

VOL. 3

NO. 4

THIRD SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Before we get into the Question Period, there were certain points of order raised yesterday during the Question Period which perhaps could have some reflection upon today's Question Period, so I thought that I might make the rulings pertaining thereto before the start of today's Question Period. After looking at the transcripts, I think there are really two issues that were raised yesterday. One, of course, is to whether or not there was anything unparliamentary said by the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), and the other, the right of the Premier or any other minister to transfer a question to another minister. I shall deal with the unparliamentary language aspect first. In looking at the transcript, there was a comment made by the hon. the member for Port au Port, and I shall read the comment and request the hon. member to withdraw it. It is on Tape 87. The hon. the member for Port au Port said, 'And all I am asking is for some justice for us in this House, Mr. Speaker.' I think that is casting some reflection on the Chair in that the Chair is not treating the Opposition people the same as he is treating the people on the government side. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that comment.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would never wish to cast aspersions on the Chair. I understand that the Chair must be impartial and that we must respect the Chair. It was just an off day yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The other issue raised, of course, was the matter of transferring the answer to a question from one minister to another. I did have some research done into the point which was raised by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), not so much, perhaps, of transferring to another minister, as to whether or not the other minister continues to answer the question unless there is leave. And in doing some research on this, I find that both have been done in the past. There has been a ruling that when an objection was made by the Opposition to a second minister, if you will, giving further information—it was objected to by the Opposition—and the Speaker then ruled in essence that the second minister could not continue with the answers.

There was also another occasion, and I am looking at November 17, 1981, November 28, 1983, and December 2, 1983—when no objection was raised to the Speaker. On another occasion there was some objection, but the Speaker continued to recognize the second minister, if you will, as I did when I recognized the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) yesterday. Maybe we could make some kind of a decision on this and perhaps the best way to do it would be if a minister wishes to transfer to another minister, then maybe if the Opposition is willing to go along with it, so be it, and if not then it might have to be done by consent.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Has the Minister of Finance taken into account what the recently announced wage freeze for public servants will do for the economy? What sort of a dampening

MR. HODDER: affect will the freeze and the Premier's call for restraint have on consumer spending in the Province? Has there been any studies done by his department to determine the affects of the restraint programme?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, usually the date of the Budget is given in the House in response to a question from the Opposition, but it was not appropriate this year to await that time. Events really required that the date of the Budget be announced at an earlier date and that was done and the hon. member I think is aware that the date of the Budget will be on the 20th, next Tuesday. And, of course, the answer to the question he poses will be one of the elements in the Budget announcement.

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

MR. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

I do not think that the minister answered that question. I asked about the dampening effect on the economy of that wage freeze. I do not think that has anything to do with the budget since that freeze has already been put into effect. But I would say that the minister has been shown in the past with the 12 per cent sales tax, that the 12 per cent sales tax did dampen the economy somewhat and threw his projections off. I will ask him another question. Will the minister meet with the unions to negotiate a fair restraint programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member's initial comments, you know, I think one could pick a single element out of the financial management of the Province and say, 'This is having a dampening or a stimulative affect on the economy'. But, of course, that is not a sensible thing to do. You have to take the whole packet together and this is what I meant, that when the budget comes down we will be putting in place our whole approach to the economy over the next twelve months. And one of the elements that will be involved in that disposition will be our restraint programme. But that will be only one of the elements in the whole packet we will place before the House in regard to the budgeting for the provincial economy, at least for the government's aspect of the provincial economy, but also the effects on the total economy resulting from the government's action. That will be all laid out in the Budget Speech.

In regard to meeting with the unions, the hon. member, I am sure, is aware that my responsibility as President of the Treasury Board is to be ultimately in charge of the collective bargaining on behalf

DR. COLLINS: of government for the public service union organizations. And in that process there are a body of officials who do a great deal of background work, a great deal of the spade work, and they meet very frequently with members of unions, with the negotiating teams of unions, often with individual members of the unions, and not only unions but other organizations. For example, we have an organization related to management public employees who are

DR. COLLINS:

not really unionized but nevertheless they have an association in their own employment interest. And these officials meet with them very frequently and, as need be, I am also brought into discussions. I have no problem whatever at any point in time in sitting down with the representatives of the unions, or with the organizations of public employees, but I do it in the context of a laid-out approach that in the first instance is worked out between officials on our side and our collective bargaining section of Treasury Board and the official representatives of the employees' unions themselves.

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

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Well, I can take from that that the minister has not looked at the effects of the restraint programme as far as his department is concerned and his projections, and that only his officials meet with unions. And I guess the fifteen minute briefing prior to the restraint was about all they could expect to get.

I am going to ask the minister another question. Has the minister or the government ever done a study of the civil service to see how money could be saved and the public service made more efficient? Is it not a fact that there are many bureaucracies within the civil service? Has the government ever looked at the civil service and done a study of the civil service in the past number of years?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is wondering if we have done, shall we say, efficiency studies and that type of thing. We have

DR. COLLINS: in Treasury Board various divisions, one of them is the O and M, Operations and Management Division. This division of Treasury Board, frequently on request from a department or agency of government, but also sometimes on their own, will review a particular government operation; they will, arising out of that review, often make recommendations and they will then often help with the implementation of those recommendations.

So we have an in-house mechanism for use as need be but also upon direction by Cabinet or by Treasury Board. We have an in-house mechanism for doing what the hon. member is alluding to.

In addition to that, hon. members may know that, under the impetus of the Premier's desire, there has been an approach made to reviewing the upper civil service executive branch.

MR. HODDER: By whom?

DR. COLLINS: There will be assessments there. These are done through Cabinet

DR. COLLINS:

mechanisms in which the Premier himself is involved. And these are essentially to find the best means of using the very extensive expertise we do have in the executive echelon of the public service. So that is another mechanism for review and encouragement and enhancement of the public service.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

A new question, Mr. Speaker.

I must say from the minister's answer it seems to me that the civil service is a like a person studying his own navel because obviously it is civil servants studying the civil service. On another question, could the minister tell me what the word 'freeze' means?

Will vacancies be filled? Will they be left open? Will the wage freeze work by attrition? Will people not be replaced, for instance, when they leave, retire or die? Will there be positions filled or eliminated?

MR. WARREN:

The freeze is cruel and callous.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, we seldom keep a public servant in place if he has died.

MR. HODDER:

I was talking about his position.

MR. WARREN:

There are forty-four over there now.

DR. COLLINS:

But apart from that, Mr. Speaker, the word 'freeze' I think is an unfortunate term really, but I suppose it has got into the popular parlance and it just means that things are sort of

DR. COLLINS: not advancing. I am not certain if the hon. member was referring to the wage aspect of things or the employment aspect of things.

MR. HODDER: The employment aspect.

DR. COLLINS: The employment aspect.

MR. HODDER: What do you do if a person dies? Do you replace his position?

DR. COLLINS: If a person dies, sometimes one of my colleagues takes care of things.

MR. NEARY: The whole administration is dead and they have not buried them yet. The voters will bury them in the next election.

MR. HODDER: Do you fill his position?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: In the public service, if an individual either resigns or retires or if unfortunately he otherwise leaves the service, we assess whether his post needs to be filled immediately in the interest of good management and the interest of the continuation of essential

DR. COLLINS:

services. If that is the case, that post obviously will be filled, and it can be filled in a number of ways; it can be filled on a temporary basis or it can be filled on a permanent basis. On the other hand, there are other posts which are of a more discretionary nature and, under the present restraint conditions, we look at those very, very closely. And we have made a policy and, of course, it has been made public already.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

DR. COLLINS: We have tended not to fill these more discretionary posts in the interests of restraints in the last number of years.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, from what I can gather from the minister, if you read between the lines of what he said, when people leave the public service, for whatever reason, politically the government is deciding who goes and who stays.

I have noticed lately that there was hired an assistant deputy minister who is receiving a handsome pension from a large national Crown corporation. Is this the policy of the government or could they not find someone of the same calibre who was in need?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I would like a few more specifics on that. I am not exactly certain to whom the hon. member is referring or to what post he is referring.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the Assistant Deputy Minister of Tourism who just retired with a handsome pension from Air Canada and was hired within days. Is this the policy of the government, that this is the type of individuals that you hire?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, this Province is extremely fortunate in having a minister responsible for Tourism who is the envy of all other provinces. He has all aspects of tourism at his fingertips.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: He can answer a question about it, not only with regard to this Province but indeed for the whole of North America, if not beyond. So I would like to suggest, if I do have permission, that I ask my hon. colleague, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) to supply that answer.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I just want to ask the minister again, is it the policy of the government to hire people who are retired rather than other people? I am sure we have enough good people in this Province to fill posts such as that.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member really wanted the information he was looking for, he would have gone along with my suggestion that the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) answer the query he put to me. However, if he does not want to do that and he wants to get into the broader question of how we hire, in the public service for permanent positions we have in place a Public Service Commission which does all the hirings with very very -

MR. HODDER: Yes. We have heard about them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The Ombudsman told us all about that, about how the Minister of Fisheries hires them.

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

I must insist that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence. There are two or three members to my right who seem to persist in interrupting. I would ask them to extend the courtesy to hon. members who do have the right to be heard in silence.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of some of the members opposite I apologize to the Chair.

With very, very rare exceptions the Public Service Commission performs the task of selecting people to fill vacancies in the public service. They do that by and large - I am not a member of the commission and so on and so forth-but I am sure that by and large they do that on the basis of merit. There are certain positions in the public service, an ADM or equivalent and above, which are filled otherwise, but those are filled after a very detailed search and analysis. As I say, permanent positions in the public service by and large are filled by the Public Service

DR. COLLINS: Commission and that is done on a merit basis.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the majority are hired by the Public Service Commission, but it is not much trouble to wander around through government departments here and find political appointees in jobs which are not necessarily political.

Mr. Speaker, another question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would be that the Premier has said there will be no layoffs, Is this so? Would the minister confirm or deny it? If not, would he tell me how many people will be laid off.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly the hon. member referred to the alternative of bringing in restraints in the form that we did, or be faced with another mechanism of achieving our budgetary objectives; that is, to engage in massive layoffs or sizeable layoffs or significant layoffs. I do not believe that the hon. the Premier mentioned no layoffs. He said no 'significant' or 'major' layoffs or some such term. If the hon. member has evidence to the contrary, that I am not quoting the Premier correctly, I will be glad to see his evidence, but that is how I recall his remark.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have to say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that the Premier came on television and said he had one choice or another choice, one was layoffs and one was not. Now I asked the minister would there be layoffs? Obviously from the answer to the question there will be layoffs. What I would like to ask the minister is where will the layoffs occur? For instance, I would ask him about janitorial services in the Confederation Building and other buildings throughout the Province. I understand that here in this building perhaps it is done on a contractual service, but others are not, and that cleaning is now down to three days a week instead of five days a week. Now could the minister tell me how many people in cleaning services have been laid off throughout district vocational schools and any other buildings run by the Province?

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

MR. WARREN: He does not know.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is quite correct, I do not know. I do not know what the arrangement is in the district vocational schools. I do know in this building here it is on a contractual basis and we have no way of knowing what a contractor will do in terms of the number of employees that he engages. A contractor will bid for a contract and he will get the contract and then he will supply the number of employees that he feels can fulfil the contract. Those employees, of course, are not public servants, either permanent or temporary, so we have no way of knowing what the contractor will do with the number of employees that he engages.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, whether the minister wants to admit it or not, if the government decides that three cleanings a week are sufficient, obviously somebody is out of work or the contractor would be pretty inefficient, so I stand by my statement on contractual employees.

I would like to ask the minister if he knows whether there will be layoffs in the Department of Transportation and Communications?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we are sensitive to the knowledge that any work that government gives out, especially work that is generated for its own functioning has a relationship to employment. But, nevertheless, our primary purpose in giving out work is to get the work done and to get it done efficiently and economically. So we do not give out contracts for cleaning, or otherwise, primarily designed to maximize employment and I do not think anyone expects us to do that. We give out a contract to get a certain piece

DR. COLLINS:

of work done and, hopefully, to get it done in the best interest of the Public Treasury. Now in regard to transportation - are there any layoffs? - I am not the Minister of Transportation, The hon. member may wish to direct a question there, but, in case he does not, my understanding is that there are periods of employment in regard to transportation, out the year, somewhat related to the seasons of the year. So there are times when there are hirings and there are times that there are layoffs. This is a cyclical thing and it has been going on for years and years and years, and I would imagine it will go on for years and years to come.

MR. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what I am hearing. I am going to give the minister another chance. There are temporary workers who work with the Department of Transportation and Communications who have been temporary workers for six or seven years. Can the minister confirm or deny whether temporary workers of six or seven years duration have been given layoff notices?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, again if the hon. member wants specifics, I suggest he go to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe).

MR. HODDER: Where they any?

DR. COLLINS: If he wants the general approach to the thing, I would say that if there are temporary workers laid off, those are temporary workers who are no longer required to carry out the duties and the functions of the department.

MR. HODDER: How many?

DR. COLLINS: And if there are temporary workers who are not laid off, I presume the reason why they are not laid off is they are still required to carry on the jobs that the Department of Transportation has to do.

MR. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing here is a minister who obviously knows that there are layoffs all throughout the civil service and the government has decided that they are going to try to keep it secret. I know what a seasonal basis is and I know that the Department of Transportation and Communications has seasonal workers. I am not talking about those. The minister knows what I am talking about so I will not ask another question on it. But I would ask the minister this: We have noticed that whenever there is a wage freeze in the public service those at the senior level are reclassified upwards, as has happened just recently. The government always knows before anyone else that a freeze is coming and you always see the reclassifications in the senior civil service. This has happened recently to the senior civil servants and those people have been reclassified. I would like to ask the minister will this trend continue?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the exact number but I think the number of people employed in the public service in one form or another numbers about 25,000 or 30,000 people. When you have that number of people in an employment structure you know that with jobs being changed, with programmes being changed, with any number of things being changed, that you have to be continually looking at their terms of employment, and for that very reason we have another division in Treasury Board, I do not want to give the impression that Treasury Board is an enormous bureaucracy, it is not, it is a very slimmed-down bureaucracy, but nevertheless we do have certain divisions in it, and another division in it is Classification and Pay. These people employed in Classification and Pay, their job is to respond to needs to reclassify. And obviously if you have 25,000 people they are going to have quite a number of reclassifications to do from time to time. I can tell the hon. member, though, that there has been no increase in that activity. We carry on year in, year out, month in, month out, reclassifications that are required by the very large number of public employees in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: You know, Mr. Speaker, trying to get information from the minister is like trying to pull hens' teeth. We live in this environment as well as the minister, and we have been quite observant that every time there is a wage freeze of any sort there is

MR. HODDER: a round of reclassifications among senior civil servants. I was going to ask the minister how many this time, but I know I will not get an answer. I have another question for him; whether he believes that the restraint programmes - and I consider this a very important question - whether he believes that the restraint programme should be applied evenly throughout the civil service? In other words, does he believe that those people who are on the lower level should receive the same type of restraint measures as those on the higher level? Does he think that a person making, say, \$11,000 with the public service should be frozen in the same manner as someone who makes \$60,000 or \$70,000 with the civil service?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to categorically deny that there has been any plan, programme, move, undertaking, whatever, to reclassify senior public servants in anticipation of a wage freeze. That is an absolute perversion of the truth.

MR. WARREN: It was done.

DR. COLLINS: There are classifications that go on, necessary classifications; they have gone on in the past, they are going on at the present, they will go on in the future. But there is

DR. COLLINS: absolutely no plan, undertaking or anything of that order to undertake reclassifications purely because some sort of freeze is coming in. And to make that suggestion, I think, is to cast a slur on the upper echelon of the public service, and the upper echelon of the public service of this Province is something that the people of this Province should be proud of. There are very many excellent people in the upper echelon of our public service, and to cast a slur on them that somehow or other they will manoeuvre around, they will lend themselves to manoeuvring and to try to overcome a freeze that is supposed to be applied to all public servants in as equitable a fashion as possible, I think is something to be deprecated and I deny it on their behalf most vigourously.

With regard to the other aspect of the question, whether things are done equitably, yes, they are done equitably. It is difficult when you have such a large group of people involved in a programme such as restraint to take care, I am sure, of every individual's needs. I am sure you could find any single person who says, 'My particular circumstances mean that this restraint programme is harder on me than some other person with another particular circumstance.' It is impossible to do that type of thing. But our restraint programme is applied as equitably as we possibly can do it.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: I would like to say to the minister, in response to the first half of his answer, that I would like to see the minister at some future point table the number of reclassifications since the provincial 'five and

MR. HODDER: four' programme and prior to this latest freeze. I would like to see the minister table that.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, if the minister considers it equitable to freeze the salaries of those who are at the lower scale of the civil service the same as those at the top, I think that the thinking of the administration is very, very conservative.

MR. NEARY: Very narrow.

MR. HODDER: Very narrow.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister about the vocational schools. I would like to ask him, Is the administration planning the closure of any vocational schools or are they planning changes in status and are they planning to close out programmes in some vocational schools across the Province?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do have to comment on the fact that the Opposition seem to have some game plan underway that I do not understand. I mean, why are asking me particularly about vocational schools? You know, I have, as a member of Cabinet,

DR. COLLINS: a responsibility to keep up what is going on in all aspects of government, and I hope I do it. But, on the other hand, if the hon. member really was looking for detailed, specific information he would not come to me, he would go to the Minister of Education (Ms Verge). And similarly, I would hope, that if he wanted to find out something in detail about the Department of Finance, he would not go to the Minister of Education he would come to me.

MR. HODDER: So you have nothing to do with hospital closures.

DR. COLLINS: Now why they do not want to do that is because of some obscure reason that I am sure I cannot quite fathom but there must be some reason to it.

MR. HODDER: Do you sit in Cabinet?

DR. COLLINS: It may be that they fear getting specific answers -

MR. HODDER: Are you President of the Treasury Board?

DR. COLLINS: -from people most knowledgeable in those fields because it might be shown up that their questions are so naive and ill pointed that they are ridiculous, so they try to go to other ministers who cannot be expected to have the information in detail that the ministers responsible for those departments have at their fingertips.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a final question. We can see what is wrong with the government when the man who handles the money , who handles the financial responsibilities of this government, the person who must handle the restraint program of this government, cannot give answers on whether vocational schools will change their status. And, by the way, I am very suspicious, Mr. Speaker, that that minister knows exactly the answer to those things. That is not a question that is a statement.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.NEARY: A supplementary. I would like to ask the Minister of Education (Ms Verge), as a follow-up to the question put by my hon. colleague , will there be any cutbacks at the vocational training schools, will there be any layoffs in the vocational training system, will any of the schools change their status in the foreseeable future or will any of them be closed? Now there are four questions in one.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this administration has pledged to continue operating all sixteen district vocational schools around this Province.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS.VERGE: And not only that, Mr. Speaker, this administration has been improving programme offerings in each of those sixteen schools.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 15, 1984

Tape No. 131

ah-3

MS VERGE: -by responding to the
changing labour market conditions. New programmes have
been added in several of the schools and some of the
older programmes,

MS. VERGE:

which have been considered irrelevant to current conditions, have been phased out. There has been a trend of introducing in vocational schools two and three year programmes which formerly were available only in the capital, in St. John's. So, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this administration has a firm commitment to vocational and technical, as well as technological education in this Province and will continue to provide the necessary resources to all fifteen of our district vocational schools.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to get the hon. minister on the record. Is the hon. minister saying definitely that there will be no layoffs in the vocational school system?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, what I said is that this administration will provide to all our vocational schools, sixteen in number, the resources they need to do the job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ah, ah!

MS. VERGE: To do the job they are going to have to gradually change -

MR. HODDER: You just answered our question.
Sit down!

MS. VERGE: - their list of courses as has happened over the last three or four years. There will have to be introduced some more sophisticated, skilled training courses which are in high demand by employers. There will have to be phased out some of the shorter trades training programmes.

MR. NEARY: A simple yes or no answer, will there be layoffs? Yes or no.

MS. VERGE: - providing skills which are in adequate supply.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition
on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, again we are getting
the long-winded answers from ministers who are against the rules
of this House. My question required a simple yes or no answer.
Will there be layoffs in the vocational system?

MR. WARREN: Yes or no.

MR. NEARY: Yes or no, that is what I am asking
the minister.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier to that point of
order.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) obviously
does not want to hear a very, very informed answer to a question
concerning how the education needs -

MR. NEARY: It is either yes or no.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - of this Province are changing.
You have some of the old trades where there are now no jobs that
are now phasing out and we have new programmes to stimulate hiring of more -

MR. NEARY: Will there be layoffs? That is what
we are asking the minister.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - people. So
the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is trying to educate the
Leader of the Opposition in the -

MR. NEARY: It required a simple yes or no
answer, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - course that higher education is going
to take in this Province in the future. And I firmly believe that the
Leader of the Opposition should listen very closely, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- to what the Minister of Education

(Ms. Verge) has to say

because the Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Neary) might learn -

MR. NEARY:

Yes or no, will there be layoffs?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- that education training is changing-

MR. NEARY: Will there be layoffs, yes or no?
PREMIER PECKFORD: - in this society and therefore there are going to be layoffs and there are going to be hirings.

MR. NEARY: All the answer we require is a simple yes or no.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: And I think it would be very wise for all legislators here to listen to what the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has to say about the changing needs of higher education in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) rose on a point of order to state that answers to questions should be as brief as possible, and that is correct. I have to advise now, of course, that the time for the Question Period has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

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

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question 2 appearing on the Order Paper of yesterday in the name of the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). The question was: "Details of any complaints the Directorate" - the Petroleum Directorate that is - "has received since January, 1980 concerning inadequate safety regulations on offshore oil rigs and supply vessels off Newfoundland's east coast." The answer is: The records of the Petroleum Directorate disclose no complaints concerning inadequate safety regulations prior to January 13, 1982 but since that time there were complaints of various nature, including one from the hon. member's leader; when the hon. member indicated, I think, in that celebrated matter there in January of 1982, that there was a great oil spill in the Atlantic Ocean and when we investigated we found that one and one half barrels had escaped into the moonpool, Mr. Speaker. So I table that answer. Mr. Speaker, I also have the answer to Question 3 appearing on yesterday's Order Paper, also asked by the unelected Liberal in this House. These questions were: "How much overtime was worked by employees of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro in 1983-84 and why?" Now 1983-84 is this year, Mr. Speaker, so we have assumed that the question was meant to cover overtime for the calendar year ending December 31, 1983 and that is to which the answer responds, because we want to help the hon. members in asking questions accurately. And the answer is: During 1983

MR. MARSHALL:

the total amount of overtime worked by employees of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro amounted to 70,070 hours. This work was associated with maintaining a reliable electrical system consisting of the Bay d'Espoir hydro-electric plant, the Upper Salmon hydroelectric plant, the Hinds Lake hydroelectric plant, the Holyrood thermal generating plant, the Hardwood's gas turbine, the Stephenville gas turbine, 2,800 kilometers of transmission and distribution lines, 42 separate diesel systems on the Island and in Labrador, twenty-five terminal stations and, Mr. Speaker, related administrative support. The total amount paid in overtime was \$1,218,110 which represented 4.5 per cent of the total payroll for the year. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that that was significantly less than the previous years. Where an industry is supplying an essential service for twenty-four hours a day, 365 days a year, it is excellent to confine the overtime to only 4.5 per cent of the total salary costs. And modesty precludes me, Mr. Speaker, from observing, but I must observe because my officials have asked me to, that this represents a marked improvement over what had occurred during the sojourn of my predecessor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I also have the answer to question No. 4 asked yesterday by the same hon. gentleman. I certainly hope this does not cause him to weep. Mr. Speaker, the question is: "Details of the steps the Province has taken to ensure that cement manufactured in Newfoundland and Labrador will be of sufficient quality to be used in the possible construction of offshore concrete platforms in this Province for use in oil development off Newfoundland and Labrador." I will just read the answer; it

MR. MARSHALL: is not very long, it is very informative and I know the hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to be informed. The reply is, 'The cement requirements, both in terms of quantity and quality, necessary for the construction of a Hibernia gravity based platform, can be supplied by North Star Cement.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: "Government in its ongoing consultations with the oil industry have been advised of the volumes and quality of cement required for the Hibernia development. Government officials have met frequently with officials of North Star Cement to review this subject and are satisfied the company can meet these requirements. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, government has been recently advised by one of the partners in the Hibernia field that a study by an independent consultant, which it sponsored, concluded that North Star Cement has the capability, in terms of capacity and quality, to supply the needs of the Hibernia development." It just remains to be seen whether the new found friends of the hon. member will see that concrete platforms are used in the construction or whether we will see the development of the Hibernia occur through floating platforms, with the oil being siphoned off - guess where? - into the Province of Nova Scotia and the Province of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday, I think it was, Monday, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) undertook to provide my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), with information concerning an ultimatum that was issued by Atlantic Loto to

MR. NEARY: people who sell the Atlantic Loto here in Newfoundland. The minister undertook to get the information as soon as possible, it is now Thursday, the House does not have the information, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it is incumbent upon the hon. gentleman - and, Mr. Speaker, the only way I can raise it is through a point of order - it is incumbent upon the hon. gentleman to provide that information as he undertook to do Monday past.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to that point of order?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Justice to that point of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously it is not a point of order. It was forty-eight hours ago the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) asked me that and I said I would get him the information, the full information as soon as possible. And the hon. gentleman for Torngat Mountains knows that I will do that, because on many occasions he has asked me questions and I have always gotten back to him. And I like to give him the full information. I do not have the full information now, if he wants part of the information I will give it. But in respect to the hon. gentleman who wants the full information I will wait until I have the full information, because I have respect for the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair recognized the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) on a point of order which I must rule was not a valid point of order because the question could have been asked of the Minister of Justice during the Question Period.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The Address-in-Reply was adjourned last day by the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I guess we can call it the second phase of the ongoing saga of some questions that need some answering and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I only have, on my time limit, about twenty-three minutes to do so. I am sure the Opposition will give me leave beyond twenty-three minutes. I am sure of that.

Mr. Speaker, first of all may I say that I have to deal with and I am responding to the first speech by the Opposition in this debate, in this new session, by the new non-elected member, as a Liberal, in the Mount Scio district. And I have to deal with a personal attack. He chose to take part in debate in a personal attack manner. I was surprised at that, Mr. Speaker. I thought more of the hon. gentleman when he was with us. I expected him, when he crossed the floor, to tell us why he crossed the floor, on what issue, on what policy, and what motivated him to cross the floor, thereby leaving our caucus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in making a personal attack on me, as he did, and it was a very personal attack, one that has been very adequately dealt with by someone on my side of the House? No, Mr. Speaker, someone who is a Liberal in the Federal Liberal Government. But that man who did deal with the accusations upon my character is a man of principle, although he is a Liberal. There are many people in the Liberal Party who are men and women of principle. But in this case I have to go further and question

MR. MORGAN: anybody who would stand in this House and question one of his own peers of the House of Assembly. And the hon. gentleman quoted in all the media said about this hon. gentleman, "The hon. gentleman would not be able to look after himself outside of the House."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I am not here, as many of colleagues and friends know, not here because I need a job, Mr. Speaker, I am here because I believe in a man who is leading our party and leading this Province in the right direction today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will make one comment further. I listened a few days ago to a national news media comment, not about me but about someone in this Province who is presently being investigated by his own peers.

MR. DINN: Who is that now?

MR. MORGAN: I am not making the accusation. I heard the national media, the same hon. gentleman who chose to personally attack me as an individual is presently under investigation by his own peers, the Law Society of Newfoundland. I am not making the accusation, it is national news. It was carried. I heard it in Toronto, Mr. Speaker. I do not know

MR. MORGAN:

why they are investigating the hon. gentleman and personally I do not care.

MR. HODDER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

On . point of order, the hon.

the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the Premier sent his hatchet man - we have always wondered why that minister was in Cabinet, now we know. He is the darker side of the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: About a year and a half ago, that minister got up and made veiled accusations about the then Leader of the Opposition which proved unfounded.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. HODDER:

He made veiled accusations.

Now, he is making veiled assassinations and accusations again without naming what he is saying. He is a master at it, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say that I feel that this type of debate in the House is not worthy or becoming of the House and that particular minister should have been flung out of here a long time ago.

MR. MORGAN:

To that point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon.

the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Any member of this House,

Mr. Speaker, can stand and quote what has been said in the media of the Province and nationally. All I am doing is quoting what I heard in the national media. That is what I am doing. I heard it in the media. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a fast ruling, because

MR. MORGAN: the game this afternoon is to cut my time as much as possible by these stupid and silly points of order.

MR. WARREN: It is going to be, too.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us not get down to that level of debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Because, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to know what is the issue, what is the policy issue that has caused the hon. gentleman to stand now and condemn this government on economic issues, on the offshore issues, on the fisheries issues, when, while he was here in this caucus, as a member of this government, he fully supported these policies and programmes?

Now, a few days ago I did say that we have not changed our policies. Our policies are they same now as they were on February 6th. And what was going on on February 6th? There was a meeting in St. John's on February 6th, and that February 6th meeting was dealing with our policies on the offshore, in particular, our stand on the offshore, our stand on the fisheries, our stand on the Northern cod issue, our stand on having a say in the management of our resources in this Province and how we were going to get a better deal with the national level of government.

MR. MORGAN: We were all, on this side of the House, planning at that meeting to get rid of the present government in Ottawa. And at that same meeting was the hon. gentleman who now stands in the House and condemns these same policies and programmes that he supported on February 6th.

Now, the key question is going to be asked and posed, not only in this House, but out in the Mount Scio district and throughout the Province: Why would someone on February 6th stand firmly behind our policies and programmes and condemn outright the present policies and programmes of the national level of government, presently a Liberal Government, and then, a few days after, on February 21st, the same month, the same year, a few days after, cross the floor and condemn the policies of this government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: The question is why.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very worthwhile to listen to some of the things that have been going on in the last few days: 'The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is incompetent, the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) is incompetent, the Premier is incompetent.' Last night on C.B.C. television, 'Oh, there are a number of incompetent ministers in the Government of Newfoundland.' Well, on February 6th, Mr. Speaker, who was the most incompetent minister at that time? - by the same hon. gentleman. Who was it? It was the present federal minister from Newfoundland in the Liberal Government in Ottawa. That was a quote from him, 'The most incompetent, bungling minister they have in Ottawa is Mr. Rompkey,' was the quote at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Oh, the irony of it all!

This weekend the same hon. gentleman is travelling down to Labrador West with that same, in his view, bungling, incompetent gentleman from Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Why is he going to Labrador West? I can tell you, Mr. Speaker. My political intuition

MR. MORGAN: tells me he is looking for a provincial seat. He is looking for a provincial seat. He has to leave Mount Scio. Or, one second, Mr. Speaker. In posing the question why he crossed the floor, maybe it was because the constituents of his riding, Mount Scio, asked him to cross the floor. Maybe that is the reason why. But I have a pretty firm indication that the answer to that question is, no, they did not ask him to leave. Did any of us on this side ask him to leave our caucus? Mr. Speaker, no, we did not. Do you know the reason why? We did not see enough of him in our caucus to ask him that question. That is why. He very seldom came to our caucus meetings. As I pointed out earlier this week, he did not even know who to send his letter of resignation to as our caucus chairman. He sent it to the wrong man, who was not even the chairman of our caucus. Now, Mr. Speaker, so far the hon. gentleman has chosen to come on the personal attack bit. I mentioned earlier this week he was involved in conversation with a man who made a very vicious personal attack on the Premier, and a few days ago he got involved in a vicious personal attack on me. And that is unfortunate, because all I am doing as a member of the House is questioning why he made his move across the floor, for him to explain it to the House and explain it to us. Now, is it because of a matter of principle? When my colleague and friend from Baie Verte-White Bay district (Mr. Rideout) crossed the floor, did he cross the floor in a temperamental mood and move at the time, a rash decision?

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, he stood and crossed on principle. He crossed on the principle that he could not agree with their policies and he said, 'I am going to stand for Newfoundland and the Premier's stand on behalf of our resources.' He came on principle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: And he went back to his district and got solid support for the Premier and his policies and came back to the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I recall just before I came to the House of Assembly, the day when a good friend of all of us here, now the Member of Parliament, Mr. Crosbie, and at the time Mr. Wells and Mr. Hickman crossed the floor. Did they leave a party and cross the floor just because of some individual, selfish motive? Did they cross on principle? Did they cross because of a policy difference? Mr. Speaker, they crossed the floor on a matter of principle and policy. At the time it was the Come By Chance issue. We all recall that, why they crossed the floor. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is going to have to, in debate more so than in personal attacks against the ministers on this side of the House, explain to his constituents, explain to the general public and explain more importantly to this House of Assembly why he made the move he did. And surely, surely it is not connected with that rumour that was circulating, and I checked it out, that there was going to be a vacancy in the leadership of the Liberal party. Now that rumour was very strong. The present leader is a fine, honourable gentleman and he takes part in

MR.MORGAN: debates in the House and
does a good job in debates.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.MORGAN: And if ever there is any
kind of award for the work he has done for the Liberal
party, that man deserves it. And what I have heard from
Ottawa sources, and good sources in Ottawa, is that
there could be, there just could be an early retirement
from the Senate - repeat, early retirement - by a
Newfoundland senator, a fine honourable Newfoundlander.
His retirement is coming up, but they were going to
arrange, or make plans to arrange for maybe this
gentleman to take an early retirement and that would
leave a vacancy in the senate. And I have said, Mr.
Speaker, and I say it again now, that nobody is more
entitled than the present Leader of the Opposition
(Mr.Neary) to the Liberal appointment if it comes up,
than the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.MORGAN: So the hon. member crossed
the floor in anticipation. Oh, he was so anxious for
that job, that seat! So anxious for it. And then
suddenly, a few days after when Mr. Cashin finds out
as well, oh, no! There

MR. MORGAN:

is not going to be an early retirement, and there is not going to be any appointment to the Senate by the present Liberal Government in Ottawa, because the Senator's retirement will be too late to get an appointment by this present government, so it would have to be from the new government, And in this case there is no question, it is going to be a new Progressive Conservative Government in Ottawa, no question about that. Now, surely it would not be that, Mr. Speaker. Surely it would not be selfish motives. Now, what really puzzled me was yesterday when the hon. gentleman was saying, when he heard Mr. De Bane in Ottawa had come out to my defence, a good Liberal in Ottawa out in defence of a good Conservative here, he stands in his place and he tries to leave the impression, 'Oh, now, look, the reason why Mr. De Bane would do that to Mr. Morgan is because he is so easy to get along with and he is giving everything away from Newfoundland and that is the reason why, he is just a soft minister.' And on the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, he is condemning others because they cannot get along with federal ministers. Now I am going to say to the same hon. gentleman, if getting an ice-making programme costing \$6.5 million for the fishermen around the Province, if getting a major improvement to the marine service centers and a major new programme for new service centers for our fishermen around the Province, if a 25 per cent subsidy just recently put in place for the fishermen on the cost of their boats, if the resource-short plant programme put in place for the first time this Winter employing 1,000 Newfoundlanders, if the subsidy for the sealers in the sealing industry, if the restructuring agreement now employing 5,000 Newfoundlanders, if a joint marketing mission getting more markets for our caplin and other species of fish in our Province, and if other measures that we are getting done for our

MR. MORGAN: fishing industry is as a result of co-operation and working with Mr. De Bane, I say why not!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Let him openly condemn these kinds of things which are good for our Province and its most important industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other ironic part was this: He crosses the floor and one of the first questions he asked to the Premier of our Province, 'Will you make every effort and make sure you get a written commitment from Mr. Mulroney on the position of the present PC Party in Ottawa, in the Opposition, on the offshore? Will you do that, Mr. Premier?' he was demanding. Oh, Mr. Speaker! And I happened to hear today that coming to the Province this weekend for a Liberal meeting, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a leadership candidate, hon. John Roberts, we are going to have Mr. Mark MacGuigan, a minister in the federal Cabinet running for leadership, we are going to have Mr. Don Johnston who is running for the Liberal leadership and maybe - question mark - maybe the hon. Jean Chretien, all coming to Newfoundland to take part in a Liberal meeting. Now I find it rather strange and ironic that now that he is over on the other side as a Liberal, he wants to demand that Mr. Mulroney put in writing to Newfoundland, like Mr. Clark did, what his position is on the offshore. The big difference being Mr. Mulroney is still in Opposition in Ottawa and the government is in power in Ottawa.

MR. MORGAN:

Now why is it that the question would not be more adequately posed, if he is going to be an influential Liberal and if he is sincere in his endeavours as a Newfoundlander - he is a fine intelligent gentleman, I respect him - but if he is sincere in his endeavours as a politician, why not this weekend, I say to the hon. gentleman in all sincerity, put it to Mr. Johnston and Mr. MacGuigan and Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Chretien if he comes down here, and say, Why do you not respond in writing to our proposal put forward, which is reasonable and fair for our Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, he stood and condemned our policy on the fisheries, not knowing that he was a member of the caucus when we developed the fisheries policy documents which, as I emphasized yesterday, were developed by the caucus members and put forward as an official document on fisheries, and he then supported it.

Now I find it further ironic that this weekend in St. John's at that Liberal meeting there are going to be some guest speakers on the issues. Now this hon. gentleman, according to his debate he is an expert on economic affairs, he is an expert on budgetary matters and finance, he is an expert on fisheries, he is an expert on law and offshore resources, now surely with such a newly found expert in the Liberal Party, they will invite him along to the big meeting they are having this weekend to try to get the youth motivated in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, suddenly there is a new shining star! He was their shining star last week or ten days ago, but now he is no longer, because he made a real bungle

MR. MORGAN: of his first speech in the House getting on with personal attacks, attacking ministers personally and their characters. He bungled badly. His name is not even mentioned in the advertisements at this weekend's meeting of the Liberals.

AN HON. MEMBER: What!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: But there is a new shining star on the horizon that the Liberals are looking at and bringing in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Garfield?

MR. MORGAN: No, no, no, no, no, A man I have respect for, a man I work with and deal with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: No, no. It is Mr. Richard Cashin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Yes, yes. There is a new star on the horizon. So the hon. gentleman is going to realize in a few weeks time the mad rush he made in the direction of the Leader of the Opposition's seat is suddenly blocked, there are going to be a few obstacles in his path.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying , since my time is almost up -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. MORGAN: I will not get leave, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. MORGAN: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

MR. MORGAN: Okay, no leave.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this government today, led by the Premier of our Province, is dealing with the economy and the problems we have in the economy in a manner which we can be all proud because today , for example,

MR. MORGAN: we have 1,400,000 Canadians unemployed across the country, a 12 per cent unemployment rate, it is 18 per cent here. We had bankruptcies across the country in the last year, in the last twelve months, 9,500 bankrupt companies across Canada; 206 in Nova Scotia, where all of the activity is taking place, 206 companies go bankrupt in Nova Scotia. Fortunately only 80 - 80 too many here - but 80 too many companies went into receivership.

Let me go on to say that while we have all this controversy about nothing happening in the offshore and everything is dead here on the offshore, we have today, presently, 2,538 workers in the offshore, 2,538 Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: \$450 million was spent this past year in the offshore. Coming up this financial year, there will be \$600 million spent in the offshore by the companies in exploratory work. The local preference policy is working so well despite the federal court's ruling, I have been told by my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), despite the federal court ruling in recent days, the local preference policy is working so well in Newfoundland in the offshore that companies are going to volunteer to carry on using it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: We have had problems in our budgetary matters, sure we have. We have problems raising revenues, but not with our expenditures. We controlled that, but despite controlled expenditures we this present year did what? We spent \$55 million on water and sewer projects in my colleague's department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: \$89 million in roads and bridges around the Province; \$1.5 million in recreation projects; \$2.5 million in fisheries projects; \$1 million in rural development; and on we go, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that this Premier

MR. MORGAN: and this government , although we are going through a recession across the country, despite the fact that the unemployment rate is so high throughout all of Canada, despite the fact that it is difficult getting revenues from the economy- we do not have the industrialized base to give us the revenues, it is just not there to get in our province - but this Premier and this Province, and I am sure I am speaking for all of my colleagues here, this Premier with his

MR. MORGAN: policies and his programme to make sure that we get control to manage and develop our natural resources, through that policy and programme, as he has often said, 'The sun will shine one day and have-not will be no more.' And let there be no more impugning of any of my colleagues and no more question marks raised. Every man and woman on this side of the House is standing firmly behind this Premier to make sure this Province proceeds in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that I say amen, Mr. Speaker. Is it any wonder that the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) a few years ago brought a private member's resolution into this House to make it mandatory to have the Lord's Prayer before we commence our session? With that kind of attitude, with that kind of muckraking, with that kind of lowering of the decorum of this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, with that kind of dark humour, I am sure that we need the guidance that the hon. gentleman recommended at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to deal with anything that the hon. gentleman said except to point out to members of the House that here you have a minister of the Crown, a minister - well, I do not know if you would call him a minister of the Crown or minister of the clown - you have a minister who is supposed to be articulating government policy, a minister who was supposed to be telling the people of this Province what plans and policies and programmes the administration there opposite have to deal with the incredible mess that they have made of managing

MR. NEARY: the affairs of this Province, A minister, Mr. Speaker, is supposed to be a highly respected individual, a gentleman who has stature, an hon. gentleman who can enunciate government policy, who can defend the administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, for the past hour we heard the hon. gentleman - half an hour on Tuesday and a half an hour today - and I ask hon. members can they name me one policy, one programme, one plan, that the hon. gentleman dealt with on behalf of the administration? Because remember, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is speaking for the administration there opposite. Did he name one plan or programme or policy to help the people of this Province? Was there any comfort in what the hon. gentleman said? Will there be any comfort to the inshore fishermen who are bankrupt? Was there any message there for people who are unemployed, especially young people throughout this Province between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five, for 43 per cent of the unemployed in Newfoundland are between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five? Will they be able to take any comfort in what the hon. gentleman said this afternoon when he was speaking on behalf of the administration?

Me thinketh, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman protested too much. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, they are hurting badly, they are smarting because the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), in the best interest of the people of this Province, decided to move his seat. They are hurting and they have sent their hatchetmen and muckrakers after the hon. gentleman. The Premier does not have the courage to get up himself.

MR. SIMMS: I thought you said you were not going to get down in this stuff?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not going to. I would suggest the next in line of the muckrakers will be the member for

MR. NEARY:

Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), he will be sicked on to the hon. gentleman. And then the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), who was ruled out of order thirty-two times in one day in this House, he will be sent after the hon. gentleman. The hatchet men over there will be yapping at the hon. gentleman's heels like a bunch of crackies, Mr. Speaker, and it would all do no good, because I have to remind hon. members of this House that the voters are sick and tired of the squabbling and the fighting and the arguing and the battling and the childishness that goes on in this House and outside of this House. They are tired of it. They are fed up with it. And they are angry, Mr. Speaker. They are angry. They are angry because this administration that was given an overwhelming mandate on April 6, 1982 have failed to deliver on that mandate. And yesterday they took great comfort in one-upmanship, the kind of a game that the Premier plays all the time, when he came into the House with a Telex from the Federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. De Bane. Now, Mr. Speaker, we know, because the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has admitted it, that he telephoned Mr. De Bane before that Telex came to the Premier. By his own admission we know that.

Mr. Speaker, the question is what did the Provincial Minister of Fisheries give to Mr. De Bane to get him to send that telegram? What did he give him? Will Mr. De Bane now be able to appoint his own Chief Executive Officer? Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting question.

MR. BARRY: Is that why he is not going to be a Newfoundlander, I wonder?

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

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is implying that there was something mysteriously wrong or was done in order for a man of principle, and all I mentioned earlier in my debate, to send a telegram to the Premier of our Province to clear the name of, in this case a colleague of his, in one of the provinces, whose name was smeared by a member of the Opposition. And I am saying, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order that is totally wrong on the part of the member now speaking. There was nothing mysterious about it. The minister chose on a matter of principle, because he knew that the charge was totally unfounded, there was no truth whatsoever to it, it was silly and ridiculous as he said in his telegram, and he chose to clear my name on the issue by telexing the Premier of our Province.

And, Mr. Speaker, then to further imply that the policies of government would suddenly change because a minister in Ottawa chose to clear a name of a friend and a colleague involved in fisheries matters, that again, Mr. Speaker, is totally wrong and the hon. gentleman is out of order and he should be asked to retract these kinds of statements.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: The question has to be raised, what did Mr. De Bane have in the way of information? I do not believe Hansard is being piped into the House of Commons, so one has to wonder where Mr. De Bane got his information. Obviously it was from the last speaker,

March 15, 1984

Tape No. 141

NM - 3

MR. BARRY:

The Minister of Fisheries

(Mr. Morgan). The Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Neary) has asked to put a question before this House, which the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier has to answer, and it is a fair question, and that is what has the Minister of Fisheries given away in order to protect and preserve his own inflated ego? What did he give away against the public interest

MR. BARRY:

of this Province? Was it the choice of the Chief Executive Officer? Was it the choice of directors? What was given? Is that why we are not going to have a Newfoundlander as the head of the new fish company?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to that point of order, as well. As hon. members are aware, it is improper to allege or to impute that a minister has acted improperly, dishonestly, unethically, traitorously with respect to performance of his duties and I would suggest that when it is submitted, when it is stated, 'What did the hon. minister give away? In return for a telegram, what did he give away?' then certainly, there is an imputation there that the minister has been bribed or is bribing or is in some way involved in unlawful or unethical conduct.

And I did not get up at the time, there was one point of order on the floor, the only way it could have come up was as a point of privilege, and when the House gets into these interminable wrangles it does not benefit anybody, actually. I will not say who it was, but one hon. gentleman was saying when the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) was speaking, he was directing it towards the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), you know, 'blackmail' and I also heard the word 'liar'. And I am not bring those up because you only bring them up inside a point of order by getting to a point of privilege. I think there are valid points of privilege, but I am not sure that anyone gets anywhere by long and

MR. OTTENHEIMER: complicated procedural differences of opinion by getting points of privilege inside points of order. So I am sticking to the point of order but I think it is important and I would hope that the Chair would consider the fact that any statement or allegation or imputation that a minister or any hon. member on any side, a private member of government or Opposition, has been involved in bribery, either offering bribery or being a recipient of bribery, any imputation of that character is out of order. And when you ask the question: What did he give away in return for something? - to my mind there is an imputation that the person has acted illegally, dishonestly, and that is not an imputation which hon. members can make towards one another. That is what it comes to.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only time that we hear from the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) - he does not participate in debate at all - the only time we hear from him is when he wants to show us what an expert he is on parliamentary procedure and law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should go and look at the rules of the House. The hon. gentleman just stated that there were statements made of allegations and imputations. There were no such things, Mr. Speaker. I put a question to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). I asked him if he indeed did call Mr. De Bane before the Telex came to the Premier and he admitted that yesterday.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY:

I then said to him, 'What did you offer or give Mr. De Bane in return for sending this Telex which was a lie?'

When you get an honourable man like the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) lying, Mr. Speaker, there must be more to it than meets the eye and therefore, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) lied. And when you have a federal minister of the Crown lying to the Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty serious matter and so it is our duty and our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to question the minister and the administration as to what they gave in return for getting a federal minister to lie. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are the nuts and bolts of the situation.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I mean, we have gone to the utter ridiculous now. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is now trying to bail out his colleague who really got himself in deep water by standing up and making a statement to the effect that the minister in Ottawa, who is a fine, honourable man of principle -

MR. WARREN: He is a liar.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentlemen can call him a liar if they want to, that is up to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Let me finish.

Then to go further and clearly leave the impression that the present minister in Ottawa, an hon. gentleman, is subject to being bribed by someone from Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, he is. He is.

MR. MORGAN: Listen to the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, listen to the members over there. They are saying, 'Yes, he is' - that the minister in Ottawa, that fine, hon. man of distinction who has been in the federal Cabinet

MR. MORGAN: for the last ten years or so, a man of principle in Ottawa, a man of dignity, that he is subject to be bribed by someone from Newfoundland -

MR. HODDER: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: - whether it be a minister here or somebody else. Mr. Speaker the accusation now is not against me it is against the man in Ottawa, 'who is up there and subject to taking bribes from Newfoundland' - 'You do this for me and I will do this for you.' Now, Mr. Speaker, two days ago there was a personal attack on me, and now this vicious type of personal attack on the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane). How low will they stoop, Mr. Speaker? How low will the Opposition stoop? - saying a man who cannot defend himself here is a man who can accept bribes and be bribed, and number two, the man is a liar. Mr. Speaker, I will say categorically that the conversation I had yesterday with Mr. De Bane was very short and brief. He was aware of what the stories were. Every day Mr. De Bane gets copies of all the press clippings from Newfoundland telling him what is taking place. The issue was in the media. I called him and spoke to him about the issue and he said, and I quote, 'Jim, you know and I know and Mr. Kirby and all the others know, Dr. Art May and everybody concerned, that what is being said is absolutely stupid and ridiculous and I will make sure it is clarified.' How did he clarify it? In his own way. He could have made a press release.

MR. BARRY: Who else was there? Who else was there?

MR. MORGAN: Listen to the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). Mr. Speaker, if they want to call Mr. De Bane a liar, which they have already done, well let us look at who else had been there throughout negotiations.

MR. MORGAN: Every day Dr. Art May, the deputy minister, is he also a liar? Dr. Michael Kirby, is he a liar? Peter John Nickleson, a lawyer, is he a liar? Mr. John Fitzgerald, the head of the Petroleum Directorate from Newfoundland, head today of the Newfoundland Petroleum Directorate, he was appointed after, is he a liar? They all know, they were all there. It is a silly, stupid statement made by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). He got himself in hot water by his personal attack on me. I have been vindicated and he has been made a fool of by making his personal attack. Now, Mr. Speaker he is going to have to account for his actions as a new Liberal member, just joined the Liberal ranks in Newfoundland, for the personal attack on the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), calling him a man to be bribed and calling him a liar. Terrible!

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

To that point of order I must rule there is no point of order. There may have been some allegations made against people who are not in this hon. House, but there is no point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to continue uninterrupted with my few remarks about the terrible, the horrendous state of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy.

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

MR. NEARY: That is the important thing, Mr. Speaker. The important thing is not whether Mr. De Bane is a liar or not, although we happen to think that he is. Because, Mr. Speaker, in conversations that we had with the gentleman, my colleague, our spokesman on fisheries, and myself, it would be interesting if we only had a tape

MR. NEARY: of the remarks that were made about the Premier of this Province and about the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) by that hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, it would be a best-seller if we had it. But I am not going to continue on that trend, I want to get around to something far more important, because the people of Newfoundland

MR. NEARY:

are tired and angry about the squabbling and the fighting that is going on. They have had enough of confrontation politics in the last four years from the Premier of this Province and they want action. There is a quiet revolution going on out there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: He got it in the main today, 'Jim'.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I be heard in silence, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: There is a quiet revolution going on out there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: I will see he gets today's Hansard.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is shouting from the doorway.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order. The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I was only responding across the House to the conversations and shouting of his colleague, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

I said I was going to make sure that today's Hansard, containing the attack on the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), would get mailed to the federal Minister of Fisheries today; after the House closes copies of their attack on his integrity and his character would get mailed to him today. So, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wants someone to listen to him in the

MR. MORGAN: House, he should control the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

MR. WARREN: Oh, go down to your tavern.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): To that point of order, I would ask each honourable member to address the House from his seat.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the real issues, the real problems in this Province, I would like for hon. gentlemen there opposite to restrain themselves. They are beside themselves today, they are smarting because we have a new colleague over here who is only interested in the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and not partisan politics. He has put his Province before politics, Mr. Speaker, and he is to be commended for that. And we intend to deal with the issues in this session. They can try to distract us all they want, and they can bring in all the red herring they want, but the fact of the matter is that the Newfoundland economy is in an incredible mess as a result of the mismanagement and the incompetence of the present administration. We have record unemployment, we have the highest taxes in the nation, we have high electricity rates and we have young people who are being driven out, forced out of the Province to look for employment elsewhere, driven from their homes. We have families who are heartbroken because their sons and daughters have gone to university, and to the College of Trades, and the College of Fisheries, and the Vocational Schools and they have their certificates, and they have their skills and their training, Mr. Speaker, and they cannot find jobs. And why can they not find jobs? Because this administration, Mr. Speaker, has created

MR. NEARY: such a hostile, political climate in this Province that business and industry will not locate in Newfoundland. The five year programme that they told us about four years ago, where they were going to create 40,000, Mr. Speaker, the 40,000 jobs they talked about creating are over in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Now, Mr. Speaker, ask the people of Gander about the performance of this administration, ask the people in Labrador City and in Corner Brook and in all the other communities in Newfoundland, in Marystown, in Burin, Mr. Speaker, where they are undergoing suffering and pain and misery as a result of the mismanagement of this administration.

MR. WARREN: And Davis Inlet.

MR. NEARY: And Davis Inlet, my hon. colleague reminds me. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Throne Speech is supposed to be a blueprint, it is supposed to be a plan of action. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the Throne Speech to indicate that anything is going to be done to stimulate the Newfoundland and Labrador economy, nothing in the Throne Speech to help our people. There, Mr. Speaker, therein lies the problem.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the member's time is up.

MR. NEARY: The administration there opposite cannot point their finger to one success in four years, And not only in four years, but since the Tories took over, in 1982.

MR. NEARY: Not one success, just one failure after another. Mr. Speaker their policies have been wrong. They refuse to change their direction. The Premier is stubborn and digging in his heels and as a result, Mr. Speaker, the whole Province is practically a welfare state. It is a terrible, terrible situation.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about restraint. Next month the lease on a luxurious apartment in Tiffany Towers, rent free to the Premier, the lease will come up for renewal, Mr. Speaker, there is where we will find out how sincere they are about restraint. No other Premier in Canada has a rent-free apartment or house except here in poor old Newfoundland. Will they renew that lease and continue to give the Premier of this Province a rent-free apartment and, in addition to that, several hundreds of dollars a month from the Tory Party, contributed by contractors and business people doing business with the government in this Province? And I regret to have to bring that up, Mr. Speaker, but by the hon. gentleman's own admission he told us that the Tory Party paid off part of a \$10,000 debt, when he backed a note for a business partner, and pays him several hundred dollars every month. Mr. Speaker, that is downright immoral, in my opinion. It should be discontinued. And I would like to hear the hon. gentleman stand in his place in this House and say, I am no longer taking a cheque from a gentleman in the Tory Party who has space leased out for a museum in the Murray premises, unoccupied for four years.

MR. CARTER: Name names.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yes. I do not have to name names. I do not have to write a book, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman knows who I am talking about. That the Premier will no longer take a cheque from an individual in the Tory Party, Mr. Speaker, who is being given benefits from this administration. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very dangerous practice and it should be discontinued. And when they talk about restraint, Mr. Speaker, let the gentleman who leads the administration set the example.

What about the government aircraft? We were told a couple of years ago, no more use by ministers of government aircraft, the King Air was grounded because it had high visibility. But, Mr. Speaker, what they did then, they did the most sneaky thing I have ever heard of, they then started using the LFY aircraft, a twin engine aircraft used for aerial surveys in this Province, paid for, by the way, to a large degree, by the Government of Canada. That aircraft is now being used to fly ministers home on weekends and around the Province. And the Premier when he wants to go snaring rabbits will charter a plane from an independent company. That is the way they have covered it up. They are still using the aircraft. That is practicing restraint. They ask the public service and the paper workers and the fishermen to make sacrifices, practice restraint, while they themselves are living live shieks, like lords, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) should table the log of that LFY aircraft that the hon. gentleman flies home in once in a while, and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and a few others. The King Air had high visibility, everybody used to see it at the airport, now they can sneak in in the LFY that is supposed to be used for aerial surveys in this Province. How often has it been used? For what purpose is it being used? Who do they think they are,

March 15, 1984

Tape 145

PK - 3

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, squandering and
wasting taxpayer money flying around in aircraft and helicopters
and planes that are chartered from private companies?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of stuff that we have to get at when the people out there are starving, they cannot balance their household budget, they are unemployed and cannot find jobs, and the political appointments in the public service, and putting people on the payroll on a contractual basis. When it comes to political appointments, this crowd could probably show any other administration in the world how to make political appointments and then come in and portray the image of honesty and integrity in government, Mr. Speaker. They have the face of a robber's horse over there. It is a sick joke, Mr. Speaker, it is a sick joke. The hon. gentleman should stop using that aircraft to get him home and go down and use the commercial airlines the same as everybody else.

Mr. Speaker, these are the things that we should be debating in this House - ways and means to stop the squandering, the political patronage, the political appointments, the mismanagement and the waste of taxpayer money. That is what we should be concentrating on instead of listening to the tirade we heard from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in the last day or so. Not a word about policy or plans or programmes for the poor old people who are suffering out there. And they will get up one after the other and they will drape themselves in the flag and they say, 'Anybody who does not agree with us is wrong, the Tory way is the right way', and they have not had one success in ten years, nothing but a string of failures, Mr. Speaker. One failure after the other and yet they will not change their direction, they will not change their policy. They are too stubborn. The Premier is leading them all around by the nose like little sheep over there. It is shameful! They do not have the courage of their convictions. The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), at least he had the courage of his convictions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: They are over there, I know they are over there, I have spoken to them, who are disgruntled and disillusioned and downhearted and brokenhearted about the way things have gone in this Province. They will tell me in the elevators, they will tell me down at Government House, and they will tell me here and they will tell me there but they do not have the courage -

MR. STAGG: Name one?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I could name a few.

MR. WARREN: You. You are one.

MR. NEARY: I could name a few, Mr. Speaker, but I will not do that, I will not embarrass hon. gentlemen. But they do not have the courage to stand up for what they think is right. They do not have the courage of their convictions -

MR. HODDER: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker, or they would not sit over there, lay back and watch the people of this Province suffer day in and day out -

MR. CALLAN: That is their attitude.

MR. NEARY: - as they feather their own political nests and play their own little political games, fighting the next federal election. Mr. Speaker, what a narrow-minded point of view. The people of Gander, as I said, will not forget. The teachers will not forget. The public service will not forget. The fishermen will not forget. The loggers will not forget. The miners, Mr. Speaker, will not forget. They have attacked just about every group, every government in Canada and it has gotten us nowhere, gotten us nowhere, Mr. Speaker. The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) surely must realize - he is a man who has a little common sense and is a decent gentleman, he must know that the policies of the administration he is supporting are getting us nowhere. We are accomplishing nothing. The art

MR. NEARY: of politics is compromise, do hon. gentleman not realize that? Negotiations are a two-way street, Mr. Speaker. It takes two to tango, it takes two to make a deal. We cannot continue this way. Newfoundland is just going to fall over the brink of oblivion if we keep going the way we are going. Why do hon. gentlemen not smarten up? Listen to the people, never mind putting the open line brigade on, the Tory open line brigade they have now lined up. And then they come in and the Premier says, 'Did you hear the programme on CBC? Cross Country Check-Up or whatever it is. After stacking it the night before, after calling the Tories around the Province to call in, block the lines, he comes in and says, 'Boys, was that not great? I am a hero. Look at what the people think of me'. And they all pound on their desks over there like trained seals, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: They are more to be pitied than blamed.

MR. HODDER: Some of them made seven phone calls.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I know somebody who made seven phone calls to that programme to block the line and tell the Premier what a great fellow he was. Mr. Speaker, it is shameful! One thing the people of this Province were worried about on April 6th, 1982 was that with such a large majority, with such a large mandate, the administration might become dictatorial and arrogant. And I ask hon. members if they can see any evidence of that in the House today? All the people in the gallery who sat here today, all they had to do was to look down: Every time the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who is supposed to be a respected man and a man of stature, a man who leads the people, when he made a snarky remark or did a little muck-raking, Mr. Speaker, all hon. gentlemen and ladies over there would pound their desks. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not an indication of the arrogance!

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

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

MR. CARTER: How much time does the hon. member have left?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I rule there is no point of order but I will indicate by message how much time the hon. member has. There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is another example of their arrogance, how they try to stifle debate in this House, how they try to muzzle the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that every major town and city, every community and village in Newfoundland except one is in serious economic trouble today. And I have been hearing rumours about that one, which we are told had substantial losses last year.

MR. HODDER: The Premier said \$14 million.

MR. NEARY: The Premier stated \$14 million. I have been trying to check it out with the company and they tell us the Premier's figures were wrong. I hope they are wrong. Every town and every village and every settlement, Mr. Speaker, is in trouble. And do we hear the problems of the people in these communities debated in this House, or do we see childish squabbling and arguing and fighting, Mr. Speaker? Is that what we see day in and day out? Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I have to say that I have been absolutely disgusted by the performance of the administration there opposite since this session started.

We intend to make it a hard-hitting session. I like lively debate, I like hard debate, I like a little banter back and forth across the floor; I do not like rowdy sessions, but I like banter back and forth, I like good humour and wit and I like a good speech, one thing, Mr. Speaker, I have learned to appreciate in this House, and I am into my twenty-second year as a member. I like a good debate, I like a good argument but, Mr. Speaker, out of these discussions and these debates must come something constructive. And the constructive things that come out of debate and talk and discussion and recommendations and ideas and suggestions in this

MR. NEARY: House, what comes out of debate is something that is good for the people. But, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House can only argue and put forward recommendations and suggestions and ideas. We are not in a decision-making role. It is the administration there opposite who make the decisions, who make the policies, who implement the plans.

MR. CARTER: Do not shout now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot help shouting. As far as I am concerned, this is a very, very emotional matter. I see too many people, I talk to too many people day in and day out, I get too many letters and phone calls from people, Mr. Speaker, who have problems that would make the hair stand straight on your head. It is frustrating. I am sure anybody who serves the public today, any member of this House, any clergyman, any member of a council, any member of a union can tell you the same thing. It is so frustrating, Mr. Speaker, that we do not know which way to turn. You can sympathize with these people, how long? How long will they accept sympathy? How long will they just stay there and you say, "I am sorry boy, I am sorry for you but there are 90,000 other unemployed Newfoundlanders like you." These people want answers. These people want to know what their leaders, what their administration, what their government, is doing for them. Where are the plans? I am going to ask hon. gentlemen when they rise in their places from now on, do not make fools of themselves like the Minister of Fisheries, especially ministers.

If the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is asked to get up and do a hatchet job on the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the hon. member should resist the temptation and get up and tell us what plans the administration that he is supporting have to deal with the problems of the people of this Province. What plans does the administration have to deal with the problems of the inshore fishermen who we are told are almost bankrupt because they have lost real income in recent years. No more income from squid, no more income from

MR. NEARY: herring, very little income from caplin, no increase in the price of fish, while the cost of operating their vessels, the cost of gear, the cost of insurance, everything gone sky high, through the roof.

MR. BARRY: A drop in lobster and salmon prices.

MR. NEARY: A drop in lobster and salmon prices, and we are talking about - how many thousand Newfoundlanders are we talking about? - 40,000 Newfoundlanders. My hon. colleague rightly pointed out yesterday there is not a home in Newfoundland that is not affected by the fishery. We are all experts on the fishery. You will not find a Newfoundlander who is not an expert on the fishery, Mr. Speaker. And why should we not be? We survived on the fishery for 500 years. It is the primary producers in this Province who pay for education and pay for health and pay for our salaries here. It is the little, lowly fisherman who does that, because he generates the new dollars. He is the primary producer. The primary producers are the loggers, the paper makers, the fishermen, the miners, Mr. Speaker. They are the ones who generate the new dollars, and they have been completely ignored.

Mr. Speaker, this government has been so preoccupied with oil and gas - they have had oil on their brain. Oil for their breakfast, oil for dinner and oil for supper, they have been so preoccupied with oil that they have ignored our other natural resources.

MR. NEARY: They have neglected the fishery, our most basic industry, a renewable industry I might add, that employs so many thousand Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker. They have ignored it. And we have been telling them for three or four years, by the way, in this House, do not ignore the fishery; we have said do not put all your eggs in the offshore oil basket. How often did I say that in this House, Mr. Speaker? Now the offshore ship is passing us by. Two courts, the Newfoundland Appeals Court and the Supreme Court of Canada, said you do not own it, you never did own it, you did not bring it into Confederation and yet, despite that, we hear the present Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) and the Premier day in and day out take to the airwaves trying to con the Newfoundland people further, trying to fool our voters again, saying the big bad wolf in Canada, in Ottawa, is trying to take our resources. What resources? The hon. gentleman says we brought it into Confederation and they are stealing it. Two courts, three Newfoundland judges of the Newfoundland Appeals Court says it is not so, and the Supreme Court of Canada, the highest court in the land said it is not so. But does the hon. gentleman accept that and get back to the bargaining table and start negotiating? No, we are going to keep on fighting, he says, we are going to keep on fighting, shadow boxing as they have been doing for the last several years. We are going to keep on fighting and ignore the fact. And the hon. gentleman will say it. I hear him. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe it, but I suppose he has to say it to prop up the morale of the Tories out there who are too ashamed to admit that the policies of this administration are wrong. They chose to ignore the two courts say you did not own it,

MR. NEARY: it is not your resource, you did not bring it into Confederation. Despite that, the hon. gentleman still goes on the radio and television and says they are trying to take our resource that we brought into Confederation.

MR. YOUNG: Is Joey's placque still out there?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, even if Mr. Devine and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) succeeded in separating from Canada, even if they succeeded in separating from Canada we still would not be able to claim the resource because we do not own it. The courts told us that before Confederation we owned three miles outside of our coast - headland to headland, three miles. The Government of Canada gave us the 200 mile limit. It is sad, it is pathetic, it is designed merely to fool the people and distract from the real issues and the real problems facing the people of this Province. And what are the problems? Let me repeat them again. Record unemployment -

DR. COLLINS: You are looking for a headline, now.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not looking for a headline, Mr. Speaker. When I stand in this House I do not need a headline. Record unemployment, a high cost of living, a high cost of electricity, the highest taxes in Canada, the highest gasoline prices in the nation, and Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on. But what hon. gentlemen will say, but we need this restraint programme because we cannot balance our budget. I say to hon. gentlemen there opposite that that is negative. What we need is positive thinking. People out there need something upbeat. They need an upbeat speech, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: the kind of one I made
on Province-wide television.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: They need an upbeat speech.
They are tired of this doom and gloom and fighting and
squabbling. I hope hon. gentlemen do not think the people
out there are not fed up and angry and tired about all
of this.

MR. TOBIN: They are going to show
how tired and angry they are in the next election.

MR. NEARY: Well, unfortunately, they
have to wait another two or three years, because the
Premier has time on his side. He can call the election.
But the people are pretty - Mr. Speaker, they should
have been over last night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, I am not going to get
into that. No I am not going to get into it. Mr. Speaker, the people
need something upbeat, they need some positive thinking,
some positive and constructive ideas for a change.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) the open line
programme (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yesterday. Absolutely out
of this world. Yes, excellent. Mr. Speaker, there they
go again. Mr. Speaker, let me show the House again. Here
they are down in a hole again, they are playing children's
games, talking about Open Line programmes.

MR. NEARY:

They are worried about their pictures and their images and their popularity polls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may we have silence?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: They are more concerned about popularity polls, whether their hair is in place when they are having their pictures taken than they are about the problems of the people of this Province.

What the people need is positive thinking, not negative thinking. The Throne Speech was negative from cover to cover, Mr. Speaker. It was negative and will do nothing to help the people of this Province. We saw the administration here give up a right to control Eastern Provincial Airways. Three years ago, this administration had the right to decide the future of Eastern Provincial Airways and three years ago they gave it up. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of a Liberal administration in this Province who financed on more than one occasion Eastern Provincial Airways. As a matter of fact, I was in the administration that gave Eastern Provincial Airways the money to buy Maritime Central Airways so they could merge and we could have a regional airline. We were as keen as mustard about that airline. But, Mr. Speaker, did we give these guarantees and loans and financial assistance without laying down some pretty stiff terms and conditions? And the terms and conditions we laid down were these, that two representatives of the Newfoundland Government would be on the board of directors, and that no decision would be made to change the shares or to move Eastern Provincial Airways without the approval of these two representatives of the

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland Government who were the representatives of the people of this Province. Now, who gave that away, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about giveaways? Who gave away that right for the final say? Who gave away that right to decide what would happen to Eastern Provincial Airways? And, Mr. Speaker, when the time came, in the crunch, what did they do? In the crunch they started to blame Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have silence, if you do not mind.

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

MR. NEARY: In the crunch, what did they do? They started to blame Ottawa again, when in actual fact, Newfoundland Capital Corporation is a Newfoundland company registered under the laws of this Province. And if they wanted to find out about the finances of Eastern Provincial they could have set up a commission of inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act to do it.

MR. CALLAN: Right.

MR. NEARY: The people of Gander will remember that, Mr. Speaker.

And what about Labrador City when they sent down their task force of public servants? What did they do? It was cruel what they did, Mr. Speaker. They decided to give the people down there who wanted to move, a moving allowance, but the string attached to it, the stipulation was that they had to move first and get paid after. And it is still the same; I have the Lieutenant-Governor's warrant right here in front of me. They have not announced any change in it. These people down there cannot afford to move. They cannot afford to move their trailers. They are economically marooned and

MR. NEARY: they are crying out for help, as other people throughout the Province are crying out for help, and they are not getting it.

Mr. Speaker, we have very, very serious problems, we have major problems.

DR. COLLINS: That is totally untrue.

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

It is in the Lieutenant-Governor's warrant that I have in front of me. People have to move first and they are paid later, unless there was a change made

MR. NEARY:

to the Lieutenant-Governor's warrant that I have here in front of me, tabled in the House yesterday by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), Mr. Speaker. And now to add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, we saw tabled yesterday and announced in the public media, an increase in the ferry rates throughout the Province. Our policy on this side of the House regarding provincial ferries is that they should be an extension of the highway system, they should be free. That is our philosophy, Mr. Speaker. The ferry between Bell Island and Portugal Cove should be an extension of the provincial highway system, just the same as the Gulf ferry across the Gulf should be an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway; just the same as we should have a four lane highway across this Province and you would be able to drive right on to your ferry and go across with no charge, or a very nominal charge.

MR. WARREN: Gasoline only.

MR. NEARY: Gasoline only.

MR. TULK: It should not be a privilege, is a right.

MR. NEARY: It is a right. It is not a privilege, it is a right. It is a right for the people of Bell Island. Let me look at it here. In 1988-1989 the people of Bell Island -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, 1988-1989, People are now paying fifty cents, fifty cents one way on the ferry, that has been in force now for, I would say, about fourteen or fifteen years. When I was the member there I would not allow the rates to change because, Mr. Speaker, it is an economically marooned community. And, incidentally, I might say beforehand, previously, when changes were made in scheduling and rates, you had to go to the Public Utilities Board. No Public Utilities Board this

MR. NEARY: time, an arbitrary decision by the Cabinet to increase the rates.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I wonder if I could just interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition for a minute.

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: According to our Standing Orders on Thursdays not later than 5:00 the Chair has to announce if there are any questions for the Late Show. There is one question asked today by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with regards to layoffs in the public service.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in 1988-1989 people will be paying on the Bell Island ferry \$1.25 one way. It is now 50 cents. Do you see what they are doing? That is a 150 per cent increase. Do you see what they are doing, Mr. Speaker? You know, they told us a couple of years ago, in an election, that there would be no increase in taxes. Well, what they have done, they forced town councils to invoke the property tax, which is causing quite a fuss throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, quite a fuss, causing mayors and councillors to resign in a lot of communities; they have upped the school tax that should be abolished, they have upped all of the licence fees. A few years ago they put a dollar on the licences for picking up scrap cars. Mr. Speaker, the dollar is still on but they are not picking up the cars. The moose licences have gone up. Every permit, every licence, even your birth certificates, marriage licences, everything gone up. So they are saying we did not increase taxes except the retail sales tax—they drove that up to 12 per cent, and put up the gasoline tax.

MR. HODDER: That goes up automatically now.

MR. NEARY: It is automatic now because they have it built in. There is a built-in increase in price. And, Mr. Speaker, now they are going to put up the ferry rates. Now listen to this. In Fogo Island, Fogo Island where you have the co-ops struggling, where you have primary producers feeding the members of this House, generating new dollars, paying the bills of public servants and public services in this Province, what will happen in Fogo Island, Mr. Speaker, in 1988-1989? The present rate for trucks, and this will increase the cost of living on Bell Island, Fogo Island, all the other places where you have a provincial ferry, the present rate is \$20.00, Mr. Speaker, for a truck to Fogo Island in 1988-1989, \$40.75, a 100 per cent increase.

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to Bell Island again, a place that I am very familiar with. Mr. Speaker, listen to this, Bell Island, no industry, the hon. gentleman ignoring the plight of the people over there - I had a gentleman in to see me

MR. NEARY:

this morning crying out for an election so that they can change the member over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOYLE: I will look forward to seeing you next time around.

MR. NEARY: I did not hear the hon. gentleman get up yesterday and protest these increases in fares. I read a letter in the paper this morning from the Commuters Committee, Mr. Speaker, listen to this: Bell Island, Mr. Speaker, where you have people who are struggling for survival, who have been downtrodden and depressed since the mines closed; trucks - \$12.50 at the present time, 1988/89, \$19.50. Now that is going to really help the people of Bell Island. It is going to drive up the cost of living, Mr. Speaker. But this is the kind of policy that we are getting from this administration. We are not getting plans and ideas and recommendations and programmes to broaden the Newfoundland economy because, Mr. Speaker, if you want to balance your budget, if you want to eliminate the deficit that you have in current account you have to create new business and industry, you have to broaden your economic base, you have to get new sources of revenue. You do not sock it to the people like the administration is doing now. That is not going to solve anything down the road. We have to get an agreement with Quebec and get the Lower Churchill developed, get the contract on the Upper Churchill re-opened, get some new dollars from that source, get the five rivers in Newfoundland, the hydro potential of these five rivers developed. You have to build a four-lane highway across the Province to create jobs for people. Bring the hydro power to the Island of Newfoundland and use it in Labrador to create business and industry, low cost electricity. Business and industry is crying out for it. Mr. Speaker, you do not travel throughout the world with your briefcase and insult

MR. NEARY: people and say, 'Look, if you come to our Province you will come on our terms'. We have to be prepared to attract business and industry to this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS: And be prepared to give it away.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, sure, Here is the argument, Mr. Speaker, We are not going to give anything away. As sure as I am standing in my place here today we will hear that said again, we are not giving anything away. But what do we do? We do not have confidence in ourselves to negotiate and bargain and out-fox and out-manoeuve the people we are doing business with. Are we saying that we do not have the ability to negotiate, no confidence in ourselves? So we lay back and we let the water from the Lower Churchill flow into the Atlantic Ocean, and we let the Trans-Canada Highway be a death trap; it was not built for these tractor trailers and the heavy traffic we have on it. They give away ferries, that is for sure. And I just gave you an example of a giveaway of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, we have to use our creative minds, we have to use our imagination, we have to develop our natural resources. We have in Labrador the largest storehouse of wealth left in the world today. Labrador, I believe, was only mentioned once in the Throne Speech and then only in passing, Mr. Speaker. Was there any reference to a Trans-Labrador Highway so we could get at these resources? No, Mr. Speaker, there was not. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is about time -

MR. CARTER: It is time for you to sit down now.

MR. NEARY: - that the administration, ministers when they are speaking in the Throne Speech debate and in future debates in this House should stand in their place and articulate government policy. They should tell us,

MR. NEARY: and in telling us, the House, tell the people what plans they have to help people cope with the major problems that are facing them today. What plans do the administration have to create employment for young people who should be working right at the crucial time in their lives, when they should be furthering their career? Instead of that, Mr. Speaker, we are developing a race of people to survive on unemployment insurance and welfare. The whole Province has been turned into a welfare state. There was a time when the unemployed who would come to see us were new entrants in the workforce or people working in construction who needed your help to get a job on construction.

MR. NEARY:

a job on construction. Is that so today, or, Mr. Speaker, are we getting people who have been hit for the first times in their lives? The middle-class people are losing their jobs and they are the ones who have always paid the bills. And, Mr. Speaker, we have to pay attention to the immediate problems of the fishery in this Province, otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that we are going to have a very, very bad year in the fishery.

I am concerned about the slowness in restructuring the deep-sea fishery. They cannot even agree on a name for the company. I suppose we will get agreement on a Chief Executive Officer, now that the provincial minister and the federal minister are kissing cousins. Perhaps now they will agree on a Chief Executive Officer and get moving.

MR. HISCOCK: And get the Northern Development Corporation going.

MR. NEARY: And get the Northern Development Corporation established and get an agreement for the fishermen and for the plant workers throughout the Province. I am proud to wear this Unity '84 button, proud to wear it. Mr. Speaker, we are not handmaidens of Ottawa like the hon. gentlemen there opposite. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) used to always love to use that phrase. The crowd over here he used to say, are the handmaidens of Ottawa. Who are the handmaidens of Ottawa now? When it comes to Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, protecting our rights, fighting for Newfoundland, we are prepared to cut across party lines. We will denounce when the occasion presents

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And he went on to say that if they were to continue this it would be totally to their peril, they would be wiped out in the next election and that they would be getting up and denying the God given birthright of Newfoundlanders, the right to ownership of offshore minerals.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the operative part, there is a slight difference of opinion between the hon. member and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), because the Leader of the Opposition was saying that never would the Opposition, when it came to what was in the best interest of Newfoundland, be in any way influenced by the Liberal Party in Ottawa. But as the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) pointed out, "Mr. Speaker, they" - that is the members of the Opposition - "they are so intimidated by Mr. Trudeau and their federal counterparts in Ottawa, they are so subservient to Mr. Trudeau and the federal Liberals in Ottawa that they are afraid to challenge, to attack their colleagues in Ottawa when they come out with a deliberate attempt to take away the birthright of the people of our Province."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, obviously things have changed somewhat since. I am not very aware that the policies or position of the Opposition has changed, but obviously the policy and position of the hon. member has changed. So it is really quite an incongruity when we hear the Leader of the Opposition saying that they do not make any reference to the position of Ottawa when it comes to standing for what is right for this Province, and yet we have their newest colleague pointing out that they are so subservient to their counterparts in Ottawa,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: subservient to Mr. Trudeau,
that they are afraid to challenge them and to attack
their colleagues in Ottawa even when they come out with
a deliberate attempt to take away the birthright of
the people of our Province.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would certainly think the people of the Province are going to be extremely confused on what the position is on this particular matter. As I have said, it was only because that was the closing sentence or two of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that I wish to refer to it so that I would not forget it. Since I recalled that quotation of the hon. member, which he made speaking in this House, I thought it would be a good idea to draw it to hon. members' attention at this time.

Mr. Speaker, people of Newfoundland, and indeed this Legislature, are now in a very important position for the Province. We in Newfoundland, and all of Canada, are suffering from a recession; we in Newfoundland like other parts of Canada, wish to maintain our integrity, our way of life. We wish to have optimism, we wish to go forward and we have to ask ourselves what are the basic foundations on which Newfoundland can progress. As the Speech from the Throne points out, since 1980 -

MR. CALLAN: If it was not for the Liberal government in Ottawa, I do not know what the provincial government would do.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I am not sure what is wrong with the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). Will somebody give him a Tum because I think he has indigestion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Since 1980 there has been an increase of 62 per cent in expenditures by this Province in education, health and social services. There are those who will argue that that is much too much for these areas of human development or social development, that we have to spend all of our money, or a great deal more, on natural resource development. Of course, the problem is we have

MR. OTTENHEIMER: to spend money in both areas.

In the final analysis I think the human resources are the greatest riches of a Province, of a people and certainly it is incumbent upon a government to do everything reasonable and possible to develop the human resources of a Province. But obviously to do that there has to be a strong economic base. I do not think anybody would suppose that in the next four years, that is from 1980 to 1984, that in the next four years Newfoundland is going to be able to increase by 62 per cent its expenditures on education, health and social services, that would obviously be impossible. So we have to strengthen the economic base, and certainly the most important way of doing that is through a resolution with respect to the offshore, not only to have money for our people, for education, for health, for social services, for senior citizens, for handicapped people, but also money for roads, for water and sewerage, for so many of the needs of the people because Newfoundland is still, has been since 1949 and is still today, behind the national average of Canada in terms of services and facilities, 'way behind the national averages in terms of income, 'way ahead of the national average in terms of unemployment, 'way ahead of the national average in terms of taxation burden. Everything that is negative we have more of, the things that are positive we have less of.

MR. CALLAN: That is because of a Tory government.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is a treadmill unless there can be found some way to break out and to accumulate the money to bring us up to the national average.

The Tum over there is not working. I believe perhaps the hon. gentleman needs something a bit more effective.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have to try to

MR. OTTENHEIMER: identify a way in which Newfoundland can come up at least to the national average. I do not think anybody has ever maintained that we have to be the richest people in Canada, that we have to have the greatest per capita incomes in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite, the hon. gentleman from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is really undergoing a most serious deterioration because he keeps on mumbling and jabbering and he goes on and on and on and he is not looking well. The hon. gentleman really is not looking well at all. He is babbling on over there ever since 3:00 p.m.

MR. CALLAN: You are looking well.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. gentleman was most upset when I referred to what his newest colleague had said about the Opposition a couple of years ago. When the hon. member heard what his newest colleague had said about him then, he did not like it, and now it has given him an attack of verbal diarrhea and mental dysentery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If the hon. gentleman could stop babbling!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I wish to remind all hon. members in the House that the hon. minister has the right to be heard in silence and if this right is not recognized I will have to discipline some hon. member.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind a sensible interjection, but to have somebody babbling total inanities on and on and on? If the hon. gentleman wishes to babble on all by himself, he can get up and make his speech and then sit down. It is one thing if somebody is saying something sensible, even provocatively sensible, even not sensible, but just to babble on and on continuously is really most annoying, especially when the hon. member is right opposite you. And all the hon. member is saying is, I should lose weight, I should lose weight. The hon. gentleman's contribution to this debate is that I should lose weight. He may well be right, but surely the hon. gentleman did not get elected from Bellevue in order to come into the House to make that point.

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

A point of order, Mr.Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward):

A point of order. The

hon. member for Port au Port.

MR.HODDER:

The point of order is I

just wonder why it is that since this House opened we have not heard one single thing that has anything to do with the Throne Speech, which is supposed to deal with the economy of this Province, the Throne Speech which is suppose to be the direction that the government is giving this Province. On this side, Mr. Speaker, every speaker has addressed the problems of unemployment, of layoffs and the problems throughout the Province. That side, Mr. Speaker, has done nothing only attack, not one concrete word, just reading little memos. What is wrong , Mr. Speaker, with the government side of the House? Why is it all of a sudden there are no policies? Why is it all of a sudden they have nothing to say except innuendo? Even the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) , Mr. Speaker,whom I respected,is up and there is no policy. Can he tell us about the Supreme Court case? Was our legal case sound or was it not? These are the things we want to hear.

MR.MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER:

Order,please! To that

point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR.MORGAN:

To that point of order.

The hon. gentleman obviously was not in the House when his own colleague spoke in debate,because in both cases so far, the first speaker, was soley involved in personal attack, and the second one is along the same line. He did

MR. MORGAN: not address any issues, any policies. Now what my friend and colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), is doing is trying to put forward quite clearly what our policies are on different issues, on the offshore in particular, but he is being interrupted by the member from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) constantly. He is trying to explain what our policies are versus what the policies are over there. What policies? They have no policies on the other side. So what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, on this point of order is if the hon. gentleman from Bellevue would stop interrupting my colleague, the Minister of Justice, and give him a chance to explain our policy, which he was doing, this issue would not be raised on the floor of the House now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

To that point of order, I rule that there is definitely a difference of opinion.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: You know, I do not particularly mind interruption and that type of thing, but it is very disconcerting, especially when someone is right opposite you. If the hon. gentleman were in a different part of the room - but, I mean, it is a continuous babble. That is what it comes down to, it is just a continuous, running babble. It is not an interjection with a question or a witty remark or even a provocative remark or even saying, Go to hell! It is just a continuous babbling.

So I would ask the hon. gentleman to stop. I do not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he speaks and I rarely interrupt anybody except with a question or something. But really, it is very difficult to speak under those circumstances. And I am so sensitive on the matter of my weight that I was going to cry when you mentioned it! I was going to cry! But I will get over that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I only have six or seven minutes today so I obviously will have an opportunity tomorrow to get into what I consider to be the main part of what I wish to say, and that is not going to be extremely lengthy either. So I will stick to something of a preamble this evening.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: As I was saying before, we obviously, in this Province, have to find a way of making a breakthrough from the position that we are in, and that we have been in since 1949, and that is being at the bottom end of Confederation and of being 'way below the national average in terms of those things we want and of being above the national average in terms of those things we do not want, such as cost of living, high unemployment, etc. We have to be able to break through that in order to be able to continue to finance our educational establishments, our health facilities, our social services, our assistance for handicapped, our senior citizens, in order to be able to build roads, install water and sewerage or whatever it happens to be, and also in order to have sufficient money to invest in our renewable resources, which can go on for an eternity. The hydrocarbon resources, as plentiful as they are, and the great amount of money that they are worth, there is a time when they will be no more. So we do have to have money to invest in our renewable resources and the proper harvesting of our fisheries and, certainly, our forestry resources.

In order to do that, obviously, the offshore resources are the one logical, stark, striking opportunity that Newfoundland has, it is certainly arguable, and it may well be that it is the only one. People would hope - and I am not getting into the Upper Churchill - but one would hope that there can be benefits there, but as things are, it is the only one, and there is an enormous potential wealth there for Newfoundland and the people of this Province and, under an appropriate sharing agreement, enormous potential wealth for everybody else.

In the final analysis, the solution to the difference of opinion will have to be by

MR. OTTENHEIMER: an exercise of political will.

MR. WARREN: Right, on both sides.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is no doubt, on both sides.

And we have to look and see what has been the traditional Canadian way of doing things, because, presumably, history has some significance for the future. Hon. members are aware of what happened in the 1930s with respect to the resources in the Prairie Provinces, and it was not through any court action that Alberta and Saskatchewan and Manitoba got control of their resources, it was through negotiation, through an act of political will. Now, obviously, the same is the appropriate answer for the offshore resources here, it has to be through an act of political will. Now, one can say, well, of course, the resources here are offshore rather than onshore, and that is a fact, that they are offshore rather than onshore. Most people recognize that geographically

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

an underwater extension of the Continental landmass. That is what it is, an extension out under the ocean, under the salt water, and it is all part of that Continental margin so it has a very integral relationship with that part of that margin which is above water, and that is Newfoundland. So the question must be asked, why politically is there such a refusal on the part of the federal government to recognize the same principles which are valid with respect to the same hydrocarbon resources onshore, why such an unwillingness to recognize the validity of the same principles offshore?

MR. NEARY: Is there anywhere in Canada where they do recognize offshore resources?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is an area in Canada where they recognize underwater hydrocarbon resources -

MR. NEARY: Oh, no! Oh, no!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - but they are under fresh-water, Now what is the difference in fresh-water and salt-water apart from the fact that one is fresh and one is salt?

MR. NEARY: There is a lot of difference.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Not at all. It is very, very evident. It is very logical. Under Lake Erie in 1913 what is believed to be the first offshore development of hydrocarbon resource, in this case it was gas, was developed.

MR. NEARY: But we do not own the lake.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, we do not. Lake Erie is an international waterway, it is under both Canadian and American jurisdiction. There was no argument with the federal government on that. Ontario had been benefitting from the development of that resource since 1913 or 1914, whatever year

MR. OTTENHEIMER: it was. It is generally thought to be the first offshore development of a hydrocarbon resources. The hon. gentlemen are so determined that Newfoundland should not have a case -

MR. SIMMS: Right on! Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: -that they cannot even stand to listen to somebody who endeavours, not in a partisan matter, but who endeavours to develop an argument for it, because this argument has been put forward to other provinces and they generally agree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But the Opposition is so unwilling to even listen to any argument which is favourable to Newfoundland's case that they are putting up the argument of Newfoundland's opponents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Why not just make an act of imagination and say for half an hour I will try to be pro-Newfoundland, for half an hour I will act as if I would hope that Newfoundland would get a fair, equitable deal, not as a beggar but as an equal partner in Confederation. But when one endeavours to point out -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - what the arguments are and to see if there is any sympathy, any understanding, any desire to bolster Newfoundland's position, one runs directly into a stone wall and all that is done is to oppose those arguments. It shows almost a constitutional make-up, and I do not say this gladly, but it shows almost -

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will adjourn until tomorrow.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It has been noted that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has adjourned the debate until tomorrow.

It being 5:30, of course, we do have one question for the Late Show, a question asked by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) lapdog.
MR. HODDER: Now, now. That is not right. Mr. Speaker, I just rose in my place and I was accused of being a lapdog. Mr. Speaker, the decorum on that side of the House is just not fit.

MR. NEARY: It leaves a lot to be desired.
MR. HODDER: We just heard from the Minister of Justice, the man who lost Newfoundland's case in the Newfoundland Appeals Court and then in the Supreme Court of Canada with some of his great ideas and arguments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the question which I asked today, and the reason that I served notice I would like to debate it again, is

MR. HODDER: because of the manner in which the questions that I asked today were answered by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

First of all, Mr. Speaker, if you were to take an overall impression of the Minister of Finance today, you would have the impression that he knew nothing about any details of any layoffs in anything because they were not directly under his jurisdiction. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the House that the Minister of Finance is not as naive as he appears to be because he hides the facts under a veneer. He is one of these very few people who will hide facts in a veneer of naivete.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier went on television in a very emotional or somber address, I call it the glorification of desperation in my private member's resolution, to tell the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that he had a number of choices; one was to freeze salaries of public servants, the other one was layoffs. And he mentioned layoffs over and over again. Let it never be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that when the Minister of Finance says that he does not know what is going on financially as far as layoffs are concerned, he is the man who is managing the economy of this Province.

MR. NEARY: He is the President of Treasury Board.

MR. HODDER: He is the President of Treasury Board. He is the person who is managing the cutbacks in this Province. And his answers today are a disgrace to any Minister of Finance. He did not have the fortitude to give us the facts. Now we know, Mr. Speaker, that there have been reclassifications, we know there have been more reclassifications than necessary. We know of cases where reclassifications were done on a blanket scale throughout the civil service. Every member of the Opposition, like the members on the government

MR. HODDER: side of this House are hearing about layoffs, people who are being laid off throughout the public service now in the Department of Transportation and in the vocational schools. We only got to talk to a cleaner under a contractual basis, perhaps, but due to the minister's restraint programme they are losing their jobs whether they are in the public service or not.

MR. NEARY: They are laying people off with five or six or seven years service.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, on the one hand we have the government hiring its friends. Any person who can hear what I am saying will know that you can walk anywhere in the civil service and find government appointments all over the place. On the other hand, not only do we have political appointments but we have more evidence of the Minister of Finance's mismanagement of the economy in that he has done the easiest thing, he has just drawn a pencil and said, 'Here is where we will get our money, we will freeze civil servants'. He has made no study to see what the dampening effect will be on the economy. And, Mr. Speaker, the questions that were put to the minister today were not answered. I would ask the minister again to stop this game of fraud. I would say to the government, I would say to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that it is a mug's game that is being played. While people are being laid off across the Province, the official position of the government is that there are no layoffs. Now that will blow up in the government's face and the minister knows it

MR. HODDER: will blow up in the government's face because they know it is happening and the ministers should -

MR. SIMMS: Come on! Tell us!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if I could speak without interruptions from the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms).

MR. SIMMS: Your time is up.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker will let me know when time is up.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker is much more competent than the former Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the government has shown that they have no ability to manage the economy. At the present time the civil service is an unhappy group of people. The government has never, in its series of cutbacks, not once has it sat down and looked at the problems that face the Province and the best ways in which to recoup its money.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time of the hon. member has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, you know, the subject we are debating really is so ridiculous that it should not engage the attention of the House. I mean, the hon. member did not bring forward one single fact to back up his case. He said, "We know they are doing this. We know there is reclassification on a blanket scale." I am not even sure what a blanket scale

DR. COLLINS: is. I know what a high scale is, and a low scale, what is a blaket scale? A spread out scale, is it, all over the place? I do not know. But anyway he did not bring forth any evidence to back up his case, He just made a statement, he just made a claim, so it is hardly worthwhile debating it. However, I will go down over the points he made.

The first point he made was my hon. colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) lost our offshore case. Our hon. Minister of Justice did not lose our case. Our case was lost in 1949 because the Supreme Court of Canada interprets our Terms of Union one way, entirely different from what the Newfoundland people interpret it. The Supreme Court of Canada interprets Newfoundlanders as going into the Canadian Confederation as colonialists. They said we had no offshore rights whatever, even if they were there we would not have had them. We were colonialists. I do not think there is a single Newfoundlander who would consider himself a colonialist when we joined Canada. We considered our people as being members of a Dominion. And I think the people from this Province who fought overseas did not think they were colonialists in the British Army. They were fighting overseas as Newfoundlanders in Newfoundland regiments. And that is just one example. I do not want to wrap myself in the flag but I am saying that if the Supreme Court of Canada thinks that Newfoundlanders are colonialists they are out of step with the perceptions of Newfoundland people and I do not think the Newfoundland people will ever accept that interpretation of their status.

DR. COLLINS: So if the case was lost, it was lost because the Terms of Union were so poorly drafted - and I have said this before in a public forum - the Terms of Union were so inherently defective that the Newfoundland people were really misled at the time. They were not told that, "You are reverting to a colonial status and you are going to join Confederation as colonialists." They were told that, "You are going to join Canada as a like dominion to Canada and you are going to bring all your rights as a dominion into the Canadian Confederation."

MR. WARREN: All wrong. All wrong.

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

DR. COLLINS: If they were misled in that understanding, it was due to the drafters of the Terms of Union, and I would like to point out that one of the architects of the Terms of Union was a long-term leader of the party opposite and he himself and his associates in the Liberal Party bear a very serious burden that they would allow the Newfoundland people to be so misled when they joined Confederation that they had -

MR. SIMMS: Right on. A good answer.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port on a point of order.

MR. SIMMS: Using up the time of the minister.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, when I introduced my few remarks, I did make one reference to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). Now the question was on layoffs, specific questions, and I was complaining about the fact that the minister has not answered. The

MR. HODDER:

fact that the minister does not answer, will not answer and has now spent something like four minutes, Mr. Speaker, speaking about justice matters in this Province should verify my point.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I apologize. I was misled. I was so outraged by the hon. member's remark against my hon. friend here that I really was carried away and I apologize.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) rose on a point of order and I think he was trying to state that the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was not being really relevant to the questions that he asked. Maybe that is so. Having said all that, with points of order being raised the five minutes allocated to the Minister of Finance has now expired.

It has been moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 10:00 a.m. Those in favour 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'Nay'. Carried.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 16, at 10:00 a.m.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
TABLED
THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1984

*Tabled by Minister
Responsible for Petrol
Directorate, 15 March 82*

In the House of Assembly

March 14, 1984

Questions

2. Mr. Barry (Mt. Scio) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Energy (Responsible for the Petroleum Directorate) to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Details of any complaints the Directorate has received since January, 1980 concerning inadequate safety regulations on offshore oil rigs and supply vessels off Newfoundland's east coast.

Reply

The records of the Petroleum Directorate disclose no complaints concerning inadequate safety regulations prior to January 13, 1982.

On January 13, 1982 the Petroleum Directorate was notified of an alleged fuel oil spill between the MV Nordertor and the drilling unit Ocean Ranger on or about December 31, 1981.

The incident was investigated by the Petroleum Directorate and it was found that a minor spill (2.5 barrels) occurred when the fuel line parted while transferring fuel from the MV Nordertor to the drilling unit Ocean Ranger.

On January 14, 1982 the Petroleum Directorate received a copy of a letter addressed to the Honourable William Marshall, Minister of Energy from Mr. Stephen A. Neary, M.H.A. Lapoile District. The letter inquired into allegations of a 1000 gallon diesel fuel spill into the ocean around October 4, 1981 from the drillship Ben Ocean Lancer while drilling off the west coast of Labrador for Petro Canada.

These allegations were investigated by the Petroleum Directorate. The investigation disclosed that there was a discharge of approximately 1-1½ barrels of diesel fuel during a drill stem test on October 3, 1981. The diesel fuel overflowed onto the drill floor and into the moonpool where agitation and evaporation caused the fuel to quickly dissipate.

August 9, 1982.

In its Annual Brief to Government on August 9, 1982, the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour raised several concerns about the adequacy of offshore regulations, the need for full-time inspectors, placement of matters concerning the occupational health and safety of workers on offshore oil rigs under the responsibility of the Occupational Health and Safety Division of the Department of Labour and Manpower, etc.

The Petroleum Directorate addressed each point raised by the Federation of Labour in detail and the response was included in Government's reply to the Federation of Labour.

On April 21, 1982 the Petroleum Directorate received an anonymous call stating concern over the level of safety on the drilling unit Zapata Uglund. The Petroleum Directorate contacted Mobil Oil on April 22, 1982 regarding these statements and on April 28, 1982 an inspector from the Petroleum Directorate visited the rig and found everything to be in order.

On August 23, 1982 members of the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour met with officials of the Petroleum Directorate and the Occupational Health and Safety Division of the Department of Labour and Manpower to discuss specific concerns regarding the recently enacted Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Drilling Regulations, 1982.

On December 7, 1982 the Petroleum Directorate received a letter from Mr. Stephen A. Neary, M.H.A. Leader of the Opposition expressing concern over supply vessel/drilling unit collisions and, in particular, a recent occasion where the MV Nordertor bumped the Sedco 706.

The Petroleum Directorate replied to Mr. Neary outlining the measures that have been implemented to prevent such occurrences and certain steps contemplated in order to minimize the risk of such occurrences. Details of specific incidents of supply vessel/drilling unit collisions were also included.

On December 22, 1982 the Petroleum Directorate received a letter outlining several recommendations for improvements to rescue equipment installed on supply vessels as a result of the provincial government's winter drilling guidelines. The letter also outlined several concerns regarding the training that the crewmembers of the supply vessels had received in the use of the equipment.

The letter generally commends the course that was offered by Medicor at the Health Sciences in conjunction with the College of Fisheries but suggests that the training should be longer and more intense, particularly with respect to the medical aid training.

These concerns have been brought to the attention of the operator and the Petroleum Directorate has been assured that these concerns will be addressed.

In January, 1983 the Petroleum Directorate was advised of concerns expressed by individual rig workers concerning the condition of the cranes on the West Venture. The cranes were alleged to be old and subject to frequent mechanical failures and constituted a safety hazard. The Petroleum Directorate was advised by DnV, the rig's certifying authority, that the cranes were not considered a safety hazard. The cranes were later inspected by a crane specialist.

On January 11, 1984 the Petroleum Directorate, through discussions with oil rig workers, was advised of several concerns about the Sedco 710. Workers expressed concern over incidents and accidents that had occurred, including:

- A mooring line failure during a severe storm;
- Lifejackets and survival suits stored at the lifeboat station for on-duty personnel found to be frozen into their containers during Christmas week; and,
- One sheave on the lifeboat davit found to be frozen during an abandon ship drill at about the same time.

These reports have been discussed with the operator. In the case of the mooring failure, anchor chain has been replaced. Remedial measures are to be implemented to deal with the other problems.

3
ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 4, dated MARCH 14, 1984
REGARDING OVERTIME WORKED AT NEWFOUNDLAND AND
LABRADOR HYDRO
=====

*Terminal stations
maintaining a reliable
electrical system
for the Island
and Labrador
15 Jan 84*

During 1983 the total amount of overtime worked by employees of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro amounted to 70,070 hours.

This work was associated with maintaining a reliable electrical system consisting of (i) the Bay d'Espoir hydroelectric plant; (ii) the Upper Salmon hydroelectric plant; (iii) the Hinds Lake hydroelectric plant; (iv) the Holyrood thermal generating plant; (v) the Hardwoods gas turbine; (vi) the Stephenville gas turbine; (vii) 2,800 kilometers of transmission and distribution lines; (viii) 42 separate diesel systems on the Island and in Labrador; (ix) 25 terminal stations; and (x) related administrative support.

The total amount paid in overtime was \$1,218,110 which represented 4.5% of the total payroll for that year.

March 15, 1984

*Tabled by Hon.
Responsible for the
Petroleum, 15/3/84*

In the House of Assembly

March 14, 1984

Questions

4. Mr. Barry (Mt. Scio) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Energy (Responsible for the Petroleum Directorate) to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Details of the steps the Province has taken to ensure that cement manufactured in Newfoundland and Labrador will be of sufficient quality to be used in the possible construction of offshore concrete platforms in this Province for use in oil development off Newfoundland and Labrador

Reply

The cement requirements, both in terms of quantity and quality, necessary for the construction of a Hibernia gravity based platform, can be supplied by North Star Cement.

Government in its ongoing consultations with the oil industry have been advised of the volumes and quality of cement required for the Hibernia development. Government officials have met with officials of North Star Cement to review this subject and are satisfied the company can meet these requirements.

In addition, Government has been recently advised by one of the partners in the Hibernia field that a study by an independent consultant, which it sponsored, concluded that North Star Cement has the capability, in terms of both capacity and quality, to supply the needs of the Hibernia development.