are, then I think they will be supportive of the government's position on these wage restraints measures. I think everything else is a lot of bulldogging, there is a lot of trying to shade the issues, that the real problem here is the Executive of the NTA, the Bargaining Unit; it is not the teachers of this Province who, I am quite sure, will always be prepared to support this Government.

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

MR. NEARY:                               Mr. Chairman, the hon.  
gentleman who just spoke, I think probably cast more  
asperions    on the teachers and insulted the intelligence  
of the teachers, more than the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)  
has been doing in the last several months.   Somebody

MR. NEARY: should get the Hansard, get the transcript of the hon. gentleman's speech and send it over to the NTA. If the hon. gentleman felt that the majority of teachers were being duped by their negotiating team or being coddled by their negotiating team, why did the hon. gentleman spend the last ten minutes trying to defend the administration and its policy?

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman's remarks were beneath contempt and nothing but an insult to the intelligence of the teachers.

I am not going to dwell on it any longer, I am going to come back to the idea, the suggestion that I made earlier about splitting the harvesting from the processing sector of the fishing industry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we hear so much these days from the media that nothing new has been said in the House. Well, here is something new now that is going on the table of this House, and let it be recorded that it was the Liberal Party of Newfoundland who said it first, that it is the Opposition who have been pressing the administration for the past year to go along with our suggestion that the harvesting sector of the fishing industry be separated from the processing sector. Let it be recorded that it has been said first -

MR. TULK: Forever and a day.

MR. NEARY: Forever and a day it has been said by the Liberal Opposition in this House. And if the media think that it has been said before in this House, maybe it has but I have not heard it. It is a part of our platform.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I can understand, there were three options. The first option that was being considered - and obviously the administration had input in the discussion - the first option was to merge -

MR. TULK: No, the Premier just went up and said, 'Let me know what you do.'



MR. NEARY: Yes. Well, that is right, the Premier went to Ottawa and said, 'Look, let us know what you are going to do, but we are against nationalization.' 'We are against nationalization,' he said, 'but tell us what you are going to do.'

Well, here is what the provincial government was told: There are three options. The first option is a merger of National Sea and Nickersons, a merger between National Sea and Nickersons and then that would be one company; and the second company would be a merger of all the Newfoundland companies. So, Mr. Chairman, what you would end up with -

MR. TOBIN: Do you agree with that?

MR. NEARY: No, I do not agree with that.

MR. TOBIN: Did you have a phone call from Ottawa this afternoon?

MR. NEARY: No, I certainly did not have a phone call from Ottawa this afternoon. Why, Mr. Chairman. Am I saying something I should not be saying?

MR. ANDREWS: No. I am just curious.

MR. NEARY: No. But this has become general knowledge in the last few days.

MR. TOBIN: Fishery Products, Lakes, and who else?

MR. NEARY: No, the first option was National Sea and Nickersons merge, National Sea and Nickersons.

MR. ANDREWS: The second (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No. Part of the first option and all of the Newfoundland companies here in this Province merge.

MR. ANDREWS: All of them.

MR. NEARY: Merge! Merge! Okay?  
So you would have two companies, you would have a Nova Scotia company and you would have a Newfoundland company. My hon. friend knows.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, I sure do.

MR. NEARY: Right.

Now the first option as I understand it, has been dismissed forthright, that what you would end up with would be a powerful Nova Scotia company and a weak Newfoundland company. So that is gone off the table.

Now the second option that was on the table was to separate, split the harvesting section of the fishing industry from the processing sector. But Ottawa could not get the Provincial Government to go along with that, so that had to be taken off the table.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, is that right? Is that right?

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what they are going to propose today, but today is too late. If they did it today it would be too late.

MR. TOBIN: You can twist and squirm all you like my friend.

MR. NEARY: And the third option that would keep Burin, Ramea, Gaultois and all these other places, would be a merger between Nickersons and all the Newfoundland companies, formed into one big Crown company.

MR. MARSHALL: What did your friend say on the weekend?

MR. NEARY: No, between Nickerson's and the Newfoundland companies.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you going to table that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, these are just little thoughts that I just wrote down.

And that the provincial and federal governments and possibly the union would take equity in this big Crown company.

Now, Mr. Chairman, also, as far as the corporation that would harvest the fish, I see no reason why the provincial and federal governments and the union could not take equity in that company, the corporation that would harvest the fish.

MR. DINN: The third option is Nickerson, Fishery Products and Lakes, J.C. Penny, all these companies merge.

MR. NEARY: All in one pot.

MR. DINN: As processors.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. DINN: And set up a Crown Corporation.

MR. NEARY: Well that would more or less be a Crown company if the provincial government would take equity into it, it would be -

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) into it.

MR. NEARY: That is right. It would be more or less a Crown company.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very interesting.

MR. NEARY: It is. It is very interesting. I am surprised the hon. gentleman is so interested in what I am saying, Because the hon. gentleman is such a capitalist, such a private entrepreneur, I am amazed that the hon. gentleman is so interested in what I am saying.

March 24, 1983

Tape 615

PK - 3

MR. DINN:

I can listen to ideas, you know.

MR. NEARY:

These are ideas.

MR. DINN:

The first two options are out?

MR. NEARY:

Option No. 1 is out.

MR. DINN:

And No. 2 is out?

MR. NEARY:

No, no. I did not say No. 2.

What I said about No. 2 was that the provincial government up to today, up to this very day, the provincial government would not go along with any signs of nationalization. In other words, they were not prepared to go along with splitting the harvesting from the processing sector up until now.

MR. NEARY: Now I do not know what is going to happen today in Ottawa. I have no idea.

MR. DINN: What were the federal government willing to do on that?

MR. NEARY: The federal government had it on the table. But the provincial government would not go along with them so they had to take it off the table for the time being.

MR. TOBIN: That is interesting.

MR. NEARY: For the time being.

MR. TOBIN: So now the federal government is going to go along with the provincial government, is that what you are saying?

MR. NEARY: No, no. What I am saying is that to put that back - I am not advocating it go back on the table now, because we have to get these plants reopened. That is the first thing. The number one priority is to reopen these plants. Now somewhere after that, down the line, the harvesting sector of the fishing industry will have to be split from the processing sector. That is a part of our philosophy, Mr. Chairman, and up to now we have not been able to persuade the provincial government to go along with that great reform.

MR. DINN: So the federal government, the union, and the provincial government, will buy out all the assets of these companies, throw them out and then -

MR. NEARY: What companies is the hon. gentleman talking about?

MR. DINN: Well, all the Newfoundland companies you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: Are you talking about harvesting now or processing?

MR. DINN: Both. Because according to you, now this is his option - the hon. member's option - and then you are going to separate them after.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman is a little bit confused.

MR. DINN: I see.

MR. NEARY: A little bit confused. What I am talking about is separating the harvesting from the processing.

MR. DINN: But that is after you said you will do that, down the road.

MR. NEARY: Well, let us get the plants opened first.

MR. DINN: Yes. Right.

MR. NEARY: I mean, an awful lot of plants in Newfoundland can go it on their own.

MR. DINN: We are going to nationalize it all.

MR. NEARY: No, not nationalize it all. I am not advocating complete nationalization of the fishery.

MR. DINN: Oh, all right.

MR. NEARY: I still think there is room for private enterprise. But what I am talking about are the Lake Group of companies, Fishery Products and Nickerson's. I think they should be merged into one big - in Newfoundland - Crown company.

MR. DINN: Lakes, Pennys. Yes.

MR. NEARY: That is what I think.

MR. DINN: Now this is the third option on the paper.

MR. TOBIN: You heard Bill Mathews saying that down at Gonzaga. That is where you heard that

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman thought that he should have said so a long time ago, because that is what we have been saying in this House since the hon. gentleman came in here.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order!  
Before I recognize the next speaker it being five o'clock I have to inform the House that the Chair has not received any questions for the Late Show today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, shame. Shame!

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

MR. MARSHALL: I only got up, Mr. Speaker, because I could not stand hearing two Liberals in a row speaking.

Now, we are considering -  
the poor hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) gets talking about fishing matters, and

MR. MARSHALL: he is obviously in a state of panic because he knows or he thinks he knows something that is going to be stated by the government which will be stated in due course. But one thing he does know or he should know, as with all of the other hard decisions that have to be made in this Province, that as far as this government is concerned, it will deal with it and it will deal with it very well. As a matter of fact, the Premier is now in Ottawa and the Premier is spelling out a great plan and blueprint for the resolution of the problems with respect to the deep-sea fishery in this Province. That will be revealed in due course.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to try to bring us back to the situation that we are in now. We are in a situation where we are considering Interim Supply. And Interim Supply means the granting of supply to the government so that after April 1st of this year the government will be able to pay the bills as they fall due. The present vote of money that has been given to the government has been given up to the end of March 31st, 1983, and on April 1st, 1983, we will have no authority to spend. As far as the government is concerned, I think it was for the first time in recent times and I think the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has to be congratulated for this, he brought in the budget in timely fashion. He brought it in on - what date was it? - March what?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: March 17th.

MR. MARSHALL: March 17th.

DR. COLLINS: St. Patrick's Day.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, St. Patrick's Day - half way through the month. He indicated what the government's position was for the ensuing year, for 1983/1984. That being so, where we have the Interim Supply before us, I



MR. MARSHALL: do not see why, Mr. Chairman, Interim Supply cannot pass because it is all a matter of - in years gone by they would not pass Interim Supply because they said they wanted to know when the budget was going to be brought in, they wanted to know the details of the expenditures. The details are there before the Committee right now. After passage of Interim Supply we have to get through the budget debate which will be called. Immediately after the passage of Interim Supply we will have consideration of Committee of the Whole on the estimates that have not been referred to committees themselves which are the Consolidated Fund, the Executive Council and the Legislature. So there is lots of business to do, Mr. Chairman, and I would suggest -

MR. SIMMS: No questions on the Late Show today, Bill.

MR. MARSHALL: There are no questions again -

MR. SIMMS: Obviously they do not have much interest.

MR. MARSHALL: - here you go. There are no questions after five o'clock so we have to adjourn in half an hour. That is another half hour wasted. The hon. gentlemen have been asking

MR. MARSHALL:

questions all week and they have not even got one question that they have been dissatisfied with or they wanted further information on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So that is the way in which the business of the House.

MR. NEARY: We will carry on after 5:30. We will carry on with Interim Supply.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, we would only be to happy to carry on because the more time we spend on the people's business the better. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, there is no point really in the way in which the hon. gentlemen there opposite are debating Interim Supply. They are not really debating Interim Supply as such, they are talking about peripheral issues.

MR. NEARY: You do not want to hear about the fishery?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, we can hear about the fishery. I would suggest there is plenty of opportunity in the Budget debate and there is plenty of opportunity in others. What we have to do is deal with the business of the government. There was a motion on Private Members' Day, the fishery was debated, and the two Private Members' Days before that. So there is plenty of debate about the fishery, you should not debate on Interim Supply. But I am just reminding the hon. gentlemen there opposite, because they do not seem to know what the rules of the House are, what the function of the House is, what the reason of the order of business is. We brought in Interim Supply so that we would get two to three months supply in order to be able to pay the bills,

MR.MARSHALL: two months, on April 1st.  
And I would suggest that there might be questions that might be asked about the bill that is before us that grants \$442 million and allots it to the various headings. And then we can get on afterwards and discuss the other matters.

Mr. Chairman, the total picture is known to the Opposition. The budgetary measures of the government for 1983-84 have been brought before the House. This only asks for a one sixth allotment of it, and I would suggest that the business of the Committee and the House would be best served if we, in a timely fashion, passed the Interim Supply. And then, as I say, as I indicated to the House, we will get on to the Committee of the Whole on the matters that will be before the whole House and then we will get on to the Budget debate.

MR.NEARY: They want to have a short session.

MR. MARSHALL: No, it is not a case of a short session, Mr. Chairman, I tell you, it is shocking. We used to have an audience in here, but the way the hon. gentlemen there opposite are conducting the debate there is nobody in the public wanting to listen to it.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR.CHAIRMAN (Dr.McNicholas): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR.NEARY: What silly nonsense we just heard from the Government House Leader, Mr. Chairman. We do not need lectures from the hon. gentleman. What

MR. NEARY: the administration is doing is asking for one sixth of the Budget and listed under that amount are various subheads, including the fishery. Mr. Chairman, let me say this, the only opportunity we have had in this House to discuss the fishery, record unemployment, especially among young people, the misery communities, the increase in electricity, the cost of gasoline, the shutting down of industries, the mismanagement of our natural resources, the only chance we have is when we raise it ourselves. We on this side of the House have to take the initiative to try to raise the real problems in this Province.

MR. TOBIN: Well, get on with it.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what we are doing, getting on with it. But we are getting a lecture from the Government House Leader because we are doing that. We have not heard any plans about the fishery, about Labrador West,

MR. S. NEARY: about Corner Brook, about Burin, about Fermeuse, about Ramea, about St. Lawrence, about Gaultois, about Grand Bank, about Happy Valley - Goose Bay - Labrador, Bell Island, Buchans - we have not heard Buchans mentioned this session. My point is this, that the hon. gentleman is condemning us because we are raising the real issues that concern people in this Province and that is what he did. The hon. the House Leader on the government side (Mr. Marshall) gave us a little lecture on how he thinks the Opposition should be performing.

MR. L. SIMMS: You do not usually worry about that kind of thing.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not worried about it, but just in case somebody upstairs who is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, just in case somebody reports that the hon. gentleman took us to task - and I have to say that I have never seen the reporting from the House as bad as it is this Session; it is absolutely incredible. I have never seen it as bad, Mr. Chairman.

MR. W. MARSHALL: You are getting all the answers you want, are you not?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. MARSHALL: You are getting all the answers you want?

MR. NEARY: All the answers to what?

MR. MARSHALL: All the answers you always ask.

MR. NEARY: No, but I am talking about the major problems that are confronting the ordinary people of this Province and the way the administration have mismanaged the economy.

MR. DINN: It is the three positions I am interested in.

MR. NEARY: Well, okay, I am coming back to that because I am not going to get away from that. The hon. the government House Leader may try to get me off the fishery, but the fishery happens to be one of the items mentioned in Interim Supply, which gives me every right to

MR. S. NEARY: debate it and talk about it, because we have heard so little in this Session of the House about the fishery which has been completely mismanaged by the administration. Mr. Speaker, all they have been talking about for the last few years, as everybody knows, is oil, and they have forgotten about the fishery. The fishery has deteriorated and gone down, and if it is going to prosper and grow and continue to be the backbone of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy, there are going to have to be some dramatic changes, drastic changes made in the fishery. And one of the changes that we have been recommending from this side of the House for the last several years is splitting the harvesting sector from the processing sector.

MR. G. TOBIN: The only recommendation you have is burn your boats.

MR. NEARY: Why is the hon. gentleman so uptight over that? Does the hon. gentleman not agree with what I just said? I challenge the hon. gentleman. He has not got the courage to stand up in this House in the interest of Burin and all of the other places where plants are closed, and admit in front of the whole House that he favours splitting the harvesting sector from the processing sector of the fishing industry. It has to be done sooner or later. It is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DINN: You are saying later.

MR. NEARY: No. What I am saying was that the government should have agreed with it when they had a chance. It was on the table.

Are you saying it should be done later or now?

MR. NEARY: I am saying the priority now is to get the plants opened.

MR. G. TOBIN: Quick now! Should it be done?

MR. NEARY: It should be done as quickly as possible but not to muddy up the water at the eleventh hour.

MR. DINN: Later it should be done.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. gentleman is interested, let me explain. Let us not at this point in time muddy up the water, just to go in at the last minute just as a decision is being made on whether or not Burin is going to reopen and Gaultois is going to reopen and throw this back on the table and muddy up the water, let us get the plants opened first. My number one priority at the

MR. NEARY:

moment, this day, is to reopen the plant; my number two priority, nationalize the harvesting - split the harvesting sector from the processing sector.

MR. DINN:

So that is where Nickersons, Fishery Products, Lake, J. C. Penney, the Province, the federal government and the union take an equity position in them now.

MR. NEARY:

Well, of course. If they go that route, I would love to see the Province and the federal government and the union, and the plant workers and the fishermen, or anybody else who wants to, take an equity position in that company. But certainly in the harvesting sector, the corporation, I think that the provincial government - well, I do not think, I know, they have no choice but to take an equity position in that corporation.

MR. TOBIN: How do you think we should get the plants open?

MR. DINN:

Because they are responsible for harvesting.

MR. NEARY:

Exactly.

MR. TOBIN:

How do you think we should get the plants open right away?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman would just encourage his colleagues to come over here and let us go over there, then I will tell the hon. gentleman how we will get the plants open.

MR. TOBIN:

Wait now!

I do not have to encourage you. You have this great trump card up your sleeve. You want on television and spoke to the Province and you said what you were going to do.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, for me to say that today, this very day, when all these plants are closed and people are unemployed and have welfare facing them, it would be irresponsible for me to say at the last minute,



MR. NEARY: do it today, separate the harvesting sector today.

MR. SIMMS: It might be irresponsible, but it would not be unusual.

MR. NEARY: No, that is why I am not advocating it be done at this moment, but it has to be done.

MR. TOBIN: What are you advocating for this moment?

MR. NEARY: I am advocating at this moment that option three be implemented as quickly as possible, with the provision -

AN HON. MEMBER: What is option three?

MR. NEARY: Option three is the one I have been talking about with the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn), which is that Nickersons and all the Newfoundland companies be formed into a Crown company and that the Province and the federal government and the union and anybody else take equity into it.

AN HON. MEMBER: A Crown company?

MR. NEARY: A Crown company, yes. What else could you call it? If the provincial and federal governments take an equity position, what would you call it?

MR. MARSHALL: Worried today, are you not?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not worried, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TOBIN: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is going to be on the Burin Peninsula on Saturday and myself and my colleague, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) will be with him.

MR. NEARY: If I were the hon. gentleman representing Burin - Placentia West, instead of being rude and not obeying the rules of the House, and interrupting, I would try to persuade the federal government and his own colleagues to get option three implemented quickly to get

MR. NEARY: that plant in Burin reopened.

And then let us go on and split the harvesting sector from the processing sector as soon as possible. The sooner it is done the better. It should have been done years ago. It should have been done years ago.

MR. ANDREWS: Your fishery policy, you came up with that in the last few days.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I could send downstairs right now and bring up the presentation we made to the Kirby Task Force back last - When was it? - last July. And, as a matter of fact, I will bring it up for hon. gentlemen tomorrow morning and I will lay it out on the table. Last July when we made our representation to Kirby, these were the recommendations we made.

MR. DINN: He turned you down, did he not?

MR. NEARY: No, the Province turned us down. The Province were the ones who said no.

MR. DINN: The Province said (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: They certainly did. The Premier went up to Mr. De Bane back in October or November and said, 'I am having nothing to do with nationalization, nothing to do with it.' He said, 'All I want you to do -

MR. DINN: That is wrong.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not wrong. That is not wrong, Sir.

MR. DINN: The hon. member was there, I said.

MR. NEARY: No, he was not there. "All I want you to do," he said, "Here is all I want you to do, I want you to consult with us before you make your decisions, but nationalization is out."

MR. DINN: Wrong.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. DINN: Wrong.

MR. NEARY: Ask my hon. colleague?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Was he there?

MR. HICKEY: Ask my brother am I a liar?

MR. DINN: I thought the hon. member's position was (inaudible) and then take them over after.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is trying to be catty now, trying to be smart. Now if the hon. member is trying to learn a little bit about having a social conscience, he should listen. You have to remember this, that the provincial government here will have to see to it that some of these plants are opened on social grounds.

DR. COLLINS: Who is resisting that?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

DR. COLLINS: Who is resisting that?

MR. NEARY: The provincial government obviously is resisting it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have not seen their plan. They have not, up to this very day, they have not put forward a plan. I have not seen a plan on the table of this House.

DR. COLLINS: Who has the plan?

MR. NEARY: Well, as I understand it the Federal Cabinet Committee have a plan. They could not get any co-operation or assistance or input from the provincial

MR. NEARY: government up to this day.

DR. COLLINS: What does the federal plans say about those plants?

MR. NEARY: Option three, I just finished  
telling the hon. gentleman.

DR. COLLINS: What does that say about those  
plants?

MR. NEARY: About what plants?

DR. COLLINS: What does the federal plans  
say about those closedowns?

MR. NEARY: The federal plan is option three.  
Mr. Chairman, option three will not be implemented without  
the co-operation and support of the provincial government and  
the union. So if there is a plant closed, if the hon. gentleman  
is suggesting that a plant may be closed, he can blame it on  
his own administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am telling you now,  
option three will not be implemented without the co-operation  
and support of the provincial government and the union.

MR. DINN: Do you support that?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I do support that.

All plants open.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member's  
time has elapsed.

The hon. member for St. Mary's-  
The Capes.

MR. HEARN: I think perhaps we should be listening  
a little more carefully to some of the ideas that are coming  
across the floor today because recently in discussing the  
Budget we have been pointing out the fact that in order to  
meet all our commitments we must obtain more revenue. Now

MR. HEARN: revenue comes from two sources, the people, and we have all admitted they are overtaxed as it is, and our resources. The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) had a suggestion there when he talked about the next Prime Minister of Canada, the hon. John Crosbie, and wondered if Mr. Crosbie would set up a shoe factory here in Newfoundland - not a shoe factory, a factory for making mukluks; he referred to it as a shoe factory. Some years ago a former leader of the Liberal Party started a shoe factory but unfortunately he lost all his soles. All he had left, as we have evidence of, are a few heels.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: And a lot of tongue.

MR. HEARN: Yes, and a lot of tongue.

MR. NEARY: You did not learn that in the seminary.

MR. HEARN: I have listened with interest to the options kicked around by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). Option three - I am surprised that nobody has mentioned this yet; I expect somebody will - option three posits the involvement of the only large company that is making any great amount of money with the plants, National Sea.

MR. NEARY: No, no, it does not.  
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: No, it does not. The hon. gentleman obviously was not listening. That is option one, and that is gone off the table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is a difference of opinion between hon. members.

MR. HEARN: The involvement of National Sea or Nickerson's with any of our plants, especially where it comes to takeover, is putting control of our fishery in the hands of another province. Certainly we have no intention of giving away control of this resource as the former administration did with many of our other resources.

In order to keep the plants that we have operating now going, in order to get the plants that are closed opened, which is the intention of this government for every last solitary plant that is on this Island, we have to get them open and the only way to do it is to secure a supply of fish so that these plants can not only operate but they can operate viably. This can be done. Predictions concerning the substantial increase in the cod fishery, the cod allotments show that the supply will be there to maintain the viable operations of these plants if proper management is put in place.

MR. HEARN: We have to realize that the plants that are closed, like Burin, Gaultois, Ramea, Fermeuse and all the others, not only affect the jobs of the people who live in those areas but the whole social structure of those communities is affected. The people in certain areas, we say or we hear, can move to other areas to go to work in a similar type of industry. But we are forgetting the amount of people who will not find employment, we are forgetting the students who during the Summer will not find employment, we are forgetting the effect it will have on the business operations in the town, and all social factors there. Consequently we are only too fully aware that these plants in these outports must be opened and must be kept open. And I think for anybody to suggest that this administration is closing its eyes to the fact that these plants are closed is a crazy suggestion. Certainly time will tell the plans that the administration has for reopening the various plants and making sure that rural Newfoundland comes back to the standard that it deems to pursue and with our help

MR. HEARN: I am sure that it will attain these ends. We cannot do that, Mr. Chairman, by giving away our resources to firms outside our Province. And we also, in order to develop the industry which is in trouble right now, need extra revenues which must come from the other resources which we have, our hydro and our offshore. Both attempts at developing these, of course, have been frustrated by the previous administration and by the present administration in Ottawa.

So when we talk about togetherness and co-operation, certainly we know that that is true. It has to come about but it is not really our move, it is theirs. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the reason why the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has so many plans today is that perhaps the telex machine has been quite active and I am sure that the fruit of this will be borne out in the days to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I forgive the hon. gentleman; he is a new member and obviously the hon. gentleman does not understand how the system works. If he does not, he should listen. The hon. gentleman should say less and listen more, he might learn something. Nowhere, Mr. Chairman, in any of the statements I made this afternoon, nowhere did I suggest or hint or advocate that power be given to a company outside of this Province. On the contrary; what I suggested was that the power be put in the hands of a Crown company in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: I never heard you say that.

MR. NEARY: Never heard me say what?

AN HON. MEMBER: I never heard that.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman did not hear me mention National in the third option. The hon.



MR. NEARY: gentleman says that I referred to National Sea. I certainly did not. The third option does not include National Sea.

MR. STAGG: It was just a slip of the tongue.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see, a slip of the tongue. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentlemen seem to be awfully touchy and awfully uptight that I introduced this matter of the fishery in the Interim Supply debate. I do not know why they are so jumpy and jittery over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could I have silence please.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: They seem to be embarrassed. Is there something going on that I do not know about?

MR. TOBIN: You are the fellow who is embarrassed.

MR. NEARY: They are embarrassed.

MR. TOBIN: You are embarrassed.

MR. NEARY: So let me run through it again just so hon. gentlemen will get it straight in their minds.

MR. TOBIN: Yes, one more time.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and I may have to do it twenty-four times before the message gets out, that the first time it was ever said in this House it was said by the Liberal Opposition and by the Liberal Party. If it is said by anybody else, they will only be parroting our programme and our policy. And if the hon. gentlemen want to be parrots that is up to themselves.

Mr. Chairman,

MR. S. NEARY: here is the proposal that we have on the table. Let me repeat it again: Number one priority is that Option 3 or some amended version of it has to be implemented quickly, immediately, so that all the plants that are closed will be reopened, Then the second priority is to split the harvesting sector of the fishing industry from the processing sector. And, as I have said, Mr. Chairman, this would enable the Province and the federal government and the union to take an equity position in both corporations, in both companies. It would give the company that is harvesting the stock a better chance to distribute the stock to the various fish plants throughout the province that now only operate on a seasonal basis. It would keep these plants operating more months out of a year. It would give us a fairer distribution to the plants, Mr. Chairman. And it would also give the companies a better cash flow so that they can meet their financial commitments. It would give the companies now in trouble a better cash flow. How would you do that? Because they would be assured of a supply of fish, and a year or two or three years from now these plants may be viable again. Do you understand? Does the hon. gentleman agree with what I just said; that by separating the harvesting sector from the processing sector there would be a better distribution of fish throughout the province that would give the companies a better cash flow?

MR. ANDREWS: Is that a change of policy?

MR. NEARY: No, that is not a change of policy.

MR. ANDREWS: You said let the companies die.

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

MR. ANDREWS: I have the quote.

MR. NEARY: Now, the hon. gentleman can have

MR. S. NEARY:

all the quotes he wants.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, about the fleet is this: The fleet is getting old and obsolete and is going to have to be replaced. A lot of the offshore draggers and trawlers should be replaced now. So look at all the money that is going to be required to replace the offshore trawler fleet over the next several years, and look at all the work it will create for Marystown replacing that trawler fleet. A lot of these draggers could be built in Newfoundland, in Marystown.

MR. TOBIN:

Right on.

MR. NEARY:

Well, we put Marystown there, so why should I not? I mean, we are the Godparents of Marystown.

MR. DINN:

It was a loser until we came along.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, kind of a loser all right! Just like the linerboard mill was a loser.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, that is the Liberal master plan that we are putting on the table. Hon. members do not have to listen, but the fact of the matter is this is the first time this session, first time in the last three years that a realistic, concrete proposal was put on the table of this House to save the fishery, to see that the fishery prospers and grows in this Province. Mr. Chairman, this is an historic moment in this House. We have for the first time laid out what we think to be a solution to the problems, the crisis in the fishing industry. It is the first time it has been laid out.

I am hoping this administration will adopt some of our suggestions, some of our recommendations. I am hoping they will. It would not be the first time that they have taken a Liberal reform. Mr. Chairman, for the first time, in recent years anyway, we have had a realistic proposal put on the table of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward) Order, please!

Could I interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition for one minute?

MR. NEARY: I move that the Committee rise and report progress, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understood that there has been an agreement that the Committee will sit until 6:00 o'clock. Is that the case?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes!

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I had understood when I was speaking, and I drew attention to the fact that the hon. gentlemen had nothing on the Late Show, so they were

MR. MARSHALL: obviously quite satisfied with all the answers they had gotten from government, and I suggested to him that we could utilize the time, half an hour, so he might be able to get some more information from the government, and he agreed. I thought that was agreeable to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Is it agreeable to sit until six?

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: It is agreeable with us but I think I heard some noes down in the back.

MR. MARSHALL: No, no. No, no.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman should start disciplining his members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee will sit until six.

MR. MARSHALL: We are interested in the business of the House, we do not need to rise the Committee, Mr. Chairman. You know, we are interested in the business of the people and the business of the House. We are interested in the abject shock on the face of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) today when he speculates on what we are going to do with the fishery.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!  
The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I am not speculating.

MR. MARSHALL: What?

MR. NEARY: I am saying this is what should be done, I am not speculating.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!  
The hon. Leader of the Opposition still has two minutes. I only interrupted him.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought my time had run out. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that I am not speculating. It is not speculation on my part. What I am doing is laying out the Liberal policy for the

MR. NEARY: restructuring of the fishing industry. That is what I am doing. And hon. members can accept it if they like or they can reject it. Up to now they have rejected and resisted reform in the fishing industry. And one of the major reforms, in my opinion and the opinion of my colleagues, is to separate, split the processing sector from the harvesting sector. It should have been done when the Liberal administration prior to 1972, Mr. Chairman, introduced that matter in Cabinet. My only regret was that they did not go ahead with it. Mr. Moores did the same thing and Mr. Moores lost his nerve. He was in the process of nationalizing the deep sea fishery but somehow or other he lost his nerve. So we are going to have to do it. It is something we are going to have to face. So I am not speculating, I am just laying that out as our case, our proposal, our plan, as a part of our plan for restructuring the fishery. Now the hon. gentleman may call it speculation but I would call it, you know, positive thinking, the art of positive thinking because that plan is being resisted so far by the administration up to this day.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

-Baie Verte-White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, I am really disappointed that you forgot the title of the district. Mr. Chairman, I have sat here for the last three or four days and listened to debate on Interim Supply from the hon. gentlemen on the other side and I have not gotten involved in interrupting them or anything of that nature,

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, but I have never seen in the six or seven years that I have been in this House -

MR. STAGG: Eight.

MR. RIDEOUT: - eight years I have been in this House, I have never seen the kind of squirming that I have seen this afternoon. I have never seen a person squirm and worm like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has squirmed and wormed and squirted this afternoon.

MR. STAGG: He is a trimmer.

MR. RIDEOUT: I have never seen it before. You know, the first part of this week, Mr. Chairman, we had



MR. T. RIDEOUT: questions coming from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) about the fishery. He thought he had a plan laid out. He thought he had a piece of ground staked out, that he was going to somehow dig a hole and bury this government in that piece of ground. But, Mr. Chairman, the hole fell in on him. The Leader of the Opposition is in a hole. If I did not know the difference, Mr. Chairman, I would suspect that the Leader of the Opposition had a phone call.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No? no?

MR. RIDEOUT: I would suspect, if I did not know the difference, because I am suspicious, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure that there is not that many people in Ottawa who would pick up the phone and phone the Leader of the Opposition. They would phone the former, former Leader of the Opposition, they would phone a number of people in the Liberal Party, but they would not phone the Leader of the Opposition. So if I were a suspicious person by nature, Mr. Chairman, I would suspect -

AN HON. MEMBER: He may have called them.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is true, the Leader of the Opposition could have phoned them, but I would suspect that somehow or other, through a collect phone call, the Leader of the Opposition was talking to somebody in Ottawa. Now it could be somebody in Alberta, Mr. Chairman, because there are certain former members of this House who, I understand, reside in Alberta who are quite capable of using the phone. But the Leader of the Opposition had to have a phone call because what he is saying in the House today and what he said in Question Period on Monday and Tuesday and for the latter part of last week is a complete flip-flop. I hope we never hear the word flip-flop again out of the Opposition because what the Leader of the Opposition has done with

MR. T. RIDEOUT: regard to the fishery is a complete flip-flop. You know, this is the gentleman who back in the Fall Session in December, said, 'Let them go. Let the fish companies go.' That is the gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, back in November and December when we were having various debates in this House on the fish companies, who said, 'Let them go.' That is the same gentleman who was up in this House on Monday and Tuesday talking about no policy, talking about us not having a plan, asking us to lay out a master plan. That is the same gentleman, now that the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) are up in Ottawa at this very hour meeting with that Cabinet Committee laying out the Newfoundland plan, who has somehow - and I suspect somehow - found out what the details of that plan is. You can really pick up the difference.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously does not understand the rules of this House, that you cannot attribute motives to any -

AN HON. MEMBER: He said he suspected.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman said that somehow or other there was a leak from Ottawa. I can tell the hon. gentleman that is not true. I did not have any phone calls from anybody. What I laid out today was our plan that we submitted to the Kirby -

MR. TOBIN: You (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Hold on, now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY:                    If the lapdog will just keep quiet, Mr. Speaker, turn up his little moustache, the lapdog, and see if he can suck in a little more, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:            Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:                    His blood pressure is going up.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, you cannot attribute motives to anything that a member does or says in this House, and that is what the hon. member is doing. Mr. Chairman, there are no phone calls. I do not know what the Premier is doing in Ottawa, or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is doing in Ottawa today. I have no idea. So, all I have done is laid out the Liberal plan and if the hon. gentleman does not like he he can lump it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is at best a difference of opinion between two hon. members, but at worst a point of discourtesy.

MR. NEARY: But can you say what you like in this House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! To that point of order I rule that there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Can you accuse a member of what you like in this House and get away with it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) does not like having the tables turned on him. The fact of the matter is that obviously, and it is obvious in the debate in this House today, that the

MR. RIDEOUT: Leader of the Opposition  
(Mr. Neary) and the Opposition party in this House  
have totally, 360 degrees, changed their course from  
Monday and Tuesday, changed their course from last  
week, changed their course from Monday and Tuesday of  
this week, because they had a phone call. And I am a  
suspicious person. I did not say they had a phone call,  
Mr. Chairman, I just suspect they had one, that is all.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order,

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon.  
the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have to get  
this straightened out: Is it parliamentary for a member  
to get up and make an accusation, a charge against another  
member?

MR. RIDEOUT: I suspect you had one.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, if that  
stands on the public record, then I can stand over here  
and make all kinds of charges and accusations against -

MR. RIDEOUT: Which you have always done.

MR. NEARY: I certainly do not!  
The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) did it the other  
day. Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman wants to play  
that kind of a game, if Your Honour is going to allow it  
to stand and the member wants to play that kind of a  
game, he should remember that two can play that game.

MR. RIDEOUT: Oui, oui!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

To that point of order,  
I rule that it is a difference of opinion between two  
hon. members.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I do not mind being threatened by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: That is unparliamentary too.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is unparliamentary as well.

But, Mr. Chairman, you know, the Leader of the Opposition gets up and he talks about a misery list. Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a second misery list in this Province. The former Leader of the Opposition, the former member for Bonavista North, Mr. Stirling, is on a misery list. I believe that he is on a misery list. The former member for Lewisporte is on a misery list.

MR. PATTERSON: Freeman White, yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Freeman White. The former member for Windsor - Buchans is on a misery list; the former member for Twillingate, thanks to our hon. colleague here, is on a misery list; the former member for Carbonear is on a misery list; the former member for St. Barbe is on a misery list; the former member for St. Mary's - The Capes is on a misery list; the former member for Burin - Placentia West is on a misery list; the former member for Grand Bank is on a misery list. Mr. Chairman, you can go on and on. There is no end to this misery list. You know, he talks about Burin, he talks about Gaultois, he talks about Baie Verte, he talks about anything, you know, but there are all kinds of misery lists in this Province. And then he talks about the Premier being up in Ottawa opposing nationalization.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Chairman, I happened to sit in on the meeting between Mr. De Bane, or however you pronounce it in English, and the Premier. I was there. And Mr. De Bane laid one thing and one thing only on the table. He said, 'Would you agree with me if I decided to nationalize the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada?' That is what he asked. That is all he asked. And the Premier said, 'Well, obviously we would like to look at other options, you know'. He said, 'I would like to look at other options', he said, 'Are there any other options besides this?' He said, 'I am not against that in principle.' But he said, 'Are there other options? Can we look at other options?' And that is exactly what Mr. De Bane asked the Premier of this Province. And obviously there was another phone call. I mean, the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. HODDER: You suspected! You suspected!

MR. RIDEOUT: I suspect there was another phone call, because the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was not present, the Fisheries critic for the Opposition was not present.

MR. STAGG: Who is he, by the way? Who is the Fisheries critic for the Opposition? Do they have one?

MR. RIDEOUT: I mean, how do they know those things, Mr. Chairman? How do they know those things? There must have been - I am so suspicious by nature, Mr. Chairman, - there had to be a phone call or there had to be a letter, there had to be something. How do the Opposition know what was discussed in private in Mr. De Bane's office in Ottawa?

MR. MATTHEWS: Obviously they do not know, they had it wrong.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. White was not there, that fellow who get a job with the NEED programme. He was not there. Mr. De Bane was there, Mr. Art May was there, the deputy minister, I was there, and the Premier was there.

MR. STAGG: Nobody else was there?

MR. NEARY: Are you sure that is all who were there?

MR. RIDEOUT: I am sure that was all who were there.

MR. HODDER: Surely the Premier must have called the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT: I assume somebody. There must have been a phone call.

MR. NEARY: You are absolutely sure?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Sullivan from the Premier's office was also there.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. Who else was there?

MR. RIDEOUT: That is it.

MR. NEARY: Are you sure?

MR. RIDEOUT: I am sure. I am absolutely positive.

MR. NEARY: You left out one.

MR. RIDEOUT: After -

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, this guy came in after. Dr. Kirby came in half way through the meeting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Very deliberate, Mr. Chairman, very deliberate. I wanted to see what the Leader of the Opposition knew. Mr. Chairman, half way through the meeting Dr. Michael Kirby appeared. I wanted to leave a couple of names out to see how much the Leader of the Opposition knew about that meeting. I wanted to do that deliberately because he accuses me, Mr. Chairman, of impugning motives, but I wanted to leave it out deliberately just to see how much the Leader of the Opposition knew about that meeting. Now, if he knew when Mr. Sullivan came in - and Mr. Sullivan was not there at the beginning of the meeting



MR. RIDEOUT: by the way - if he knew when Dr. Kirby came in - and he was not there at the beginning of the meeting, by the way - I wonder what else does know?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: There was only nationalization on the table, he said. Well, I say God bless us, my dear, there is no nationalization on the table today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: If there is a member of this House who should not mention the words squirm or worm, it is the hon. gentleman who just took his seat. We saw the hon. gentleman - I wish I had the Hansards here in front of me -

MR. NEARY: squirm and worm his way across the House. And the excuse that the hon. gentleman used to get over across the House, what was the reason the hon. gentleman gave?

MR. SIMMS: His people supported him.

MR. NEARY: What was the reason the hon. gentleman gave?

MR. DINN: He was re-elected with a bigger majority than the hon. member.

MR. RIDEOUT: I got a bigger majority than you and I crossed the floor.

MR. NEARY: And now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman - his colleagues should stay and hear this - if the hon. gentleman wants to point fingers and make suggestions about telephone calls, let me tell the House -

MR. BAIRD: That man is sick.

MR. NEARY: Well I did not start it. Let me tell about telephone calls that the hon. gentleman is now making to a certain individual up in Ottawa trying to get himself fixed away.

MR. RIDEOUT: What?

MR. NEARY: Do you want me to pursue it a little further?

MR. RIDEOUT: Me?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let me tell the House about other telephone calls that are being made to Ottawa by hon. gentlemen from that side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of getting down and rolling in the mud with the hon. gentleman. When I got up on my point of order and said to the hon. gentleman that he should be careful in playing that kind of a game because two can play that game.

MR. TOBIN: Yes, but what he told is true.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and what I am saying is true too. There are phone calls going out of this Province to Ottawa not from this side of the House.

MR. SIMMS: No calls from that side of the House to Ottawa?

MR. NEARY: No, there are not, not from my office anyway.

MR. SIMMS: You do not call Ottawa?

MR. NEARY: No, I certainly do not.

MR. RIDEOUT: They will not talk to you.

MR. NEARY: They will talk to me.

MR. SIMMS: How do you know if you do not call?

MR. NEARY: Well, if I call, I want an appointment to go up there and I make my appointment.

MR. TOBIN: Sure you said you do not call.

MR. NEARY: But the hon. gentleman is so wrong. Mr. Chairman, he should be careful in playing that kind of game. The hon. gentleman might find himself in an embarrassing situation.-

MR. TOBIN: I would say your telephone is still hot. Be honest.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that we put forward today on this side of the House a very realistic plan -

MR. TOBIN: Just today?

MR. NEARY: Not only today, we have been putting this forward - Mr. Chairman, the decorum of this House since the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) came in here has gone down considerably. It has deteriorated drastically, Mr. Chairman. It has deteriorated, I would say, about 75 per cent. Now, Mr. Chairman, one man should not be allowed to wreck this House.

MR. NEARY: One man should not be allowed to turn this House into a tavern or a bar or a gymnasium, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CALLAN: Into a snake pit.

MR. NEARY: Into a snake pit. Thirty times in one day!

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us about the tavern you own.

MR. NEARY: Now, there is another snide remark, Mr. Chairman.

Now, I mean, I am warning hon. gentlemen that if they want to continue to play that kind of a game, if they want to make irresponsible statements, untruths, I guarantee you that I will give them as good as they can send, and they should realize that by now. I can look up and down the ranks and I guarantee you that if I ever hear that kind of a remark again from an hon. gentleman that he will regret it! Something about a tavern! I own nothing in this Province, nothing, especially a tavern.

MR. SIMMS: My colleague said, 'Tell us about the tavern,' that is all.

MR. NEARY: No. I heard what he said: 'Tell us about the tavern you own.' I own no tavern, I own no business and I have no intention to. If the hon. gentleman wants to continue that trend I would be glad to debate with him anytime and we will see who will come out on the losing end.

MR. BAIRD: You were never a partner in a tavern or club either.

MR. NEARY: No, nothing.

MR. CARTER: How much of the tavern do you own?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen over there have been galing all afternoon. I only wish we

MR. NEARY: had the television cameras in this House so that the people could see the arrogance of this administration since April 6th, in the last year or so.

MR. SIMMS: Talk about the fisheries now.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I am coming back to the fisheries.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Interim Supply is before the House and the hon. gentleman has spoken for six or seven minutes about irrelevancies and his own personal little paranoia or whatever it is that he might want to spew out and talk about, but we are not interested in it. What we are interested in is the estimates. If he wants to speak, I think he should be relevant.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: That is not a valid point of order, Mr. Chairman. As Your Honour knows, we are doing Interim Supply, various government departments; it is completely wide open. It is probably one of the most wide open debates that we could have in this House. And, Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the hon. gentleman get up when the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) was over there squirting out his venom and his poison. I did not hear the hon. gentleman get up then to a point of order. I think the hon. gentleman is just - we are getting to them, Mr. Chairman, and they cannot take the criticism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order:  
It is very difficult for the Chair to rule on the rule of

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): relevancy, but this is a money bill and the debate is rather wide-ranging so I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So let me repeat, Mr. Chairman - and I hope that the media will pick up the message - for the first time in this House today, the first time since the House resumed almost two weeks ago, I have laid on the table a plan, a partial plan - it is not complete, not a master plan - part of a plan that can save the Newfoundland fishery.

MR. TOBIN: You might have the rest tomorrow.

MR. S. NEARY: The decorum of the House, Mr. Chairman, I wonder is it important or is it not important?

MR. BAIRD: You are a fine one to talk about the decorum of the House!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I think it is time that they were all put on tranquilizers over there, Not only one individual, I believe they should all go out and get their pills.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time since the House opened almost two weeks ago, we have laid down a partial plan for restructuring the offshore fishery in this Province.

MR. ANDREWS: How come you did not have this plan on Tuesday?

MR. NEARY: Well, I am glad my honourable friend asked me that. We are not the government. For two days in a row we have been pressing the government to find out what plans they had for restructuring the fishery. They did not produce any plan, they had no plan. We were told that last Wednesday they met for the first time and hurriedly put together a bit of paper they call a plan. So we decided today that we would lay out our proposals, our plans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I hope hon. gentlemen are enjoying themselves because they keep asking for positive suggestions, they keep asking for positive ideas and they always accuse us of being negative. Well, here we are today putting together positive ideas. I have not heard one hon. gentleman get up yet and say, 'Yes, we agree with the Opposition.' I have not

MR. S. NEARY: heard one say, 'We agree with separating, splitting the harvesting sector from the processing sector.' I have not heard one hon. gentleman. I heard the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout), the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) get up, they made some rather wild and irresponsible statements, but they did not address the issues. They did not say what option they were in favour of. They did not say what plans the government had. They did not tell us whether they agreed with the Opposition that the processing sector should be separated from the harvesting sector. They did not say that they agreed with that. Separation should have been done two years ago - separation should have been done not two years ago, it should have been done ten years ago. The hon. gentleman did not tell us where he stands on the marketing of the produce of the sea. The hon. gentleman did not tell us if he agreed with option three. Nickerson and all of the other Newfoundland Companies - and National Sea is not a Newfoundland Company, in case the hon. gentleman is not aware of it - and the controlling interest in that Crown Company would be held by both governments and possibly the union, if the union wanted to get in on the action. The Crown Company, because the provincial and federal governments would have equity in that Crown



MR. NEARY: company, would be controlled by the people. Is that not the way it should be? I did not hear the hon. gentleman address himself to that and say whether he agreed with it or not. Does he agree with it? Does the hon. gentleman agree with it?

MR. MARSHALL: Wait until next week.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. MARSHALL: Wait until next week.

MR. NEARY: Wait until next week!

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

The hon. the member  
for Baie Verte-White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I only have a couple of minutes, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. gentleman who just took his seat made some reference to the fact that he had not heard us mention the separation of the processing and the harvesting sector of the fishery. Well, you know, we have listened to the hon. gentleman in the House over the last couple of weeks in Question Period, and we would have gladly listened to him again today, Mr. Chairman, in the Late Show, but they are so obviously satisfied with answers that there is nothing to debate in the Late Show, but we never heard the hon. gentleman mention that either. There has been no mention. So maybe my suspicious nature, Mr. Chairman, of phone calls or telexes or things of that nature was just proven true. The hon. gentleman found out about some things, I would suspect today, and this is the new policy that he now wants the media to pick up. This is the new policy that the hon. gentleman wants the media to pick up and be identified as the Liberal policy, the great reform Liberal policy. This is the new policy that

MR. RIDEOUT: the hon. gentleman wants the media to pick up. But, Mr. Chairman, I would suspect that the media in this Province are more astute, more responsible in their duties and that than to do that kind of thing. Because obviously some of the things that will be layed out on the Table today in Ottawa the hon. gentleman has some forewarning. And like the old fellow says, 'Forewarned is forearmed'. So he has some forewarnings and therefore is trying to carve out a new policy to try to fill in the hole that he has created in this House over the last number of days.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just before I clue up, I do not know what the hon. gentleman was talking about on phone calls. I do not keep a log, but I believe since December I have made one phone call to Ottawa and that I am sure can be -

MR. SIMMS: You were looking for a Senate appointment.

MR. RIDEOUT: I was looking for a Senate appointment. I am sure that can be justified by the records that are kept by somebody, Public Works or the Speaker's office or whatever, and that can be stipulated. And neither do I take pills, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that the only people who take pills in this House are the Opposition and they are stunned pills.

Mr. Speaker, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!  
The hon. member for Kilbride,

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted. Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I would like to advise the House that the Social Services Committee will meet in the House of Assembly at seven this evening to review the estimates of the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 10:00 a.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

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

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

March 24, 1983

ANSWER TO QUESTION #13

Appearing on Order Paper #5 of 1983. Asked  
by the Honourable The Member of Bellevue,  
Mr. Callan.

QUESTION: A progress report for the Newfoundland  
Government's proposal to convert Lake  
Melville, Labrador into a major port.

Has the Government made any representation  
to Ottawa for financial assistance to  
help with this conversion?

PROGRESS REPORT

LAKE MELVILLE WINTER NAVIGATION STUDIES

BACKGROUND

The Department of Development remains confident that a year round shipping corridor to a deep water port in the western end of Lake Melville is both technically and economically viable. This conclusion is based on a number of studies, including icebreaker probes carried out in 1980, 1981 and 1982 in which access by modern icebreakers was confirmed. In 1982 a study of the incremental cost of maintaining such an operation indicated that ice conditions would not increase costs to a level which would create a barrier to the development of the area. This is particularly true if the Canadian Coast Guard continue to provide icebreaker service at no cost to commercial shipping.

1982/83 Program

Studies continue into the assessment of ice management techniques and technological advances. An oceanographic and ice measurement program is being carried out in the area of the proposed dock to determine operational difficulties. A revised cost estimate for a heavy industrial wharf at North West Point now shows costs in excess of \$100 Million, primarily because of poor soil conditions in the area.

Ice conditions within the lake itself have been found to be particularly severe this year. A survey of these conditions using side looking airborne radar (SLAR) and conventional survey techniques have identified ice ridges of up to 12 M in some areas. A routing has been selected however which would avoid areas of most severe ridging. This is shown on the attached sketch. Ice thickness measurements along this route show ridging of 3 to 4 M which is considered navigable by an icebreaker. An icebreaker probe by the CCGS Sir John Franklin was scheduled for March but had to be cancelled because of the heavy pack ice conditions prevailing off the Newfoundland coast. We hope to carry out this probe in April if the icebreaker can be made available and if funding arrangements can be made.

#### FUTURE PLANS

As the technical and economic viability of year round access is becoming apparent, efforts in the future can be greatly reduced. Studies will continue into technological advances which could improve access and reduce costs. Major initiatives such as more icebreaker probes will not be carried out unless particularly severe conditions occur which could test winter access, or in support of confirmed industrial development in the area.

The Department of Development is presently involved in feasibility studies into an aluminum smelter project and development of the forestry potential of the area. Only when industry expresses a strong interest in development in this area would it be appropriate to consider further financial support in the provision of the necessary facilities. Of the considerable infrastructure required to support such development we feel port facilities and icebreaker support would be likely candidates for Federal assistance.



Answer to Question No. 16 by the Honourable the Member  
for Torngat Mountains to the Honourable the Minister of Social  
Services - Order Paper No. 5, dated March 11, 1983.

- (a) Number of boys and girls who left the  
training homes at Whitbourne and St. John's  
without permission since January 1, 1982.

83

- (b) Number of boys and girls who left the  
training homes who were involved in  
vandalism and crime that resulted in  
further court action since January 1, 1982.

41

- (c) Total cost to the Department for vandalism,  
damage and crimes committed by boys and  
girls who left the training homes since  
January 1, 1982.

\$12,771.52  
(50% attributable to 2 persons)

24 Mar. '83

ORDERS OF THE DAY 8/83 THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1983

QUESTION 25

Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information.

Details of the amount of money his Department has taken in on a monthly basis as a result of the retail sales tax since January 1982.

ANSWER

List attached detailing receipts from January 1982 to February 1983.

REPLY TO QUESTION 25 FROM MR. HODDER (PORT AU PORT)

IN ORDERS OF THE DAY, THURSDAY, 17 MARCH 1983

RETAIL SALES TAX

RECEIPTS

January, 1982	25,064,633
February	18,517,200
March	17,455,356
April	21,281,118
May	20,964,163
June	20,458,260
July	23,165,685
August	21,822,713
September	23,040,049
October	23,497,938
November	23,040,904
December	23,033,402
January 1983	30,540,094
February	20,186,246

Tax receipts for any given month  
are from sales tax returns for the  
previous month.

QUESTIONS ASKED IN HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
NO. 45

ORDER PAPER 9/83 - MARCH 21, 1983

---

QUESTION: Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House of Assembly the following information:

Number of pictures of the Premier distributed to public institutions around the province.

How much did these photographs cost (a) framing (b) hanging (c) cost of photographer and (d) number of prints and total cost?

ANSWER: I did not distribute any pictures of the Premier to public institutions around the Province.

QUESTIONS ASKED IN HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

NO. 48

ORDER PAPER 9/83 MARCH 21, 1985

QUESTION: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

The number of helicopter trips taken by the Minister during the fiscal years of 1981 and 1982:

- (a) reason for trip;
- (b) places visited;
- (c) date of departure;
- (d) date of return;
- (e) cost of travel;
- (f) other costs; and
- (g) individuals who accompanied the Minister on these trips.

ANSWER:

During the two years in question I used helicopter service to facilitate Government business on one occasion only. This was to transport myself and departmental official from Goose Bay to Rigolet, Postville and Makkovik and return for the official opening of new medical clinics in these communities. I was accompanied by an engineer project manager from my Department.

24 Mar 1983

ORDERS OF THE DAY 5/83 FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1983

QUESTION 14

Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

List of names of individuals and/or companies who received loans from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and the purpose for which the loans were granted in the years 1981 and 1982.

ANSWER

The Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation reports to the Minister of Development.

The Honourable Minister of Development has been asked to table the information requested.