

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.  
FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1978

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries thirty grades IV, V and VI students from the Pentecostal school in Brown's Arm, Stanhope, in Lewisporte district. These students are in St. John's on an exchange visit with Vaters Academy of St. John's and they are accompanied by Mr. Melvin Bell, Mr. Norm Austin and Mr. Rice. I know all hon. members will join me in welcoming them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: I rise to present a petition on behalf of seventy-seven residents of the community of Fleur de Lys. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is simple and it is asking that the remaining forty or fifty homes in the community be hooked up to the water and sewer system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the water and sewer system was began in that community some five or six years ago back, around 1971 or 1972, and since that time well over \$1 million was spent on installing a water and sewer system to serve the community. Those homes and the petitioners in this petition were on the original plan when the plans were drawn up and approved and the original financing began for the project - those homes were to be included in the water and sewer project for the community. In fact, Mr. Speaker, access to homes were blasted some three or four years ago and they are still sitting there with the rocks piled up in the air. Roads are still torn up and so on. It is a mess in any account, and of course the sad part of it all is that forty or fifty homes in the community still do not have water and sewer services despite the fact that well over \$1 million has been spent

MR. RIDEOUT: on the system. As I have indicated, the system was engineered, designed and so on for the whole community and funding had been provided for three or four years in a row but these two years, since 1975, Mr. Speaker, no funds at all have been spent on completion of this system. So the system is there about three quarters complete; three quarters of the community has the service and the other quarter is still waiting and no funds have been forthcoming for this past four or five years.

I would like to say also in supporting the petition, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that the design was drawn up for the whole community and estimates done on that particular project, that as far as I am concerned this is another one of the examples where consulting firms have been ripping off this Province for the past eight or ten years when it comes to water and sewer projects.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: There are consulting firms in this Province that should be -

AN HON. MEMBER: In jail.

MR. RIDEOUT: That should be in jail, to use the expression of my hon. colleague. They have ripped off communities right, left and center in my district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you referring to A.B. Walsh?

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not mind saying that I am referring to Gorman Butler in this particular case, Mr. Speaker. They have ripped off communities right, left and center in my district and I am sure -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been called.

MR. WINDSOR: Notwithstanding the fact, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is hardly qualified to discuss the capabilities of engineering firms in the Province; he is entering into the realm of debate, Sir.

MR. RIDEOUT: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I doubt

MR. RIDEOUT: if the hon. member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) is qualified to talk about the water and sewer system in Fleur de Lys and I submit I am supporting the petition without debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear that there is a difference of opinion on various gentlemen's qualifications with respect to engineering and not being one myself I would hesitate to make a decision. However, the second aspect of the hon. gentlemen's point with respect to entering into debate was a valid one and I point out to the hon. member that he may not enter into debate.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, it is an ill wind that blows no good

MR. RIDEOUT:

because we have now found the defender of the consultant firms in the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is quite clear. Those people are asking for the basic service to be hooked up to the water and sewer system that is already there. I table the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo followed by the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague. Sir, the same thing has happened in the petition which he referred to as happened in Musgrave Harbour in the district of Fogo, and people there are under the same impression that too much monies were paid to the consultant engineers and not enough left to complete the water installation in that community.

AN HON. MEMBER: There should really be no need to come into St. John's about water.

CAPT. WINSOR: Well, this is the point, Mr. Speaker. I can only refer to it as it applies to Musgrave Harbour. And at Musgrave Harbour when the installation had taken place there was absolutely no supervision from government. Now the representative of government, as I understood it, was the engineer himself. You know, it is like having a court in hell, as they say, and the devil your judge. And this is why that water system was not completed: There was no supervision by government. So, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. minister is concerned. I am sure that this is not the first time it has been brought to his attention, and will be, I would say, in future. Because there are a lot of people suffering today because of mismanagement of funds. I am not prepared to say here who mismanaged the funds, but the blame I am placing here goes to the government for not properly supervising the installation while it was taking place. I support that petition, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: I rise to support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and although I suppose it would be natural, or some people would consider it to be natural for me to just pick on the government because of lack of management, as my hon. friend indicated, but the fact is that there are times I am convinced that maybe the Minister of Municipal Affairs through his officials, or Highways, or whatever department is concerned, have in fact given contracts to consulting firms, have paid out good public money, and they have been led down the garden path. What they have done is they have paid the money - I cannot knock a minister for this, because I know there are times when they have fallen into one heck of a trap. And I am sure some ministers - I know, in fact, that they have thought about it and talked about it privately, and in some cases, I believe, have taken some action against it. This is not to say or to suggest that all consulting firms or all engineers are bad. That is nonsense. We are not trying to do that in any way, shape or fashion, but what I am saying is that I would hope that if there is a consulting firm that has been awarded a contract by any department of government, whether it be municipal, federal, provincial or whatever, and they have done a lousy job, in fact they have been negligent in their charge, that there should be some second thoughts given to giving them any more work -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: - to paying them any more money. It is wrong. I mean, we are smart enough apparently to whip into some poor little welfare recipient if that is out of line. How can we have this double tier standard that we have? Is it a fact that those who have the money - the cash and the firms, I mean - that they have another form of justice? And as long as we let them get away with this because they are allegedly so-called professionals - I mean, there are professional crooks too.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out to the hon. gentleman that he is straying somewhat from the prayer of the petition

March 10, 1978

Tape 120

EC - 3

MR. SPEAKER:  
water system.

which requested the completion of a

The hon. member.

MR. WOLAN:

I certainly thank you very much,

Mr. Speaker. All I am saying is that I am not merely jumping on the government on this. It would be easy, I suppose, to say that in this particular water system, but there have been cases of systems put in the ground, they have been dug up - it is beyond the shadow of a doubt, other experts, other engineers will tell you it has been the fault of the engineering and the consultant. And what I am

MR. NOLAN: saying is that no action in many cases has been taken. I do not knock the minister in this regard. What I am hoping is that he will pay close attention to the prayer of the petition and that he will not stand by and let any consultant get away with taking the people to the cleaners.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just to say a few words on the petition and to talk to some of the remarks that were made by some hon. members opposite. Certainly I cannot say whether Fleur de Lys will be done this year, completed this year or not. We will have a look at that. The Capital Projects Committee in the department will look at that and make recommendations and hopefully it will be one of the ones that will go forward, but I cannot speak to that at this point in time.

With respect to consultant firms, just to clarify some of the, maybe, misconceptions that some hon. members may have, consultant firms are basically appointed by the town councils. In other words, they make a recommendation to me and the contracts that are signed are between the consultant, or the town, and the construction firm. So the town would make a recommendation to me as to whom they want for consultant, even though in some instances I may not like it. One firm, for example, may be getting too much work. Their competence is such that everybody wants them.

MR. NEARY: I know all about these.

MR. DINN: Some firms, for example, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Metro Engineering.

MR. DINN: It is not a consulting firm and that is before the courts and you were ruled out of order on that yesterday. And if you do not know the rules of the House at least abide by the one rule that says that you should sit in silence while somebody else is speaking.



MR. DINN: So just to clarify the point, the consultant firms are appointed basically by the town councils.

MR. NEARY: That is right -

MR. DINN: And until we change the legislation -

MR. NEARY: - but approved by you.

MR. DINN: Well certainly, anything that is done by the councils are approved by the minister, but I have often gone back to councils and made recommendations and they have come back to me and said, "Under no circumstances. We want such-and-such." And that is the one they got. And obviously then they have to put up with what that consultant firm does. But the majority of consultant firms in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, are excellent firms. They do an excellent job for government and there may be one or two that do not quite measure up.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River has yielded for the hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Just a brief comment, Mr. Speaker, on the petition and the comments made as well; I want to disassociate myself as a member of this House of Assembly with the statements made that consulting firms, some of them, should be in jail and they are professional crooks. I do agree that, as my colleague just mentioned, that some of the engineering work done on water and sewer work by some firms is better than other firms. And therefore it may be a future consideration to look at the possibility of grading these consulting firms as to who is the best and who is the worst. But I take strong exception to statements being made that they are crooks, and they are professional crooks and I take strong exception to statements being made that they should be in jail. I heard that statement and I want to make it clear that at least one member of the House of Assembly disassociates from these kind of statements.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to enter into the realm of debate on this issue here. I would like to support the prayer of the petition for the completion of the water and sewer system in the community in my friend's district. But as a couple of points have been raised I would like to point out on the Labrador Coast, talk about consulting firms, there is one community of over 300 people in which in the last three years, four years, a consultant firm has charged or has been involved in the water and sewer project in excess of \$3 million. \$3 million for a community of 300 people to put in a water and sewer system in which only this Winter, after \$3.5 million actually, have been spent by these companies involved in the project, a humus toilet has now been installed in the people's homes in this community. And if this is not ripping off! It may not be crooked but if it is not then it is getting pretty low that this amount of money -

MR. MORGAN: Makkovik.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, that is right, the community of Makkovik. And heretofore I never got involved in it because I feel that water and sewer which is highly important in these communities in the North where it builds up, and there has been some things gone wrong, there has been a lack of supervision. The consulting companies were not appointed by the community

Mr. Strachan: or the town. It was done through some involved and strange procedure a number of years ago, but I suggest that the ministers and my friend, who is looking for the completion of his project, should look into these kind of situations very carefully before we get into more of them and find that it will cost in excess of \$3 million for every small community in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to rise to support the petition presented by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), and to indicate that I am fairly familiar with the community and with the project that he mentions and that is mentioned in the prayer of the petition. And I am aware that at the beginning, in the first couple of years of that project, there was all kinds of problems dealing with the design and the way the project was handled. Because simultaneously with that development at Fleur de Lys there was one at Nipper's Harbour which in the initial stages ran into the same kind of problems, I think the same engineering firm was involved.

There are four points involved here, Mr. Speaker, which are worthy of note. One, there is a grading system that was instituted in the Department of Municipal Affairs as it relates to consulting engineers two or three years ago, which therefore inspects, supervises all consulting engineers in the Province that do water and sewer work. That is in place, and all consulting engineering firms are being graded as to their competence given the history of their work on particular projects around the Province. Number two, there has been court initiated on a number of projects where there has been demonstrated by the council that inadequacies and incompetence is rampant either on the contractor's part or the consulting engineers' part.

Let me mention, Mr. Speaker, just the case in Placentia is one that has gone to the courts. Let me mention that two other communities in which there was a fair amount of evidence about lack of supervision or lack of proper work, Whitbourne and Port au Choix, where

Mr. Peckford: hundreds of thousands of dollars additional were extracted both from the consulting engineer and the contractor, who had to go back in and do additional work.

The fourth point is that Makkovik was a federal project, and it is only since the Province took it over that we have been able to make some sense out of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the prayer of the petition, Sir, so ably presented by my hon. colleague the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) on behalf of his constituents in the community of Fleur de Lys who are complaining about the water system that is in place but only three-quarters working. That is the way I understand it, and that is right. One-quarter of the system is not working.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend who just rose to support the petition, who just took his seat, the present Minister of Mines and Energy, when he was Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing undertook at our insistence, and I was one of the ones that kept pounding at the minister, the minister undertook to do an investigation of all consulting engineering firms in this Province to see if they were ripping off the department. Now I was hoping that the minister when he rose to support the petition, because of the remarks made by my colleague about the consulting engineers, would tell us what the results of that investigation were. Perhaps the present minister can tell us, either in supporting the petition or maybe later on.

But there is a problem, Mr. Speaker. There is a very serious problem. You have a whole list now of communities including Fleur de Lys where water systems have been put in place and in one incidence, I believe down in Placentia, you have a sewerage system that is after costing over \$1 million, and I do not believe there is one house hooked on to it yet. I would like for the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) to get up and support the petition, and tell us what happened down in the hon. gentleman's community of Placentia. Then we had it in Port au Choix, we had it down in-

MR. PECKFORD: Port au Choix and Whitbourne.

MR. NEARY: We had it over in Whitbourne, we have it down in Torbay, we have it down in Pouch Cove. Mr. Speaker, the thing is getting out of hand, getting completely out of hand, and it is a very serious problem. And the hon. minister is wrong when the hon. minister says that the council are the ones who recommend the consulting engineers. The council recommend consulting engineers after getting a number of gentle hints from the department.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, they do not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know wherein I speak. I was on a town council for twelve years,

MR. PECKFORD: That is wrong.

MR. NEARY: over twelve years, Sir, I spent twelve years as a member of a town council that we did a lot of water and sewer projects and every time, Sir, in every instance the consulting engineers were hired after the department indicated what consultants they wanted to work on the job.

MR. DINN: Recommended by the department, accepted or rejected by the council.

MR. NEARY: Well there you go now! That is not what the minister said a few minutes ago. The minister left the impression that the town councils took the initiative, when in actual fact it is the minister's department that takes the initiative.

MR. DINN: Not true.

MR. PECKFORD: No, it is not true.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the minister just told us.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I have to point out to hon. gentlemen on both sides that debating the method of appointing consultants is quite clearly outside the subject matter of the petition, which is a water system in Fleur de Lys. So I would ask hon. members not to continue at this moment the debate on the method of appointing consultants.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Unfortunately part of that water system in Fleur de Lys, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that because of the goof by the consulting engineers it will now cost the residents - if it is remedied, if it is rectified, somebody has to pay for it and it will be the unfortunate people in Fleur de Lys.

MR. PECKFORD: The government that you were a part of appointed those consultants to finish, by the way.

MR. NEARY: Appointed what consultants?

MR. PECKFORD: The ones in Fleur de Lys.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when did that water system start?

MR. PECKFORD: Consultants were appointed in 1970-71.

MR. RIDEOUT: It started in '72, I think.

MR. NEARY: It started in '72. My hon. friend says the system started in '72. I would question that very much. I would question that very much.

MR. PECKFORD: Consulting engineers were appointed in '71.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was in government for three and a half years, Sir, and I do not remember one case, one instance, of where a sewerage system was put in, for instance, like the one in Placentia, and not a house hooked onto it. Or the system in Fleurs de Lys breaking down, only three-quarters of it working. I do not remember one case. But we have had a whole list since this hon. crowd formed the government back in 1972, on January.

MR. PECKFORD: There was no work done prior to that.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the prayer of the petition and I hope that the hon. gentleman will be successful in getting that situation remedied and that the real culprits will be the ones that will foot the bill and not the people of Fleur de Lys.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition. I can well appreciate the frustration the people from Fleur de Lys must have with a system that is three quarters completed. But I must, Sir, take exception to the remarks made by the hon. member; as a professional engineer I think I was lumped in there with his remarks as well as anybody else that he spoke about.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The hon. gentleman might be able to find a way of getting those remarks in and he might not, I do not know. But a frontal difference of opinion is of the very essence of debate and I would remind the hon. member he may not enter into debate.

The hon. member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I regret that this debate took place because it is clearly outside the prayer of the petition. However, I did want to make that point I take strong

MR. WINDSOR: exception and if the hon. gentleman has a complaint to make in relation to a particular firm, then I suggest he lodge that complaint with the Association of Professional Engineers in this Province, who would very happily look into that matter for him.

MR. MURPHY: Fair enough.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition, and I certainly can appreciate the position he finds himself in, representing that district.

In 1974 a water and sewerage system was commenced in Placentia and over probably \$700,000 spent and the thing is not working. It is highly unlikely it will ever work. And I would like to say that the consultants for that project were the children of the Liberal Government, Gorman Butler. In 1968 they started and in 1974 their plans were completed and the job started in the spring of 1974. Now it is in court. The bonding company, Dart Construction, for the contractors went broke, Gorman Butler -

MR. NEARY: Are you going to blame the tidal wave on the former administration too?

MR. PATTERSON: No, but I would not doubt that you possibly would. That is not the wave that brought the Liberal Party back to power.



MR. DECKFORD: I do support your petition there and I hope that it will be put back in operation.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Sir. I would like to ask the minister what is being done about the North side of the Argentia naval station. I understand there are a large number of people interested in establishing fish plants and other industries on the North side of that base but they cannot get any satisfaction from either the provincial or the federal governments. What is being done to get the North side under control of the Province and/or the Government of Canada to get it out of the hands of the Americans so that long term leases can be entered into with these people who are interested in establishing industry in Argentia?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, we have an interim agreement with the Government of Canada on part of that facility in Argentia. The main area right now of concern and contention is the large building that we hope to convert to a cold storage facility. That is a proposal that is now being considered by the Department of Economic Regional Development for assistance. The Government of the United States has never had any hang-ups or compunctions about turning that property over to whomever is decided to be the proper recipient. The problem has been in trying to identify to whom it should be turned over. This frustrating struggle has been going on at least four years' since I was in Industrial Development, and prior to that when the American authorities indicated their desire to turn this property over to another jurisdiction. The Government of Newfoundland felt that it should have some input into its disposal, as indeed is the case in Stephenville and Pepperrell. The Government of Canada had some

MR. DOODY: reservations about this. Some departments were a great deal more co-operative than others but I am happy to say that the thing is now coming to a point of realization and we should be in a position soon to do something constructive with these buildings before they are beyond hope of redemption and they do become obsolete and useless to anybody.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. minister tell the House if the government are still employing a security service to protect property and buildings that we do not own on the North side of the base? And if so, would the minister indicate if public tenders were called for that security service? If public tenders were not called, would the minister tell us why public tenders were not called?

MR. DOODY: There are Public Works employees there.

MR. NEARY: Well perhaps the minister - Public Works employees? Well my understanding, Mr. Speaker, was that it was a private investigating security company.

MR. DOODY: No. There was an interim period when things were deteriorating out at Argentinia at such a rapid rate that the member for the district and others brought it to our attention that if something was not done very quickly, that irrespective of jurisdictional responsibility there would be nothing out there to do anybody any good. We had to act very quickly so on an interim basis there was a private company hired to put some caretaker staff in place. Subsequent to that, and within several months of that date, as I remember, the responsibility was passed over to the Department of Public Works and their employees are now the security staff at Argentinia. That may not be absolutely correct in detail as to the months or whatnot but that is the general substance of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Fogo followed by the member for Eagle River.

CAPT WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I may have to preambule this question a little.

Capt. Winsor: Three or four years ago people started to settle on the centre part of Fogo Island, and since then there has been a controversy going on between the councils on Fogo Island, namely, the Council of Fogo, the Council of Joe Batt's Arm, the Council of Seldom, as to who should have the control over the developing of that part of Fogo Island. Now I understand that representations have been made to the minister as to who should have control. I wonder if the minister will tell the House now whether or not he has made a decision or where does the matter stand now? And if there is any decision made, who would get the control?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have a few boundary disputes in Newfoundland today. In this case the department set up a commissioner to go out and have a look at the problem, and he has made recommendations to me. The commissioner's report has been received by me. I had a look at it, and the report basically recommends that the central part of Fogo Island be controlled by Urban and Rural Planning in my department. I do not think that that is quite possible. So what I have done is I have sent my regional manager from Gander over, Mr. Wilson Weir, to have a look at the situation, and to make some more recommendations. I have the option of course as minister to either - well, I have accepted the report of the commissioner, but to approve of his recommendations or not - in this case I do not feel that Urban and Rural Planning here in Confederation Building in St. John's can control development of the central part of Fogo Island. So I have asked my regional manager to go over and have a look at the situation, and to talk to some of the people over there.

I would certainly welcome some recommendations by the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, on anything we can do to fix the situation over there. Certainly, hopefully, we will come up with the right conclusions, but we have not arrived at what the right conclusion is as yet, and it may take some more time.

CAPT. WINSOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, perhaps, as a suggestion to the hon. minister, one way of dealing with it would be to have a plebiscite among the people directly involved; let them choose, you know, who they would rather go under the control of, whether it is the Town Council of Fogo, Joe Batt's Arm or what have you. That is the suggestion I would make to the minister, to set up a plebiscite there and let the people choose rather than go in and say you are going to go with this one or that one. Then it will be their voice, who would have the better knowledge of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent suggestion, and I will certainly take it under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that I would recognize the hon. member for Eagle River next.

MR. STRACHAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I kind of slept on the rules in the last while.

Mr. Speaker, I watched the opening of this hon. House on television in Nain, and I watched the Premier make his speech. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy concerning that. The Premier has stated, it is an obvious statement, that the Gull Island project is almost totally dependent on finding a user for the power; especially if the power comes back to the Island or is held within this Province, then a fairly heavy industrial user will have to be found. That is a fairly obvious statement. I am asking the minister this: at the moment we are trying to find users for power in this Province, especially for the Gull Island project, why is it that this Province then is pursuing so heavily a course with Quebec on the Upper Churchill of wanting to recall more power rather than ask for our fair and equitable value in money for the resource?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: I think the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) has his wires crossed interpreting government policy as it relates to access to Upper Churchill power. The course that

MR. PECKFORD: we are presently pursuing is one to gain additional value for the power that is presently being sold in the interim. And in the long term there is a court action underway to try to get additional recall back which would be some time in the future. So that therefore is a two or three pronged attack, and not one that solely relies upon recall and hence no more money.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a change in attitude compared to last year because I remember in this House last year when we advocated trying to get the fair and equitable value.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman was recognized to ask a supplementary, which is a question arising out of the previous answer, and I believe he was getting prepared to debate the previous answer.

MR. STRACMAN: Could the minister then indicate whether this is a change in the attitude by the administration since last year? At that time, they did indicate that what they were looking for was total recall of power rather than looking for value in money and that our attitude on this was a heretic attitude - they attacked us on this - and I am wondering whether this is a changed attitude then from last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, there is no change in attitude from last year, but there is a change in the interpretation, in the way the hon. member sees the situation.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

Just before the hon. gentleman asks the supplementary, I have been informed that we have twenty-six Grade VI students from the Goulds Elementary School, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Thistle, and I know hon. members would wish to welcome them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: In reference to the Gull Island question as posed by the hon. member, I am wondering where it stands at the moment in view of the remarks, I believe, either in the press or the House of Commons in Ottawa by Mr. Crosbie, the member for St. John's West, that Gull Island would never go ahead. Now where does it lie at this moment? I mean, is this the position of the government at the moment provincially, or the minister, or what is the current position?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Crosbie is a member of the House of Commons for St. John's West and, therefore, reflects in his statements and questions in the House of

MR. PECKFORD: Commons the views of himself as well as that of the federal P.C. Party of Canada and, therefore, no way necessarily reflects the view or policy of the Government of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Fear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the original questioner, then I recognize the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. STRACMAN: Could the minister indicate whether at meetings which have been held or meetings which will be held with the members from the Province of Quebec, an indication will be made by this Province that a resource taxation possibly will be applied to the Churchill Falls power in order to try to regain our fair and equitable value of the power? Will this be indicated to them, and will it be indicated to them in a fairly strong and a fairly tough manner as we indicated and was the position of this party in the House last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: I consider it irresponsible for me to try to indicate to this hon. House today the kinds of alternatives that we will be exploring with the Quebec delegation today, but rather, just to indicate to the hon. House that we will be insisting upon fair and equitable return on all matters dealing with Labrador power, and then, in due course, we will be informing the hon. House.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower. In the Speech from the Throne there is some reference to government's concern about strikes in the public service. I am wondering whether the minister is in a position to inform the House as to whether or not he can tell us anything about the government's intentions in this matter, some more specifics on what the legislation might be, or just what the government's intentions are?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. BOUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, from time to time, new acts that have been passed in the House and gazetted have to be

MR. ROUSSEAU: changed to some extent, and presently government is looking at some changes or contemplating some changes in respect of the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act. One of the changes is not the question of whether strikes will be outlawed or not in the public service, and I do not know how that was read on the statement that was there. Maybe the statement is ambiguous - that is possible - but at this point in time, government



MR. ROUSSEAU: Is not considering the abolition of strikes in the public service, but there are some changes being contemplated in the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: In these changes that the minister is contemplating, is there any effort to involve the people that are concerned, the unions, or is it just the intention of government to railroad through these changes?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, yes, there will be, as there always has been. That is not to say that either side, or both sides, may be happy with the changes that are there. Certainly their views will be elicited. The government will give consideration to their views as government did with management and labour in the Labour Relations Act, the new Labour Relations Act. That is not to say that they are going to be completely happy for labour's point of view or from management's point of view, but certainly their views will be elicited.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for Port au Port, followed by the hon. gentleman for Lewisporte, and the three colleagues sitting behind him.

MR. HOJDER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. the Minister of Education. Did the minister or the government make an agreement with the other nine provinces indicating that they would provide French language instruction in Newfoundland, and if so what was that agreement? What were the details?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there has been no general agreement. What had happened at the First Ministers Conference, the Ministers of Education were asked to look at the state of minority education

MR. HOUSE: in each of the provinces. This was done and we did a survey, for instance, for Newfoundland and passed back to the First Ministers.

The general agreement is, and there is nothing written on it yet, that where possible and feasible, where there is a French minority in the Province, we will provide education in that language, the French language. There is no written agreement but I think it is just a generally accepted agreement where it is feasible and of course where we in the Province now have that going on in two places where it is feasible; in Labrador City, we have a French school there, and there is a French school in the hon. member's district, Port au Port, and that is an immersion school and it is developing year by year. It is up to about grade four now, I think, and it will become bilingual from there on, I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Does the minister intend to take steps to implement French language instruction in the communities which are most French, I suppose the communities of Mainland and Black Duck Brook in the district of Port au Port, which have no language instruction at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: This of course is originated through the school boards and we have not had discussions with regard to that yet. Of course if the school board is interested we will certainly hold discussions with them and see what can be done.

MR. SPEAKER: I indicated I would recognize the hon. member for Lewisporte next.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, and this of course would involve his dual role as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs as

MR. WHITE: well. Could the minister tell the House what the present status is with respect to negotiations with Ottawa re the five ferry services on the Northeast Coast, namely Change Island, Pogo, St. Brendan's, Greenspond, and of course the Green Bay service as well?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DOODY: The ferry services that are currently being paid for by the Government of Canada are an ongoing concern of the Government of Canada. They have been trying to rid themselves of that responsibility for quite a long while. The Government of Newfoundland has resisted that and will continue to do so unless we can get some sort of an arrangement with Ottawa that will be satisfactory to the Province in terms of the financial ability to carry the service at a level to which the people who live in these areas are entitled. And to that end we are still discussing the matter with the federal department.

I have had one very brief meeting with the federal minister, discussed it very quickly, talked

MR. DOODY: in terms of the agreement that the Government of Canada recently entered into with the Province of British Columbia on the ferry service in that area, and hopefully we will come to some arrangement that will be acceptable to both jurisdictions. As of this moment, Sir, there are no definite conclusions drawn or no definite arrangements arrived at.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate whether or not the federal government has threatened or given notice that it is going to cut off those services at the end of March of this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Well, they have indicated that they certainly have that intention, Your Honour. We have, as I have said, not accepted that; whether we will be forced to do so unilaterally remains to be seen. I would think that that is not the case. The attitude of the federal government appears to be one of co-operation and conciliation and I hope that we will be able to arrange something more satisfactory than the ultimatum which the hon. member refers to.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Could the minister indicate if the Bell Island - Portugal Cove ferry service is one of the services which the federal government is trying to buy its way out of?

MR. DOODY: As the hon. member is well aware, the Bell Island service is one that the federal government is most anxious to get its way out of, to buy

MR. DOODY: its way out of, as the hon. member refers to. It accounts for the major part of the bill that the federal government foots. The problem with the ferry service to Bell Island is not as urgent nor as imminent as the problem to which the hon. the member from Lewisporte refers to because the federal are hooked in there until 1985, anyway. I have indicated they would like to buy their way out; once again we certainly have no intention of going along with that unless we can get some sort of a satisfactory arrangement prior to the date that I just mentioned.

The Bell Island situation is somewhat different than the other ferries which were described earlier, as I said, because of the date and the arrangements that are now in place.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The original questioner.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware of the deplorable conditions that exist on Change Islands with respect to this service? And does he plan or the government plan to express a little more concern with respect to this problem, with only two or three weeks left to go?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: It is pretty difficult. I guess the best way to answer that is that the government is certainly aware of the deplorable conditions of the ferry terminals and the ferry situation on Change Islands. It has been a matter of concern for some time and it is one that has been brought to the attention of the responsible authorities, and it is one that was raised once again, as I mentioned, by me and it certainly has been raised many times by my predecessor. It is not one that has been

MR. DOODY: ignored or treated lightly; there is a great deal of concern and hopefully, the people responsible will share our concern and show something tangible toward remedying the situation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I have indicated that would be the final supplementary.

The hon. members for Conception Bay South, Baie Verte - White Bay, Stephenville, and Bellevue.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, earlier the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing in answer to a question on boundaries indicated there were some problems. One of the problems I am sure he is familiar with - it is difficult to believe there could be jurisdictional disputes in Paradise, but such is the case, and I am wondering if the minister has any new information on that and also, because there is an involvement with St. Thomas and the possibility of an election coming up there, I am wondering if the minister can bring us up to date on that total situation, not now, on Monday, on the whole thing.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I could bring the hon. member up to date on that thing, but I think the more appropriate place would be downstairs in the office or something, because it is quite involved. It involves the St. John's watershed, it involves St. Thomas, and it involves Metro Board so probably that would be more appropriate.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary then.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: I am just wondering if perhaps the minister could expand a little on when there will be an election, for example, in St. Thomas to satisfy the people down there who have made enquiries? I know you have made announcements and so on, I am wondering where the situation is? And as for the other matter, of course we can discuss it as he suggests.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, we have set up some people in St. Thomas for the election, the returning officers, etc. We need, I believe, one other person and we do not have that person as yet. So when that is done an election date will be set and away we will go, very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Jay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, and by way of a short preamble I am sure the minister is aware that a couple of nights ago the report of Dr. Irving Selikoff was presented to the provincial government. And one of the recommendations of the report was that certain roads on the Baie Verte Peninsula be paved to control the asbestos contamination.

The minister at that time, the Minister of Transportation, indicated that had he met with the Cabinet that would be done, and that engineering work would get underway this Winter.

I wonder if the minister could tell me whether or not in fact any engineering work has yet been done, and some sort of progress report, whether it is done, in progress, or how soon we can expect the engineering work to be completed and so on?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: There has been some engineering work done, Your Honour. I cannot tell the hon. member exactly how much or what degree of completion has been arrived at in terms of engineering and design. The hon. member is absolutely correct when he says that government recognizes the significance of the problem, the difficulty in the area. How much can be done in any given year

MR. DOODY: will be governed of course in terms of the actual physical ability to do a certain programme or a certain project in an area at a given time. We have asked the department to come in with a series of alternatives or proposals or options that we can study and get at as quickly as we can with a view to alleviating the problem. Hopefully we can do it all this year. If we cannot pave it all this year, then certainly we will have to try some alternate way of keeping the dust down in those sections that cannot be paved this year. As I say, it is an important and involved question and one that we are looking at very closely and carefully.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: In view of the fact that the government have accepted the significance of this problem, and I am very appreciative of that, I wonder could the minister tell me whether or not his department has in fact any plans for early tender call for this work on the Baie Verte Peninsula so that as soon as climatic conditions become favourable in the Spring this programme can get underway, without, you know, waiting until August or September to get going?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Well I would certainly hope, Sir, that we can get something started up there long before that. As I have indicated through you, Sir, to the House, a report has been requested from the senior officials in the department to supply us with the various options and the various patterns through which we can follow to bring the situation to a satisfactory resolution. Obviously that will have to be started whichever the options are accepted. We have got to make a start as quickly as we can and as early as we can. Until such time as we see exactly what the engineering detail is and what is involved in it, you know, it would be most improper to make a suggestion as to exactly when tenders can be called because I do not exactly know what the programme will be.



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville, followed by the hon. member for Bellevue; the hon. member for Port de Grave, time permitting.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Could the minister indicate to this House how long the consulting firm of Woods Gordon has been employed as selling agents for Labrador Linerboard? And what is their daily fee charged to this government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. DOODY: No, I cannot, Your Honour. It is a question I will have to take under advisement. I do not have that information at my finger tips.

MR. MCNEIL: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary.

MR. MCNEIL: Could the hon. minister take under advisement as well the total amount of monies paid to this firm in any work concerning the Labrador Linerboard from its beginning to now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It is an old question, and perhaps the simplest way to explain what I am getting at is to read an extract from a letter that I recently received.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: There is a specific Standing Order to the contrary that the hon. member may not read letters, telegrams in prefacing a question. So the hon. gentleman will have to get to his question via another route.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on at least two occasions a promise has been made by at least two former Ministers of Municipal Affairs and Housing that they will change the system whereby a person who lives in an unincorporated area and perhaps the Minister of The Environment is listening as well, a person who lives in Hillview, for example, which is unincorporated, he and his wife are paying - this is where the letter is from - he and his wife are paying over \$30 a year to have their garbage collected at Hillview under The Waste Disposal Act, okay? This gentleman works in Clarenville, he has to pay the service fee in Clarenville as well as the thirty-odd dollars in Hillview, the unincorporated community; his wife works in Come By Chance and she has to pay the service fee there as well. So here we have a family of two, a man and his wife, paying triple, triple taxes. As I say, I am talking to the Minister of the Environment, and of course, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and the Minister of Justice is not here, but it involves at least these three ministers. When is the minister going to change this stupid set up, this stupid law? As the minister is aware, I am sure, if I live in Norman's Cove, which is incorporated, all I have to do is pay my service fee there, and if I work at Long Harbour I take my receipt for my taxes that I paid in Norman's Cove, the incorporated area, take it to the Town Clerk in Long Harbour, and she says, fine you have your service fee paid.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman has asked his question.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to answer a question like that. First of all, Waste Disposal Committees are set up and they charge a fee for service; that is under the direction of my

Mr. Dinn: hon. colleague down there from Consumer Affairs and the Environment. Obviously if the people are working in Clarenville and it is a legal tax, and under the Local Government Act, I guess, they are doing it, Clarenville is certainly not breaking the law, We are looking at a new municipal government bill right now that hopefully will change, you know, make some of the changes that you are talking about. But right now the old Local Government Act allows a municipality to charge a service fee, and certainly if there is a Waste Disposal Committee in Hillview - if a Waste Disposal Committee is set up obviously the Waste Disposal Committee can collect dollars for a service.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one supplementary and then the hon. member for Port de Grave. That will be the final question.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, can the present Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and the former minister, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), can they remember me asking this question over the past two or three years? They indicated there was an obviously flaw in the regulations at that particular time and they were going to try and straighten it up immediately I was wondering what progress have been made in trying to straighten that regulation up so that we do not have double taxation, and in this case triple taxation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may? A Waste Disposal Committee has been mentioned, which is purely a voluntary committee and is formed for one purpose only, to collect the garbage that the people put out and to look after it. So basically what we can do about it I do not know. It is not ours, there is no funding in it, the people just collect from each neighbour to pay the costs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy. Could the minister indicate to the House, based on present estimated capital costs of the development of the Lower Churchill, at what rate this power would have to be sold to amortise the costs for the development of the Lower Churchill?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it would depend upon a number of factors and therefore any answer has to be one which is conditional upon what factor you are talking about. If you are talking about bringing 800 megawatts to the Island and selling the other 300, then you will have one fee that you can charge the consumers of the Province of Newfoundland. If you have all of it coming back to the Province, some of it being used industrially and commercially and other of it being used domestically, then you might have another rate. So it will depend upon how the development is carried out. The normal practice that we are following that you have an export of half the power, then you would be talking about somewhere in the range of twenty-five mills for the power here on the Island. But that is a figure which can change, based on escalation and the capital cost and based upon whether or not this split will be 300 and 300. On the traditional way of looking at Gull Island, and that is having 300 megawatts come back to the Province or be fed in Labrador and in the Island, and the other 300 being exported

MR. PECKFORD: at a reasonable market value price, then you are looking at somewhere in the mid-twenty range mils-wise for the power to the domestic consumer in the Province.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. PECKFORD: Orders of the day, Mr. Speaker. Order No. (1).

MR. SPEAKER: No. (1) the adjourned debate on the amendment to the Address in Reply.

Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to apologize to the hon. House for the condition of my voice today. I do not have laryngitis, Mr. Speaker. I consulted with my physician before I came into the House, the hon. gentleman on the opposite side, my own personal physician confirmed that I do not have laryngitis, that I have the flu that is on the go. It is not a result of my speaking yesterday for one hour and a half or so. But I hope the House will bear with me today if my voice sounds a little raspy, Sir, it is something over which I have no control. There is nothing I can do about it. My physician told me that it would take about a week before you get over the flu and there is nothing I could take today that would improve my voice. So hon. gentlemen are going to have to have to put up with the condition of my voice.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday before the House rose at six o'clock, before we finished the Late Show, Sir, I was going down the line and pointing out to the House and to the people of this Province examples of extravagance and waste and negligence on the part of the administration and the poor relationship between the Province and the Government of Canada. After I went outside the House somebody asked me if I could give a couple of illustrations, could I be more specific today. Well, Mr. Speaker, I might say just starting off though that I must of really gotten to the members yesterday because two or three of the members - and this seems to be well orchestrated - took to the radio stations in Central and

MR. NEARY: Western Newfoundland this morning to say that Neary is wasting the time of the House. Mr. Speaker, that is completely untrue as Your Honour knows. The duty of the Opposition in this House, Sir, is to get information out to the people. The people in the press gallery have a very grave responsibility of making

MR. NEARY:                           sure that information that is brought out in this House, especially if it involves extravagance and waste, scandals of one kind and another - and according to the 'phone calls and the things that are being dropped in my mail box these days there is probably another gigantic scandal on the horizon that as soon as the proper documentation is put in my mail box by some anonymous person who has been putting bits and pieces of paper there now, then I shall have to as a part of my duty and my obligation and responsibility as a member of this House, and it is the responsibility of any other member, to see that this information is brought to the floor of the House and then communicated through the media to the people of this Province. That is what we are here for, 'r. Speaker. We are not here, Sir, to be dummies. We are here to try to do a job in the best interests of the people of this Province. And as I indicated, 'r. Speaker, the press, the news media, the people in the press gallery, have a very serious and a very grave responsibility to make sure that information and things that are discussed in this House get out to the people, not only, 'r. Speaker, once in a while in the heat of debate - and fortunately it has not happened so far this session, except that the Minister of Tourism yesterday took rather personally something I was saying when I was talking about the minister's capacity as Minister of Transportation and Communications. And if you are a minister you have to be prepared to take criticism. And the minister got rather personal. But apart from that little personal, that little sour note that was interjected by the Minister of Tourism there has been no name calling, Sir, in this session of the House, no name calling to my knowledge. There was very little last year, and if there is any name calling, Sir, it is coming from the other side of the House and not from this hon. side.

MR. MURPHY:                           Read your own speeches. (Inaudible)  
The hon. member (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY:                           There were two  
of my young children sitting in the gallery one time in here, 'r. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, no! Not that again!

MR. NEARY:

- and I am going to tell it again because it should be on the hon. member's conscience to the day he goes to his grave.

MR. MURPHY:

(Inaudible) member's conscience - name was brought up (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, through brute force, Sir, I was suspended from the House for five days. It was purely political, it was partisan politics, Sir, because I accused the Minister of Finance at the time, the hon. Mr. John Crosbie, Esquire, of conflict of interest because he had been secretary of a company, Cadens, he had been secretary of that company that bought Eison Brewery out in Stehenville while he was Minister of Finance, and they forgave the social security tax and the tax on beer that was owed by that company, and I accused the minister at the time of conflict of interest. And as a result of my doing a job for the people of this Province, I got a five day suspension - brute force, majority carried in the House by the people on the other side. And while I was sitting outside the rail, Sir, with two of my children, visiting the public gallery, who do you think, Mr. Speaker, who do you think was the gentleman who got up in this House and made one of the most vicious personal attacks on me that I have ever seen made on an hon. member in this House? Vicious personal attack, pure venom! With two of my young children sitting in the gallery! And then that gentleman just points the finger across the House and said, 'Read your own speeches.' I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that that hon. gentleman read his own speeches.

So I hope, Sir, that the media -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are you talking about there,

'Steve'?

MR. NEARY:

I am talking about the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs, who is responsible for garbage in this



March 10, 1978

Tape 132

PC - 3

MR. NEARY:

Province and in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I would say those are wasted words.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would hope, Sir, that the gentlemen of the press will not be sucked in, even though some of them have been wined and dined in Europe in the best bistros, in the best hotels and the best

MR. NEARY: restaurants in Europe and North America, I hope, Sir, they will not be sucked in, that they will not only report every name calling of any kind that goes on in the House. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder what you have to do in this House. Do you have to get out in the middle of the floor and do a strip-tease? because that seems to be the only type of thing that is reported.

Mr. Speaker, the press have a very heavy responsibility to communicate to the people of this Province, to report, and I am sorry to say, Sir, that the reporting of the last few years has not been the best. Now some are good, some are bad. I will not get into names. Some are pro Premier. The Premier can do nothing wrong. My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, will get up and ask some pretty hefty questions in connection with the financial condition of this Province, and what happens? The CBC reporter will take the Premier out in the corridor, say, "Mr. Premier, is this true?" And the Premier will say, "No, of course it is not true." And then he will go on and make a political speech and then that is pumped out on the CBC that evening as part of the conventional wisdom of the Tory Party, as gospel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: No research done on it.

MR. MORGAN: Do not tell any lies.

MR. NEARY: No research done, hardly a mention of the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know whether the Leader was mentioned or not.

MR. MORGAN: Who is the Leader?

MR. NEARY: Sometimes they mention the people who ask the question, sometimes they do not. Out in the corridor, who do you see? The ministers propped up, high and mighty in front of the television sets, "Look, the Leader of the Opposition, the

MR. NEARY: member for Eagle River, the member for Conception Bay South asked you a question today about So-and-So, "Well what do you think of that?" "Oh, I think the member for Conception Bay South or Eagle River are full of baloney because it is not true." No research, they just accept that as being gospel. Is that the kind of reporting, Sir, that this House should be getting?

MR. MORGAN: Are you saying it is unfair?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt at all that before a question is put to a minister on the other side of the House that my hon. friends on this side do their homework. They have a fair idea of the topic of the information that they are trying to get, which they hope will be communicated to the people of this Province. They have done their homework. They have the information. But they never get a chance, they never, never, never, never get a chance, Sir, to let the people know because they are stymied by this foolish procedure that is followed, especially by the CBC. The private networks, you could understand them trying to cuddle up to the Premier to get a bit of advertising for themselves and that is why you hear these people saying, "Oh, Neary is abusing his privilege in the House of Assembly because he got unlimited time." I have no intention of taking unlimited time. I am going to take my time. I am not going to make a speech that conforms with somebody who is hosting an open-line programme. I am going to make my speech the way that I feel like it in accordance with the rules of the House, and Your Honour has ruled that I am in order. I am not out of order. I did not bully Your Honour. I did not bully Your Honour. I did not ask Your Honour for extra time. I only am speaking in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. Neary: And yet my hon. friends, my hon. friends this morning could not resist taking to the airwaves on another scurrilous personal attack in Central and Western Newfoundland. The Minister of Health usually does not resort to that type of tactic, Sir, but I must have really gotten to him yesterday when he took to the Open Line this morning in Central Newfoundland to again personally attack me. Well members on the other side can criticize me all they like for the amount of time that I take to make speeches in this House, and to bring out information, and I hope that I will bring out another bit before we adjourn today, and next week I hope to uncover a gigantic scandal if I get the proper documentation; if not that will be the end of it, as my hon. friend knows. I never shoot from the hip, I always have the information before I let her go.

And so I am going to make my speeches here the way that I want to make them, and not the way that the people who have been wine and dined in Europe and who have been converted, who would like to have a representative in both parties, one in the Liberal Party and one in the Tory Party, I am not going to conform to that, I am not going to fall into that trap, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would you permit a question?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will have all kinds of time to ask -

MR. MORGAN: Are you (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am saying, Sir, I am saying this, if the hon. gentleman will just follow what I am saying maybe it will filter through, maybe it will filter through, but what I said, Sir, and I will repeat it for the hon. gentleman, if the hon. gentleman wants to hear it. I can understand the private media, treading lightly, treading softly because of the favours, the little bit of advertising they get.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Could Your Honour ask the hon. gentleman to restrain himself, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG) Order, please! I must remind hon. gentlemen to my left that a member has the prerogative to be heard in silence when he is speaking.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: But the national television, Sir, the CBC, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that is suppose to be so fair and so broad-minded they should not have to kowtow the Premier or any minister of this House. The taxpayers of Canada are pumping a half a billion dollars, \$500 million into that Crown corporation, and we think that we should be getting equal treatment, fair treatment, that is all we are asking for. We are not asking for any favours, Sir. I never asked for a favour from a news media or a newsman in my life, and I never will, and if they do not feel like carrying my material they do not have to.

MR. MORGAN: Who is asking favours now?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, -

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am criticizing the procedure that is used in connection with the Question and Answer Period. The person who asked the question should have some rights. And that is why I am suggesting, Sir, that the television cameras, in order to clear this matter up, in order for the people to see what goes on in this hon. House, and it is not all bad, the television cameras should be brought in on the floor of the House, and the radio stations should be allowed in on the floor of the House. The hon. administration are afraid, they are afraid, Sir, to allow even a one month experiment with the Oral Question Period. They are afraid, they are too cowardly. The hon. gentlemen are too cowardly to allow the television cameras to come in and televise the Oral Question Period which is only a half an hour a day.

Mr. Speaker, the morning before last when I was driving up here I heard something that almost turned my stomach, and that was this gentleman who was wined and dined all over Europe coming out and

Mr. Neary: saying, Oh do not put the television cameras in the House because all you will see is Freeman White picking his nose. And that very same gentleman is the same gentleman who says, All they do up there is name call and attack one another personally, and character assassination. Well, what would you call that? What would you call that, Mr. Speaker? Trying to belittle my colleague from Lewisporte (Mr. White).

MR. NEARY: if he does not like the cut of his jib, let him say so. If he does not like his policies, let him say so. But do not attack people personally. And I hope the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) does not take my remarks about his incompetence as Minister of Transportation and Communications, and his row that he had with his counterpart in Ottawa, I hope the minister does not take that personally.

MR. MORGAN: Always stay out of rows with Ottawa. Always stay out of it. Fight for this Province! There should be more fighting for this Province, not crawling to Ottawa, begging to Ottawa. Fight for your rights!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can get back now to where I left off then yesterday because the hon. gentleman has interrupted me. I am not coming down - I want to make it clear, Sir, I am not coming down like a ton of brick on the media but I do hope that they will report, report, report the proceedings of the House, not rush in at a quarter to four and say, "Oh my God, I have got to have a tape done by four o'clock" without even sitting in the House and listening to the debates; rush in, cold off the street, get a minister up or grab somebody up, hurry up, get him up in front of the television camera - operating on a shoestring! - back to the station, and that night you get the proceedings, the report of the proceedings of the House for that day. Is that not something, Mr. Speaker? The report, probably about twenty seconds. And there are some very important things transacted in this House on both sides. All the bad fellows are not over there and all the good fellows are not over here. I would say we are pretty well divided. We have the good and the bad as far as debate is concerned, as far as bringing out information is concerned. All the good fellows are not on one side and all the bad fellows on the other. And I am not trying to lecture the press as to how they should do their job, but they should report more than just a snide remark that is made across the House at somebody, or an insult that is hurled at

MR. NEARY: somebody or a personal attack that is made on somebody.

My hon. friend is back in his seat now.

I perhaps will end up my few remarks on this particular aspect of my speech by again going back to the day I was sitting outside in the Speaker's Gallery there when one of the most vicious personal attacks ever made on a member of this house was made by the hon. gentleman with my two young daughters sitting up in the gallery.

MR. MURPHY: \$250,000 to get yourself elected!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the kind of information that I am trying to bring out in this hon. House, the kind of information is the kind of information that I hope that the hon. gentleman who is responsible for garbage will be able to provide me with.

MR. MURPHY: I have no control over you whatever.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. gentleman will be able to provide me with some information, and the people of this Province -

MR. MURPHY: Any you want.

MR. NEARY: - and the press with some information on Affiliated Marine Metals.

MR. MURPHY: The most communicative minister in the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Affiliated Marine Metals -

MR. MURPHY: I will have you over for dinner some day.

MR. NEARY: Affiliated Marine Metals, Sir, if hon. members will recall, was a company that was set up by two gentlemen by the name of Smith I believe, and Mulalley, Smith being a Torontonian and Mulalley being a Newfoundlander. Mulalley later, because I kept a record of the share list in the Registry office, for a long time Mulally did not show on the share list at all but eventually he did and the company was set up as a result of these two gentlemen meeting



MR. NEARY: on the Queen E II when the hon. the -

MR. MORGAN: And your good friend John Shaheen.

MR. NEARY: - when the hon. the Premier and the hon. Mr. Crosbie and the hon. Mr. Hickman and all the other ministers who are now condemning Mr. Shaheen and knifing him in the back took great pride in going down to Come By Chance at that great reception down there and the Premier officially opened the oil refinery at Come By Chance. So it was on the Queen E II that Mulalley and Smith met. And then they formed a company called Affiliated Marine Metals. And then they persuaded the government to put a dollar on all licences in Newfoundland so that that company could go around Newfoundland and collect car wrecks.

Now so far, Sir, I think I have been fairly factual, no innuendo, no personal attacks. No. That is right, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, we told sometime ago by the hon. minister that that company was no longer collecting car wrecks. I believe they were in financial difficulty according to the reports I read in the newspaper and the questions I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs in the last session of the House. But we are still collecting the dollar, we are still taking that dollar. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I paid my dollar, I paid my dollar, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: Give me the receipt for that dollar and I will give you the dollar back.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand the hon. gentleman is saying that they are no longer collecting that dollar and that all the people from whom it has been collected will be refunded?

MR. MURPHY: You give me a receipt for one dollar on behalf of car wrecks and I will give you a dollar back.

MR. NOLAN: You have raised the license fee.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the government raised the license fees. How dense is the hon. gentleman?

MR. MURPHY: Raised a dozen -

MR. NEARY: Raised it by one dollar. Go back to Hansard, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: Have you got anything to add to the Province at all? That is the fifth time you are after saying that. This is what Bas Jamieson is talking about.

MR. NEARY: I hope one of our research assistants, Sir, is listening to me and he will go back to Hansard and find out when the announcement was made on that dollar. It was put on for an indefinite period of time. There was no time limit put on it and it was put on to pay off this company for collecting car wrecks. Now I do not care whether Mr. Mulalley is a Tory or whether he is a Liberal. It so happens that he is a staunch Tory but he is a Newfoundlander.

MR. MURPHY: He is a good, sensible fellow.

MR. NEARY: A good sensible fellow! He is a good Tory. God bless him for it, I would say. The man cannot help it if he is on the wrong side.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman was a great Tory once, he was a great NDP, and now he is a great Liberal.

MR. NEARY: One thing, I was never a Tory, and I will never be ashamed that I was an NDP and that I ran NDP. I will never be ashamed of that. But I was never a great Tory.

Mr. Speaker, the question that I want to put to the hon. gentleman is this. I am told, and the stories are making the rounds, that when the company was formed, and it was incorporated at the time by the Tory bagman, at that time and has since been deposed like the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the Tory bagman has got the Royal Order of the Boot. One day I sat down in the Premier's private dining room and had lunch with him and I heard all about the bagman, heard all about him. And then the bagman came to see me and I heard all about the Premier from him, and both of them will be to see me very shortly, before this thing is all over. It was the bagman that incorporated the company, a nice little cozy affair. Then I am told that either some money was either borrowed from the bank or was owed to the bank. Is the hon. gentleman listening to me because I want to get the answer?

Mr. Speaker, the story that is making the rounds is this: The Tory bagman went on the back of a note for Affiliated Marine Metals and when they ran into financial difficulties the government bailed out the Tory bagman and their Tory supporter who owned this company by paying off the bank. Now I want to know from the minister if that is true or false? Now is the time to straighten it out. Is this correct or is it not correct?

MR. MURPHY: This is not question period but I will say to you that it is no more your business than it is mine whatever transaction between an individual and his bank. Phone the bank,

MR. MURPHY:           whichever one it is. They will tell you.

MR. NEARY:           Mr. Speaker, if there is public money involved then it is the business of every member of this hon. House.

AN HON. MEMBER:       Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:           I am not interested in Mr. Mulalley's private business. Whether he sells or did sell liquor to the government, that he had a liquor agency, I am not interested in that. I thought it was only Liberals who did that. I thought it was only Liberals who had liquor agencies. But apparently there are a few Tories around who have liquor agencies and who are pushing their product in the liquor outlets.

                          Mr. Speaker, to go back to the question again, the crucial question is this: I would like to get a reaction from the minister

MR. NEARY:

and I would gladly yield my seat to give the minister a chance to answer the question, and then I will carry on with my speech.

Is it correct that the government, using this dollar or public money, got the party bagman off the hook by paying off the bank? Is that correct?

MR. MURPHY:

May I, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY:

Would the hon. member yield?

MR. MURPHY:

Just to put the records straight.

MR. NEARY:

Just to put the records straight,

Mr. Speaker,

MR. MURPHY:

Because there is so much that comes out of this House and I get a little worried sometimes at lies and half-truths and the like, Sir. As far as I am concerned, when I became Minister of Consumer Affairs I took over Affiliated Marine Metals. And they had a contract with government at which they were paid, I think, \$27.50 to collect cars from thither and you, of which they collected, I would say, in the area of 24,000 cars. In the agreement was written that until the cars were flattened and shipped out of this Province - was it 20 per cent or 25 per cent? Well, whatever it was, 20 per cent or 25 per cent would be withheld. In other words, instead of being paid \$27.50 per car, most of them are in at the Octagon now, as the hon. gentleman knows, they were only paid approximately \$21.00. So if they had been able - and the bottom went out of the market - if they had been able to ship, I would say there is about \$150,000 worth of inventory in there now that they could have turned into cash; but because of the fact there is no market for it, it is still in there and as far as I know there is not one cent being paid to Affiliated Marine Metals only that \$21.00 for collecting these cars which are here, in Corner Brook and so on. So that it is to the best of my knowledge and belief and I have been minister for the past two years. Does that satisfy the hon. member?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The bank.

MR. MURPHY:

As far as the bank is concerned, if any of these gentlemen are having trouble with the bank, that is their business. But as far as I am concerned, and out of the funds of my department, there has not been one cent paid to the bank to bail anybody out. Any more than that I cannot -

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, just to get on the public record to make sure that I understand the minister correctly, \$160,000 is being withheld.

MR. MURPHY:

Approximately, I would say in that area.

MR. NEARY:

Approximately \$160,000 is being withheld from Affiliated Marine Metals even though Affiliated Marine have sold their inventory, turned their inventory over to the bank, so that the bank is responsible now for the inventory, and the government has \$160,000 in hand - is that correct?

MR. MURPHY:

That could happen. Morally and any other way, if they would ship these cars out tomorrow, in my opinion as minister, they would be entitled to receive the balance that was withheld for every car wreck that we shipped out of the Province.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are making a little bit of progress; we are getting a little bit of information out of the hon. gentleman.

MR. MURPHY:

That is not progress. I have made that statement at least ten times. Do not try to distort the facts.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would just restrain himself -

MR. MURPHY:

No, I just like people to be honest - once in their lives to be honest.

MR. NEARY:

- and if the hon. gentleman would keep his savage hatred to himself and just try to remember that the hon. gentleman is a minister of the Crown -

MR. MURPHY:

Yes.

MR. NEARY: - a Queen's minister -

MR. MURPHY: Right.

MR. NEARY: - a member of the House -

MR. MURPHY: And proud of it.

MR. NEARY: - and must deal with the Opposition members whether he likes it or not.

MR. MURPHY: Right! decent or otherwise.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is not an island unto himself. The hon. gentleman is part of a government that has to give this House information. And that is what I am trying to do, I am trying to pry as hard as I can some information out of the hon. gentleman. Now, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman please tell me if the government, or if the bank has had any proposals in recent times, in the last year, to remove these car wrecks, to buy these car wrecks, to bring in a machine to crush the cars? And if so, would the minister tell the House? Maybe the minister does not have the information now -

MR. MURPHY: This is not Question Period.

MR. NEARY: - why the proposal was rejected? And would the minister also tell the House - Mr. Speaker, this may be of some interest. And I would say Mr. Mullaley, who I know is a fine gentleman - Is Mr. Mullaley

MR. NEARY: on the government payroll at the present time? Would the minister confirm or deny that?

MR. MURPHY: That is right, and another gentleman.

MR. NEARY: And the other gentleman who was part of that company, is that gentleman on the payroll too?

MR. MURPHY: Right.

MR. NEARY: Well, would the minister tell us what Mr. Mulalley's position is with his department?

MR. MURPHY: Actually -

MR. MORGAN: Ask it in Question period.

MR. NEARY: What is the position? What is Mr. Mulalley's position with the minister's department? The minister does not know?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I know. I know all about it.

MR. NEARY: Well, would the minister tell me, because I would like to know?

MR. MURPHY: No, I am not going to tell you. I would not tell you anything. I would not give you the correct time if I had an arm full of Bulovas.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, even though he may not like me, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: I do not mind you. You are all right if you were under a stone anywhere.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman cannot sit in his seat. Even though he may squirm and twist and turn at the questions I am asking -

MR. MURPHY: I never squirmed anywhere in my lifetime. Thanks be to God my conscience is as clear as a newborn baby's.

MR. NEARY: - I think as a matter of courtesy to the people of this Province the minister should



MR. NEARY: now tell the House - I am sure there are other members who are curious to know - what Mr. Mulalley's position is with the minister's department.

MR. J. CARTER: I cannot hear you, speak up.

MR. NEARY: What is Mr. Mulalley's position? Would the minister tell me? Is Mr. Mulalley working with Consumer Affairs Branch of the minister's department?

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not see why he should not say.

MR. NEARY: Is Mr. Mulalley working with the Department of the Environment? Is Mr. Mulalley working with the Insurance Branch of the minister's department?

MR. MURPHY: No, he is selling building supplies on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thought it was only the Liberals who did these things?

MR. MURPHY: What things?

MR. NEARY: I thought the minister responsible for the car wrecks, Sir - I heard the hon. gentleman, Sir, when he was on this side of the House say that the Liberals were the only ones who did these things.

MR. MURPHY: I always tell the truth.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us in all seriousness what Mr. Mulalley's job is with his department.

MR. MURPHY: Question Period is over, I think, is it not?

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman ashamed to tell me? That is the second -

MR. MURPHY: No! no! I was never ashamed

MR. MURPHY: of anything I did in my life, thanks be to God.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should be proud of it because Mr. Mulalley, I am sure, is a very able man. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear in this House, Sir, that I am not ridiculing Mr. Mulalley because he is a Tory. It is a democratic country we are living in. It is a democratic country, Sir, but I do hope, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that no government, no minister who was so critical of the former administration would dare take a man on the payroll because he is a staunch Tory supporter. I hope that government would not do that. And that would be the last thing, Sir, that would enter my mind. The last thing that would enter my mind. So therefore, Sir, without ulterior motives, I wonder if the minister would not be good enough to tell me when he knows I do not have an ulterior motive, that I am terribly interested in Mr. Mulalley's position in life, and I would like to know what Mr. Mulalley's job is.

MR. MURPHY: I would like to know if it is true that you have no ulterior motives?

MR. NEARY: That is right, I have no ulterior motive other than I would like to know what Mr. Mulalley does to justify the tax money that is collected in this Province, that goes into general revenue and is paid out in wages to all the public servants of which Mr. Mulalley gets his share. I hope he gets a good salary. I hope the minister did not shortchange him.

MR. MURPHY: No, no!

MR. NEARY: Could the minister tell us what he does? What does Mr. Mulalley do?

MR. MURPHY: He is well looked after. You need not worry.

MR. NEARY: What does he do? Mr. Speaker,

March 10, 1978, Tape 138, Page --- apb

MR. NEARY: is the minister ashamed  
to tell the House? First of all I think it might come  
as a little bit of a surprise, a bit of news for the  
hon. gentleman to find out

Mr. Neary:

that Mr. Mulalley had graduated from Affiliated Marine Metals and is now on the staff of the department for which he collected car wrecks.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a fact?

MR. MURPHY: Be the greatest tragedy ever occurred.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. No, it certainly is not. Well,

Mr. Speaker, you will not see anybody over here getting personal.

You will not see anybody over here, Sir, trying to attack anybody's

character. I want to make it abundantly clear, Sir, that I have

the privilege and the honour of being considered to be on a friendly

basis with Mr. Mulalley. And so therefore I do not see why the

minister should hesitate in telling the House what Mr. Mulalley does

for his salary.

MR. MURPHY: Well, he works.

MR. NEARY: He works?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Very good, now we are making a bit of progress.

MR. MURPHY: That is it.

MR. NEARY: What does he work at?

MR. MURPHY: At various things.

MR. NEARY: Like what?

MR. MURPHY: Such as.

MR. NEARY: Such as, yes. And what is his salary? And furthermore, Sir, -

MR. MURPHY: To be quite frank I have not the faintest idea what the gentleman is being paid. It has all been approved by the commission that goes through and if he gave me even \$2, I think that is a familiar figure to the gentleman, even if he gave me \$2 I would not be able to tell you.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I hope Your Honour is paying attention to the innuendoes, and the dirt, and the snide remarks, and I hope Your Honour is paying attention to these, because, Sir, they are not

Mr. Neary: true as my hon. friend knows, my hon. Deposed and Rejected Minister of Transportation.

But, Sir, let me get back on Mr. Mulalley. I do not want to get side-tracked, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: Shall we get on with the debate (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Before the minister goes could the minister tell us if this job falls, as the minister so often said when he was over here, if this job falls within the ambit of the public service?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, he is going to wait for me to tell you.

MR. NEARY: Does Mr. Mulalley's position fall within the ambit, as the minister used to say, of the public service? Was the job advertised for?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Did everybody in the Province get a crack at it?

MR. MURPHY: I do not know if everybody did.

MR. NEARY: I see. Or was it a political appointment?

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Carry on!

MR. NEARY: Why does the minister just admit that it was a political appointment, if that is what it was. Was it a political appointment? Was it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend so often on this side of the House hurled insults galore across at members and ministers and the former Premier of this Province. They used to say, Look, you are a bunch of rogues, all you are doing is hiring on political hacks, the minister used to say, political patronage of the worst kind. That is when the minister was over here he used to say to us when we were over there. Surely that minister, that minister who hurled so many insults at the opposite side of the House when the minister was over here as a member, and as Leader of the Opposition, surely that minister would not make a political appointment.

MR. MURPHY: Certainly not.

MR. NEARY: I would hope not, Sir. I would lose faith in human nature if that happened because the hon. member leaves the impression,

Mr. Neary: Sir, that he is so lily white and Simon pure that all the bad fellows are over here, all the bad fellows are on Bell Island, there are no bad fellows down here in St. John's, they are all good fellows. They are all good fellows. And all the bad ones are across the Tickle. Surely the Minister of Manpower must really be shocked to hear that the last of the Puritans in this hon. House, who struts in with his halo on his head every day, surely that minister would not

MR. NEARY:

make a political appointment. Does the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) believe that?

Mr. Speaker, can I go back and ask the minister once more or do I have to give up, or will I lose my voice altogether? Or will I have to wait until the middle of next week?

MR. MORGAN: Slow down, I suggest.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the minister please tell me, and the other members of the House, what Mr. Mulalley does? What his position is? What his title is? Was the job advertised for? Did all the unemployed people in Newfoundland who could qualify for that job, did they have an opportunity to apply? Or did we just have the laying on of hands?

Mr. Speaker, I can see that I am wasting my time. I am not going to get the answer.

MR. MORGAN: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. MURPHY: It is not your time, it is our time we worry about.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday again, Sir - and I will come back to the minister later on. The minister is sizzling enough now for one sitting. I will come back to the hon. gentleman later on with a few more questions that I have for the hon. gentleman. And I might tell the hon. gentleman that I am still not satisfied with the answer I got on the financing of that company.

MR. MURPHY: What a shame! The world will go in mourning.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that when the former Tory bagman opens up, when he opens up, there is going to be a - China will not be far enough for half of that crowd to go.

MR. MURPHY: One thing about it, you never think of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I do not. I have very good reason in this case. How can you avoid it, Mr. Speaker? How can you avoid

MR. NEARY: it? I will not mention his name.

AN HON. MEMBER: No. No.

MR. NEARY: I understand they have several.

Mr. Speaker, I understand they have several bagmen, several. They have several, Sir, who use strong-arm tactics in the last election to raise a few dollars to get my hon. friend from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and his colleagues elected, the hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island, strong-arm tactics. And, Mr. Speaker, if hon. members think that I am joking all they have to do is look at what is happening in Public Works today.

What is happening in that investigation, Mr. Speaker, or is it only the poor old welfare recipients that get the boots put to them? Mr. Speaker, what is happening to that investigation, now that hon. gentlemen have reminded me of it? It has been going on now since the last session of the House, the scandals in the Public Works Department. Has the investigation been completed? The people of this Province, I am sure, would like to know. It is their money. And maybe I am wrong, Sir, but I have a feeling that that information would be of some interest to the people of this Province. I believe it would be of interest to members of this House. Maybe the media are not plugged in. Maybe they could not care less. Maybe if they did not have the information they would not put it out. I do not know. Maybe they would. Some of them are pretty good fellows. But what is happening to that investigation, that RCMP investigation into the goings on in the Public Works Department in connection with a substantial amount of taxpayers' dollars that was paid out to various and sundry contractors without calling public tenders? What has happened to that investigation? Have charges been laid? Will charges be laid? Or is the whole matter just some exercise in futility? Is it a waste of time? Nobody is guilty or all hands are guilty, or the thing is being covered up. What is the situation?



MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, am I wrong in assuming that that kind of information is not what the people of this Province should know when it is their money. Did somebody rip off Public Works? If they did, they ripped off the people of this Province. Did they?

Mr. Speaker, the only reason I am raising it is this - I would not raise it at all - my only reason is this, that rumours are flying, rumours are flying, Sir! and I -

AN HON. MEMBER: Ha! Ha! Ha!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman ha! ha! ha!

MR. NEARY: At least we know there is a bit of life in him anyway. Rumours are flying, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Anybody left up in the gallery?

MR. NEARY: No, that is right. They are listening. Do not worry, they are listening. They are listening. You need not worry.

Mr. Speaker, rumours are flying, Sir, and I think that these rumours should be squelched. If there is no foundation, Mr. Speaker, if there is no foundation to the rumours that there is skulduggery gone on in the Department of Public Works, that contracts have been given without calling public tender, that there has been a misuse, an abuse of public funds, if that is so, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: Overpayments.

MR. NEARY: - overpayments, extras, contracts awarded without calling public tenders, if all that happened, then, Sir, I wonder if the Minister of Public Works and Services could tell me if and when charges are going to be laid? Is the investigation complete? And if so, when can we expect to get a report in this Hon. House on that investigation involving millions of dollars, so I am told, in the Department of Public Works? Or alternatively, Sir, if everything is clean, if everything was above board, then we should know, we should be told. Because the RCMP, I understand, have spent a lot of time and taxpayers' dollars examining the records of the Department of Public Works and investigating the various and sundry companies and it is not fair to these companies, if they are innocent, to have this hanging over their head. The matter should be cleared up at once and the weak-kneed Minister of Justice we have in this Province, or the Minister of Public Works should tell us if the investigation is complete, if it is, is everybody clean? Did everybody come up smelling of roses or was there a bit of skulduggery and charges will be laid as a result of that skulduggery? I think that is a pretty fair and

MR. NEARY: reasonable question and I hope, Sir, that we can get the information.

And, Mr. Speaker, talking about skulduggery and scandals, last year I rased the matter of the Scrivener affair over at the Health Sciences complex, at Memorial University. And, Mr. Speaker, I laid certain documentation on the table of this hon. House in connection with that alleged scandal.

MR. J. CARTER: Just enough to tantalize.

MR. NEARY: Just enough to tantalize the hon. gentleman. Well maybe before this session is over I will lay a few more items on the table that may tantalize the hon. gentleman who sits there and supports an administration even though the hon. gentleman got the Royal Order of the Loo from the Premier when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Education. He was not rejected or deposed or demoted; right out of the Cabinet altogether, right off the eighth floor for being so Victorian in the hon. gentleman's thinking! And sitting there now supporting an administration that allegedly has given a gentleman the go-ahead, as indicated to one gentleman in this Province, that he can have the contract to build an extension on Confederation Building.

MR. J. CARTER: Name names.

MR. NEARY: No. No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: - innuendoes. You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Tourism, Sir, will get the message in due course. If the hon. gentleman's head is too thick to absorb what I am saying, that it cannot filter through, then it will in due course. It will in due course.

MR. MORGAN: What is his name?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what a minister to ask me that question! And the minister down camped in his posh office in a building

MR. NEARY: that is owned by that same gentleman  
downtown for which no public tenders were called.

MR. MORGAN: - that is something else.

MR. NEARY: For which no public tenders were called and  
the minister is camped in an office that is owned by that same  
gentleman and then the minister says, "Name names."

MR. MORGAN: Whoever owns the building is a slum landlord,  
I do not care who he is. Whoever owns the building I have an office  
in is a slum landlord.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who hired the premises?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the minister  
take that up with the Minister of Public Works,

MR. NEARY: or get in touch with Mr. Mulalley. Mr. Mulalley is working for the Department of the Environment and perhaps Mr. Mulalley will come down and clean it up and the minister with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The dump should be closed up, I must say.

MR. NEARY: And that hon. gentleman from St. John's North (J. Carter) sits there day in and day out with his colleague from St. John's East (Wm. Marshall) who once in a while get up enough nerve to take a little flick at the government's policies but they are always very careful, they always preface their remarks, Mr. Speaker. Did you ever notice, Mr. Speaker, they always preface their remarks by saying, "Well, this is the way the former administration did it. This is the way they did it and we condemn them for that. We are not going to go along with it, it is all their fault!" But now we see the Premier trying to give away the Lower Churchill to the Government of Canada and to Mr. Roosevelt.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) - never give it away.

MR. NEARY: So you get a six page or an eight page statement from the hon. gentleman condemning the government and his colleagues for not clarifying their position with regard to Crown corporations on the Lower Churchill.

MR. JOHN CARTEK: Who is he talking about?

MR. NEARY: I am talking about your colleague, the other gentleman who got the flick. I was away at the time; it was either Rockefeller or Roosevelt that strolled across the lobby of Confederation Building arm in arm with what the minister refers to, his boss, the Premier, as God.

MR. DOODY: Oh! That is 'Frank', you mean.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman got it now. And so they continue to support that administration, Sir, so I would assume that they are supporting the good and the bad. That the morals that they put out once in a while for the people is just a phony, it is all phony.

MR. J. CARLER: Would you rather then support you?

MR. NEARY: I would rather have the member get up and demand to know what is happening in connection with the investigation down in Public Works. And I would like to see the member get up, the member is always so pure, get up and ask what is happening in connection with the extension to Confederation Building, what is happening in connection with renting office space downtown. Mr. Speaker, I have put the questions to the hon. gentleman and the trouble is that I do not get any answers. I have not heard the hon. gentleman ask any questions about these things and the hon. gentleman, I believe, is terribly interested in these matters, the hon. gentleman and his colleague from St. John's East (Wm. Marshall). The hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Wm. Marshall) is always there eager to jump in to give a legal opinion, a constitutional opinion when something arises concerning justice or the courts in this Province, but very seldom, Mr. Speaker, will you see him get up and ask about anything controversial unless he blames it on the former administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, to carry on with my trend of how the relations between Ottawa and the provincial government deteriorated; and how the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Transportation and Communications at that time and the Minister of Rural Development, how they brought about a situation where Newfoundland lost millions and millions of dollars. Let me give the House an example - and the Minister of Mines and Energy, by the way, is guilty of that to a certain degree too, and the Premier. And I will tell this House right now, Sir, that as of the day before yesterday when I started my speech - and the hon. gentleman can come in and sit down. I would like to get the answer to this, it may be of some interest to the people. Mr. Speaker, talking about questions, let me point something out to the House, if I can find my statistics here.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen say Question Period was this morning, put your questions on the Order Paper, ask questions. Well let me say what kind of a track record this hon. crowd have for answering questions. Last year, Sir, the number of questions tabled in this House, in the 1977 sitting of the House was 248.

MR. MURPHY: 247 of them were tabled by Smallwood.

MR. NEARY: 248 questions and I do not care who they were tabled by. I have tabled a fair number myself.

MR. NEARY: 248 questions were tabled. Well, hon. gentlemen on the opposite side who are now telling us that we can get all of the information we want. All we have to do is ask questions, put them on the Order Paper or ask them during the Oral Question Period, would hon. gentlemen care to take a guess how many of these questions were answered?

MR. MORGAN: More than half of them were answered orally in the House. More than half of them.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman put his seat in jeopardy by telling the House that more than half of these questions were answered? Would the hon. gentleman do that?

MR. CALLAN: Now there is a challenge.

MR. NEARY: Now there is a challenge for the hon. gentleman.  
I will tell you what I will do, Mr. Speaker, if -

MR. MORGAN: I will tell you what I am going to do.  
I will put my seat in jeopardy if you will confirm and prove your statement made in the House yesterday that the Premier had to go to Ottawa and apologize to two ministers of the Crown.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: I will do that right now if you can prove it, and I will resign my seat in the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman -

MR. MORGAN: Back up your statements now.

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman may be interested in knowing, Sir, that there were 248 questions asked on the Order Paper last year and the total number answered by the government was 104, not even 50 per cent. Of the 144 tabled questions not answered -

MR. MORGAN: - Pick up the challenge.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, of the 144 -

MR. MORGAN: Prove the charge you made in this House.



MR. NEARY: Your Honour, could you get the Yahoo to keep quiet?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! The hon. member for LaPoile has indicated that he wishes to be heard in silence, and I would ask the members to my left to please adhere to that ruling.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I stand on a point of personal privilege.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: I will allow the Chair to make the decision whether it is a point of privilege or not. I put forward to the House, on a point of personal privilege, for the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to accept my challenge to prove statements made about me yesterday in the House of Assembly, and made subsequently in the media, through CBC network in particular yesterday evening, that the Premier of the Province had to go to Ottawa and apologize for my rowing with Ottawa and my colleague the Minister of Fisheries' rowing with Ottawa. I will put my position as minister on the line right now, I will resign as the Minister of the Cabinet if the hon. gentleman can prove these statements. If he cannot prove them, I am asking him to resign his position as Opposition House Leader of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of personal privilege, that is just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! The hon. member is speaking to the point of privilege?

MR. NEARY: No, I am just pointing out to Your Honour -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I feel that it is not a point of privilege but just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): I have made my ruling.

MR. MORGAN: There is a point of order. It is a point of order. The point of order is that the hon. gentleman has made charges in the House of Assembly against an individual member of the House, in this case two ministers of the Crown, and the point of order is that the hon. gentleman should not be allowed to continue in this kind of slanderous attack on ministers unless he can prove what he is talking about.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is Your Honour going to allow that kind of specious point of order to be raised to keep interrupting my speech? That is not a point of order, Your Honour knows that. It is just the hon. gentleman trying to squirt a little venom and a little spite and a little hate across the House.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I still feel it is not a point of order, but just a difference of opinion in the heat of debate.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I must say, Sir, I am not heated, although I am having the hot and cold flashes today with this flu. that I have got. But, Sir, the total number -

MR. MORGAN: What a man! Chicken! Chicken!

MR. NEARY: If the hon. member can just -

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

A few moments ago I made a ruling that the hon. member wished to be heard in silence, and I will ask the hon. members to my left to please refrain from interrupting.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to suggest to Your Honour, because that is probably what the hon. gentleman wants me to do, that the hon. Speaker name the hon. gentleman. I am not going to suggest that, Your Honour. But I think Your Honour knows the rules sufficiently well enough to know that if the hon. gentleman keeps

Mr. Neary: interrupting that the hon. gentleman can be named.

Mr. Speaker, 248 questions were tabled in 1977 sitting of the House, 104 were answered, The 144 tabled questions not answered in the last sitting of the House the vilest offender was by far the Premier who answered 5 out of a total of 37 questions directed to him. Most of which were not asked by Mr. Smallwood by the way, most of which were asked by the hon. Member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) and myself, for the benefit of the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett).

AN HON. MEMBER: He never had enough assistance.

MR. NEARY: And the memo goes on to say that the Health Minister fails to table fourteen answers. And what about the Minister of Transportation and Communications of that time? Now if I can get the hon. minister's attention, The hon. gentleman who just finished telling the House that we were going to get all the information we want all we have to do is ask questions: What kind of a track record does the hon. gentleman have in that regard? Does the hon. gentleman remember last year how many questions the hon. gentleman did not answer? Give him a guess. One?

MR. MORGAN: Quite a few -

MR. NEARY: Quite a few.

MR. MORGAN: - questions, nonsensical questions.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is not for the hon. gentleman to decide, Sir, when questions are legitimate and when they are nonsensical.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Smallwood was gathering -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not for the hon. gentleman to decide.

MR. MORGAN: - information for a book.

MR. NEARY: I just finished telling the hon. gentleman that most of the questions that were unanswered were asked by the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde, asked of the Premier, and myself. Well, how many did the Minister of Transportation, now deposed, rejected, demoted -

MR. MORGAN: Still a man, though.

MR. NEARY: How many did he not answer, Sir? Well, the hon. gentleman failed to answer fourteen. The Minister of Public Works, who is now the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, and the Fisheries Minister, how many questions would the hon. gentlemen say they did not answer in the last session of the House? - on the Order Paper now I am talking about. And we are told, Sir, we are told every day, 'Ask questions and you will get the information.' How many

MR. NEARY: did the Minister of Fisheries not answer last year? I will tell the hon. minister - ten - ten each. They are tied - there is a tie. They have something in common. And that is the only thing they have in common, they refuse to answer. They refuse to give the House the information on ten questions each.

MR. W. CARTER: How many were answered?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just finished telling the House - perhaps the hon. Minister of Fisheries was not in his seat - 248 questions were asked -

MR. W. CARTER: How many did we answer?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not have that statistic, but 248 questions were asked of the government - the government who are so generous in giving information whenever you ask for it. All you have to do, according to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, who refused to give me information this morning on Mr. Mullaley's job and his salary and whether or not anybody else in the civil service or in the Province could get a crack at that job - was it advertised?

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: I want to bring to the House's attention that the information being put forward to the hon. House by the hon. member now speaking is incorrect. The information stands as follows with regard to questions asked in the House last year, filed and recorded by this government and by the House. Last year, a total of 769 questions was asked, total by all members of the Opposition. Out of that, 485 were given answers to by the ministers of the Crown. These are the facts -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will lay my information on the table of the House and I presume the hon. gentleman will do the same thing.

MR. MORGAN: Sure, I am for all that.

MR. NEARY: My information will be tabled, Sir,  
and incidentally, before I table it -

MR. MORGAN: Table the information now.

MR. NEARY: - before I table it, the Minister  
of Finance at that time refused to answer eleven questions. So there  
it is, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order - I see it  
not as a point of order but as more or less a point of explanation.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) information, both sides  
table and then we will see who is lying.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back  
to the Minister of Fisheries if the Yahoo will just keep quiet, restrain  
himself. If the hon. lounge lizard would just keep quiet and give me a  
chance to get my -

MR. MORGAN: Whose character is he attacking now?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of  
Fisheries, Sir, tell the House -

MR. MORGAN: That is not personal, I suppose.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a right, I  
believe, to the protection of the Chair. Would Your Honour -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member wishes to speak  
without interruption.

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the Minister of  
Fisheries. Sir, if it is true - and this involves quite a substantial  
amount of money - is it true that the cost sharing agreement with  
respect to fisheries, including

MR. NEARY: the boat building federal subsidy have not been renewed by the Province, and as a consequence there is no ongoing programme on this policy? Would the minister tell the House if that is correct and if so why is there not a cost sharing agreement signed with the Government of Canada? Is that correct?

MR. W. CARTER: That is not quite right. I will be speaking after you so -

MR. NEARY: Well the minister can nod his yes or not, nod in the affirmative.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Well, okay. I can only go then on the information that I have. I am told that due to incompetence and negligence on the part of the Minister of Fisheries that there is no agreement. And I am also told, Sir, that the Government of Canada, the Federal Minister of Fisheries became so frustrated over relations with the provincial government, especially with the minister, that they removed their boat building subsidy from the board room of the Fishery Loan Board down to Pleasantville.

Now hon. members may not understand what that means and let me see if I can explain, Sir. One time when a fisherman in this Province applied for a loan to build a boat or buy a boat and he made his application to the Fishery Loan Board, his licence was all taken care of, his provincial bounty was all taken care of, and the federal subsidy was all done through the Fishery Loan Board. Am I right or wrong?

MR. W. CARTER: I will answer you later.

MR. NEARY: Am I right or wrong?

MR. W. CARTER: I will answer you later.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, today that is not so. Today it is not so that a fisherman who comes into this city, who has to visit government departments, one end of the city to the other, scattered all over the place, has to know, go to the Fishery Loan Board, and then

MR. NEARY: go down to the Federal Fisheries Department in order to enquire about his federal subsidy. He has to go to three or four, four or five buildings at tremendous expense to the fishermen, to the applicant, all because of the attitude of this government and the Minister of Fisheries. They had no policy. They were giving Ottawa the run-around. They were hurling insults at Ottawa. And Ottawa out of desperation had to take that privilege that they gave the Fishery Loan Board for approving federal subsidies on building new boats. They had to move it down to Pleasantville, back to the Federal Fisheries Department, at tremendous inconvenience to the fishermen of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the cost sharing programme that I am talking about was the kind of a programme that used to take care of gear replacement. Is it because of the gear replacement scandal that Ottawa has refused to sign a new agreement? Or is it because the minister has not put a new agreement yet before the minister? This programme, in case hon. members do not know, took care of storm damage, gear replacement, new technology, experimental projects in the Fisheries Department, and we had all these matters covered under an agreement up to a year ago. And I am told, and I want the minister to tell the House if it is correct or incorrect - and I hope I am wrong, I hope the people who gave me the information are wrong - that there is no agreement, no agreement due to the incompetence.

MR. W. CARTER: For what?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously was not just listening to me. Cost sharing agreement involving fisheries to take care of storm damage, to take care of gear replacement of one kind and another, one sort and another, new technology for the fishery, experimental projects and that sort of



MR. NEARY: thing, the agreement was very wide ranging and included just about everything.

The agreement existed up to a year ago, I am told that no such agreement exists today because the minister has not put forward a package to his federal counterpart or to the Government of Canada. And I am trying to find out from the minister if that is correct, if it is true or false? Just as stoned faced as the Minister of Consumer Affairs when I asked him about Mr. Mulalley.

MR. W. CARTER: Give your speech and we will answer your questions -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is not fair, Sir. Mr. Speaker, it is not fair for me to leave the impression inside or outside of this House, to leave a wrong impression. That is not fair and I want to be fair about this.

MR. W. CARTER: Ask a question and we will answer -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to be fair about it. I cannot point my finger at the minister and say, Look, I have heard because of the minister's incompetence, and because of his insulting attitude towards Mr. Romeo LeBlanc, because of his attitude toward the Government of Canada, because of his prejudice toward Ottawa that we do not have a general fishery agreement. It would not be fair for me to leave that impression in the House, so I am hoping that the impression that I left in the House last year of the minister will be the right one, that the minister has done his homework and I am asking the minister now to tell me so that that impression -

MR. W. CARTER: My incompetence has not been confirmed by a judge of the Supreme Court.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Not yet, Sir, not yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I would like to know what the hon. gentleman means by that slur, that innuendo.

MR. MORGAN: That is quite obvious.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, maybe I can ask the hon. gentleman if he will elaborate. Because there are fifty-one members in this House and I would not want for one moment the people of this Province to think that the Minister of Health, who used to be Minister of Fisheries, that his incompetence is being decided by a judge of the Supreme Court. Or Mr. Crosbie, who used to be Minister of Fisheries. Or the hon. gentleman from Humber East (Dr. Farrell), who used to be Minister of Public Works where scandals are going on, or alleged scandals. And I would not hope that a judge of the Supreme Court is passing judgement on my hon. friend. I believe my hon. friend should clear that matter up. He has placed fifty colleagues - or is

MR. NEARY: it the hon. gentleman? Is his incompetence being decided by a judge of the Supreme Court?

MR. MURPHY: Fifty colleagues? No way!

MR. NEARY: Whose incompetence is being judged?

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman's.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. MORGAN: I view you as incompetent anyway. Total incompetence.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Speaker, I may think that the hon. gentleman is a genius and the hon. gentleman may think that I am incompetent, and we both could be wrong. Just as well, Sir, and I do not care who he is, and I am not allowed to criticize judges in the Supreme Court.

MR. NOLAN: It has been done in this House though.

MR. NEARY: It has been done by Mr. John Crosbie, as a matter of fact, who took the hides off judges of the Supreme Court.

MR. NOLAN: And not ruled out of order either.

MR. NEARY: That is right. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot get involved. I wish I could debate it with the hon. gentleman, I only wish I could. But I think the hon. Minister of Fisheries either has to explain himself or he owes the House an apology. Is it the Minister of Municipal Affairs because of the situation down in Fleur de Lys? Or because Metro Engineering, the government's buddies did not finish their contract down in -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. DINN: The case with respect to Torbay and Pouch Cove are currently before the courts and therefore sub judice and should not be discussed in the House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I am asking the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. What I am asking the gentleman, if the judge is - the Minister of Fisheries mentioned this - is a judge of the Supreme Court deciding the minister's incompetence? Is that what the judge is deciding? Because the Minister of Fisheries said it, not me.

MR. DINN: Certainly not.

MR. NEARY: Oh well, I hope not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will have to draw to the attention of hon. members the convention with respect to sub judice on a question of fact. If this is to be pursued I will have to determine for myself specifically what is sub judice. I do not carry in my head every matter in the Province which is sub judice, but by presuming both hon. members are aware of what is, it will not be necessary for me to adjourn as long as that is observed.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I do not know about the other side, Mr. Speaker, but I have no intention of pursuing it except that I would like to get back to the Minister of Fisheries and ask him is it his colleague the Minister of Health who is under scrutiny by the judge of the Supreme Court for the Scrivener affair? Or is it the Premier who is being judge? as being incompetent by a judge of the Supreme Court for the Scrivener affair?

The hon. Minister of Fisheries should not lower himself by making snide remarks

MR. NEARY: and innuendo and hurling insults across this House. Because, Mr. Speaker, let me say to hon. members on the opposite side of the House that people who live in glass houses should not take a bath. And I would submit to the hon. gentleman that that applies to the hon. gentleman as well as other members of this House.

So I am going to come back again, Sir, to the business of this House. And it is the business of this House. What about this cost-sharing agreement? Does it exist? Should it exist? Are the reports that I have correct or are they false?

MR. NEARY: If they are true, then it is costing the Province millions and millions of dollars. And, Mr. Speaker, is Your Honour aware - the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat; I wish he were, Perhaps the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, if he is listening, or the hon. Minister of Justice could tell me and tell the House, and tell the people of this Province the agricultural agreement, the DREE agreement that expired more than a year ago, more than a year ago between the Province of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada, has that agreement yet been renewed? Could the hon. Minister of Justice tell me that? The hon. gentleman used to be Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. HICKMAN: That was under the old ARDA agreement, That was under the old ARDA agreement and there has been a new one, a more embracing agreement, but I cannot remember the name of it now.

MR. NEARY: Is it in effect at the present time?

MR. HICKMAN: There is an agreement in effect at the present time, but the name of it and the title of it for the life of me I cannot recall now.

MR. PECKFORD: There has been no stoppage of that.

MR. HICKMAN: But ARDA is dead, as you know.

MR. NEARY: I know. ARDA is as dead as this government, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: As dead as FRED.

MR. NEARY: As dead as a dodo. Extinct.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Minister of Agriculture, if we can ever get him up on his feet in this hon. House other than to introduce his estimates, I would like for the gentleman to confirm what the hon. Minister of Justice just told us, that there is an agreement. Because my information, Sir, which comes from the usual reliable sources indicates to me that the agricultural agreement between Newfoundland and DREE, on the other hand, the Government of Canada expired more than a year ago and has not yet been renewed. And if that is so, Sir, again we have an example of why millions of dollars are sitting up in Ottawa, sitting up in Ottawa waiting to be picked up by this Province.

MR. NEARY: Now the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, seems anxious to give the House some information.

MR. PECKFORD: No, I am just saying -

MR. NEARY: He seems to be -

MR. PECKFORD: I told you it was extended.

MR. NEARY: All right. Okay. Fine. I accept the minister's word, but the minister - I am after going down the line and I am not getting very much co-operation, but I am glad the Minister of Mines and Energy is so anxious to give the House information because I want to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy a question that has very serious implications in this Province, and it has to do with the development of the Lower Churchill. If hon. members will recall the hon. Bud Cullen, I believe it was, the Minister of - they have changed the name of the department recently; it is now called Employment and Immigration; it used to be the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. The hon. minister responsible for employment and immigration in the Government of Canada threw out an offer to the Province of Newfoundland, threw out an offer, and the offer was this -

MR. PECKFORD: Eight months after we had -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would just wait for the question, if the hon. gentleman will be just a little patient; I have to give some background just in case there are some members of the House who do not understand what it is I am getting at, or maybe the media have never heard of it, and we are depending on them to get this information out to the people of this Province. The hon. Mr. Cullen and the Government of Canada, he was speaking for the Government of Canada, made an offer to the Provincial Government, to the Province of Newfoundland whereby they would finance on a fifty-fifty basis.

MR. PECKFORD: No.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yes. Finance on a fifty-fifty basis up to a certain amount, and I forget what the amount is now, whatever they feel the cost of a job is, because this was a job creation programme. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says, No.

MR. NEARY: Perhaps my facts are not 100 per cent, but they are 99.9 per cent. But the real question is the one that I want to get the answer from the minister on, not the facts. Mr. Speaker, I am laying out a question, giving the House some information that I would like to get an answer from the minister on.

Anyway the Government of Canada made an offer, let us put it that way, they made an offer of some kind or other - is that correct?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is correct. The hon. Minister of Justice says, No. The hon. Mr. Bud Cullen, Sir, right at this moment, up in Ottawa has money available for job creation, cutting wood on the Lower Churchill, on the site of the Lower Churchill.

MR. PECKFORD: You want facts ?

MR. NEARY: I want to get the facts.

MR. HICKMAN: The idea of -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can stand, I will yield, but just to get an answer to my question, I want to carry on with my speech, Your Honour.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. The idea of having a job creating programme of site clearing in the Lower Churchill came from the Government of Newfoundland, and no one else. And it was brought to the attention of several ministers, not the hon. Mr. Cullen at the time because he was not at the meeting in Ottawa. I was asked as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to submit a detailed proposal to the Government of Canada through the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and in June of last year, I have forgotten the



MR. DOODY: precise date, that detailed proposal was submitted to the Government of Canada and it was not a proposal for cost sharing, it was not a proposal where they limit the amount of money per job but it was supposed to be -

MR. CARTER: It was not cost sharing.

MR. DOODY: - and it was not supposed to be cost shared, and we were told that it would be welcomed with great enthusiasm. We are still awaiting signs of that enthusiasm.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for that little piece of information but, Sir, I have to go back again to the facts that I was laying out. Even though the hon. gentleman has told his side of the story, there is another side to that story: there has been no follow-up. Mr. Speaker, I have it from my usual reliable sources in Ottawa that the hon. Mr. Cullen and the Government of Canada are waiting for this government to communicate with Mr. Cullen because there is a substantial amount of money there that can be made available to clear the site of the Lower Churchill and this government has not taken the initiative, another example, Mr. Speaker, of where there are millions of dollars left on the table in Ottawa.

MR. PECKFORD: In order to get the \$4 million that they are offering in total we have to spend \$12 to \$14 million.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me -

MR. PECKFORD: They will give us \$2 million if we commit \$7 million. They will give us \$4 million if we commit \$14 million. That is your fifty-fifty.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me comment on what the hon. gentleman just said, Sir. My understanding of this money that is available for job creation in this Province is that it is negotiable, it is negotiable, Sir, and Mr. Cullen and the Government of Canada are waiting, anxiously waiting for this hon. crowd, who have hurled insult after insult on the Government of

MR. NEARY: Canada and its ministers and its Prime minister, is waiting for a counterproposal, is waiting for the government to come, this Province to come and negotiate, and Mr. Speaker -

MR. PECKFORD: Let us get it straight.

MR. NEARY: Let me finish my trend first and then the hon. gentleman can have the floor. And, Mr. Speaker, if - and I say this for the benefit of the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations - if the Province and the Government of Canada cannot come to an agreement on the cutting of wood on the site of the Lower Churchill then they can come to some other agreement. That is how generous the Government of Canada is on this matter.

I will yield for my hon. friend to answer a question, Sir, and then I will come back with my few remarks again.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Justice pointed out a few minutes ago, back in May a number of ministers from this government met with a number of ministers from the federal government in Ottawa and one of the things that were high on our agenda was an idea which came from us and which we put in writing and threw out on the table of that meeting: "Hey, seeing you are spending tens of millions of dollars in Canada Works money in this Province every year on various programmes, Canada Works and FLIP and all the rest of them, is it not possible out of the \$50 or \$60 million that is being spent for one sixth or one seventh or one fourth or one fifth of that, \$10 million of \$60 million, say, to be allocated towards a special make-work project which would employ three hundred to four hundred people, especially in the woods industry because of the Linerboard shutting down. and you would then take up the slack with the loggers there on clearing the Gull Island site which is a project that will get off the ground in the next couple of years, the work would have to be done in any case; that even if the federal Department of the Environment and the provincial Dept. of the Environment say they cannot give

MR. PECKFORD: us clearance for all the clearing because some of it is environmentally sensitive let us allocate and delineate that area on the Gull Island reservoir which is not environmentally sensitive and do a one year programme of \$10 million or \$15 million or \$10 million, or whatever the figure was, and then while the work is going ahead in that year the environmental departments could go ahead and do their assessment on the more sensitive areas so that when the first year was over then we could get approval environmentally for a second section to be a second year and so on until all the all the 300,000 or 400,000 cords of it would be cut. It would have to be cut in any case if the Gull Island project was to get total project release. That was submitted in writing to them in June 1977. They procrastinated between

MR. PECKFORD: the Department of Manpower and Immigration, or whatever it is called up there, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, DREE, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Department of the Environment and Treasury Board in Ottawa, from June 1977 up until Christmas and New Year's of 1978, January 1978. We could not get a reply as to it.

They told us in May it was a fantastic idea. We thought that it was a good saw-off. We appreciate that the Canada Works Programme is rampant with politics, that it is a make-work project, that a lot of MP's, perhaps on both sides of the House of Commons, would not want to see all the money go in big projects so that they would not be able to get their little things for their communities and their constituencies. So \$10 million of a \$60 million Canada Works scheme for all the Province would still leave \$50 million for the members and we would have 300 or 400 jobs that could possibly do for three or four years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the hon. gentleman wishes to resume his speech.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was not too bad in the beginning of his remarks -

MR. PECKFORD: I am not finished yet -

MR. NEARY: No, but the hon. gentleman is now attacking -

MR. PECKFORD: Okay.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to do, I am trying to save the hon. gentleman's scalp because if the hon. the Premier is down on the eighth floor in his office in a meeting with Mr. Levesque, listening to the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy attacking Ottawa, which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were told not to do because of the bad blood and the relations -

MR. PECKFORD: You do not want to hear any more.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to save -

MR. PECKFORD: I will take care of it.

MR. NEARY: I am trying to save the hon. gentleman's scalp.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not want you to.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was getting political and then attacking Ottawa.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not want you to.

MR. NEARY: In typical Tory fashion.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not want you to.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, let me say to the hon. gentleman, let me say this to the hon. gentleman, that the idea was not original. The idea for job creation of these permanent jobs, these big projects was not original. It is something that I have been talking about inside and outside of this House for a good many years.

MR. PECKFORD: - originality, it would put you right back in the Stone Ages, my dear man.

MR. NEARY: So therefore it is not a matter of who gets the credit because that is not what I am interested in. I do not care who gets the credit. What I want to do is see people get jobs.

MR. PECKFORD: There you go.

MR. NEARY: That is what I am interested in, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PECKFORD: You will not listen to it.

MR. NEARY: And I would submit, Your Honour, I would submit to Your Honour and to the minister that if procrastination is the thief of time then all the members on that side of the House should be locked up long ago. Because it is this Province, it is this government that is procrastinating.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this has been a very worthwhile exercise this morning. So far I have managed to get I think it is three, if not four, ministers on their feet to try to get some information. I hope it will not be considered as a wasted morning. I am not finished yet. I hope to get a few other, I could not pry

MR. NEARY: any information out of the Minister of Fisheries. I could not pry any information on Mr. Mulalley.

MR. W. CARTER: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. W. CARTER: I did intend to wait until I spoke to reply to the member but obviously he is still wound up, and he is not going to wind down this morning and I think the record should be set straight because he is misleading the House. He mentioned about the cost sharing projects that were in place in the Department of Fisheries at Ottawa. The fact of the matter is that there were cost sharing programmes.

Ottawa, and I will give him the reason for it if he wants to hear it, Ottawa -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but there is no point of order that I am aware of. Now if the hon. member yields then he may continue but if he does not, he may not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am -

MR. W. CARTER: I should have a right to set the record straight.

MR. NEARY: I am going to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity, because, Mr. Speaker, this has been a very worthwhile exercise and I think it is good and I do not think you can consider the morning to be wasted. I am making my speech. I am asking for information. Some ministers are giving me information and others are not. Up to now the Minister of Fisheries refused but if the minister wants to answer my question to set the record straight, because that is what I am looking for, information for the fishermen and the people of this Province, if the minister wants to do that, Sir, and Your Honour is satisfied for me to yield and then resume my speech again, well I will be very glad to do it because that is what I am looking for, information. Is Your Honour satisfied with that?

MR. SPEAKER: I will just say before the hon. minister comes in, it appears that the whole maybe a sentence or two of clarification

MR. SPEAKER: on yielding. When an hon. member is speaking he has the right to speak without anyone else. He asks questions of other members. Number one, they are not obviously required to answer and, number two, they may not answer unless and until the original speaker yields. Then of course another difficult point comes in: after yielding a while a person who has yielded decides that he has heard as much as he wishes to, and when he then insists on his right to speak again I do not think the Chair has any choice but to give it to him.

I just make that clear because it becomes sometimes a complicated position. But that in fact is the position.

MR. NEARY: I thank Your Honour. I, Your Honour, am looking for information for the people of this Province and Your Honour will understand that I do not mind yielding although it interrupts my speech because information is what we are looking for. And I am glad that the Minister of Fisheries is going to give the House some information. I will yield and then resume my speech.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I do not really appreciate having to seek the permission of the hon. member to make a short few remarks in the House, but in the interest of putting the record straight, I will. The fact of the matter is that there were cost sharing development programmes between Ottawa and the Atlantic Provinces for a number of years. Indeed, in 1974, I think it was, the total amount for Newfoundland cost shared was around \$300,000. At that time they commenced to scale down the amount of cost sharing, in fact, to where in 1977 - 1978 it was around \$100,000 or \$150,000. But I should point out that that was a policy that was applicable to all of the Atlantic Provinces. So if my attitude towards Ottawa is responsible, well then obviously the other Atlantic Provinces were made suffer too. But that, Mr. Speaker, is not the case. The fact is that Ottawa in its wisdom or otherwise decided to eliminate these cost sharing programmes, and the reason given, which is a rather strange one, is that they were not getting enough credit for it, that the provinces had the gall to assume some of the credit for the things that were being done in their respective development departments and, consequently, Ottawa did not get credit for the money and they decided they would then cut it out. And that is the reason for the discontinuation of these cost sharing development programmes. At no time, by the way, did it affect gear replacement. The gear replacement programme that caused such controversy in the Province in the past few years was under -

MR. NEARY: - that kind of gear -

MR. W. CARTER: No, you mentioned gear replacement -

MR. NEARY: Not that kind of gear replacement.

MR. W. CARTER: - experimental gear programmes. Yes, right, that is part of the development cost sharing grant. And I repeat, these grants had been discontinued I am told, in all of the Atlantic Provinces, not only in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. minister for that little piece of information that I hope will be of some help to



MR. NEARY: the House in trying to make up their minds on whether or not relations between the provincial government and the Government of Canada are as bad as I say they are. Both ministers now, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Fisheries have taken their little flick at Ottawa, the Minister of Fisheries stating that the reason they discontinued the programme was for a childish reason - the minister did not say 'childish', I am saying it for him - childish reason because they were not getting credit for their programmes.

MR. W. CARTER: That is their reason, not mine.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would submit to this hon. House, Sir, and I have very good reason to say this, that there are millions and millions and millions piled upon millions of dollars left on the table in Ottawa that should be coming into this Province today that are not coming in as a result of bad blood, poor relationship between the Province and the Government of Canada. No, that is not the right way to put it, Sir; that is an incorrect statement I just made and I will withdraw it for this reason, because it is not because of the bad blood - that is only part of the reason. The other part of the reason is this: it is because of the attitude - the laziness - that is the word I am looking for, the laziness on the part of certain ministers in the administration of not doing their homework, of not bringing the proposals to Ottawa. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker, not the one the hon. gentleman just tried to ~~put off~~ on us.

MR. W. CARTER: Wait until your masters speak.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Leblanc - thank God, I would say for Romeo Leblanc, or we would have the West Germans in here, we would have the draggers out there, we would have the boots put to the inshore fishery.

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Thank God that Romeo Leblanc can stand up to the big shots, the big fish merchants! Thank God for that!

MR. W. CARTER:

Ask the fish plant owners in

Isle aux Morts about Leblanc.

MR. NEADY:

Mr. Speaker, talking about

Isle aux Morts, there is another question I can put to the hon. minister. The hon. minister told us when Connors Brothers took over from their sister company in Isle aux Morts, which was now Melpack Fisheries, which is E.C. Packers, which is Westons, the biggest corporation, the biggest conglomerate in the whole of Canada, the wealthiest business in the whole of Canada who have now gone international, when Connors Brothers, I presume for income tax purposes, took over from Melpack Fisheries, my hon. friend and I got together and we went and talked to various people about getting that fish to process ground fish. And I remember the minister making a statement at the time - he said, 'Connors Brothers over in Lark Harbour' or wherever they are in New Brunswick, 'are the biggest canners in Eastern Canada.' Well, Sir, that was a fact - the minister was not exaggerating, that was a fact - one up for the minister. But, Sir, Newfoundlanders who live in Isle aux Morts cannot put that in the oven for Sunday dinner. I managed in the last year -

MR. W. CARTER: What about the 116 people working -

MR. NEARY: I am coming to that, Sir. I managed without any help from the minister .

AN HON. MEMBER: Ah, ha!

MR. NEARY: And I helped with the Concerned Citizens Group, and the minister would not go down to Isle aux Morts and meet with the group at a public meeting.

MR. W. CARTER: I have been three times.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. gentleman has been there three times; I have been there twice with the hon. gentleman. The Concerned Citizens Group in Isle aux Morts and myself managed, persuaded, shamed Connors Brothers into at long last processing groundfish in that plant. And last year, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister will remember, his colleague, who is not now on speaking terms with the hon. the Premier, hurled insult after insult across the House at me, scoffed at an idea that I brought up in this House about the dragger fleet being mobile, moving around the Province chasing the fish. And the Minister of Fisheries laughed it off and is now out publicly -

MR. W. CARTER: I did not laugh it off.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Fisheries laughed it off and is now out publicly saying it is a good idea, and in actual fact, Mr. Speaker, it is happening on the Southwest Coast. The draggers, Sir, from Port au Choix are providing the supply of fish for that fish plant in Isle aux Morts. They picked up the challenge. They took the challenge that I flung out in this House last year, and instead of hauling their draggers in on shore this Winter, and the Minister of Rural Development, surely members -

MR. W. CARTER: Because of the defunct licencing policies, once these Port au Choix ships go back to their traditional grounds in May your plant will be closing up.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is not telling me anything I do not know because the hon. gentleman heard me saying it on the radio the other day.

MR. W. CARTER: Right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, and this maybe of some interest to members of this House. The Minister of Rural Development, remember, scoffed at it and said the hon. member for LaPoile will never get forgiveness from the fishermen of this Province. These big longliners, the Minister of Fisheries was announcing a \$30 million longliner programme at that time, and that is what prompted me to raise it.

MR. W. CARTER: One hundred ships -

MR. NEARY: Thirty million dollars the minister said he was going to spend on longliners. \$30 million. And at the time the minister was making the statement we had \$30 million worth of longliners in on shore, and some of them had not been in the water for three and four and five years. And so that is what prompted me to make the suggestion, why must we undertake \$30 million longliner programme when we have boats that are on shore, hauled up, we have boats in the names, in some cases of taxi drivers, and barbers, and so forth and so on. Why did we need another \$30 million longliner fleet when around that time most of them were on shore? And I said, why do they not chase the fish, keep the boats fishing for more weeks and more months out of a year? Well the Port au Choix fishermen decided to do that this Winter; they put their boats on the Marine Service Centre which was built by the Government of Canada on a 90-10 basis in Isle aux Morts. They put their boats in there for their annual refit, and then after they had their annual overhaul, and they spend Christmas at home with their families, they came back, they finished their refit, and then they went fishing and are now providing fish for the plants in Isle aux Morts, in Rose Blanche, and in Burnt Islands. I was there the other day. And not only are they there from Port aux Choix, but they are also there from Nova Scotia. The highliner so far by the way, Mr. Speaker, and this appears to be a real good Winter fishery in my district, the highliner so far is Nova Scotian. I would submit, Sir, the reason the gentleman is a highliner is because his boat is better equipped than ours. They can go out and he can tell you exactly when he is over

MR. NEARY:

a school of fish. I was in the cabin the other day, last week when I was down, I saw the roll of paper that comes off when they go out, it is always on and when they go over a school of fish all kinds of little pencil marks come on the paper to indicate that there is a school of fish. Our people are out wandering around in the wilderness, in the dark because they cannot get the assistance from the government to get the right kind of equipment to compete with that kind of fishing that goes on.

But the minister is right, Sir; when the Port au Choix boats return to their home ports in, I would say, probably when the ice goes out in April sometime, then there will be no more supply of fish for the fish plant in Isle aux Morrs and the plant will have to close down again. Fortunately this year most of the plant workers will be after working long enough to get enough stamps to get their unemployment insurance for the winter. Therein is the weakness, Sir. There is the weakness.

The Connors Brothers - the Connors Brothers have not made any effort to provide fishing capability. They put in one cutting line. They are now working two shifts because there is lots of fish coming in there now. But they have made no provision, and that is the weakness in their programme, they have made no provision for catching capability.

MR. W. CARTER: They cannot get licences.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thought I just heard the Minister of Fisheries say they cannot get licences. Is that the same minister, Sir, is telling the people of this Province that the West Germans can get licences? Is that the same minister, Sir?

MR. W. CARTER: No, but what about the licences issued before 1972?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, did I hear the hon. gentleman say to the people of this Province publicly that the West Germans if they come in here will have no problems to get licences because they will be catching the Northern stock off Labrador.

MR. W. CARTER: I did not say that.

MR. NEARY: The minister did not say that? Well the Premier said it. Well what did the Premier say? On my understanding of the Nordsee deal -

MR. W. CARTER: Do you want me to answer?

MR. NEARY: I will yield to let the minister answer, Sir, because I am looking for information. But I want to make myself clear to the minister the kind of information I am looking for. My understanding of the 200 mile limit, Sir, is that eventually we will have all Canadian ships inside the 200 mile limit.

AN HON. MEMBER: When?

MR. NEARY: When? I do not know. It may take a little while but that is my understanding. And my understanding is also, Sir, that if the Nordsee deal was approved by Ottawa that licences will be granted to the West Germans, to tap a fishery resource that Newfoundland or Canada is not taking advantage of, and that is the Northern stock that I heard the minister refer to. Is that correct? That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, if the West Germans can do it, why can Connors Brothers not do it? Mr. Speaker, if the West Germans can get the licences to catch that Northern stock off Labrador, if the minister is supporting a proposal from the West Germans -

MR. W. CARTER: - your question.

MR. NEARY: If the minister is supporting a proposal for the West Germans, why would he not support a proposal for a Canadian company to catch that fish instead of letting the West Germans come over and catch it? Could the minister answer that question? Now has the minister got that question straight? Now I want to make sure about this. Because I do not want another attack on Ottawa and get the minister - I do not want to get the minister in hot water. I do not want to get the minister to misunderstand or give the House the wrong information. What I was to know is this: Why would not the minister, or would the

MR. HEAVY:                   minister support a proposal from Connors Brothers, a Canadian company, to licence draggers to catch that fish off Labrador and the Northern stock before he would support the Nordsee deal? That is the question I am asking the minister. And I will yield and I will carry on with my speech.

MR. W. CARTER:           The member is obviously, Mr. Speaker, trying to throw a red herring across the scenes because what we did say was that the Nordsee-Ocean Harvesters proposed merger and new companies.

MR. J. CARTER:

should not be refused licences to operate five fishing vessels while Ottawa, Mr. Leblanc in Ottawa, will in 1978 be issuing 500 licences to foreign ships to catch 52,000 tons, 104 million pounds of codfish, most of which will come from the so-called Northern waters, waters between Hopedale in the North, down to off the southern tip of the Avalon in the South and out 200 miles.

The licences that will be issued, at least that we are asking to be issued to - or at least to the Nordsee-Ocean Harvesters Company is to provide ships to displace foreign ships that will be operating within our 200 mile limits under licences issued by Ottawa, by Leblanc, we believe that as long as there is a foreign ship fishing within our 200 mile limit, catching our fish, fish to which we have first right, that no Canadian vessel should be refused a permit to go out and to displace that ship.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Including Connors Brothers.

Now if in taking that position, Mr. Speaker, that I am being disloyal to my Province or I am an impediment to the development of our Province, when I say so be it, I will not apologize to the House, to anybody in Canada or indeed in Newfoundland for fighting for what I know to be the rights of our people. We are being denied those rights by the masters of my friend opposite in Ottawa. They are blatantly ignoring our right, blatantly, brazenly ignoring our rights and until that situation is corrected, and if it takes a change of government to do it, well then I intend to continue my opposition to Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: I am trying to save the minister the embarrassment, Sir, of being disciplined again by his boss because the gentleman just made another scurrilous attack on Ottawa, on Romeo Leblanc.

MR. W. CARTER: Tell us what you are doing.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, attacking the Government



MR. NEARY: Mr. Leblanc is not going to help the situation any. It is not going to help the fishermen of this Province. The question I put to my hon. friend and my hon. friend evaded it, and the question was this, the minister is on public record as saying he is in favour of the Nordsee deal.

MR. W. CARTER: Under certain conditions.

MR. NEARY: Oh! Now what are the conditions?

MR. W. CARTER: You are aware of them as I am.

MR. NEARY: What are the conditions under which the minister is speaking.

MR. W. CARTER: I will be speaking after you, I will tell you what they are.

MR. NEARY: The government and the minister are in favour of the Nordsee deal, a foreign takeover of one of our greatest natural resources - let the foreigners take it. And we have Connors Brothers - the minister raised the matter, I did not raise it - Connors Brothers down in Isle aux Morts who will stop processing groundfish just as soon as the Port au Choix longliners go back to their home ports and they have not. The Minister said to me in response to that, they cannot get a licence. Well why can they not get a licence as well as the West Germans?

MR. W. CARTER: The West Germans have not got licences yet.

MR. NEARY: But the minister is fighting tooth and nail.

MR. W. CARTER: And we are fighting for Connors Brothers.

MR. NEARY: There is the difference, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is fighting for his buddies, the big wheels.

MR. W. CARTER: You do not want to hear that, do you?

MR. NEARY: The big shots, the hon. gentleman is now moonobbing -

MR. W. CARTER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - with the multi-nationals.

MR. W. CARTER: Down spending Christmas with John C. Boyle.

MR. NEARY: The spokesman for the multi-nationals.

MR. W. CARTER: Or John Shaheen or Al Vardy.

MR. NEARY: The spokesman, Sir, for the multi-nationals, the Minister of Fisheries. No wonder the fishermen have become disillusioned with the minister. The minister who is now the chief spokesman for the multi-nationals -

MR. W. CARTER: That is right, not for John Doyle though.

MR. NEARY: Not for the ordinary fishermen.

MR. W. CARTER: Not for John Shaheen.

MR. NEARY: Not for the ordinary fisherman of this Province, Sir.

MR. W. CARTER: Not for Al Vardy.

MR. NEARY: No, not for Craig Dobbin either.

MR. W. CARTER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Or not for A.B. Walsh either.

MR. W. CARTER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what kind of a slur or what kind of an innuendo the hon. gentleman is trying to get across but if the hon. gentleman wants to get down in the mud and roll around a little bit -

MR. W. CARTER: No, I would not get down with you, 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: - well then we will do it. But I would like for the hon. gentleman to be a little more specific. If the hon. gentleman is going to make a charge let him make it.

MR. W. CARTER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Not sit there and snipe like a guttersnipe

MR. W. CARTER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Let the hon. gentleman stand up man-fashion and make a charge and then I can deal with it, and not sit over there sniping at this side of the House.

MR. W. CARTER: If you will ever sit down I will start my speech.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is this, that my honorable friend instead of - and there has been bitter dissatisfaction for the fishermen of this Province. My honorable friend is now the chief spokesman for the international fish companies and the multinationals and the big fish merchants of this Province and not the spokesman for the fisherman and that is why, Sir, that is why the honorable gentleman is favouring Wordsee -

MR. CARTER: I must be getting through to you, 'Steve.'

MR. NEARY: - favouring Wordsee and the honorable gentleman is not getting through to me but I think I am getting through to the honorable gentleman. It is not becoming of the honorable gentleman to lose his cool -

MR. CARTER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - and to start making snide remarks -

MR. CARTER: I do not either.

MR. NEARY: That is not becoming of the honorable gentleman and I would certainly not do it to the honorable gentleman unless I have to defend myself and if I do then the honorable gentleman, as I reminded him a few moments ago, the hon. gentleman, many hon. gentleman on that side live in glass houses, and they better be careful of what time in the day they take a bath. I would say that to the hon. gentleman, and to his colleague to his left.

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible) press known.

MR. NEARY: Restrain yourself, Mr. Minister. Restrain yourself do not lose your cool. I am saying, Sir, to this House that the hon. minister has turned out after a year and a half or so in that portfolio to be a great disappointment to the fishermen of this Province, has become a spokesman for the multinationals, and the international companies. And if we are going to fight for a company,

MR. NEARY: Sir, fight for a Canadian company or a Newfoundland company, not for a West Germany company. And the minister sits there and says, Oh Connors Brothers cannot get a licence. Connors Brothers can get a licence to catch that fish, that Northern stock just as well as the West Germans can.

MR. W. CARTER: Booth Fisheries could not get them.

MR. NEARY: The only trouble is the minister is in there fighting tooth and nail for Nordsee, but he is not in there putting the boots to Connors Brothers or Westons.

MR. W. CARTER: I am fighting to displace the foreign ships that LeBlanc is licencing the fish within our waters.

MR. NEARY: A noble ambition indeed, Sir, a noble ambition. It is too bad the minister is not going about it in the right way.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: It is too bad relations with Ottawa and Mr. LeBlanc are so strain.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I think it is about time, Sir, that the hon. the Premeir took a good hard look at that situation, with all due respect, and I know they have had their rows, the hon. gentlemen and the hon. the Premier.

MR. W. CARTER: Do you want the Premier to take a look at the Nova Scotia situation as well, and the Quebec, and New Brunswick and P.E.I. where it is even worse? Is that my fault?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am here elected to this House to protect and further the interest of the people of this Province, not the people of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. And I would submit to my hon. friend that Nova Scotia and New Brusnwick are up knocking on Ottawa's door day and night putting proposals before the Government of Canada, taking the initiative, producing ideas and plans for the development of their fishery -

MR. W. CARTER: They are not getting any -

MR. NEARY: - while we have a minister down here who does nothing but hurl insults towards Ottawa.

AN.HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: And towards the Parliament Building and towards

MR. NEARY: Romeo LeBlanc, instead of going up and saying, here is our plan, here is our Magna Carta to develop the fisheries. Show us some results of all of these meetings that the minister held around the Province and went around at public expense, show us the results. We have not seen any. The fishermen have not seen any.

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty dollars.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would - I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty dollars a year.

MR. NEARY: There is the result, Sir. They got to pay \$20 now for a permit that used to be free, a little identification card that used to give them S.S.A. tax exempt on their gas and oil to operate their boats and go out and catch the fish, now they have to pay \$20 for that card. It has been free since Confederation. That is the kind of a backlash they have gotten for being co-operative and trying to be helpful to the minister. Is the minister going to sit there and allow that to happen? Or is the minister going to knuckle into his colleague, the Minister of Finance and Justice, go for the jugular

MR. NEARY: and say, "Look, you cannot do this to my fishermen." The gentleman was not very long down in the Finance Department, he was not very long down there when out goes the memo, it is dated February 28th., Mr. Speaker. It that months? It is less than two weeks ago, is it not? That is right. And it has not been out for months. It happened since that minister was appointed by the hon. the Premier. Put the boots right off the bat to the fishermen and the loggers and the lumbermen. And you know, Mr. Speaker, that fact was not important enough, that little fact alone was not important enough for the press gallery to pick up, that little fact that the government, the Minister of Fisheries and his colleague the Minister of Finance, had put the boots to the fishermen in this Province by charging them \$20 for a little identification card that they would have to the dealer every time they went or the dealer came to them to supply oil and gas, that little card made it tax exempt. That little card is now going to cost \$20.

Mr. Speaker, some fishermen, some small fishermen would be better off paying the tax on the oil and gas than they would by paying the \$20.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$50 next year.

MR. NEARY: And next year, as my colleague says, it will probably be \$50.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the policies that this government have been following that so many of our people had to take advantage of Manpower mobility grants last year to move elsewhere in the Province and to move outside the Province. I wonder, Sir, if the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations has been concerned enough, and interested enough, to find out how many Newfoundlanders received Manpower mobility grants last year to move outside this Province, to take jobs in other provinces of Canada. Can the minister tell me that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, but as I always say, if there was one there was one too many.

MR. NEARY: Well, if there was one there was one too many but that is not the answer to my question, Sir. We have a minister responsible for Manpower and Industrial Relations who seems to be in hot water with his constituents these days. You would think the minister would want to know how many Newfoundlanders went to Alberta for instance last year? Would the minister be interested in that kind of statistic?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not have it at my finger tips but I have it.

MR. NEARY: The minister has the statistic. Well -

MR. ROUSSEAU: How many got mobility grants.

MR. NEARY: Yes, well, that is right. How many got mobility grants? Now there are probably a lot more Newfoundlanders went and got mobility grants. But, Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in knowing where the minister got these statistics.

MR. ROUSSEAU: From the Canada Manpower.

MR. NEARY: Is that so? Mr. Speaker, the minister should now think and be careful. Are you sure the minister got that statistic from Canada Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well who else? The mobility people there -

MR. NEARY: But I am asking the minister. The minister would remember if he asked for it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You knew that is where they came from. We get lots of statistics -

MR. NEARY: Does the minister have the statistics in his department at all?

MR. ROUSSEAU: As far as I recall, yes.

MR. NEARY: As far as the minister recall, yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: If you want them I will get them for you.

MR. NEARY: Well can the minister get them for me?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Not now, I cannot, the office is closed.

I will get them for you -

MR. NEARY: Well, I will tell you what, Mr. Speaker, they are the kind of figures, you know, you do not forget. Because if somebody

MR. NEARY: said 500 Newfoundlanders got Manpower mobility grants to go to Alberta last year I believe the minister would remember that figure. I would. And I am as stunned as a bat.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: I would remember it.

Mr. Speaker, this may be of some interest to the House. Maybe the minister might learn something new today. Mr. Speaker, I am sure now that the hon. gentlemen are going to think I am picking on certain ministers. Well, the Minister of Fisheries should be interested in knowing that 7,500 people, 7,500 individuals in this Province last year applied for and received Manpower mobility grants to move within the Province, and to move outside the Province, 7,500 were uprooted. And out of that number, Sir, 2,900 mobility grants were approved. 2,900 is a figure you do not forget. And I am glad the minister has the figures in his department.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am stunned than a bat.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am really glad that the minister has the figures in his department because I am told, from my usual reliable source, that the first time the information was asked for I asked for it. I was told that. Now perhaps my source of information is -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Maybe we deal at different levels.

MR. NEARY: Maybe we do. I deal at the ministerial level and I work down from that. Maybe the minister starts at the bottom and works up. But anyway 2,900 mobility grants were approved last year for people to move to the Mainland, to other provinces of Canada. And out of that number, Sir, exploratory grants and relocation grants and people going out for interviews and that sort of thing, 430 of that number, 480 headed for guess where? Alberta, 480. I beg your pardon. Fort Macfurray mostly. 480 went out to look



March 10, 1978

Page No. 155

RM - 4

MR. NEARY: For that pot of gold at the end of the rainbow in Alberta. 2,900 mobility grants approved within the Province, within provincial boundaries, pardon me, 2,900 approved to move to other provinces, Ontario, Nova Scotia, Quebec, not so many to Quebec, to Ontario and to Western Canada. 7,500 total moved within the Province. Interesting statistics and

MR. NEARY: something for us to be very alarmed and very concerned about, Sir, that our people are being uprooted because they cannot find jobs in their own Province. They cannot find jobs, first of all, in their own hometowns. They are uprooted and they have to move to another part of the Province which is not so bad, but having to leave your own native Province, your own native home, well, Mr. Speaker, nobody has had as much experience with that sort of thing as I did on Bell Island when the mines closed, and I saw grown men weep because they had to leave their native home.

And we have, Mr. Speaker, we have in this Province - I am going to get back to the Minister of Fisheries again - we have a natural resource, Sir, we have a natural resource in this Province with a potential, I would think, to employ just about every Newfoundlander who wants a job. And because of the laziness of the administration, because of their tardiness, their tired, old routine, because they are so anxious to get on the golf courses and get on the barrens, and get out by the side of a pond fishing, the proposals have not been put forward, the proposals have not been - oh! my hon. sparring partner is back. Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has moved the adjournment of the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday, March 14, 1978 at 3:00 p.m.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, March 14, 1978, at 3:00 p.m.