

VOL. 2

NO. 60

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
10:00 A.M. - 1:00 P.M.  
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1983

The House met at 10.00 am.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Before we proceed, it is a pleasure for me to welcome to the Speaker's gallery today Major Harold Long, who is the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Nova Scotia legislature.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to report to the House on the affects of the 1982/83 budget for hospitals. Yesterday, November 17, 1983, the Newfoundland Hospital Association held a press conference on that subject. As I have said many times publicly during recent months, I am very pleased with the manner in which the hospital boards operated our hospitals in the past Summer. While admittedly there were a number of day-to-day operational problems, there were no major problems and hospitals exerted a very determined effort to deal with their problems at the local level. There were some positive events that set the stage for hospitals to more effectively manage their operations during that period and these were noted in their press release. One, there is a good supply of health manpower allowing hospitals to avoid, where possible, the use of costly overtime. Secondly, the government changed budgeting system in a manner that permitted hospital budget flexibility thereby enhancing the management capability of the individual

MR. HOUSE: hospitals. And thirdly, hospitals were advised by government of their budgetary position prior to the commencement of the current fiscal year thereby allowing the hospitals time to effect planning for managing their budgets.

The three items referred to above are very important in terms of hospitals being able to effectively plan and manage their budgets during the current year.

Last year we increased the overall hospital operation by 12 per cent over and above the amounts provided to hospitals in the previous fiscal year. While there has been a lot of talk about cutbacks in health care, the fact remains that government did provide hospitals with a 12 per cent increase. However, government was not in a position to provide hospitals with all the funds they requested. At that time, government recognized that hospitals could use more funds and, in many cases, needed more funds to provide the quantity of services which they would like to provide to the people of the Province. The fact remains, however, that government was not in a position to provide more than 12 per cent. Indeed, 12 per cent was 4 per cent more than the growth in provincial revenues for the year before and was considerably more than similar increases in hospital budgets in other provinces. The

MR. HOUSE: record must be set straight and people must recognize that hospital budgets were not cut back. Because of the way discussions have gone, I am sure that there are some people who believe we actually gave hospitals less to operate this year than we did last year; however, a reasonable increase was given. We acknowledge that that increase did not meet the expectations and we do not in any way want to minimize that fact.

This Summer there were approximately 300 beds, or 10 per cent of the beds in the Province closed for varying periods of time. This action was taken by hospitals to allow them to operate within their budgets for the current fiscal year. The Newfoundland Hospital Association has done an evaluation of the effects of the bed closures and their basic conclusion was that in areas outside St. John's there was no significant deterioration in patient access, increase in waiting lists or in the time patients waited for services. That is the Hospital Association's assessment, Mr. Speaker.

In total, the number of beds closed outside of St. John's was approximately 100. In the St. John's area, where most of our tertiary care services are located, the effects of the budgetary situation were more pronounced. I think this is a fair assessment and one that obviously flows from the very nature of a tertiary care service.

I cannot disagree with the assessment, which indicates that during the past Summer there were fewer hospital services provided because when you close hospital beds, the result cannot be other than a decrease in the number of services, that is the purpose of it.

MR. HOUSE: In reviewing the comments of the Hospital Association, it confirms my own views that the current budgetary situation did not appear to have created major problems within the system. There were a number of problems of an operational nature that did cause some disruption in the services that were provided. If unchecked or left for a long period of time without adjustment in the system, these could perhaps develop into more serious problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: However, one must expect this when one is operating in such an unusual situation which is not ordinarily the normal operational environment. Actually, the report of the Newfoundland Hospital Association confirms what I have been saying and what I have been advised by people in the system concerning the impact of the year's restraint programme. I would acknowledge that the effects could have been worse had the hospitals not demonstrated a strong and determined effort to do a good job.

If serious problems had been uncovered by hospitals, it would have been of great concern to me. As most people know, earlier this year I appointed a monitoring committee to provide an avenue for hospitals and institutions with problems to be able to address these problems to some objective body. If there were major problems revealed by the Hospital Association that had not been referred to the monitoring committee or to me directly, it would have been a matter of great concern to me. I am happy to say that that was not the case.

MR. HOUSE:

Many of the problems referred to by the association were of an anecdotal nature. Before these situations can be interpreted in any meaningful way, they would have to be put in some kind of historical perspective in terms of the situation in years gone by. It is simply not enough to compare a statistic for this Summer with, say, last year and leave it at that. These statistics of these incidents must be placed in some kind of historical perspective in order for them to be meaningful. For example, there are all sorts of factors that affect waiting lists for elective surgery. I would concede that one of the significant factors is the availability of operating room time and the availability of hospital beds. Other significant factors are the availability of surgical staff to perform the procedures that are needed. There are obviously other factors which influence the size of waiting lists.

The report of the Hospital Association has alluded in general to the possibility that the budgetary situation may have had a negative impact on the quality of care. I will be seeking more information on this from the association. Frankly, I do not think there has been a negative impact. I do recognize that there has been a negative impact on the quantity and perhaps the quality of some services, particularly patient amenities, but it must be made clear that reductions in patient amenity services are not quality of care issues in the sense we view quality of care.

The Hospital Association has expressed concern about the future and the need for more money to be provided to hospitals if they are to meet people's expectations of service. People have to realize that our services have to reflect our ability as a Province to provide



MR. HOUSE: health care system that is costing almost a half billion dollars this year. It is a system that largely meets the needs of our people. The assessment of all concerned, including the Hospital Association as well as our own, do not, in my judgement, indicate otherwise. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Now we will hear it.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he will hear it, Mr. Speaker, unlike what the minister has said. There is an old saying that politics makes strange bedfellows, which may explain the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). But, Mr. Speaker, it is even truer that political requirements make otherwise sensible people do and say things that they would not otherwise dream of. And the minister's statement -

DR. COLLINS: Say something constructive now, something constructive.

MR. ROBERTS: The most constructive thing the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could do is hand in his resignation immediately. That would be constructive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now let me talk about the Minister of Health (Mr. House) because it is his statement. And what I have said is that this statement is a classic example of the minister trying to defend the indefensible. And I will give him credit, he made a good fist of it. Only the Minister of Health in this kind of a situation could say that the problems are anecdotal. Of course they are anecdotal, they are about people! That is what health care is about: People who get sick, people who need care, all about incidents, all about human incidents. The whole health care



MR. ROBERTS: system, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more than hundreds of thousands of incidents a year men and women, Newfoundlanders, who go to hospitals, who go to doctors, who say, 'We need care. We have problems, we have pains, we have illnesses, we have concerns we need care.' Of course, it is anecdotal, Mr. Speaker. Of course it is anecdotal - that is exactly what the health care system is about. And if the minister really can find no better defence for this government's failure in the health care field then to take refuge behind the sophistry that it is all anecdotal and we must put them in historical perspective, then, Mr. Speaker, you know, we have come to a pretty pass indeed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two facts which not even the minister in his political necessity can deny. First of all, there was a cutback in health care services in this Province this year. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, this cutback came despite the 12 per cent increase in dollars allocated. And the reason it came was 12 per cent increase was not enough to enable the hospitals to continue to operate at the same level as they had hitherto attained with the full support and consent of the government. We should remember, Mr. Speaker, that the hospitals and the health care system had gone up to this level not on their own, not on some mad toot of their own, but it got up there with the support, the encouragement and even the direction of the government which, to their credit,

MR. ROBERTS: is now building even more hospitals around. We cannot afford to keep open the hospitals we have and yet we are building new ones. What kind of policy insanity is this? We cannot afford to operate what we have and yet we are still opening more. That is one point - there were cutbacks. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, the Hospital Association made it crystal clear in their statement yesterday, the statement given by Dr. Watts and by Mr. Burnell, that the effect of the cutback was harsh, particularly harsh in St. John's. It is again a sophistry of the minister to say that they found outside things worked okay, they did not. They said they were less harsh outside. Now what that shows is that if we have any excess capacity it is outside of St. John's. It is here in St. John's that the hospital needs now are and the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has got to start addressing those - The problems of the Grace General Hospital, which are becoming, I gather, acute, the problems of St. Clare's, the problems of the Health Sciences Centre - yet that is where the cutbacks were worst.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the heart of the minister's statement is found on page 6 where he says 'The Report of the Hospital Association had alluded in general to the possibility that the budgetary situation may have had a negative impact on quality of care.' It said that. It said there was a negative impact, and the statement shows it. And what that means, Mr. Speaker, is that the Hospital Association, which is a non-partisan, an apolitical body made up of the experts who actually run the hospitals - not the minister trying to defend an indefensible political brief, not the minister trying to explain away the inexplicable, not the minister trying to account for the unaccountable - These are the men and women who have to deal with the anecdotes, the sick people who come in and end up on beds in halls or the people who need surgery who are told, 'Come back next week

MR. ROBERTS: or next month or next year, but not now'. Those anecdotes, the human anecdotes, the people who have to deal with them have said, Mr. Speaker -

DR. COLLINS: That is not right.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) quitely contain himself? He, Mr. Speaker, cannot even estimate how much he is going to get in his own sales tax revenues. I have had a better record of estimating, Mr. Speaker, the sales tax yield this year than has the minister. And that tells you something about the minister because I am no expert, so where in God's name does that leave him?

Now let me come back to the Minister of Health (Mr. House). The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that we are slipping back in health care in the Province today.

MR. TOBIN: Time is up.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this government's time is up. We are slipping back, Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Health (Mr. House) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - Mr. Speaker, is presiding over a deterioration -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. ROBERTS: May I carry on, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has about one minute left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, I cannot hear you, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has about one minute left to finish up.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that this Minister of Health is presiding over a deterioration in the health care system in this Province and that is a tragedy in the making. Our health care system had come a long way in the last thirty years but it still had a long way to go and with this minister we are slipping back. That is the tragedy, and it is made even more tragic by the fact he will not recognize it, he will not accept it, he will not do anything about it. Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in connection with the budget for the Ocean Ranger Commission of Enquiry. I asked the minister before the House adjourned in June if the budget had been approved for the Ocean Ranger Enquiry and the hon. gentleman told me that they had it under consideration, I believe, at that time, could he tell the House now if the Province's share of the cost of the Ocean Ranger Enquiry, if that budget has been approved yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Certainly for the present fiscal year the budget has been approved. Yes.

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. gentleman give us some kind of a figure of how much did it cost the Province to date, what the cost of the Ocean Ranger Enquiry is to the Province to date?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to take that as notice just to check the actual amount. The formula, of course, is 50 per cent federal, 50 per cent provincial, but the amount that has been spent to date I will certainly undertake to get it for the hon. gentleman tomorrow.

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

MR. NEARY: I thank the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and look forward to getting his figures on Monday when the House meets again.

Could the hon. gentleman tell the House what the projected cost of the Ocean Ranger Commission of Enquiry is?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of

Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon.

gentleman is probably aware it is financed on a year to year basis, so the estimates for the next fiscal year would not be finalized yet-

MR. NEARY: But it is going ahead.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, but it certainly is going to be in the area of several millions of dollars.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Several millions is the provincial share. The total cost, we are told, is - what? - fourteen or fifteen million dollars, in that area?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is correct.

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is that the inquiry is going ahead. I would ask the minister when he is bringing in how much has been spent to date, if he would also try to get the projected cost to the Province of this inquiry.

Now, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in connection with some concerns that have been expressed about the cost of this inquiry. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if the administration has any concerns about the cost?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly we are concerned about costs. It is a very heavy financial burden on the treasury. We certainly are concerned about it. The hon. gentleman will recall that originally it had been the intention of the Province to have a provincial Commission of Inquiry, which would have been a three person commission which, certainly at that time it was contemplated, would report in in approximately a year. The hon. gentleman will recall, of course, that then the federal government appointed an inquiry as well, and it was

MR. OTTENHEIMER: decided to amalgamate, if you wish, the two into a federal/provincial inquiry. There is no doubt that the cost is very heavy and that every reasonable restraint should be used. Of course, it is an extremely important area and it also leaves government in the position of not wishing to or appearing to interfere in the course of such an inquiry. But there is no doubt the cost is heavy and it is a matter of concern.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I appreciate the hon. gentleman's answer that the administration do not want to interfere in the progress of the inquiry, but would the hon. gentleman inform the House if he or any of his colleagues have held discussions with the head or anybody in the Ocean Ranger Commission of Inquiry regarding the administration's concerns about the cost?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the provincial financing is financed from the budget of the Department of Justice and there have been meetings between provincial officials and the staff of the Royal Commission with respect to the cost.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.



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

MR. NEARY:

Would the hon. gentleman indicate the nature of these discussions? Is it to try to scale down the cost of the enquiry, to ask the Commission of Enquiry to exercise greater restraints? Could the hon. gentleman give us some idea of the nature of these discussions, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, obviously, when any public expenditure is involved, all of the facts and explanation and justification, if one wishes to use that term, have to be supplied. Of course, a Royal Commission has a very, very large area of autonomy and, as concerned as the government is about cost, it would indeed be quite a departure from custom for the government to tell a Royal Commission that you may not do this, or we will not fund your doing this, if, in the opinion of the Commission, the doing of a certain thing or things is necessary to fulfill their mandate. So it is an area in which government's position is quite different, obviously, than in approving expenditure for any line activity of a department. That is the problem. We exercise as much control as we can and I suppose the overall guideline has to be that, obviously, we are accountable for public monies spent and there can be no carte blanche to a Royal Commission. Yet, on the other hand, obviously it would be inappropriate to interfere with the actual work of the Commission. And if the Commission says doing this and doing that and doing the other thing are necessary, in our opinion, to

MR. OTTENHEIMER: fulfill the mandate that we have, then it is very difficult for government to say, number one, we will change your mandate, because obviously we can hardly do that, or, number two, well, we will take this action even though you say this will prohibit you from fulfilling your mandate, because that too would be to interfere in the mandate. So, yes, it is a very difficult thing. I suppose, in the final analysis, obviously responsibility rests with the government because the government has to vote the money.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But in the final analysis one has to count to a very great extent upon the judgement and reasonableness of the Commission itself, one has to count on that. I mean, we count on that for the findings of the Royal Commission, and to a very large extent we have to count on the reasonableness and the judgement of the Royal Commission.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for that information. I would ask the hon. minister if on Monday, when he is bringing in the amount of the budget and how much they have spent to date and so forth, he would bring in as much information—because this seems to be a very heavy matter, Mr. Speaker—bring in as much information as he can because from the minister's answer it would appear that the Ocean Ranger Commission more or less have a blank cheque. Now the

MR. NEARY:

minister may not agree with that harsh term but that is what it would appear. He certainly indicated that, Mr. Speaker, and I can understand the tightrope

MR. NEARY:

that the hon. gentleman is walking with regard to this situation. Let me ask the hon. gentleman this question: Does the Commission consult with the administration, with the officials or the minister or anybody in the administration, before they implement plans down the road for the next year or couple of years? Do they consult with the Province so that the minister or somebody in the administration can examine to see if they do have illusions of grandeur? If they do, can the minister tell the House what these plans are for the next year or two?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly in a budgetary context the Commission has to present its plans and envisioned expenditures and what they are for and, obviously there is discussion, there is question and answer and additional information is sometimes required. And the government obviously makes known its concern with respect to expenditure but, as I say, in the final analysis, with respect to Royal Commissions, while obviously there is the responsibility of the government with respect to the expenditure of public funds, there is also the responsibility of a Royal Commission, any Royal Commission, to endeavour to fulfill its mandate in as reasonable and expeditious and yet thorough a way as possible.

MR. ROBERTS: As a matter of interest, to whom is a Royal Commission responsible?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: To both governments in theory.

MR. ROBERTS: You were just saying you cannot control them.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: You know, that is sort of a part of the system. When a Royal Commission is appointed -

MR. NEARY: whom do they report to, Treasury Board or to the Minister or to whom when they have these meetings about plans?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It would be officials of the Department of Justice and Treasury Board, to both. The actual estimates are voted in the House through the Department of Justice, so obviously there is the Department of Justice.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is why we are asking the minister questions.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes. And obviously there is an overall Treasury Board involvement as well for expenditures. The immediate contact would be with the Department of Justice; there could well be contact with Treasury Board as well.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the hon. gentleman.

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

MR. NEARY: Then the hon. gentleman obviously must be aware of the plans of the Ocean Ranger Commission of Enquiry for the next couple or three years. Could the hon. gentleman give us some indication of what their plans are for the next year or two?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, on Monday, when giving the cost breakdown to date, I will certainly indicate what we have been informed of as being the Royal Commission's plans.

MR. NEARY: Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: I have a couple of more questions for the minister not on the Ocean Ranger but on another Royal Commission, this one the health care one. My questions grow out of Special Warrants which his colleague, the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins), tabled yesterday. These reveal that about \$900,000 is to be spent on this Royal Commission this year. I have a couple of questions. First of all, could the minister tell us whether he has approved the budget? And I do not just mean \$64 for stamps and \$124 for pencils. What I am getting at is who approves the budget? I mean, a Royal Commission is set up, it does not answer to anybody in the ministerial sense, that is contrary to their very nature.

MR. ROBERTS: But do they have an open-ended checkbook? Can they go and do what they want? Can they just go ahead and say, 'We are going to have hearings'? Supposing this Royal Commission - which it has not done, of course - but suppose it were to say, 'We are going to go on a tour of Scandinavia, Africa, Asia, North America and South America and have a look at health care costs in these places', are we just stuck with paying the bill? What I am getting at - first of all, I have to ask the minister because the votes are carried by him - is can he tell us whether he approves their plan of operations in any ministerial sense?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, in general, yes, the Royal Commission would be required or asked to submit a budget. The budget would come into the Department of Justice and it would be reviewed and any additional information necessary would be asked for. In a situation like this there would be consultation with the Department of Health, which would be much more knowledgeable on it, and eventually there would be a recommendation for the approval of a certain budget which, no doubt, would come from the Department of Justice and would then have to be approved by Treasury Board.

There is certainly that process of review. I think it is fair to say as well that in a Royal Commission of such a nature as the health one, which is much more specific in terms of time and in term of mandates and also, of course, it is exclusively a provincial one - not that that alters its independence but it certainly simplifies procedures -

MR. ROBERTS: It only has to deal with yourselves, not Ottawa.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes - there would be certainly that process of accountability in terms of expenditure.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have two or three supplementaries, I realize I have to catch Your Honour's eye each time but I want to let the minister know there are two or three supplementaries.

It follows then, I assume, from what he said, and it would certainly seem to me to make sense if in fact it does follow, that a minister, in this case the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), is responsible in an overall way. It is not a question of telling the Royal Commission what to opine or what to find or even what to ask, other than in their terms of reference. What I am getting at is I understand the minister to say - he could perhaps confirm or deny this, or say what he wishes on it - that there is some control, that if a Royal Commission - to continue my admittedly absurd example - said, 'Look, we are going to go and have a look at the health care system in Hong Kong', somebody could say, 'Hold on now, we are not paying for that. If you are going to do that you are going to do that on your own shot and not on the Treasury of the Province.' I assume then that in that sense a minister, in this case the Minister of Justice in consultation with his colleague, the Health Minister (Mr. House), does approve the plans and the mechanism by which this approval is affected is through the budget process. Am I correct in that?

The minister is nodding acquiescence.

The Hansard will not record a nod, of course. I wonder if the minister would undertake - I realize he would not have it here - to give us in the House a breakdown in the same kind of detail as we would get in the estimates - I do not want more than the estimate type of detail, but the type of detail



MR. ROBERTS: in the estimates of the \$900,000 which is estimated this Royal Commission spends? At least the \$900,000 is what we know about. Perhaps the minister could give us, if he would, a breakdown in the same detail as we would get in the estimates and perhaps at the same time may I ask if he would undertake to give us an indication of whether this \$900,000, which was estimated in June, in turn has turned out to be the actual number or whether the actual is different, and if so what is it?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I will

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

certainly undertake to get a breakdown of the amount with respect to the Royal Commission on Health, to the best of my knowledge, the \$900,000 is the total.

MR. ROBERTS:

And the actuals as well as the estimates.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

I thank the hon. gentleman.

One other question, I am cognizant of the fact that capable people must be paid adequate remuneration, and I want to say, as I have said, before that the people on this Commission—Dr. Patey, Mr. Orsborn, and Mr. Pynn, I believe, is the third member—are capable people. But nonetheless I am disturbed by the rates of remuneration, I wonder if the minister at this stage, or perhaps subsequently, could tell us why he—and I assume it was he—has approved rates of remuneration which, based on 200 working days a year—and if you work forty-eight weeks, five days a week, you work 240 days a year—based on 200 days a year comes out to \$130,000 a year for the Chairman, and \$100,000 a year for each of the two commissioners, at the rate set forth in Order-in-Council 7-83-83, which, of course, was tabled as part of the documentation accompanying the Special Warrants? These rates do seem to be a little high. Mr. Orsborn in practice does very, very well, he is a very capable and competent lawyer. But But still is this full-time work for these people? Let me ask the minister as well. And, secondly, forgetting Mr. Orsborn, Mr. Pynn and Dr. Patey, I believe, are both employees of either the University or the General Hospital. I could be wrong, but the Minister of Health (Mr. House) is nodding.

MR. HOUSE:

Dr. Patey is with the School of Medicine.

MR. ROBERTS: Dr. Patey is with the School of Medicine, so the University, and Gar Pynn is Head of the Business School at the University. Are they on a leave of absence from their other jobs? Are they being paid twice? Because these annual remunerations rates strike me as being very high, \$100,000 a year in the case of the members, on a basis of 200 days a year at \$500 a day, and \$130,000 a year in the case of the Chairman. That seems to me to be very high -

MR. NEARY: We thought they were volunteers.

MR. ROBERTS: - because of course they get their expenses as well. Could the minister either make some comment on that now or could he undertake - I realize, you know, he might not have all of this information - could he undertake to make a statement in the House so that we can then deal with it? And perhaps I can add one other question, Is this the normal rate which we, the Province, are paying Royal Commissioners? If so, I suspect there are going to be a lot more applicants to serve on them.

MR. NEARY: They do a little better on the Ocean Ranger Commission.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly the rate that a person is paid obviously depends to a large extent, as most things do, if you wish, on the market and depending on the profession which they represent.

MR. ROBERTS: But these guys do not get \$500 a day in private life.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will check on this, but I would be reasonably confident that Mr. Pynn and Dr. Patey would have been on a leave of absence for a certain period of time while they are

MR. OTTENHEIMER: serving on the royal commission but I will check on that to be sure. The rates of pay, of course, are based on a per diem schedule. I think that was essentially the hon. gentleman's question, whether while being paid this amount they are relieved of their responsibilities and of their pay, whether they have a leave of absence from -

MR. ROBERTS: Are we paying them twice? Two of these members are being paid out of the public chest anyway, of course.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes. To the best of my knowledge they would be on a leave of absence during the period of the commission, or during a certain period of time agreed upon between them and their employers, but I will check that to be sure.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Perhaps the minister could check as well the normal rate of pay. Now I am not interested in personal incomes or anything, but I am interested in where public money goes. And it seems to me, from what I know of the university and from what, for example, the President of the University has said in his public statements - the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is not here but I think she would confirm this - a \$500 a day rate is well above what any employee of the university gets. I mean, the President of the University I do not think is paid \$500 a day. And looking at the Medicare statistics, there is no doctor in the Province, other than two or three specialists, making that kind of money. And these are gross fees. I mean, a doctor out of that has to pay his office, whatever that comes to, and the same with lawyers. I

MR. ROBERTS: mean, a lawyer could say \$650 a day, which is not out of line for commercial rates in downtown St. John's, but that includes overheads. We have seen the fuss about Donald McDonald getting \$800 a day on the Royal Commission on-what is it called? - Economic Prospects. So, Mr. Speaker, I just ask the minister if he could address these issues because it looks to me as if these rates are too high taken in context and perhaps he could explain it to us and then it will be time to make whatever judgements might be appropriate.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it seems like this is the day for the Minister of Justice. I have a question for the Minister of Justice. A few weeks ago there was a claim in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland from a Daniel S. de LaPenha, of Hilton Head Island, South Carolina, who submitted a claim to the Newfoundland Supreme Court for a large portion of Labrador. Could the minister advise the House how long ago he knew that this claim was pending to the Supreme Court?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it would have been some months that it has been more or less public knowledge that this gentleman in the United States was going to present a claim for portions of Labrador which he alleges were granted to some of his ancestors by William of Orange, I believe.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. If the minister knew some months ago, or officials of his staff knew some months ago, does he not think

MR. WARREN: that knowing that the Premier has said publicly that this government is considering land claims with the Inuit and Innu people of Labrador, would it not be in the proper interest of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that those associations could have been notified if there was a case pending in the Supreme Court?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, this was a case

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

against the Crown, against Newfoundland, and counsel for Newfoundland were present in court and put forward the Province's arguments which denied any validity to the claim whatsoever. So, you know, the claim was against Newfoundland itself and I think it was quite appropriate that the Crown in right of Newfoundland which appeared to defend the integrity of Newfoundland. It was not a matter really that was tied in with aboriginal rights or with any negotiations that might be going on between the Inuit people or others in the Province, it is really a matter of this gentleman making a claim for land with respect to the Crown in Newfoundland in general.

Now, I should say, of course, that the matter has been heard and judgement has been reserved, so it would not be a matter on which I could give an opinion on the substantive issues. But this really was a claim against Newfoundland; it was not a claim against the Inuit or was not tied in with aboriginal rights whatsoever.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, of the minister, I quite agree that it is appropriate the Crown should defend the integrity -

MR. NEARY: It is the minister's day in the barrel.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is the minister's day in the barrel, as the saying goes. But it is quite appropriate the Crown should defend the integrity of the Province

MR. ROBERTS: and I have no doubt that we were in the very best of hands legally.

As I understand it, what has been heard by, I believe Chief Justice Hickman of the Trial Division, is a preliminary motion by the Crown to strike out the statement of claim. Now, the Chief Justice will make his ruling and he will do one of two things:

Either strike out the statement of claim, in which case I understand this gentleman from South Carolina has said he is going into the Appeal Court, which will be his right; or the Chief Justice will allow the statement of claim, in which case the matter will go forward to a trial on the merits. But in either event, Mr. Speaker, as the minister I think will agree, there will be at least one more day in court on this matter. That being so, and there being the further point that the Inuit and Innu of Labrador have an interest in the proceedings in that they have asserted a claim to lands which are embraced within the claim of this gentleman from South Carolina, would the minister consider instructing



MR. ROBERTS:

his solicitor, his counsel - I am not sure who appears for him, but whoever appears for him-to ask the Chief Justice, in whose hands the matter would lie, for leave to serve either a third party notice or whatever other procedure may be appropriate upon the representatives of the Inuit and Innu so that they could appear, if they choose, by counsel and could participate in the further arguments which will come no matter what the Chief Justice's disposition of the matter now before him? There are procedures, I do not think this is the place to go into them, but the minister no doubt is aware of them. It is entirely in the hands of the trial judge who he lets come in, of course, but somebody has got to ask. Would the minister consider instructing his counsel to raise the issue the next time the matter comes before a judge? It will come before another judge because, as I have said, these people from South Carolina have said they are going to appeal if they lose on this one, and if they win on this point then the matter will go forward in due course to a trial on the merits. So could the minister whether he is prepared to do that? Then the Inuit and the Innu people could do whatever they felt fit depending on what the Chief Justice or the trial judge permits.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
of Justice.

The hon. Minister

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
we have not received a request from the Innu or any other people -

Mr. Speaker, of course,

MR. ROBERTS:

Consider this as one.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- to participate. I

really wish to give the matter a lot of thought and to

MR. OTTENHEIMER: discuss it with people in the department before I would make an undertaking to that effect.

MR. ROBERTS: What I asked was would the minister consider? In fact, I prefer the minister to think before he speaks, he does that almost always and we are all the better for it, but what I understand him to say is that he will take up the matter with his law officers. Am I to assume that the House in due course will have a statement of some sort from him as to what decision he has arrived at after the process?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly undertake to inform the House. I think that this is a matter which obviously I would not undertake to give any decision on Monday or Tuesday or that type of thing.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think it is a matter which has to be very carefully assessed. Obviously there may well be strong arguments for and there may well be strong arguments against, and I think in the final analysis the decision that is made will have to be obviously based on what in our assessment is in the best interest of the Province as a whole, which includes the Inuit people and includes everybody.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we note with dismay this morning that ten minister were absent from the House during Question Period, including the Premier.

MR. SIMMS: That is not out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: It is out of order to have ten ministers absent.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is out of order because we have a lot of questions to ask of these ministers. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a question in connection with the Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants that he tabled yesterday. They are a real gold mine of information, Mr. Speaker, and, I might add, a record amount was tabled in the Lieutenant Governor's Warrants yesterday. But I am interested in the one involving Strange Lake in Labrador where \$70,200

MR. NEARY: had to be found for a boundary survey. Could the minister tell the House if that is an indication that there is some kind of a dispute over the discovery of this rare mineral at Strange Lake in Labrador?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the issue somewhat, fifteen Special Warrants were tabled and the total amounts was \$30.9 million, approximately. But it also included offsetting revenue to the extent of \$18.2 million, so that the net amount of expenditure was approximately \$12 million for the fifteen Special Warrants. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the amounts there were included in the budgetary update statement that I made the other day. These Special Warrants -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - relate to the fiscal year 1983-84. These Special Warrants refer to the present fiscal year and the updated statement I gave yesterday referred to that same year and projected to the end of this year. So those Special Warrants were included in that statement I made yesterday.

In regard to the specific question the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked, I think that he may be aware - he may not be aware, I do not know - but I suspect that he was aware that the boarder in Labrador between this Province and Quebec has not been laid down on the ground. There has been a decision in certain terms by the Privy Council in the UK but it actually has not been translated into an actual line on the ground or whatever they put on the ground to define it, so that the Special Warrants in question refers to some work being done in regard to that.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS: Pursuant to the Canada Games  
Park Commission Act 1978, Section 19(4), Mr. Speaker, I  
wish to table the financial statement of the Commission  
for the year ending March 31, 1983.

MR. ROBERTS: How much did they raise?

MR. SIMMS: It is all in the report. They  
did very well as a matter of fact.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad they did, the government  
did not give them enough money.

MR. SIMMS: Thanks to the Friends of the  
Commission, I think it was called, headed by a very well-known,  
prominent citizen, Mr. LeMessurier, who happens to be in  
gallery as a matter of fact with the Sargeant-at-Arms. He  
should be commended for his efforts.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree. I agree.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I also wish -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I thought he had completed his career as a politician.

MR. SIMMS: Well, his career is not quite over yet.

MR. ROBERTS: It is the minister who is at the end, but carry on.

MR. SIMMS: No, no. It is the former, former Leader of the Opposition who is at the end.

Pursuant to the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council Act, Mr. Speaker, Section 15, I wish to table several copies of their annual report for this fiscal year for members who might be interested. In fact, this is heavy stuff and of quite a deal of interest to the people of the Province of Newfoundland. There is only one exception to that, Mr. Speaker, and that is the Leader of the Opposition, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who has no interest in anything other than making political speeches.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it should come under this heading, but yesterday the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) raised a question concerning the moving of the desk. I have discussed it with my officials and they assure me that the carpenters who did the work did not remove any materials from the desks. Some secretary - some blonde girl is what the carpenters told me - removed the material from the hon. member's desk and put it in the office of the Opposition.

MR. YOUNG: In no way, Mr. Speaker, did my officials or my workers have anything to do with the material in the hon. member's drawers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: A point of order on that, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: I do not think it is a funny matter whatsoever. I am not going to have the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) put it back on one of the secretaries and say that it was her fault. You are not getting off making a scapegoat out of this. The matter is that it is gone, it is lost; I accept that. I am now in the process of recompiling it and I will get it done without the minister's help. But I am not going to have it blamed on somebody as a scapegoat. Number two, there is a seating plan. Number three, there was a book on the desk with my name on it. They knew it. Number four, the girl who did come down did take something off the desk of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). She did not touch anything else and I am not going to have her used as a scapegoat. The Minister of Public Works and the Speaker's Office have responsibility for this House. What happens to the materials left on the desks or in the drawers, or wherever, is the responsibility of the Minister of Public Works. As I said, I accept the fact, Mr. Speaker, that it is lost and it is gone, but I am not going to have it made a joking matter and I am not going to have one of our staff or any other staff in this building made a scapegoat for the incompetency of the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

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

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that I am amazed that hon. gentlemen there opposite would treat this matter so lightly. But I want to clarify a point that was made yesterday by somebody there opposite concerning who took the initiative in having the seating arrangement changed. Well, I can tell the House that it came about as a result of a letter -

MR. SIMMS: You asked to have it changed.

MR. NEARY: No, we did not ask to have it done, Mr. Speaker, and that is the point I am making. It came about as a result of an initiative taken by the Speaker's Office, in a letter from the Clerk of the House addressed to me, asking me if we wished to have the sitting arrangement changed. The initiative came.

MR. SIMMS: You asked to have it changed.

MR. WARREN: Shut up, boy, and listen.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: It did not enter our mind to have it changed until we got this letter from the Speaker's Office. So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen are wrong again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It would appear that this is not really a valid point of order, but an internal matter which subsequently will be dealt with.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Consolidate The Law Relating To Compensation To Workers For Injuries Suffered In The Course Of Their Employment," carried. (Bill No.80).

On motion, Bill No. 60 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.



Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Election Act (No.2)," carried. (Bill No. 71).

On motion, Bill No. 71, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Bill No. 31.

The hon. Leader of the

Opposition adjourned the debate.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, how much

time do I have left?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we

were debating a bill that would put no bread on the table of the working class people of this Province. It will do nothing to create jobs for

MR. NEARY:

young people who are unemployed in this Province, and we have a record number of young people unemployed, Mr. Speaker, right at a time in their lives when they should be working in their professions, they should be laying the foundation for their careers and their future lives, what do we have? We have a silly bill to set up a procedure whereby we can protect historic objects and have somebody look after historic documents and papers. Now, that may be fine, Mr. Speaker. I understand we already have somebody doing that. We already have the Archives and we have an archivist.

MR. ROBERTS: We have an archivist.

MR. NEARY: We have an archives, we have had it for years.

MR. ROBERTS: It does not do anything new.

MR. NEARY: That is right. My hon. friend points out it does not do anything new, except the hon. gentleman thinks that this is great stuff to get him the leadership of his party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: He thinks it is great stuff. If the hon. gentleman wants to lead that party, he is going to have to come up with a little heavier timber than that.

MR. SIMMS: I guarantee you one thing, I certainly would not want to lead that one over there!

MR. ROBERTS: We feel the same way about the hon. gentleman opposite leading this party.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, as I indicated yesterday, is a fine minister, getting the reputation around the Province as being the minister of fines, a fine minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, I presumed yesterday

MR. NEARY: when we talked about this that historic objects will include such things as the astrolabe, this unique and unusual discovery that was made on the Southwest Coast a year ago by a resident of Port aux Basques, a constituent of mine. I understand it is the first one to be discovered in North America. The astrolabe, as hon. members on both sides of the House know, it is a unique historic navigational instrument. Mr. Speaker, it was even developed before the sextant. And, Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see that the astrolabe did find its way back to the museum in Port aux Basques this past

MR. NEARY: Summer, but that historic item, Mr. Speaker, has been lost from the Southwest coast forever. Its location now is at the discretion of the person in charge of the archives, of the museum here in St. John's, who might feel like sending it back to the Southwest coast for viewing by people down there, who rightly own it. By the way, it was taken away from them by the minister who, with some pretty heavy-handed tactics sent the RCMP plain-clothes men into my constituent's home, Mr. Speaker, and did not even identify themselves. They came in and had a cup of coffee and a chat and then produced a search warrant to search the house for the astrolabe. And this gentleman, by the way, who discovered the astrolabe just a mile or so off Isle aux Morts, was prepared to turn it over to the administration. And then they came up with - I think the story of the astrolabe is well-known - but then they came up, Mr. Speaker, with the most outlandish and ridiculous offer to these people who found that astrolabe. They did not even clear their expenses. Now, Mr. Speaker, does that encourage people who make discoveries in the future to report them to the provincial government, to the minister's department? Does that encourage them? No, it certainly does not. There is provision in the act, by the way, to compensate these people who found the astrolabe, but the hon. gentleman was too miserable to do that. And instead now he has turned off forever anybody ever reporting, unless they want to, an historic discovery around our coast. It was a bad piece of public relations, handled by the Martins and the Coys. It was the Martins who started out handling it before the last election, the second one that I clobbered down in LaPoile. The Martins and the Coys. They were the chief advisors, they were the ones who hoodwinked

MR. NEARY: the fellow who found the  
astrolabe and told him to report it. I wish he had gotten  
to me first. The hon. gentleman would have coughed up.

MR. SIMMS: You would have broken the law,  
would you?

MR. NEARY: No, I would not have broken  
the law. Mr. Speaker, I would not have broken the law,  
but I guarantee you that possession is nine-tenths of the  
law and the hon. gentleman would not have gotten it until -

MR. SIMMS: Why do you not read the law?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I read the law.

MR. SIMMS: Well, you read it wrong.

MR. NEARY: And I sat in that man's home  
until 4:00 a.m. in the morning many a night listening  
to his tale of woe, the way he being treated by this  
administration,

MR. NEARY:

brow-beaten, and high-handed tactics were being used, Mr. Speaker, to try to get the items that were found on that wreck off the Southwest Coast near Isle aux Morts, the heavy-handed tactics.

This find was made accidentally by a couple of scuba divers in my constituency and, Mr. Speaker, I would say that as a result of this experience, and the publicity that it has gotten, that people will think twice before they will report such discoveries to the minister's department in the future.

Now what about the astrolabe? All this man wanted in Port aux Basques was to have the astrolabe left on the Southwest Coast. Was that an unreasonable request - was it? - to leave it where it belongs on the Southwest Coast where it was discovered.

MR. BAIRD:

That is where we should leave you.

But the minister said,

MR. NEARY:

"No, it is going to St. John's and the museum in St. John's will decide where it goes and I will decide where it goes." Mr. Speaker, it was in mint condition. It had to be put under controlled temperatures, the hon. gentleman said. It had to be kept under controlled temperatures because when you get an item like that from under water, being there for several hundred years, when you get it up it has a tendency to decay and fall apart and rust and corrode. I was one of the first to see the astrolabe. It was in mint condition, Mr. Speaker. And it could have been placed under a controlled temperature just as well in the museum in Port aux Basques as it could here in St. John's. And I make one last-ditch appeal to the minister, in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, and if the minister has any fair

MR. NEARY: play at all in his bones,  
then he should return this astrolabe to Port aux Basques.  
Give it back to the people.

MR. DINN: That is not the right way to pronounce it.

MR. NEARY: As-tro-labe.

MR. DINN: As-tro-lab.

MR. NEARY: Lab. Well, Mr. Speaker,  
everybody in my constituency and I call it an astrolabe, but  
if the intellect wants to change the pronunciation let him  
get up and speak in the debate.

MR. WARREN: Is it tomato or tomato?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that astrolabe  
belongs to the Southwest corner of this Province and should be  
put back in the museum in Port aux Basques and left there, and  
not just sent out for a few weeks during the Summer. It does  
not belong to St. John's. It seems St. John's wants to grab  
everything. St. John's wants to grab everything. They cannot  
see beyond the overpass, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: And where do you get the most tourists in this Province? In Port aux Basques.

MR. SIMMS: No, there are lots of tourists in St. John's and the East Coast of the Province.

MR. NEARY: Is that so? That is what the hon. gentleman thinks. He should come down to my constituency in the Summertime. We do not know what the tourism industry is on the East Coast, Mr. Speaker. Tourists in recent years have been coming up to Corner Brook, Gros Morne national park, up the Great Northern Peninsula, across to Southern Labrador, and a lot of them do not come East of Deer Lake. They stay on the Southwest Coast where they get good hospitality and there are lots of things to see, Mr. Speaker. But the hon. gentleman cannot see beyond the St. John's overpass - put everything in St. John's.

MR. SIMMS: You do not know me very well.

MR. NEARY: I do know the hon. gentleman very well. You know, Mr. Speaker, when you get elected in Ottawa you have a tendency to get into an ivory tower. You are meeting your colleagues every day, you are on the same plane with them, you are at the same cocktail parties with them, you are travelling all over the world, you are at the same meetings with them, you have your own recreational facilities, you have your own swimming pool, so you have a tendency to lose touch with reality when you get elected to the Parliament of Canada. That is what happens to a good many politicians. Once they get up there they live in their dream world. But the same thing happens in this Province. When you get elected to represent an outport and you get into the ministry in this Province, you have a tendency, Mr. Speaker, then to have tunnel vision, you cannot see beyond the St. John's overpass, and that has happened to a good many ministers, Mr. Speaker.



MR. SIMMS:

That is what the people in LaPoile are saying about you, boy, like the telegram you got from the town council out there asking you who you represented, Remember?

MR. NEARY:

Does the hon. gentleman want to see a few I got from his own district?

MR. WARREN:

Or read the letters in the Telegram about him.

MR. NEARY:

If you want to start the mug's game, we can produce a few too, you know, from Harbour Main and Bell Island and the Burin Peninsula. Does the hon. gentleman want to start that row?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, may I do it now during this debate?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was protesting some time ago that the Government of Canada did not have a presence in this Province as far as a minimum security institution is concerned.

Now, I understood that the administration there opposite, the people there opposite, had favoured St. John's.

MR. SIMMS:

That is not true.

MR. NEARY:

That is true. The people there opposite favoured St. John's.

MR. SIMMS:

It is not true.

MR. NEARY:

The people there opposite favoured St. John's and I favoured the West Coast.

MR. SIMMS:

It is not true.

MR. NEARY:

It is true.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -  
MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!  
MR. NEARY: - the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) is not in his seat. If he were here -  
MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I just wish to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that we are discussing a bill concerning the Archives and not minimum security institutes. I would ask him to direct his remarks to the bill being discussed.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I am not permitted to comment on what the hon. gentleman said, I presume, Mr. Speaker. I am not allowed to talk about the Tory -

MR. SIMMS: It is okay with me but it is not okay with the Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman listening? I am not allowed, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman objects.

MR. WARREN: He is talking to the doctor.

MR. NEARY: I will wait.

MR. WARREN: Wait until he gets his prescription.

MR. NEARY: I am not allowed to talk about the big Tory -

MR. DINN: Nobody is listening to you anyway.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see.

MR. WARREN: Wait until he gets his prescription.

MR. NEARY: He has to get his instructions, Mr. Speaker, his instructions from the doctor. We will wait.

Mr. Speaker, I am not allowed to tell the hon. gentlemen about their Tory representative out there who sent me a telegram. Is that what the hon. gentleman -

MR. SIMMS: What was that again?

MR. NEARY: Their Tory representative in Port aux Basques, I am not allowed to say anything about this guy who sent me a telegram.

MR. SIMMS: The Mayor of Port aux Basques?

MR. NEARY: The big Tory.

MR. SIMMS: The Mayor of Port aux Basques?

MR. NEARY: The fellow who was up to your convention-

MR. SIMMS: Do you mean the Mayor of Port  
aux Basques?

MR. NEARY: -and on your  
Tory executive -

MR. SIMMS: Do you mean the Mayor of Port  
aux Basques?

MR. NEARY: - in Port aux Basques.

MR. SIMMS: You mean the Mayor of Port aux  
Basques, do you? It was the first time ever he got  
involved politically, by the way.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Is that so?

MR. SIMMS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Oh!

MR. SIMMS: Openly. He saw the light. He  
saw the light.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to  
give the hon. gentleman a lecture on that particular gentleman.

MR. SIMMS: I have known him a lot longer  
than you have known him.

MR. NEARY: Yes, through the Kinsmen. The  
hon. gentleman got a few Kinsmen turned over the other way  
back when he came into politics. Because he was a former governor, he  
got a few Kinsmen but fortunately they are flocking back to  
the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: We have born-again Liberals  
like you would not believe, including Kinsmen, teachers, the  
public servants who have been ridiculed, hospital workers -

MR. SIMMS: How about your Young Liberal  
meeting the other night in Grand Falls where you had fifteen show up -

MR. NEARY: - construction workers, pulp and paper workers, miners, flocking to the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STEWART: That was some dream you had last night.

MR. NEARY: Born-again Liberals.  
But anyway , getting back to this bill, Mr. Speaker, I was asking the hon. gentleman yesterday what this bill will do to put bread on the tables of the people who are hungry in this Province.

MR. NEARY: The other day we heard in debate in this House members there opposite talk about how cruel it was for National Revenue to go back eleven and twelve years to make collections. Well, we have the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) over there doing the same thing with overpayments on social assistance.

MR. ROBERTS: He is going back twenty and thirty years.

MR. NEARY: Twenty and thirty years he is going back. Now what will happen to all these poor people, a lot of them on Canada Pension now and a lot of them on Old Age Pension? Will they become historic objects, Mr. Speaker, and be put under the minister's care? And I asked him yesterday about the paper mill in Corner Brook, Will that become a historic object because of the inaction, because of the incompetence and the inaction of this government? And what about all the mining facilities in Labrador West? What about the hospital in North West River? Is that now to become a historic object to be placed under the care of the minister? And what about the hospital in Botwood and the hospital in Buchans? Are they to become historic objects? And what about the hospitals at Come By Chance and Markland? Will they become historic objects? What about the Burin fish plant? Will that become a historic object? Will the member down there become a historic object and come under the care of the minister in due course?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what about the causeway they are going to build to Bell Island, Mr. Speaker? Will that come under the care of the minister and become a historic object? What about the oil refinery up in Holyrood? Will the hon. gentleman take that under his wing, Mr. Speaker? And what about the oil refinery in Come By Chance? Will hon. gentleman take that under his bill to look after and go

MR. NEARY: and put a big bronze plaque  
on it, historic site, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, will the  
hon. gentleman make an inventory of all the industries and all  
of the businesses that have been shut down since this administration  
became the administration in this Province eleven years ago,  
make an inventory of all of the industries that are shut down  
and design some kind of a plaque and go out and nail the plaque  
on the door to say, 'This is a historic site and it comes under  
my department'?

MR. NEARY: We are going to have to set up a committee, as the hon. gentleman is so capable of doing; he announces every day a new committee or he invites a proposal for the Summer Games or the Winter Games, or he fines somebody, he increases the fines on somebody, a fine minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: What a vicious attack.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman is not vicious. But the real point that I am making is this, that here we are in this House on November 18, 1983, the day of the great Liberal ball in Corner Brook, and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have to say this, as of midnight tonight, one stroke before midnight tonight I will have served my 21st year as an elected member of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I will start my 22nd year as a member of this House. And the point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that I have seen a lot of faces come and go in this House and I have seen a lot of things happen in the political life of this Province but I have never, Mr. Speaker, in 21 years as a member of this House, I have never seen a crowd that wanted to shirk their responsibility as the hon. gentlemen there opposite. I have never, in my experience in this House, seen a crowd who lacked plans for the recovery in the Newfoundland economy. I have never, Mr. Speaker, when the Smallwood administration resigned in 1972 the total provincial debt in this Province was \$750 million. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) said we were in grave financial trouble at that time. As a matter of fact, I have his quote right here that I will

MR. NEARY: get out for him next week. And the member for St. John's North told us that we were broke. Mr. Crosbie used to tell us we were broke, \$750 million. And now it is climbing towards \$4 billion and we do not hear a peep out of the hon. gentlemen.

MR. WARREN: We are not broke now.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, the point is that after -

MR. WARREN: That is progress.

MR. NEARY: That is progress alright.

MR. WARREN: Progress downward.

MR. SIMMS: More competent people.

MR. NEARY: The public debt, \$4 billion, over \$7000 for every man, woman and child in this Province. When a child is born in Newfoundland today it owes, when it opens its eyes, \$7,000. So, Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making, here we are discussing this bill - now it may be essential but it is not a number one priority, it is not important.

MR. TOBIN: It is a good bill though.



MR. NEARY: As good as the bill is -  
MR. SIMMS: It is important.  
MR. NEARY: As good as it is, it is not

a number one priority. The number one priority is to solve the problems out there in the Newfoundland and Labrador economy, that is the number one priority, and to try to do something about the incredible financial mess in this Province, and to try to put young people to work, and to try to get people off the dole and get them back working, and to try to get hospital beds open, and to try to keep industry going, save Corner Brook, save Labrador City, save Burin, save Grand Bank. That is what we should be doing in this House, Mr. Speaker. As important as the minister thinks this bill is - in his own little mind he thinks it is the most significant and important thing on the face of the earth - it may be important to him, Mr. Speaker, but it is not important to the ordinary people out there.

MR. BAIRD: Sit down. You are making a fool of yourself.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is making a fool of himself in Corner Brook. Now they are beginning to question whether there is a company that Bowater are negotiating with or not. The hon. gentleman cannot even get the name of the company that Bowater are negotiating with. They do not trust the administration enough to give them the name.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman may feel it is an important bill and in his own little mind, in his own little corner of the world, Mr. Speaker, it may be important, but what about all the people out there who are in pain and suffering as a result of the mismanagement and the incompetence of this administration? What about them?

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Will there be dancing in Grand Bruit tonight because we are going to pass a bill to set up some kind of procedure down in the Archives to look after historic objects?

MR. NEARY: We will have a lot of historic objects, Mr. Speaker, in the future and most of them will come from that side of the House after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I had to go on the air down in Burin Peninsula one time and tell the people down there that their member was so rude that thirty-five or thirty-six times in one afternoon he was brought to order by the Speaker. I do not want to have to do that again.

MR. TOBIN: It backfired on you. Did you read the editorial that was in the paper then?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is a lady in this City, I believe, who gives a course in how to be courteous, and in ethics.

MR. TOBIN: And how come you did not go to her?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should go out and take the Dale Carnegie Course.

MR. DINN: You could have used that twenty years ago.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to hearing

MR. NEARY: from the hon. gentleman when he closes the debate on this bill. No doubt he will get up and tell us that it is the most important thing to him on the face of this earth. He wants to make his mark in history. Mr. Speaker, you know, if the hon. gentleman does have leadership aspirations, and I think that he does, he is always trying to make nice statements, nice, except for his fines, make nice statements, non-controversial, but what the hon. gentleman does not realize is that he is cluttering up this House with trivial matters, with insignificant legislation, housekeeping stuff, when we should be debating the Newfoundland and Labrador economy, when we should find out what the administration is going to do with Ultramar in connection with the oil refinery at Holyrood. They have been talking now for months and they are no further ahead now than when they started. It is time they took the bull by the horns, Mr. Speaker, or took the bull by the other end.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, they have been taking it by the other end.

MR. NEARY: And they have it by the other end. It is time they went around and took it by the horns.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Bell Island situation, I just asked the hon. gentleman but he was not in his seat, what will happen to the causeway?

MR. ROBERTS: Why do we not have a quorum call?

MR. NEARY: Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

QUORUM CALL

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

There is a quorum present.

The hon. Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I understand

my two colleagues are going to have a few words and it is eleven twenty-five. The only reason we are talking on this bill is because we have nothing else to talk about. And I hope that the people up over my shoulder will remember and I should not have to remind them, that it is the government that calls the order of business in this House, not the Opposition. I am going to have to give a certain gentleman, a star of Here and Now, I am going to have to give him a lecture soon on Question Period. He puts me, I believe, in the same category as a minister, as though I am making statements and so forth. All I do is ask questions and look for information. So I am going to have to give him an insight on Question Period, what Question Period is. Question Period is what it implies. It is Question Period. We ask the questions, we are looking for information, and it is the ministers who make the statements and give the information, and they are the ones who should have the egg over their faces.

MR. TULK:

Is it true that you refused

an interview with CBC?

MR. NEARY:

Yes, I certainly did.

MR. TULK:

I would say that was the first time in your life. Was that the first time in your life?

MR. NEARY:

No, it was not. As long as that particular gentleman continues his partisan reporting of this House,

MR. NEARY: unless he can show me that he is not partisan in his reporting, then I intend to refuse interviews with that particular gentleman. I am not going to subject myself to slurs from the likes of that, Mr. Speaker. I am too long in this House. As a matter of fact, that particular gentleman has come under fire before in this House and it might be a good idea, somewhere down the line to think about bringing them before the Bar of the House, to answer for his complete and utter ignorance of how this House works.

MR. SIMMS: pointing your finger?

MR. NEARY: I am not pointing the finger at anybody, Mr. Speaker. But I am sure that the fellow who got a five page note from me yesterday will get the message, Mr. Speaker. So the reason I mention that is to draw attention to the fact it is not the Opposition that calls the Order of Business in this House, it is not the Opposition that wastes the time of the House, we are forced to debate orders that are called by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

MR. TOBIN: What is wrong with that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what choice do we have? We have tried every angle in the book to get a debate on the economy this session. The government refused to debate the economy, to debate the high retail sales taxes and the unemployment, especially among young people. They refused to debate these things. There is nothing we can do about it. It is the government that calls the Order of Business in this House, will that get through to the star of Here And Now, the Here and Now star, that we do not call the Order of Business?

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, you got flayed last night.

MR. NEARY: Oh did I now?

MR. WARREN: You did not know the answer on Tuesday.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister, obviously, is still smarting under that one. Mr. Speaker, we only ask questions. We do not make statements or accusations. We are looking for information. I hope that sinks into the thick skull of the Here and Now star. We ask questions. We look for information. Mr. Speaker, it is the government who makes statements and gives answers. I hope that sinks, get through at long last, because if it does not, I say God Help the information that goes out to the people of this Province from this House. They pack up their cameras at 5:20 in the evening and the world could collapse down around us in this House and they are gone. And what do you get on Here and Now that night? A twenty second news report. Twenty seconds is what you get.

So, Mr. Speaker, my point is this - Could we have a quorum call again, Mr. Speaker, We cannot keep them in their seats. We should have compulsory seat belt legislation in this House.

MR. TOBIN: We have a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD):

Order, please!

There is a quorum present.

MR. NEARY:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we will catch them scooting in and out the doorways over there. We will keep a quorum. And also, Mr. Speaker, is is the responsibility of the Government House Whip to keep a quorum in this House. I believe what is necessary, I believe what we need to do is to take these people and give them some kind of a course, an educational programme in how this system works.

MR. DAWE:

You are straying a little bit.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, I am. But the point I was making is this, that the only reason we are debating this bill now, and we may just as well stay on this as anything else, is because we are forced to debate it. The government called this order and we had to get up and debate it.

DR. COLLINS:

We have lots of other things. Why do you not pass this and we will get on to another subject.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would gladly pass this bill if the hon. gentleman can assure me we are going to debate the Newfoundland and Labrador economy. Can the hon. gentleman give me that assurance? We will let all this legislation go through.

DR. COLLINS:

It is up to the House Leader.

MR. NEARY:

It is up to the House Leader? The hon. gentleman makes his remark and then he pawns it off on the House Leader.

DR. COLLINS:

You know what he is like.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader called this order of business, we have to debate it. We regret that we have to debate it. It is merely of

MR. NEARY: a housekeeping nature. I cannot say that it is wasting the time of the House but our precious time in this House could be spent on something better. Anything we do in the House is never a waste, although members sometimes go out and say, 'Well, we are wasting time'. We have precious time in this House and we should devote our energies and our ability to trying to find solutions to the record unemployment we have in this Province and the incredible financial mess the minister has gotten the Province in, the hospital beds that are closed, hospitals shutting their doors for the last time to sick people, medical clinics closing down -

MR. TOBIN: Opening in your district, opening.

MR. NEARY: - industries shutting their doors right, left and center. The Premier is presiding over the demise of the Province and here we are discussing a bill to improve the procedures in the Museum and in the Archives. Well, that may be appropriate, because we will have an awful lot - maybe the hon. gentleman is looking down the road for the next couple of years, as long as the administration sits over there, maybe he is beginning to realize that we may have an awful lot of historic objects in this Province that may need to be looked after, like the Bowater paper mill, like the power plant in Deer Lake, like the oil refinery in Holyrood, Labrador West's mining operations, the oil refinery at Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker, the Burin fish plant, the Grand Bank fish plant, all may become historic. May-



MR. NEARY:

be the hon. gentleman knows more than he is telling us. Maybe he realizes that his department is going to be the biggest department of all, that he will have so many historic monuments and objects around this Province to look after, maybe he is laying the foundation now for his big bureaucracy, for his empire, to look after all these things, because I am sure his colleagues will not be able to look after them.

MR. WARREN:

He will have lots of committees.

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. WARREN:

He will have committees

all over the place.

MR. NEARY:

The Newfoundland Hardwoods,

another historic object, the Buchans Mine, a historic site, the Bell Island mine. Mr. Speaker, we used to hear so much from the administration when they were over here were we are, when they were in the Opposition, about what they were going to do for Bell Island. They have been over there eleven years now and they have not lifted a finger. And, Mr. Speaker, that ferry they bought for their buddy down in Springdale, that ferry the government financed for their buddy, of course that will become a historic object.

MR. WARREN:

How much did that cost?

MR. NEARY:

Well, that cost them, I

believe, a couple of million dollars so far.

MR. SIMMS:

How about the overpass

in Glovertown?

MR. NEARY:

The overpass in Glovertown,

MR. NEARY: there should be a big sign put on that, the Newfie joke of the century. The overpass at Glovertown, and hon. members should realize this, the overpass at Glovertown was meant to be an overpass for Gambo.

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

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!  
The hon. House Leader on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, yesterday a ruling was made that the hon. gentleman had to be relevant to the bill which is a bill with respect to the Archives. Now he is trying to circumvent this by what he is saying, trying to say this is going to be an Archive and that is going to be an Archive and he is talking about economic development and that. The hon. gentleman has plenty of opportunity to discuss matters of economics as it affects the Province, and this is a bill with respect to Archives and I think the hon. gentleman is being irrelevant as well as being very boring.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order I would remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we are discussing a bill on the Archives, Bill No. 31.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, while the hon. gentleman was raising his point of order - did you rule on the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - while he was raising his point of order I was handed a news release hot off the press; 'The President of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, Beaton Tulk, has just announced that Gambo businessman Paul Thoms will represent the Liberal Party in the Terra Nova district by-election December 7, 1983.'

MR. NEARY: Good-bye unwanted Tory candidate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: 'Mr. Tulk says' - listen to this - Mr. Tulk says eleven persons have sought party advice on the possibility of carrying the Liberal banner.'

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

Although the information that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is giving out is very interesting, it has nothing to do with Bill No. 31 which we are discussing. I would appreciate it if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would direct his remarks to the bill.

MR. NEARY: I apologize to Your Honour. I did not realize that I was breaking the rules. I apologize to the Chair and I have to say that we will now have another historic object for the hon. gentleman to look after in the name of the yodeler, the country and western yodeler, the unwanted Tory candidate.

MR. WARREN: I would say he will be put in charge of Farm Products, or something like that.

MR. BUTT: Look at your colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) sliding down under his desk.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: He will end up Chairman of Newfoundland Farm Products, no doubt.

MR. WARREN: That is where they all go, is it?

MR. NEARY: That seems to be the Newfoundland Senate. We have our own Senate here now. We will have Senator Greening, Chairman of the Newfoundland Farm Products.

MR. SIMMS: And Senator Neary in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, to wind wind up my few remarks on this bill, we regret very much that we are being forced to debate this kind of legislation at the gravest time in our whole history. We have a very grave economic and financial situation in this Province, anything could trigger bankruptcy. Hon. gentlemen there opposite in their simplicity do not seem to understand that, that Newfoundland is bankrupt if we were not a Province of Canada. If we were not a province, Mr. Speaker, we would not be able to pay our bills, we would not be able to borrow money.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. minister believes that.

MR. NEARY: The only thing that is saving us, Mr. Speaker, is that we are a Province of Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: The last time there was a Tory government in Newfoundland they drove her under, too.

MR. NEARY: That is right. It took a Tory Government to get the United Kingdom to appoint a commission. I hope it is not a Tory Government that will get Ottawa to

MR. NEARY: turn us into a territory, because they could very easily do it, Mr. Speaker. So we have some very grave matters to debate in this House and the government will do anything, the administration will do anything but talk about the economy. They will bring in these foolish bills like we are debating now rather than talk about unemployment or reducing the retail sales tax or plans for recovery in the economy. They just do not want to talk about it. What are the issues? Let me ask the minister, when he winds up second reading on this bill, let me ask him to state what he thinks the real issues are in this Province.

MR. WARREN: Archives.

MR. NEARY: Is it the archives?

MR. WARREN: Yes, it is the archives.

MR. NEARY: Is it the museum? Is it regulating people's lives? Is it imposing heavy fines on people? Is it appointing committees? Is it Summer games or Winter Games, or is it -

MR. ROBERTS: Indoor or outdoor games.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

- or is it the terrible state, the horrible mess of the Newfoundland economy and the incredible mess the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has created in this Province?

DR. COLLINS: I am a pretty sensitive person, you should not say things like that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says he is sensitive. He is like an old red rooster! You know when they wrote the song about the 'red rantin Tory out there in a dory' - there is the original 'red rantin Tory', the original, and he is still at sea. He is an old red rooster! He is tough. He does not care how cruel he is to the people of this Province. He is so tough! He sits there day in and day out while his colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) shuts hospital doors to sick people. And being a doctor, he sits there and chews on the end of his glasses, Mr. Speaker, and just lies back and takes it. And the hon. gentleman knows there is pain and suffering in this Province as a result of the policy of his colleague, the Minister of Health, people waiting in Emergency and Out-Patient Departments and lying in corridors. Nobody belonging to the hon. gentleman would do that, I guarantee you. Mr. Speaker, nobody belonging to the hon. gentleman would be forced to take that kind of treatment. And this hon. gentleman is supposed to have a code of ethics.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, his time is up, is it not?

MR. NEARY: No, my time is not up yet. If the hon. gentleman keeps provoking me, I will go on forever.

MR. SIMMS: You have gone on forever and have not said a word.

MR. TOBIN: Are you for the hospital or against the hospital going to Burin?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they have turned the sod down there now three times for that hospital. Three times they have turned the sod and, as my hon. colleague said today, they are making announcements on building new hospitals and shutting down hospital beds and closing

MR. NEARY:

hospitals and medical clinics.

Mr. Speaker, we regret very much that we have to take the time to debate these matters. We would like, if the administration does not mind, to debate these matters, like the bill we had before us, after we have straightened out the incredible mess in the economy and after we have straightened out the finances and rescued Newfoundland from bankruptcy, where we are at the moment. We are bankrupt, no question about that. If we were on our own we would be bankrupt. The only reason our credit rating is not affected, the only reason we can still borrow is because the money lenders say, 'Well, you are a Province of Canada and Canada will not let you go bankrupt.'

DR. COLLINS:

That is not accurate.

MR. NEARY:

That is accurate. I went to Standard and Poor's and Moody's in New York two years ago and that is what I was told. I was told in the presence of two of my colleagues, 'Well, we do not worry too much because you are a Province of Canada and Ottawa

MR. NEARY: could not afford to allow one of its provinces to go bankrupt. I nearly fell off the chair when I heard that statement. A \$4 billion debt - the hon. gentleman cannot mismanage the debt - \$750 million after twenty-three years of Liberalism, \$4 billion after eleven years of Toryism, and nothing to show for it. Not one thing to show for it. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost two years since that dark and dreary day of April 6, 1982, when that administration was given a strong mandate to negotiate an offshore agreement; still no sign of an agreement and all we have had during that two years is record unemployment, hospitals shutting their doors, sick people not getting treated, the highest taxes in Canada, industries closing down right, left and centre, chaos in the fishing industry, in the pulp and paper industry, in the mining industry. That is what we have got in the last two years, since that dark dreary day, April 6, 1982. Not one member there opposite, or anybody within listening distance of me can deny that, that we are into the worst period in our whole history, Mr. Speaker. And hon. gentlemen sit there day in and day out and make rude remarks, they contribute nothing to the decorum let alone the debates of this House.

MR. TOBIN: And what about you?

MR. NEARY: At least I can get up and make a speech. That is more than I can say about the hon. gentleman who spent five minutes the other day, five minutes on a bill that affects his district more than any other district in Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN: And you had an hour and took thirty minutes.



MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is not in his seat.

MR. TULK: You had an hour as the Leader of the Liberal Party.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman found five minutes for his constituents to speak on that bill that was hailed as the greatest thing that ever happened since Confederation by the Premier, five minutes he could find. So at least I can contribute, I can make a speech, I do not need any notes to do it either, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: After twenty-one years that is the least you should be able to do.

MR. TOBIN: I can tell you one thing, it is shameful for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to have an hour and only use thirty minutes.

MR. NEARY: It is just wonderful to be able to spend five minutes talking about a bill of that magnitude, that affects your district so much.

MR. TOBIN: How much did you spend?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. member took five minutes of his time. How wonderful! And the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), I believe,

MR. NEARY: gave five or six minutes. The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) -

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

MR. NEARY: - made no contribution.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to bring to the hon. member's attention once again that we are discussing Bill No. 31 and not at this time discussing the Fisheries Bill.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: The only thing I can say to that, Your Honour, is that I would ask for the protection of the Chair, because there are all kinds of rude interruptions coming from members there opposite, Mr. Speaker. The only thing I can say, I got sidetracked when I was rudely interrupted, as I still am, by the hon. gentleman. Thirty-six times in one day, that has to be a record in any jurisdiction in the world.

Mr. Speaker, so we regret very much, it is unfortunate indeed that we have to use the time of the House, not waste the time, to use the time of the House on these very trivial, insignificant items, these very small matters when we have so many important things, so many items that need top priority, that need immediate attention from the administration. I am not blaming the hon. gentleman, I am not saying it is the hon. gentleman's fault, by the way, what I am saying is that it is the government that calls the Order of Business. The hon. gentleman does not call the Order of Business, it is the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). The Government House Leader calls the Order of Business, and we are satisfied any time they want -

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is being rude again. Do I have to go and tell his constituents about him again?

MR. TOBIN: Yes, and see what an impression you will make. Want to read their article?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are well aware of what Mr. Hudson can do, we are well aware of his poison pen.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, first of all, the hon. gentleman, apart from being rude, is out of his seat and he is shouting across the House as if he were in a beer garden somewhere, a beer tavern downtown. I do not know, if the hon. gentleman realizes it yet or not, but this is the House of Assembly. It is the highest court in the land. The hon. gentleman would not be permitted to go down to the Supreme Court where testimony is being taken, where evidence is being taken and where lawyers are speaking, the hon. gentleman would not be allowed to interrupt or be rude, Mr. Speaker, and Your Honour should apply the same rules to this House. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not blaming the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) for forcing the House to debate this bill today. We are quite prepared to give up the time, any time the hon. gentleman wants and I fling this on the table as a challenge to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could we restrain the ignorant, incompetent from the Burin Peninsula (Mr. Tobin) .

Mr. Speaker, I throw a challenge on the House for the Government House Leader now to let us forget on Monday, today now is shot, here it is quarter of twelve, let us forget bills like the one we are debating now, let us forget these bills and let us get on to something more



MR. NEARY: The chaos in the Newfoundland fishery and in the pulp and paper industry and the mining industry, let us talk about some of these things. Let us talk about Holyrood and let us talk about Come By Chance, let us talk about young people who are unemployed. There are eight or ten items that I have thrown out for consideration for the hon. gentleman. We cannot seem to get a debate under Standing Order 23, perhaps I might be able to shame the - I can only, Mr. Speaker, try to shame the hon. gentleman into calling a government order, bringing in a government measure on the economy. And, Mr. Speaker, we can only stand here day in and day out and appeal to the hon. gentleman. We cannot force him to do it, because here we are, we are just like two hockey teams; you have forty-four members on one hockey team, on that side, and seven on a hockey team over here. There are days, Mr. Speaker, we feel like we have been dragged through a meat grinder in this House. And there are days when some of us feel the referee is on their side, and then we have the star of Here and Now to contend with. Mr. Speaker, I mean, it is a very, very difficult task we have, it is a difficult task. But it is not the quantity of the members here, it is the quality. I have nothing but high praise for my colleagues who are trying to keep democracy alive in this Province, who are trying to carry on the people's business in this House under very grave difficulties because of the stonewalling of the ministers, and the arrogance of the ministers. They talked about Mr. Smallwood, his arrogance and his dictatorial attitude, you should have been in this House yesterday and the day before if you want to see a dictatorial attitude and if you want to see arrogance, especially from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is this relevant?

MR. NEARY:

Yes, it is. It is relevant, Mr. Speaker. It is because what I am arguing, Mr. Speaker, is that there are matters of higher priority than this bill we have before us.

MR. SIMMS:

That is not relevant.

MR. NEARY:

It is not relevant?

MR. SIMMS:

You are supposed to talk about the bill.

MR. NEARY:

We are talking about the bill.

We are just saying -

MR. SIMMS:

You have talked about everything but and you have not mentioned a word yet.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we are condemning the fact that the administration saw fit to call this bill rather than to call a measure or lay plans on the table of how they intend to deal with the incredible mess they have gotten this Province in.

MR. TOBIN:

Do you want to read that editorial I have here?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how long more can the hon. gentleman continue his rudeness before Your Honour names him?

MR. WARREN: Yes, throw him out.

MR. NEARY: You talk about rowdyism in this House, we did not see anything like it in the last twenty-one years that I have been here, we did not know what rowdyism was until the hon. gentleman arrived from the Burin Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is not to blame, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms), although the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth welcomes the opportunity to get up to speak at the drop of a hat. He will make an announcement on anything, he does not care what it is. As long as it is not offensive, as long as he can straddle the fence, the hon. gentleman will make an announcement on anything. If it has to do with motherhood the hon. gentleman is all in favour of it. The only deep water he is getting out in is fines, he wants to fine everybody, the fine minister.

MR. WARREN: When he was Speaker he could not wait to get out.

MR. NEARY: Yes. He was so glad to get out of the Chair, I think, so he could make his move. But I must say, it is not very impressive so far, not very impressive.

MR. WARREN: He is not leadership calibre.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: The best speech I ever heard you make was yesterday evening when you spoke on child abduction.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have made some pretty good speeches in this House, some pretty good ones. The hon. gentleman has only been here a year and a half, or a couple of years. He should have been here for the last twenty-one years, Mr. Speaker. At least I think I have made my mark in the history of this Province and that is more than I will be able to say

MR. NEARY: about the hon. gentleman. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can go and play with his archives, play with his museums, play with historic objects, play with the fellow with the monkey suit on, that fellow going around this Summer for the Sir Humphrey Gilbert celebrations, going back and forth across the Atlantic, Dr. Something, with a monkey suit on him. He can go and play with his medallions he has left over from the Sir Humphrey Gilbert celebrations, and he can play with his committees, Mr. Speaker, but the fact of the matter is -

MR. SIMMS: That is unnecessarily vicious.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, one thing I would never do is viciously attack the hon. gentleman. All I am trying to do is make a point and the hon. gentleman knows what the point is. The hon. gentleman cannot wait now to leap to his feet to close second reading of this bill. But I will bet you the hon. gentleman will not deal with the real questions that I have raised.

MR. SIMMS: I will deal with the legislation.

MR. NEARY: He will deal with the legislation.

Oh, I see, he will hide behind that. As a matter of fact -

MR. SIMMS: Because I know the rules and I know you are being irrelevant.

MR. NEARY: Oh! But, Mr. Speaker, one of the rules of this House, as the hon. gentleman knows -

MR. SIMMS: Be relevant during debate.

MR. NEARY: - is that you can give leave



MR. NEARY: to a minister to do anything he wants to do, by leave. Well, we give the hon. gentleman leave - okay? The hon. gentleman cannot hide behind the rules, he cannot hide behind the piece of legislation.

MR. MARSHALL: You cannot give leave.

MR. NEARY: We will give the hon. gentleman leave, this side of the House, by unanimous consent. By unanimous consent we will let the hon. gentleman talk about the economy.

MR. WARREN: Real bread and butter issues.

MR. NEARY: We will let the hon. gentleman talk about bread and butter issues, talk about the economy and talk about the sick people who are forced to wait in corridors of hospitals for hours and days before a bed can be found to put them in.

Mr. Speaker, I only have three or four minutes left. I understand a couple of my colleagues wish to speak. Mr. Speaker, we are going to support the piece of legislation but we regret very much, and we are very dismayed and disturbed over the fact, that we have to use the time of this House to debate such trivial matters when we should be taking about the heavy items that affect the everyday lives of ordinary Newfoundlanders. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman will get the message and not think that I was directing my remarks personally at the hon. gentleman because, Mr. Speaker, he is one of my favourites on the other side. I am rather amused with him on times, at the issues that he uses to try to promote his leadership campaign, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that if he needs a few words of advice, come around and see me and I will be glad to give him a bit of advice on what the real issues are in case, since he came into St. John's, he has gotten swept off his feet and is in that imaginary world, in that ivory tower

MR. NEARY: that I spoke about that the members up in Ottawa have been in for the last three or four years.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I just want a few words in this debate. The hon. gentleman there opposite has spent one hour asking why it is necessary to debate this measure to the extent that it has been, or to even bring it before the floor of this House. Yet the consummate contempt in which he holds

MR. MARSHALL:

the proceedings of this House is indicated by fact that he gets up and speaks for a whole hour on an issue that, in his mind, is extremely unimportant. He speaks about irrelevancies, and obviously the Opposition are going to filibuster with respect to it, because the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) now wants to get up and speak about it. Now, that is certainly his right, but I would hope that the hon. gentleman would be relevant to the bill itself. I am not going to waste the time of the House on the matter further - not that it is a waste of time, but the hon. minister has introduced the bill and explained it fully and I know the hon. minister will be able to respond on the closing of the bill itself. But I do wish to say a few words with respect to what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said and what the former Leader of the Opposition, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), said as well with respect to another bill yesterday.

This government has given quite ample opportunity to discuss the economy of this Province. As a matter of fact, the government welcomes discussion on the economy of this Province. There is a provision through Question Period that is provided here daily when all the ministers can be questioned for half an hour on whatever subjects that the hon. gentlemen opposite wish to bring up within the realm of relevancy, and, certainly, within the realm of relevancy is the economy.

We have another procedure in this House, Mr. Speaker, that was put there by this democratic government when we revised the rules of the House. There was a time, and it has to be mentioned

MR. MARSHALL:

once more, when I sat

in this House in Opposition, when you did not even have a Question Period and you were not allowed to ask questions in this House. And they were backed up by people who were the elected members, including certain of the hon. gentlemen opposite. You could not even ask a question. And one of the things that we did to reform the rules of this House was we provided for what is called a Late Show on Thursday afternoons. So not only for thirty minutes a day can they examine us on the economy, but once a week, if they feel that questions have not been answered to their satisfaction, it is they and only they who have the opportunity to bring up in that half-hour period questions, to examine us on things they were dissatisfied with, to draw it to the attention of the public as to why they think we were not answering questions fully and sufficiently.

Now, what has happened this

year? We

MR. MARSHALL:

have had fifty-nine sittings of the House - seven into fifty-nine goes eight - there have been eight or nine weeks that we have been sitting. There have been eight or nine of these sessions I think, if you consult the record, Mr. Speaker, no more than two of those sessions were used. Instead, they wanted to get off a half an hour early on Thursday. Yesterday was a good example, and the week before. Here the House had not sat for two or three months and they come in here and they have not availed of that procedure here on two occasions. So, I mean, I think it is quite obvious. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) yesterday gets up and parrots the same thing the hon. member opposite said today, that this bill was not important. The bill being addressed at that time was the reciprocal enforcement of judgements with respect to child abduction. It may not be important, Mr. Speaker, for the gentlemen there opposite, it may not be important for the great majority of people, but it is certainly extremely important to a parent whose child has been taken away in a matrimonial dispute to another province of Canada, or to another country. But the hon. gentlemen there opposite did not see anything important enough about this to debate and they deride it.

The same way with this bill on the Archives. There are bills that have to be brought into this House from time to time to give them legislative sanction, to make sure that the procedures of government are operating properly. The provision of our historic resources and the Archives of this Province are obviously very important to the history of this Province and to everything with respect to its pulse and its culture and its social history, and that is extremely important to any person in any government in any Province that has any pride in its provincial history. But, of

MR. MARSHALL: course, the hon. gentlemen  
there opposite have absolutely no pride in their provincial  
history, all they seem to do is want to parrot what comes  
from Ottawa and try to turn this Province into the type of  
insipidness that we see from time to time from across the  
Gulf.

MR. MARSHALL:

very important to the provision, Mr. Speaker, of the history of this Province and it is worthy of debate. I am not going to take any more time of the House except to say that, number one, the provisions that are brought before this House are extremely important, they are worthy of debate, some more than others, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has gotten up and criticized us for bringing in a measure of this nature, yet has spent one hour debating it, or attempting to debate it while talking about irrelevancies. There are ample opportunities in this Legislature to discuss economic matters or anything, but the hon. gentlemen there opposite have not availed of it. There is a Question Period, there is Late Show they have not used. We just got through a long debate with respect to the restructuring of the fisheries. Now, obviously, if the gentlemen say there have been no measures brought before the House that are important, they do not consider that important. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that that particular bill did not in legal terms require legislative sanction, but the reason why we brought it before this House was to give it a public airing and give all members a chance to debate it fully. So that is the way that the government is operating the affairs in the Legislature. We are trying to make it relevant, and we are trying to encourage debate, and we are trying to encourage questions being asked of the administration because that is the way in which the government should work. But we are not meeting any success with the Opposition, and we have seen an example of why when we see the way the Leader of the Opposition acted yesterday and today in the way he dealt with this particular bill.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I just want to have a few words on this bill. As the Deputy Premier (Mr. Marshall)

MR. HISCOCK: has said, we have lots of time to talk about the economy. There are about eighty or ninety questions on the Order Paper, questions to this administration and we still do not have response to them. As the member just said, there are things that are relevant to debate, yet for almost fifteen minutes, while he was up, he did not refer to the bill in any way whatsoever.

But this side, Her Majesty's Royal Opposition, believes very strongly that the legislation that is brought before this House, particularly since I have been elected, since 1979, and in former times, most of these bills were passed in the last twenty minutes before the Sessions were adjourned. We have now a full Session devoted to what we consider housekeeping bills, bills of no consequence whatsoever. They may be important



MR. HISCOCK: to a department, they may be important to the Chairman of the Community College in Stephenville who wants to have a bill brought in which would make him a president instead of a principal. Those bills may be important to certain people or to certain departments, but when it comes to getting jobs for our younger people, improving the standard of living for our people, improving our hospital care, care for our senior citizens, etc., very, very little is being done. We now have a bill dealing with the archives, that is quite true, but after 400 years what do we find? We find the Colonial Building falling down, on the inside we find out that things which have been put in the custody of the Province, by the people of the Province, are in storage, in rooms. We had an exhibition, 900 years of history, at the museum this year and what did we find out? Those exhibitions, where did they come from? They came from the Smithsonian Institute, they came from McGill, they came from a London museum, they came from other parts of the world. After 400 or 900 years of history, or whatever you want to call it, depending on what group you take, what have we had and what do we have? Zilch, nothing, very little. And now we have a minister who has discovered that instead of his department just having a Wildlife Division, it also has an Archives division. Well, I commend him for it. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, instead of bringing in legislation like this we would be much better off if we were purchasing the history of the various governors in the Province, of the various original paintings and sketches and stamps and other artifacts of this Province that would give us some sense of history. But instead, no, Mr. Speaker,

MR.HISCOCK: we are just bringing in high publicity bills with very, very little substance.

I would like to go back to the fact that here we have in the Province a Department of Tourism and what do we find? We find that the Department of Tourism is spending more money on computers so that you can go into motels or you can go into chalets and at the press of a button get information. Three quarters of the information on these computers is not reliable, they are there just, in fact, to occupy time. The only person who has actually benefited from this type of programme is the one who sold the computers, the one from whom the computers were purchased. We also find out that after the Labour Day weekend all the Province's parks, museums, Commissariat House and various other responsibilities of this provincial government close down.

MR. HISCOCK: It has been proven that in Nova Scotia they had 3,000 bus tours in that province and we get 10 per cent. After the Labour Day weekend - I suppose it is because of the fact that students go back to school - we close everything down. Why do all of our parks have to be closed down? Why close down all of the tourist chalets, not leaving open even one where you can dial in.

I remember when friends were here from Toronto and also from Austria, I took them to see the Commissariat House and the old Garrison Church on a Sunday, Labour Day weekend, and found it was closed. Not only that - I took a look around and found paint peeling off the building. As the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) said, we are building more hospitals and we cannot even afford to maintain the ones we have; we are getting into more cultural projects and we cannot even keep up the ones we have. An example is the museum in Grand Bank. Because we cannot afford to paint it; we are now putting aluminum siding on it. And I can go on and on with examples.

MR. MATTHEWS: Is there something wrong with that, or what?

MR. HISCOCK: No. It would never have been there if we had had to wait for this administration to put it there.

MR. MATTHEWS: What would not be there, the siding?

MR. HISCOCK: The museum itself.

I want to get to the subject of Red Bay in my district, Mr. Speaker, and areas like Cupids, L'Anse-au-Meadow and Port au Choix with respect to things that have been done in the Province. We have found that we have had to rely entirely on Parks Canada to keep up national and provincial standards, that if we do it we end up, as I said, leaving things in a state of disrepair.

MR. HISCOCK: A perfect example is the Colonial Building. The plaster is falling off the ceilings. Behind the Speaker's Chair in the Chamber is a painting and I suppose it is because Mr. Smallwood is in the painting that it is behind the Chair. Go down there now -

MR. SIMMS: That is an order.

MR. HISCOCK: Well, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) should go down there

MR. HISCOCK: and should acquaint himself with it for the simple reason, Mr. Speaker, -

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): On a point of order, the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Just for the benefit of the hon. member who I know has only been in the House for three or four years, the Department of Tourism is a separate department, it is not related to the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth. The Department of Tourism is a division of the Department of Development which is administered by my colleague, the Minister of Development (Mr. Neil Windsor).

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) who has been in the House just as long as the gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and will not be here as long when all is said and done, let me point out there is no Department of Tourism, it is a division, as he said, of another department. The Department of Tourism was set up by the Moores Administration, but like so much that the Moores Administration did, has been undone by the present Peckford Administration.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order I rule that it was a matter of explanation.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. SPEAKER: Jack Fitzgerald will not agree with that.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the archives, and you can get into various types of archives, it can be documents, it can be maps, it can be paintings, it can be buildings, one of the things that I would like to bring up and I had just begun when I was interrupted by the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms), I would assume that the painting of the first Cabinet after Confederation is of an historical nature, just like the 400th Anniversary painting that was done by H.B. Goodridge, that was on the covers of all the exhibitions we had this Summer and that was on display at the museum. I would assume that the painting of the first Cabinet and the first Prime Minister, or Premier after Confederation is of historical value. It may not be looked upon as of historical value by a narrow-minded P.C. Tory Administration at this time, because we are too close to the Smallwood years. But maybe after 150 years or 200 years - we have already passed our 400th year, maybe with the passing of time we will look at that in a more historical period and say, that was a group of people who felt that Newfoundland's history should have gone in the direction of Confederation. Maybe 200 years from now we may not be in Confederation, we do not know where we will be. But I do say to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth that there is one thing he can do, he can at least make sure that it is not left there for vandals to get at. As I have said, he is the custodian, and he is the one who is bringing in the legislation on the archives.

But with regard to the other archives, I want to get back to Red Bay.

MR. HISCOCK: Parks Canada officials, as well as other people and the provincial Department of Tourism, have found an historical site down in the district of Eagle River, in the community of Red Bay, concerning the early Basque whaling site. The first will ever written in North America, for example, was written there in 1457, long before Columbus discovered America. This year they have found over fifty or sixty bodies, they have found kilns which they used for rendering fat, they have found other buildings belonging to the Basque whalers and they have found another galleon with smaller boats in it. It is of major importance, but what is the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth doing. We find that we have to, in most cases, go to the Research Council of Canada for funding. We find that we have to rely on the university, we have to rely on Parks Canada. Now, after five years of research they have had to apply to DREE, to the provincial component to get extra funding to continue on with it. It is not of provincial standing, not national, but international standing, Mr. Speaker. And what are we doing as a Province? We are not even allocating enough money. We should all realize that one of the ways that we can put the economy on a sound footing again is to develop industries that are going to bring in new dollars. And the only way we can bring in new dollars is by our natural resources, whether that be fish, whether that be mining, whether that be agriculture, whether that be forestry. And one, of course, is tourism, which can bring in new dollars. And, I for one on this side, believe that the \$400,000 that was spent this year on the 400th Anniversary was well spent.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear.

MR. HISCOCK: Not only well spent but not enough was spent. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that what we did was take the

MR. HISCOCK: \$40,000 spent on sending visual groups across which was fine, but we did not carry on with any amount of advertising to get these 3,000 tour groups in here. If we were concerned about increasing tourism and taking a percentage of our tourism dollars and putting them towards our archives and our museums, etc., then we would have a greater base. But when people travel from away and come here, what do they find? They find that there is a tax on their hotel, they find there is a tax on their meals, they find that we have an unbelievable gasoline price, they find out the price of liquor is extremely high, they find the price of cigarettes is extremely high, and food. So out of the 3,000 bus tours we get 10 per cent basically, because we have priced ourselves out of existence. And the same way with regard to the sales tax of 12 per cent. There comes a point of diminishing returns, that after a while people say, "Look, no, cigarettes are too high. I am not going to smoke them." "No, gasoline is too high, I am not driving as much as I did. I would like to go to Newfoundland but I cannot afford to go across the Gulf and drive all the way to St. John's, so we will only go to Gros Morne, or we will not go at all."

As to the Archives bill itself, it is a matter that could be passed in a second in this House, and all the other legislation that is being brought before this House, Mr. Speaker, could be passed in twenty minutes, unanimously, as we ended up doing with the fisheries bill. And the reason why it is not, Mr. Speaker, with forty-four government members, if the government had its way - we had Question Period today,



MR. HISCOCK: ten Cabinet Ministers were not here. The Deputy Premier ended up saying we have stopped asking questions, we do not use the Question Period. How can we ask questions if the Cabinet Ministers are not even here? And this is a common occurrence, Mr. Speaker, and one of the reasons is, because they have forty-four seats they feel that they can completely ignore parliament, they can completely ignore the business of the people, and end up as James I, and II, and Charles I and II, rule by devine right. We have a government now, Mr. Speaker, and a Premier that, as far as I am concerned, basically feel that not only do they know what is right but everything that they do is right, and if they had their way, they were allowed, they would operate under the devine right principle: they are doing what is

MR. HISCOCK: best for the people and they know what is best for them. And as the Premier says many, many, many times when he gets up in the House of Assembly, anybody who does not agree with his concept and philosophy is not a supporter, not only of his administration, but not a supporter of the the Province. So we have a government that is not only arrogant, but beyond the point of arrogance and getting to the point of believing that they are here by divine right and they operate by divine right.

Mr. Speaker, the archives in the Province are in a very sad state of disrepair. The buildings that are the responsibility of the Province are in a sad state of disrepair. You only have to go around Confederation Building here to find out it is falling apart, let alone the archives. So what we find on this side, Mr. Speaker, is that the government itself is not dealing with the day-to-day business because they are bringing legislation before the House of a minuscule nature, of a petty nature of a very small housekeeping nature and it is being passed up the line by bureaucrats who feel that they must, in many ways, bring legislation before the House in order to give the ministers profile in the House, in the media and in the Province. They feel that if a minister is not presenting legislation in the House of Assembly, then the bureaucrats, these officials feel that that is a reflection on the departments and on the ministers, that the departments are not doing their jobs. So we have legislation each Session, day to day, to give profiles to the ministers.

But, I hope, as I said, Mr. Speaker, the real substance, that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) will not only bring in legislation like this but make sure that more money goes toward the provincial parks and that more money goes toward the development

November 18, 1983

Tape No. 3194

MJ - 2

MR. HISCOCK: of our museums, the development  
of tour groups in this Province and the tourist potential  
that we possibly can have. If

MR. HISCOCK: he goes in that direction, Mr. Speaker, then it is quite possible that we can bring in \$200 million or \$300 million extra into the Province a year. And it is not too far-fetched to think that if we did make a concentrated effort and stressed the quality of life that we have in the Province, stressed our two national parks, stressed Labrador, stressed the wilderness and stressed our sea and our historic history and our wide-open space, that we could end up attracting far more American, Canadian and international tourism dollars than we are.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I would just like to say with regard to this bill, it is a day-to-day bill that could be passed in ten minutes. The Deputy Premier accused us of filibustering. As I have said, if the government had their way not only would there be no debate on this bill or any other questions, the House would not even be open, he and the Premier would rule from Confederation Building by divine right and issue decrees and edicts from time to time to the people, telling them what they should do and that everything is all right in the empire.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD: You cannot speak from there, it has to be from your chair.

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

MR. ROBERTS: My hon. friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird) says you can only speak from your place in the House, and that is correct. Only he can speak from his Chair or, if you wish, from another part of his anatomy that perhaps comes into contact with his chair.

You know, it is an interesting rule, it does not apply in England. We ape the House of Commons in London in so many things, of course, but in London

MR. ROBERTS: nobody has an assigned seat except the Speaker. That is the only assigned seat in the House of Commons.

MR. BAIRD: Irrelevant, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: It is perfectly relevant, we are talking of historic objects, archives, records. I would think, Sir, that the Speaker of the House of Commons in London is a historic object. There has been a Speaker going back 600 years, Your Honour. Your Honour may not realize it, but Your Honour is verging on being an historic object. And I venture to say that will touch off another spate of letters in the newspaper in the morning.

MR. MCLENNON: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. McLennon) has let us know he is alive. There will be rejoicing tonight, Mr. Speaker, in Badger and in Millertown Junction and in Buchans and in Windsor that they still have a member, because there have been very real questions raised as to whether he is alive or not. And I want to say how appropriate it is when we are talking about preserving objects that we know that the member for Windsor - Buchans is with us. If only now

MR. ROBERTS: he got to the point of making the kind of intelligent contribution to the debate that his friend for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) makes on occasion, he would come a long way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about the bill. My colleagues says eloquently and effectively exposed the government's strategy, if that is not too high a name to put on it, but exposed it for what it is. I am not going to repeat at any length what they have said; here we are debating a bill that really comes to grips with the issues affecting this Province today. There will be meetings tonight in Northeast Crouse, in my constituency. A very large, well-attended public meeting will be held in Northeast Crouse, it would be larger if there was anybody living there, but a very large, well-attended meeting will be held in Northeast Crouse to pass a resolution commending Her Majesty's ministers for their attention to the public weal of this Province as exemplified by this bill.

In any event, the government decide the Orders of the House, the government decide what business to call, the government will decide what we should deal with on four days a week and so we have to deal with the bill. It has been pointed out, I think, that it does not do anything new; it does not establish an archives, it simply separates out the archives from the present administrative set-up. I do not quite know what purpose, what good purpose is achieved, what result follows from that. The minister may have said so in his opening remarks, if so, I did not follow him because he did not say it in terms that I could understand and that may be my fault as opposed to his fault.

Now that I have the minister's attention for which I am grateful, let me say that I am not sure what purpose is achieved.

MR. BAIRD:

His undivided attention.

MR. ROBERTS:

I appreciate his undivided attention, And I am grateful as always to my friend for Humber West (Mr. Baird), because if ever there was a man who was undivided it is the gentleman for Humber West.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point I was making - I mean, it is twenty-five after twelve on Friday, what do you except? - the point I am making is I am not sure what is accomplished in any substantiative or significant way by dividing the archives in a legal sense from the hitherto accepted legal structure which was codified in the 1975 legislation, as I recall it - 1973 legislation, I bow - and setting it up under this bill. You know, it is a matter of absolutely no significance, I would have thought, even to the operation of the archives, and in saying even to the operation of the archives, I want to make it quite clear that like my colleagues here I believe the archives are very important. I think that the archives of this Province, the records of this Province are an object of public expenditure that is deserving of more money than has been spent there. I know we are in tough times, I am not going to go over all of that ground right now, but the archives are a very valuable part of the functions performed by the government of the Province. And I think, too,

MR. ROBERTS: we have been well served by our archivists.

MR. HISCOCK: Bobbie Robertson.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) interrupted me. I am grateful for the interruption, but I am not sure - I am sorry.

MR. HISCOCK: Bobbie Robertson.

MR. ROBERTS: Bobbie Robertson has served us extraordinarily well. She is not the archivist, she is the Secretary/Treasurer, I think is her correct title, of the Newfoundland Historical Association. Bobbie Robertson, a most amazing lady, well up in her eighties. I do not think she makes any secret of her age, so I am not revealing any secrets. I was in the Colonial Building the other day for a meeting of the PAC which meets there - we are not allowed to use the lovely, plush conference room upstairs we are only a Committee of the House of Assembly, we are sent off to the Colonial Building, but that is a place of some honour so we are not unhappy or discontent - and I was speaking to Bobbie Robertson and she is as vigorous and as alert and as interested and as concerned in the history of this Province as any person has ever been and her contribution has been immense.

MR. TOBIN: She is a fine woman.

MR. ROBERTS: She is a very fine woman indeed, and a great lady as well. But I concur with my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) that Bobbie Robertson is not only a dedicated public servant, but one of the most amazing people that I know and it is an endless joy to spend any amount of time with her. Her knowledge of what has gone on: She was showing me the other day, speaking of the kind of material that is available in our archives, Sir Hugh Tudor who was a bit of a well-known



MR. ROBERTS: figure in England briefly, at the end of the first war - he had a distinguished record in the first war, serving in the British Army, General Sir Hugh Tudor. He won his knighthood for military services. He served admirably in senior command positions. And Sir Hugh Tudor came out to Newfoundland in the early 1920's, he worked with George Haws, the fish exporters, and the story I have always heard, and I believe it to be correct, is he came to Newfoundland because he could not stay in England. He could not stay in England because his name was on an assassination list by the IRA arising out of the time of the troubles, because Sir Hugh Tudor at the request of his friend - I guess he was the Colonial Secretary - but in any event, at the request of his friend the then minister in charge of it, had taken a leading role in a group of gentlemen known as the Black and Tans. And anybody who knows anything about Irish history, the terrible history, the tortured history of that troubled land, knows that the Black and Tans were men of infamy. At the time of the troubles there was equal blame. The Irish were just as savage as the Brits and the Brits were just as savage as the Irish and both of them were just infamous. It is hard to believe that so-called civilized men could do what both groups did. The Black and Tans were the auxiliary troops sent into Ireland by the British Government which then, of course, was also the Government of Ireland - the United Kingdom included Ireland. And my friend Exploits (Dr. Twomey) who I believe is from

MR. ROBERTS: the South of Ireland, from the twenty-two and not the six will, I am sure, confirm every word I am saying, the savagery of that period. And Sir Hugh Tudor was one of the senior officers in the Black and Tans. They were called Black and Tans because they had tan uniforms with black leggings, much the same kind of reasoning that led to the Blue Puttees who occupy a glorious page in our history as opposed to the Black and Tans who occupy a very dark page in the history both of Ireland and of England.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: But at any rate, Mr. Speaker, my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) has once again returned to lower the general level of the debate. We are talking about the archives, we are talking about historic objects, we are talking about valuable things as opposed to what he normally dedicates his mind to.

But I am saying that our Archives, or Bobbie Robertson in particular, has a memoir that Hugh Tudor wrote. It is a typescript and she was kind enough to let me borrow it and read it. I am not sure if it is in the Archives or if it belongs to Mrs. Robertson personally, but I am sure that she would be delighted to make it available to any hon. member. It is a fascinating document. Sir Hugh Tudor only died six or eight years ago. He lived here in Newfoundland quietly, I do not think anybody ever knew he was here. But this memoir, which is mostly of his days in the war, his service in France during the war, is replete with references to Churchill. They were intimate friends. And Churchill, in fact, during the period after he left the Duchy of Lancaster as a result of the Gallipoli disaster - which, of course, was no disaster in the long run but a disaster for the troops who were there, including the Newfoundland Regiment which was bloodied and very messily at

MR. ROBERTS: Suvla, one of the battles in the Gallipoli campaign - Churchill was forced out of the Admiralty when the first coalition came in in May, 1915 and became Chancellor of the duchy and then subsequently was forced out of the Cabinet later on by the Tories - Churchill was a Liberal in those days - and went back into active service and went to France and spent six months in the trenches commanding a battalion of the Royal Scots Fusileers. And during this period, Tudor was his Commanding Officer or was Commanding Officer of a division in an adjacent place in the line. And it is a fascinating story of these contacts between these men - they were personal friends and they would go and have dinner or lunch and Tudor describing his life in the trenches.

MR. TOBIN: Who wrote the story?

MR. ROBERTS: Hugh Tudor himself did it.

It is typescript, but it is in the first person and, you know, 'I drove over today to' you know, 'Plug Street' or whatever the name of it was, 'and had lunch with Winston', or 'Winston came by and we had dinner' and 'He is having a tough time in the trenches,' that kind of thing. And the references to Churchill are by his first name because, of course, they were friends, they were colleagues. And it is, you know, just a little era or area of Newfoundland history not widely known but it is there. And our history is filled with these sorts of things. Michael Harrington in the Telegram is an historic resource in himself. The Offbeat History column that I think now appears twice a week or The Newfoundland Quarterly, which I am glad to see has been rescued and revived - it was apparently on the verge of expiration, on the verge of going under, in any event; I am not sure how it has been put together but Harry Cuff and his associates have put it together and it is carrying on.

MR. ROBERTS: In fact, I hope the minister will be able to - I am not sure what assistance, if any, he is providing to The Quarterly, but that is again worthy of a grant to support it.

But there are all sorts of these aspects of our history

MR. ROBERTS:

that are irretrievably linked to the archives because they are based only on material that, if it is not held in the Archives, will disappear. You know, if that record of tudor's which is a typescript and I suspect there are only one or two copies - it was not published, it is just legal size pages, typewritten on onionskin. I have no doubt that as long as Bobby Robertson is there she will keep them safe, but I wonder what happens then after? I know the Archives have gathered in a lot of records but there are an awful lot still around this Province and there is more that needs to be done. You know, there are only two or three or four men left alive now who went over the top in July 1916 in the Somme at Beaumont Hamel. There were a couple of dozen a few years ago but, you know, in the name of all that is sacred can we not arrange - and maybe the minister could do this, - to have somebody, a skilled interviewer sit down with a tape recorder and talk to those men. I have met some of them from time to time and they are still mentally very vigorous and well able to recapture what went on. You know, that was a day in our history, a day that we do not ever want to see repeated, but a day in our history, and the first-hand survivors, there are only two or three or four left. I saw in the paper the other day, as many hon. members might of, Mr. Abe Mullet, now in his 90s, gone over to France and gone back to Beaumont Hamel as part of a delegation which the Government of Canada put together of veterans of the First War. But these men are going to be gone very, very, very quickly.

MR. ROBERTS: The other year the last, I think, of the survivors of the 1914 Newfoundland disaster died, a gentleman in Wesleyville whose name I - Mr. Sturge was it? - forget, but anyway there was a note in the papers, and if Cassie Brown had not done the marvellous piece of work she did in Death on the Ice, the experiences of the men who lived through and who recount and remember again that terrible day in our history were gone. And that is something I say to the minister that the Archives ought to be doing more of. I do not know how much they are doing. I know they are limited. Obviously, they have a limited amount of money, they have a limited amount of staff, but if there is something that ought to be given an absolute priority in addition to the preservation of documentary evidence, it is the preservation of the oral history. Because

MR. ROBERTS: these men, and my friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) mentions Nurse Abernathy down in Trepassey who I believe is getting to be an older lady now and if we do not get this history, the experiences of these people recorded then you can never get them back. Trevour Bennett's mother, Nurse Bennett is still alive in Daniel's Harbour, again a lady up in her nineties. There has been a book written about her, it is quite a good book. The late mother of my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), about whom a marvellous book was written. And again both of these I suspect are only a part of the life story, the experiences, because a book is 200 or 300 pages of 60,000 or 100,000 words. You know we use this up in the House in a week for no value at all. You know it is not a lot and I do not know whether my hon. friend ever had an opportunity to sit with his mother, I saw her from time to time, I knew her not well but I had the privilege of knowing her, a vast fund of stories of what life was like on the Labrador before the Americans came, before the war.

MR. GOUDIE: I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that my oldest brother Horace is writing a book.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I know Horace.

MR. GOUDIE: The last chapter is -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I am glad to hear that and I look forward to reading it when it is published. But the way to get a lot of this down is with tape recordings with older men and women and then a means of preserving them. It is a well developed technique now, it is not earth shattering but you know it is part of what we are. What we were is part of what we are and the changes have been so dramatic in this

MR. ROBERTS: Province, even in the last twenty years. You know my friend from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) who came out to Newfoundland as I recall it, after the war, and went to practice in Botwood, has lived through an era in those roughly forty years that he has been with us here in Newfoundland -

MR. NEARY: Pre Confederation.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. - you know it is like night and day, and the next four years will see no change compared to what we have seen. Of course we will see technological change and perhaps a new world. We could replace the House of Assembly with a system whereby we are a computer, we are all plugged in and everybody can vote instantly, the sort of thing that the Premier now tries to do with his foolish little telephoning polls. But you know the change in life in Newfoundland has been so very great that we should be making an extra effort now because in ten or fifteen years all of this of our history will have been gone. There is probably not a man alive in Newfoundland today



MR. ROBERTS:

who knows how to build a schooner. There is probably not a handful of men who know how to make a barrow. All the thousands of Coopers there were.

MR. TOBIN: My grandmother was one.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am glad to hear that.

My grandfather was a Cooper at one time.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible)

about two months ago.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad to hear that and I wish him many more years. You know, the art of cooperate -

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Good. You know, to show that we know our own history Victor Buffett's book - Buffett By Nightfall - not Victor Buffett, you know the man I mean. You know the book Buffett By Nightfall which is an oral history of life on the Islands in Placentia Bay. Buffett By Nightfall was (inaudible)

MR. WARREN: Victor Butler.

MR. ROBERTS: Victor Butler - I thank my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) - whose home in fact is on Placentia Bay. But all that these people can tell us - my friend from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) and I do not agree on a great amount these days but would agree with me that in the medical world the old doctors are going. My father is going to be seventy-five on Monday if he lives that long, I certainly expect he will, he seems to be in vigorous health. But, you know, he is now one of the oldest doctors left alive in Newfoundland. All the old men have gone or many of them have gone - Cluny MacPherson, Dinty Moores, Templeton on Bell Island - men whose names were legend. But are there any doctors left around today who ever saw a case of diphtheria?

AN HON. MEMBER: Howard Drover.

MR. ROBERTS: Howard Drover is still left and there are some older men still left but very few. I mean, there were not many doctors. When I was a boy in St. John's thirty years ago there were only about fifty doctors in St. John's.

AN HON. MEMBER: Dr. Audy.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Dr. Audy was a very fine man.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is dead now.

MR. ROBERTS: I know he is dead but as I said he was a very fine man. But there are not very many of the older men left is what I say to my friend from St. John's South (Dr. Collins), very few who remember what it was like to practice medicine. And you can go around the Province in area after area like on the Labrador - how many of the older people are left who in those days did a magnificent, magnificent job? And that same job that same piece of work, I say to the minister, can be done anywhere in this Province. How many men are left who remember Grand Falls? Grand Falls did not exist until 1904, that is seventy-nine years ago. There may well still be men alive who remember Grand Falls in the early days when it was just a town being carved in what was then wilderness. But there are not many left.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I thank my friend from St. John's South, Dr. Paddon, the Lieutenant Governor again a man who is part of our history both in his own right and in the sense of following in his father's and mother's footsteps, equally Dr. Gordon Thomas. You know,

MR. ROBERTS:

there are many men around we could name, John Heet , for example, as far as I know is still alive, but an older man. John Heet must be up in his seventies at the very least by now.

MR. WARREN:

What about Mrs. Loder.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well Mrs. Millie Loder in

North West. There is case after case, and perhaps I know a little bit more about medicine than I do about some others, I know a little bit more about Northern Newfoundland than I do about some other areas, but I am sure that could be applied in area after area. And since we are talking about public records and provincial archives I say to the minister that there are very few items of public expenditure that would be worth more in the long run, because if we do not preserve our history it is going to be gone, and what I am saying to him and I will leave it at that is very simple, we have undergone such cataclysmic change in Newfoundland in the last thirty or forty years that our history is disappearing very rapidly, this type of our history, the oral history. We do not have a lot of documents. Most of us cannot trace families back any length of time in Newfoundland because -

MR. MEARY:

Most of us do not want to.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well - we want to know which

pirate we were descended from or which of our ancestors were hung.

MR. BAIRD:

I traced mine back

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

And if my hon. friend thinks

that worries him think what it does to the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

It is a state secret, I should

tell my friend for Burin-Placentia West that that is regarded as

MR. ROBERTS: a state secret in Ottawa, that in fact Brian Tobin is related to him. That is a state secret.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, there are many relations in Newfoundland that we never know about.

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. ROBERTS: I do not think that is part of history, Roberts in his name, is Lord Roberts, and Joseph is Joseph Chamberlain. But the hon. gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) wonders if he can legitimately say that his family go back an extraordinarily long time, it is too bad they have come to such an end.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I do not think, not that I know of, but I do not really know, my people were Conception Bay people, my mother's people of course are Nova Scotians, but my people were Conception Bay people, Roberts, Pearceys Dawes, The hon. gentleman for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) and I first we go back far enough doubtless have much in common in addition to a common political alligance which we shared at one time.

MR. NEARY: But not related.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know if we are related or not.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect I am getting close to the half an hour, I wonder if the minister would clue this up and we will have done a -

AN HON. MEMBER: The member for Torngat.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh I am sorry, my friend for Torngat.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I have two other points I want to make, in addition -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well I only have half an hour, but

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

DR. COLLINS: I wonder if the hon. member will yield?

MR. ROBERTS: By all means.

DR . COLLINS: I would like it put on the record somewhere at this point that the hon. member brought up about his father being 75. His father was a long time member of the staff of the Grace Hospital, a very long time as a member of the staff there, surgical staff. The other day the Grace Hospital celebrated its Sixieth Anniversary, it opened in December 1923. I do not know when the hon. member's father went on

DR. COLLINS: staff there but it was very soon after it opened, if not at the time. I am not sure.

MR. ROBERTS: It could not be Quake because I would say he would have only been fifteen, but he went on staff with my father's uncle, Dr. Will Roberts, I believe was the doctor who helped to found the Grace. And when my dad came back and started practice about '37 or '38, I do not recall it but I have been told, he went to work at the Grace.

DR. COLLINS: Almost immediately I would say.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, almost immediately thereafter and his whole medical practice centred in large part about the Grace Hospital. Of course in those days doctors worked at - they had staff appointments in all the hospitals, and the surgeon at the General got \$50 a month.

DR. COLLINS: St. Clare's and the Grace.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, there were three, the gentlemen from St. Clare's and the Grace and as I recall it he generally got \$50 a month and he did all the surgery. Those were the days.

MR. WARREN: Your father took care of my stomach.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad of that. I am glad my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) had his stomach taken care of.

Let me just make two other points if I might, Sir. First of all I want to say a very brief but a very sincere word of recognition to Bern Gill. Bern Gill came to the Archives late in his career. He had done many, many other things over the years. I had a hand in helping him to get in the Archives in that I was a member of the Cabinet which

MR. ROBERTS: appointed him. It was a marvellous appointment and for a man, particularly a man who never had any archivist or archival training I think Bern Gill, my understanding is that Bern Gill performed superbly as the archivist and I think all of us in the Province who are interested in this kind of matter owe him a very great deal. His accomplishment was all the greater because he did not have any formal training as an archivist, what he did have is a very deep and real concern for Newfoundland history. Bern Gill is one of these men who cares about what has gone on in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Put his name down.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I was going to come to that. I think one of the things for which my friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) and his colleagues ought to be complimented and I do compliment them is that the building down at Pleasantville has been named the Bern Gill Centre, or the Bern Gill whatever.

MR. SIMMS: Records managment centre.

MR. ROBERTS: Records management centre.

I am not sure about the bureaucratic jargon but the important thing is that we have recognized Bern Gill. Indeed one of the features of our public administrations I have always liked is that we name buildings and bridges whatever after the men who have gone before, you know the Hoyles Home, there are many of them throughout the Province.

MR. SIMMS: Smallwood Academy.

MR. ROBERTS:

I am sorry?

MR. SIMMS:

The Smallwood Academy.

MR. ROBERTS:

Moores Drive.

The Smallwood Academy,

MR. NEARY:

Jamieson Academy.

MR. ROBERTS:

Jamieson Academy.

But I am even thinking of men who have left this world, you know the Ballam Bridge. There are many of them.

But it is something we should carry on doing, commemorate the men and the women who have - indeed there is Southcott Hall to mention one named after a woman - who have served this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

Yes, yes. I would

think what we should name after the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is the Confederation Center, the Marshall Confederation Center.

MR. WARREN:

No, they should

call it the Young Block.

MR. ROBERTS:

The Young Block.

I will have to think that one through. I have heard the minister called a block head but I do not know about that.

Anyway, Mr.

Speaker, it is something that we should continue to do in my view. I do want to take -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The E.P. Reddy

Subdivision in Marystown.

MR. ROBERTS:

I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The E.P. Reddy Subdivision.

MR. ROBERTS:

Or the Canning Bridge

equally across the arm up there in Marystown. The E.P. Reddy Subdivision, Eddy Reddy was a marvellous man, a



MR. ROBERTS: marvellous Newfoundlander,  
a marvellous public servant.

MR. TOBIN: He spent twenty-five  
years in politics for the municipality.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. And my hon.  
friend may not know an Eddy Reddy other than as an older  
man but working with Eddy Reddy as I had occasion to do  
was one of the joys. He was in the National Convention  
you know.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) Deputy  
Mayor.

MR. ROBERTS: Good, good. And  
if you could but touch the hem of his garment municipally  
speaking you would be doing very well I say to my friend  
from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). I do not know  
what Hansard makes of all these interruptions, Mr.  
Speaker. Poor Mr. Stamp up there will be driven to  
wits end by some of this today. But I do want to pay  
a tribute to Bern Gill. He served this Province  
admirably and we are all in his debt. And finally  
let me ask the minister - my five minutes must be  
nearly up, Sir, but if I may - what rule do we have  
on the public access to government documents in this  
Province? And I do not mean the open ones and I do not  
mean the Freedom of Information Act. What I am talking  
about are Cabinet records. For example are the records  
of the Commission of Government, the Cabinet - I do  
not mean the departmental records I mean the Commission  
which was a Cabinet along with the Legislature. It was  
everything and nothing. Are those records available?  
Do we have a thirty year rule? The minister, I know,  
understands what I mean by the term 'thirty year rule'.

MR. ROBERTS: Could he tell us what the policy is? For example, it is now thirty-five years since first the Cabinet of Newfoundland as a Province met. Are those minutes in council accessible? We do not keep minutes in this Province comparable to the Canadian Cabinet's minutes or the British Cabinet's minutes but we do keep minutes of council. Are those records available? Are the correspondence files open or are there closed files? In any event whether they are open or closed what is the rule? Is it a ten year rule, a thirty year rule, a fifty year rule or a forever rule? Obviously, if they are not open they should be open. But equally obviously there ought to be in my view some period during which the records are closed. But there comes a point when the records should be open. The British Cabinet records are now open I believe up through the second war, the fascinating insights into what went on. The Canadian Cabinet records I believe are open until about 1950. I am not certain of that. I know that Mackenzie King's diary is now public and that is a fascinating document in itself.

MR. NEARY: The Government of Canada were releasing a book on some of the document.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the Government of Canada my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) points out, put out a book on some of -the documents but there are still many questions in our history that have not been answered and the answers to which in part lie in the Cabinet/Commission records. So perhaps the minister -

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour. I will just conclude. Let me say to the minister that - I have lost my train of thought now and I had one. For once I had one. The Cabinet records, let me say that the Cabinet records ought to be made available. There is no good reason why Cabinet records ought to be kept secret after a reasonable period. And in the English speaking world twenty-five, thirty years seems to be the accepted period. After that, to use the phrase that is so eloquent and is the modern jargon but it is still eloquent and so we should adopt it, English is a living language after all, 'Let it all hang out'.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the minister has brought in the bill. It certainly would not have been my choice of what we should debate today or what we should deal with as a priority in this House. But since he has brought it in we will deal with it and I would congratulate him for doing whatever he has done and I wish him well with it. The Archives may not win him any public glory but I will tell you that by helping to build the Archives, Mr. Speaker, in my view the minister can do a great deal of great value for the people of this Province. Because, as I said earlier, what we were is a large part of what we are and a large part of what we will be. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

The hon. the member for

Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

It is the wish of the House, it being five minutes  
to one, that I adjourn the debate and start Monday. I  
am going to speak for twenty minutes anyway.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are we going to adjourn?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Okay. It has been  
noted that the hon. member for Torngat Mountains adjourned  
the debate.

On motion, the House  
at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at  
3:00 P.M.