

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1978

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am pleased to welcome to the House of Assembly on behalf of all hon. members thirty-one Grade VIII students from St. Kevin's School in the Coulds accompanied by their teacher, Miss Turner. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these students and their teacher to the House.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Last week in Europe there was an event that took place that did not get much publicity here and I think it is worthy of the House to take note. And I personally have a great deal of pride in recognizing what happened there, and that is when some forty-eight hockey teams from Europe and North America competed in the Oldtimers' Hockey Tournament and the Conception Bay Sea Bees won the tournament outright. And I think it is a credit to the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Those were days, Mr. Speaker, when conflict was probably more pleasurable than it is today as far as some of us are concerned, but I would like to move that this House go on record of extending congratulations to a bunch of people who were very popular in this Province when they were participating in major hockey and certainly have been a credit to the Province and to our country overseas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. N. DOWE: Very briefly, Sir, I would like to associate myself on behalf of my colleagues with the remarks of the hon. the Premier on the Oldtimers' Hockey, the performance put on by the people from Newfoundland, by Conception Bay South particularly. Perhaps Oldtimers - I should not say this, Mr. Speaker, but it seemed

MR. M. N. ROWE: to me when the hon. the Premier was making his statement there was a feeling of empathy and sympathy at the concept of being an oldtimer -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. M. N. ROWE: - in terms of politics particularly, Mr. Speaker. And maybe it is time now to make way for the new brood that is coming up in political life.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. M. N. ROWE: But, Mr. Speaker, I just say that by way of an incidental comment. I do join wholeheartedly with the hon. the Premier's remarks regarding the Oldtimers' Hockey Tournament.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. gentleman if what has proceeded is under the heading Statements by Ministers, obviously it will be by leave before I could recognize the hon. gentleman. If it is previous to Statements by Ministers, and words of general congratulations then obviously I will recognize him. Do I understand it correctly that this is not strictly speaking Statements by Ministers? I am thinking of the precedents last year when other hon. members were denied the right to speak on Statements by Ministers unless they were leaders of a caucus.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Premier and Leader of the Opposition. Many other players naturally have been known down through the years from our particular part of Conception Bay. We know them all quite personally. I should say, following the games down through the years. We are glad to know that the Gee Dees actually were from our part of Conception Bay and as the Premier noted, he was very closely associated with those Gee Dees at one time.

AN HON. MEMBER: He owned them.

MR. ROWE: Perhaps he owned them. But I want to

March 14, 1978

Tape 157

TC - 3

MR. DAVE: go on record as associating myself with the remarks that have been made and offer my congratulations. And I understand that they are to arrive at Gander around 3:30 this afternoon, and a reception is being planned, I think, for Friday or Saturday of this week.

But before I sit down I would like to take this opportunity as well to offer congratulations to Ascension Collegiate, Fay Roberts. Last Sunday at the stadium there

MR. DAWE:

they won the All-Newfoundland Schoolboys' Championship. They played a team from my friend from Exploits' (Dr. Twomey) district. The town of Botwood had a team there. They had a good series. Bay Roberts Ascension Collegiate won by only one game. The calibre of the hockey was beyond what I thought was being played by the young fellows today and I would like to associate myself with those extending congratulations to Ascension Collegiate and at the same time congratulate the team from Botwood High School for the excellent series they provided.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave of the House, before we get on to Statements by Ministers, to continue in this vein for about two minutes longer. I would just like to bring to the attention of the hon. House that on Friday and Saturday of last week a number of M.H.A.'s travelled from here to Botwood to partake in a mockey game there in Botwood on Friday night and on to Springdale in the great historic district of Green Bay on Saturday afternoon at which tournament we were fortunate to come away as the victors and were presented with a trophy. We are very proud of that.

The member for Exploits, the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power), the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor), the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) and the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and yours truly were successful in counteracting a very massive onslaught by the Lions Club of Springdale. We would like to go on record as thanking the Lions Club and Kinsmen of Botwood and also the Lions Club of

March 14, 1978, Tape 158, Page 2 -- apb

MR. PECKFORD: Springdale for putting off
this great mockey tournament in Botwood and Springdale.
Lions Winter Carnival Mockey
Cup, Springdale 1978:

Fearless in the House,/
Fainthearted on the ice, / Thanks for coming Humbugs,,
Wasn't Springdale nice?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ooo

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I table the
Public Accounts of the Province of Newfoundland for the
year ended March 31, 1977, and the Report of the Auditor
General to the House of Assembly for the financial year
ended 31 March, 1977. I compliment the Auditor General
for his excellent report and I also compliment the
officials in the Department of Finance of this Province
for having implemented such excellent accounting
practices. May I, while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker,
indicate to hon. members that Friday coming, Friday the
seventeenth day of March, 1978, the budget will be
brought down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like
to table The Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Regulations
1977, and The Mineral Regulations, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

Answers to Questions.

MR. HICKMAN: I am sorry, I cannot hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave to revert to Notices
of Motion? Agreed!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice

MR. HICKMAN: that I will on tomorrow ask leave to ask the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Thank you, Sir. A question, Sir, for the Premier. In view of the statement on the news today that apparently the Public Utilities Board has now sent the government a report following the hearings involving Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro which are likely to result in an increase to the consumers of this Province, if implemented, of some 15 per cent in their electricity rates, is the Premier now prepared to say what the government intends to do about this recommendation by the Public Utilities Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the retail price would be more like 7 or 8 per cent as opposed to the 15 per cent which would be charged to Newfoundland Light and Power. We have not had an opportunity to study it yet, it just arrived this morning. Certainly when we do have an opportunity to study it the government will be making its position clear.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Can the Premier give a little more specific idea to the House, Mr. Speaker, as to when we are likely to know if any increase is going to be implemented regarding the rate of electric power?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Mines and Energy who is responsible to answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER:
Mines and Energy.

The hon. the Minister of

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we received
the report this morning and it is now being analyzed.
I have just had

MR. PECKFORD:

the opportunity to speak to the Premier rather briefly as we were coming in the House. The matter is being analyzed, the report, and there will be recommendations, of course, from the Department of Mines and Energy to Cabinet this week and hopefully then government will have a chance to fully review it and make its position known as it relates to the recommendations in the report. Suffice it to say, as the Premier has already indicated, that the 44 per cent increase requested by Newfoundland Hydro would translate itself into around a 14 per cent retail price increase, and hence the amount recommended by the Public Utilities Board to be awarded to Newfoundland Hydro being somewhere in the vicinity of 23 or 24 per cent would therefore correspondingly mean a reduction in the amount of retail price that would be given to consumers and domestic consumers in the Province and hence it would seem on the surface that the amount of retail price increase inherent in this recommendation from PUB would be around the 7 or 8 percent mark. But that would also depend to some degree upon Newfoundland Light and Power's reaction to the overall price increase.

MR. W. N. KUNE:
MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.
The hon. Leader of the Opposition
Directed to the Premier, in view

of the fact that if this Province, if this government were to receive further income or greater income from the Upper Churchill Falls project, the government might be in a better position to subsidize the possible electricity to consumers in the Province as a whole.

Can the Premier tell the House whether when he was speaking to Premier Levesque on Friday, presumably negotiating something or other although that never became clear, whether the Premier told Premier Levesque

MR. W.N. ROWE: point-blank that unless we got a better deal on the Upper Churchill power, the Premier and the government were prepared to pull the switch on the Upper Churchill power development?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honorable Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not tell Mr. Levesque that we were going to pull the switch.

MR. W.N. ROWE: One further supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Will the Premier then, Sir, tell the House whether, in view of the fact that prior to the meeting with Mr. Levesque he had stated that before any negotiations, further negotiations with Quebec, take place there must be a revision, a favourable revision of the contract between Hydro Quebec and Newfoundland regarding the Upper Churchill power so that we get a better share, a fair share, whether now that policy has been changed, since the impression received from the press conference that he and Mr. Levesque had on Friday was that the Premier and Mr. Levesque were prepared to commence negotiations on the other rivers in Labrador in spite of the fact that apparently no different conclusions had been reached regarding the upper Churchill power?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it was made very clear to Mr. Levesque that our first priority has to be the re-negotiation of the Upper Churchill contract. The bargaining power we have in that regard, I think, is well known to all in the House as to what that is; we have some bargaining power with the head waters, the eventual head water flooding of those three rivers particularly that flow into Quebec with hydro potential.

March 14, 1978

Tapé 159

DW - 3

PREMIER MOORES: We also, of course, have the surplus power from Minimuskrat or Gull Island development, if we cannot attract industry to use it ourselves, some surplus power, that would have to be negotiated. But, primarily the thing we want to make sure of is that any hydro development we have or anything we do will be to reverse that particular policy that has gone before in this Province and anything we do for new development, all developments will be in the best interests of the people of this Province.

MR. W.M. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W.M. ROWE: Can the Premier tell the House then, Mr. Speaker, why since some two or three weeks, well a month or so ago, he made a public statement concerning the drastic action which the government was prepared to take, from which has been inferred by everybody in the Province and not denied by the Premier to be the pulling of the switch, the turning off of the switch and closing down the Churchill Falls Hydro project if we do not get a fair share of the value of that, can the Premier tell us why this subject was not broached with Mr. Levesque and in discussing the Upper Churchill power he did not make his position clear to Premier Levesque that we in this Province are prepared, if necessary, to take the drastic action of pulling the switch on the Upper Churchill power unless we get a fair share of the value of that power for this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I never said that it was not mentioned. I just said that we did not make an outright statement that we were going to do it. There is a distinct difference. It was very definitely mentioned and the mood of the people of this Province was made very clear to Mr. Levesque and the situation is of course that anything as drastic as pulling the switch, as it is phrased, would be a very last resort and hopefully, Sir, there are enough sensible and sane people on both sides to come up with another solution before that would be necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary question to the Premier. It was outlined on Friday in the House that the present course being taken by this administration is to obtain additional value for the power that is presently being sold in interim to Hydro Quebec. Could the Premier indicate to us what method he intends to apply, or what method

MR. STRACHAN: Has been applied for the gaining of this additional value for the power presently being sold and whether he told the Premier of Quebec what method he was going to use, whether he could tell us now in the House, and the people of the Province, what method he intends to use for the gaining of the additional value for this power?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORE: Mr. Speaker, that is obviously the subject that we have discussed many times amongst ourselves and are still discussing with our lawyers, with other people involved from Hydro and other places, and until such time as we have finalized, and I mean finalized the position I think it would be wrong to just bandy it around without having the full facts available for the House.

MR. STRACHAN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the Premier indicate then whether this is a significant change from last year in which the forefront of the attack was the recall of 500 megawatts of power and now we have indications that the forefront of the attack is the recall of the value so that the regaining of the additional value for the power and that in the long term only is the recall of 300 megawatts of power?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORE: I think, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say, and I think the hon. member himself realizes that if the court case rules in the favour of our Province, whereby recall is allowed, I think without - well, Mr. Levesque himself was the first to admit when we talked last week that if that was the case that automatically reopens the price for the power as well because if you can recall any or all the power, obviously at that rate the inclination would be for Quebec or whoever else to automatically adjust their rates so that it became more profitable to us rather than establish just energy intensive

PREMIER MOORES: industries in such huge quantities that would be needed to employ all 5,225 megawatts of the Upper Churchill power. It would be obvious that once the Island had its domestic needs and some industrial needs that it would be in Quebec's best interest to renegotiate the price. So obviously the recall also affects what in fact is the pricing of the power from the Upper Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for Eagle River for a supplementary, and the hon. member for LaPoile for a final supplementary, and then the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. STRACIAW: The Premier then is indicating, and I wanted to confirm this from his talk here, that what we are doing now then is that in the interim there is no hope whatsoever for any action on the Churchill Falls power until the court has made a decision which we have been told will be down the road a number of years, so that between now and when the court case has finally come to a decision, this Province must sit back and watch and not gain any value or be able to negotiate with Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that whilst negotiations, dialogue if you like, are going on with Quebec and will continue to go on, this Province and this government has no intention of standing by, as the hon. member suggests, for two or three years and do nothing until the court case is concluded.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile a supplementary.

MR. LEARN: Mr. Speaker, both Premiers, I think, following the meeting at a news conference said that they would abide by the decision of the court. Now let me ask the Premier this; under what statute, under what authority is the Province suing Churchill Falls Corporation and/or Quebec Hydro for

MR. NEARY: recall of 300 megawatts of power? Under what statute?

Is it a statute of this Province? Could the Premier indicate the authority under which action is being taken against Churchill Falls Corporation and/or Quebec Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, and I should take notice of this question and get an accurate answer for the gentleman, but as I understand it it is the water lease agreement that was an act of this house between the Government of Newfoundland and CELCO, whereby the government is suing through the water lease agreement between this government and CELCO. It is a Newfoundland act, a Newfoundland law, if you like, and that is the vehicle which we are using to get the recall and hopefully that will result in the price increase after.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member yield? A further supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier then indicate that would it not be possible for Newfoundland— and we have heard so much about somebody giving the power away— would it not be possible under this same statute that the hon. Premier does not know about at the moment, would it not be possible to stop all the sale of power to Quebec Hydro if we had use for it here in this Province, 5200 megawatts, would it not be possible? How can the Premier say that the power has been given away?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The big thing here, Mr. Speaker, is if we had use for it. The fact is that 5225 megawatts supplies approximately 40 per cent of all the electricity used in Quebec. Our total usage in this Province, now total usage, is about 1300 megawatts.

MR. PICKFORD: 1100.

PREMIER MOORES: 1100 megawatts. So obviously to use 5200 megawatts is a huge job, plus the fact that once that is done then Quebec Hydro become responsible for the bond holders, the other people who have lent money, and that has to be paid off immediately.

MR. MON. MEMBER: Quebec Hydro?

PREMIER MOORES: Quebec Hydro, I am sorry.

MR. MICHENER: CFLCo.

PREMIER MOORES: CFLCo. with the guarantee of Quebec Hydro. But, Mr. Speaker, the ramifications of what the hon. member for LaPocle (Mr. Neary) mentions obviously is one that we are seriously considering and what the alternatives, and what could possibly be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier.

Now that the Kings Lake project is getting ready to go on stream - there are tenders called practically every other day. On September 14, 1977 the Premier made the following statement and I quote, "With respect to employment the first priority will be given to the people of the Buchans area for obvious reasons." Now my question is does he still stand on that statement and will priority still be given to the people of Buchans?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I certainly personally would like to see that happen where the people have the skills that are required for that particular job. But there is a problem there that I did not realize at the time and I think the hon. member may realize it or may not. That is that the Construction Trades have an agreement with Newfoundland Hydro to do their work for them, and the union at Buchans is the Steelworkers, and the problem I suggest is going to be a lack of co-operation whereby one union will allow workers from another union to come in to work where they have people actually waiting in their own unions out of work at this time. So it is not an easy one but if you are asking me how I feel personally about it and as to how the government feels, certainly I would like to see every opportunity go to the people of Buchans.

MR. SLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: I have been aware as other have been aware that there may or not be a problem but then again, Mr. Speaker, the Province, the Cabinet and the Premier and this House have got a commitment to the people of Buchans and I think that the Trades and Labour people are probably expecting a meeting or a call from the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. So I would like to phrase a question to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. Has the Minister, recognizing the situation existing in Buchans, recognizing that the Buchans economy is facing total collapse with a layoff of around 500 men in March of next year, one year, has he talked to the Trades and Labour people and looked at the possibility of negotiating ways and means that the Buchans people who get laid off on that job get work on the Minto Lake project? It is their resource and that is just as important as any agreements existing between unions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

Mr. Rousseau: Yes, we have had some very preliminary discussions with the Building Construction Trades Council. We will be working on that matter. I understand there are a number of people who are construction oriented working at Buchans who have not been employed really in the construction industry for some time now. It is our hope, as the Premier has indicated, that as many people from Buchans as possible get jobs on that project, and we will pursue that matter with the Building Construction Trades.

MR. FLIGHT: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: The Premier knows, Mr. Speaker, because this has been debated and talked about for a long time, that the only way the people of Buchans can get priority anyway, can take advantage of any priorities offered them on the Hinds Lake project is to have access roads into the construction sites from Buchans which would be a maximum of eight, ten miles of road added to what will already be built. Has the Premier or the Cabinet considered putting those access roads in so as to give the people of Buchans the priority that he has indicated that he wants them to have.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South followed by the hon. gentlemen for LaPoile and for Bellevue.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I wonder would the minister be good enough to inform the House whether he was in receipt of a request for assistance from a number of residents on a road branching off from Dunfield Road in Foxtrap on the weekend concerning the fact that the road has been blocked there, and no ploughing by either any municipality or provincial authority and the residents of course are left in a position whereby if there is a fire or a serious accident or hospitalization required that there is no way the residents can get out. And I am wondering if the minister could, one, provide us with the information as to when he received a request for assistance; two, what is the reason

Mr. Nolan: for this problem that has been a very serious one for the people there now for at least two years, in some instances; and what if anything he is prepared to do about it?

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

MR. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the second part of the question first, what are we prepared to do about it? Instructions have been given to the highways people in that part of the Conception South district to plough that particular road, and this is being done this afternoon. I have had conversations with people who lived on that road, and are living on that road, and it is an unusual and a rather frustrating situation in which they find themselves. They are not in an incorporated community - Foxtrap is not part of the Conception Bay South municipality - and the road on which they live has not been accepted by the Province through the Department of Transportation and Communications as the responsibility of the Province. It is not up to standard. The developers who put the road in there, and subsequently sold lots and had houses built thereon, did not bring it up to a standard acceptable to the department and as a result the department has refused to accept it. And I want to make it clear the department still refuses to accept it, and it is still not recognized as a responsibility of the department. We do recognize a responsibility for the people who live in that area, however, and in the interest of health and safety we have undertaken to plough the road and to keep it ploughed. Obviously, as the hon. member has indicated, the people do have a right to emergency services, fire protection, and ambulance services and so on, and we will keep the road open for that purpose. But the road is really too narrow to do a satisfactory or an adequate job, so I am told, and there is a danger of -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. DOODY: Wait now, I am trying to answer some of these questions. These people are former constituents of mine. These are people in whom I have a very sincere and honourable interest, and I am trying to answer my friend's question, if the man from Lapoile (Mr. Neary), the

Mr. Doody: hon. member is bored, or discouraged, or unhappy, you know, I can stop, if the House does not want it. What odds, that is enough anyway, Your Honour, We will let it go.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman ask for a supplementary?

MR. LUSH: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: On Saturday there was a house burned on the Gauline Road and I understand from reading in the paper that one of the major reasons for the house being completely burned was the difficulty that the firemen had in getting to the house because of the poor conditions of the road. Now that is not the burden of my question because it was a bad storm on Saturday. The major issue is that the road was not ploughed on Sunday so that the family concerned could get back and get some of the things that were not burned. So I wonder if the minister can explain what might have happened here, whether the equipment was overburdened or just what the situation was?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Highways.

MR. DOODY: I have not had a report on that particular situation, Your Honour. I could certainly look into it for the hon. member. I would anticipate that the nature of the storm that we had over the weekend was such as to put a overburden, too much pressure, on the amount of equipment available. It was a rather heavy snow storm, a lot of drifting, roads were in terrible conditions. I know that the crews were working late and working hard and on that particular I do not have any specific information on it. I will be only too happy to find out what the reason was for that delay. It is a most unusual one.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I will recognize the hon. member for LaPoile next.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, Sir. Would the minister indicate to the House if the minister has turned thumbs down on a police commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. MOLAN: Will we repeat the question for you?

MR. HICKMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice to the House that I am dissatisfied with the answer the minister has given me and wish to debate it during the Late Show on

MR. HEARY: Thursday coming.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South on a supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: If the answer to the question from my hon. friend was no, that thumbs have not been turned down, what is the minister going to do about it and when is he going to do something on the police commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Well I guess, Mr. Speaker, I better keep some of that information for the debate, because the debate is going to be that I did not say no. Obviously then the hon. gentleman must have felt I should have said no because otherwise there would be no debate.

The answer to the question is no, and I did not turn thumbs down.

MR. HEARY: - thumbs up.

MR. HICKMAN: I indicated to the Police Brotherhood at their request, some time ago or some months ago, that before there was any change in the existing legislation dealing with police commissions I would accede to their request to submit a brief. They have indicated to me that they are working assiduously on the brief and they hope to have it ready by this Fall.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated I would recognize the hon. member for Bellevue next, followed by the hon. members for St. George's, and Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. HICKMAN: In the meantime we have an excellent police force.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Tourism in connection with the current hunter capability tests that are being conducted. First of all I want to ask the minister - the minister knows that no political party would conduct an election during February and March, so would the minister explain why these capability tests are

MR. CALLAN: being conducted during February and March when it is very difficult for people to travel to the points where it is necessary to take these tests? Why was February and March chosen?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, apparently the hon. gentleman is confused because there is no designated month to carry out the hunter capability test. The test, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member can remain quiet a second -

MR. CALLAN: - February.

MR. MORGAN: The test, Mr. Speaker, the hunter capability test under the hunters' safety programme of the Department of Tourism, Wildlife Division, commenced in the Fall of last year. It has been ongoing since that time to the point where now we have over 12,000 prospective hunters tested and passed those tests around the Province. These tests are ongoing now, true. They will be ongoing until approximately around the end of April or the middle of May this year.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell the House what percentage must a prospective hunter score on the written or oral part of that test in order to be considered a capable hunter, what percentage?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the tests are in two forms. One is the oral or written test whereby a person is asked to answer ten questions. If he can answer seven correctly out of the ten he can pass the written/oral test. Then he is asked to carry out shooting tests and these shooting tests can be very seldom carried out in the same location as the written/oral test. That is very obvious. So we have to move the applicants to areas like for example in St. John's the Rod and Gun Club which is a bit of a disadvantage I guess to the

MR. MORGAN: people living in town who have to travel out to the Trans-Canada Highway and then they have to attempt to hit a target sixteen by sixteen, fifty yards away from that target, at two shots out of three. If he passes these two tests he then qualifies to make application for big game licences.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the written or oral test,

MR. CALLAN:

not the shooting aspect of it. Would the minister agree that it is not ten questions, there are twenty questions - ten on a page for a total of twenty? And would the minister not agree also that, you know, anybody that can fail six of these out of twenty is still considered a capable hunter? How can that be? Seventy per cent is the actual figure, I believe.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, apparently the hon. gentleman cannot understand. You have to answer correctly seven questions out of ten.

MR. CALLAN:

That is seven out of ten -

MR. MORGAN:

Well, that is 70 per cent is it not? - 70 per cent in both cases. So the hon. gentleman surely must understand that the hunter, to be looked upon as a qualified applicant to qualify for a big game licence, has to get 70 per cent.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated that that will be the last supplementary.

MR. CALLAN:

I am dissatisfied with the answer and I wish to debate it on the Late Show.

MR. MORGAN:

Oh, that is the idea. Great, great!

MR. SPEAKER:

I have indicated I will recognize the hon. member for St. George's followed by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MRS. ISAAC:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. I would like to refer to the agreement that was signed recently between the provincial minister and the federal Minister of Agriculture. It refers to a small farm development programme, and it is my understanding that it is a small scale family farm. I would like for the minister to tell me just what type of farm this would be. Is this a back garden type thing or would it be a small type farm on a commercial basis? Would you explain that please, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: It would involve both, Mr. Speaker, the small family type farm whereby a family tries to increase their income, or subsistence type farming, the small commercial farm. And there is no real dollar value put on the amount that has to be farmed in order for people to qualify to get assistance - managerial assistance, this is not financial assistance, it is managerial assistance in how to keep books, accounts and various technical assistance that they may use in order to develop the small farms, whether it is the back garden variety or it is a supplement to the income which they may get from other sources such as fishing or logging.

MRS. McISAAC: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MRS. McISAAC: Well, this agreement then amounts to a \$100,000 expenditure and it amounts to three field staff workers assigned with the federal government. Could the minister tell me if there is any other agreement with respect to agriculture that has been signed between the provincial and federal governments that would relate to agriculture on a commercial basis?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: There is no agreement presently in effect, Mr. Speaker, regarding agriculture development in the Province. We are working with the federal government on the possibility of getting a DRED agreement to replace the AEDA agreement which phased out last year, terminated last March, but at this point in time that is the only agreement that we have with the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated that I would recognize the hon. gentleman from Trinity - Bay de Verde next.

MR. F. BOWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Fisheries, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: In view of the severe storm damage that has taken place in the last couple of months in ten to twelve communities in the district of Trinity - Bay de Verde to the fishing facilities, which will presumably be taken care of by the federal and provincial government where these facilities fall under the jurisdiction of the federal or provincial government, could the minister indicate if this administration has any policy to help the private fishermen where they have lost private sheds, private fishing stages and fishing gear and boats? Is there any policy that the provincial government is undertaking or formulating to help the fishermen who have lost private gear?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, there is no ongoing programme of assistance to cover loss of private gear. He mentioned the federal/provincial cost sharing programme. I should point out that that programme is only applicable where the losses are such that it would qualify for assistance under the Emergency Measures Organization, which means that if the losses would exceed \$500,000 - one dollar per capita for our population - then the federal government would undertake to cost share such a programme in excess of that amount as was the case in the 1974 gear replacement programme. Some time ago we did put together a report in which we recommended certain things to Ottawa, for example, to join the Province in a gear insurance programme that included, I should point out, onshore facilities. Ottawa so far has not seen fit to join with us on that kind of a programme, but we are continuing to look at it and are hoping some time in the near future that we can put together some kind of a gear insurance programme. I believe that that kind of a programme is necessary because there are substantial losses suffered almost on a yearly basis by fishermen. But certainly at the present time there is no ongoing programme except the subsidy on landings that we are paying. That

MR. G. CARTER:

money is intended to go towards replacing lost gear or gear that is worn out.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: The Address in Reply .

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate and the amendment to the Address in Reply.

Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. SEARY: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SEARY: I thank my hon. colleagues, Sir. I was going to rise on a breach of the privilege of the House, Sir, earlier and Your Honour thought, I believe, I was going to stand to make a Ministerial Statement. But the proper time to rise on a breach of privilege of the House is at the earliest possible moment which was when the House met this afternoon so I just want to point it out to Your Honour. Nevertheless it does not really make any difference now because I have the opportunity to get the matter corrected on the public record anyway. And it involves the Minister of Tourism, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the hon. gentleman had stated a point of privilege at the time he would have been recognized because a person wishing gain the recognition of the Chair on a point of privilege, that obviously takes precedence. I just state that so that hon. members are aware of it.

The hon. member.

MR. SEARY: That is right, Your Honour. It is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, it is most serious. One of the vilest sins that you can commit in this House is to give the House false information, especially, if you deliberately give the House false information. I would submit, Sir, that on Friday when I was speaking in the Throne Speech debate on a vote of non-confidence that the Minister of Tourism gave the House false and incorrect information. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but he rose on a point of

MR. NEARY: order to do it. And the false information that the minister gave the House was in connection with the statement that I was making about the number of questions that were asked on the order paper in the 1977 session of the House and the number of answers that were received from ministers. I was reading my memo, Sir, that I had in my hand and if the House will remember, and if they do not I will refresh their memory, that in the 1977 session of the House the Opposition collectively put on the order paper 240 questions directed to ministers of the government and out of that number, Sir, 104, only 104 were answered by ministers. At that point, Sir, and I have Hansard here in front of me, the verbatim report of the House, the Minister of Tourism rose on a point of order. He said, "Mr. Speaker, a point of order." In the Hansard it says 'Mr. Morgan.' "I want to bring to the attention of the House that the information being put forward to the hon. House by the hon. member now speaking"-which was me-" is incorrect. The information stands as follows," quoting the minister. "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 were asked totaled by all members of the Opposition but out of that 695 were given answers to by the ministers of the Crown."

AN HON. MEMBER: 495.

MR. NEARY: 495. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of the hon. members of the House that this is a serious abuse of privilege of this House. It is an attempt to mislead the House, raising a point of order to do it, and the hon. gentleman owes the House an apology because the statement that the hon. gentleman made in his point of order is incorrect. And the hon. gentleman was shouting across the House to me "Chicken, chicken! Resign, resign!" challenging me right, left and center, gone berserk, gone right out of his mind. And now I ask the hon. gentleman in all decency to stand in this Hon. House and admit that the hon. gentleman was wrong, that the actual figures were as I quoted, 240

MR. NEARY: questions were asked by the members of the Opposition of ministers of the government and out of that number only 104 were answered.

Would the minister now do the honourable thing and stand up in this Hon. House and admit that the hon. gentleman was wrong and apologize to the house? Mr. Speaker, I will yield and then carry on with my speech on the vote of non-confidence. I will yield to the hon. gentleman to do that, Sir, because one thing we must maintain in this House, Sir, is integrity and honour. And I would hope that the hon. gentleman would be decent enough, man enough to stand up now and admit that

Mr. Neary: the hon. gentleman was wrong and apologize to the House. I will yield and then I will carry on with my address if that is satisfactory to Your Honour.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am only too pleased to stand in the House and correct the situation which was brought to the House by this hon. gentleman last Friday, and whereby I tabled in the House of Assembly at the time was of the opinion the information regards to questions asked and questions answered for the last session. What was tabled, Mr. Speaker, in error, were the questions asked and the questions answered, and these figures are correct for, 1975 and not 1976.

Now in apologizing to the House of Assembly I feel that the hon. gentleman could also accept my challenge I issued last Friday as well, and be a man and accept my challenge to the other end.

MR. NEARY: I accept the hon. gentleman's apology.

MR. W. ROWE: A humble apology.

MR. NEARY: A humble apology to the House, Sir, and I would hope that in future that the hon. gentleman would be very, very cautious about throwing challenges across this hon. House. Mr. Speaker, -

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

MR. NEARY: - no wonder the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If there is a valid point of order I obviously will hear the hon. gentleman. I would point out that it is not unknown for points of order to be raised in order to give hon. members an opportunity to enter into debate, and this has been known on rare occasions to happen on both sides of the House, and I think it usually leads to more heat than light. But the hon. gentleman being aware of that then obviously he has the right to raise a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: A point of order; that the hon. gentleman pointed out may be correctly so that I misled the House, not intentionally, last Friday. At the same time I would like to bring to the House's attention that the hon. gentleman also misled the House of Assembly, whether intentionally or not, by a statement about myself, and my colleague the Minister of Fisheries involving the Premier, which I have asked him to either substantiate or deny or apologize to the House of Assembly as well. That is my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It would appear that the point made by the hon. gentleman fell within the general species defined a few moments ago.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Also, Mr. Speaker, on Friday when I started to get into my few brief remarks on this vote of non-confidence I made reference at some length to the media, about the reporting of this hon. House. My remarks, Sir, were not meant to tar all members of the press gallery or of the media with the one brush. I zeroed in particularly, Sir, on the CBC, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which receives \$500 million a year of taxpayers money. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, out of all of the important information that I pruned out of the ministers on Friday, that I squeezed out of the ministers - and I had five ministers up giving the House very valuable information, Sir - when I stepped outside of the House a reporter from the CBC approached me and said, "Mr. Neary, could we do an interview with you?" And I said, "Yes, of course. I presume you want to talk about some of the information, for instance, the kind of information that was brought out that the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Finance between them had left millions of dollars on the table in Ottawa that should be now used in this Province, that has been left in Ottawa because they are too lazy to take the initiative and go and negotiate agreements

MR. NEARY: with the Government of Canada, and the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, millions of dollars left on the table in Ottawa that should be now in use in this Province to create employment for Newfoundlanders.¹¹ I thought that was a very important factor, Sir, especially when ministers were put on the spot and practically admitted that this was correct. The Minister of Mines and Energy, for instance, I charged -

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, but (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I charged the Minister of Mines and Energy with gross negligence.

MR. W. ROWE: And properly so.

MR. NEARY: And properly so, Sir, in not taking the initiative to go and negotiate with the hon. Mr. Cullen, the Federal Minister of Employment and Immigration, to negotiate a deal whereby the Government of Canada would help finance the cutting of the wood on the Lower Churchill to clear the site. My information, Mr. Speaker, from my usual reliable source leads me to believe that there is money available, and if it cannot be obtained for that particular project it can be obtained for another make-work project in this Province.

MR. PECKFORD: No!

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, that is so.

MR. PECKFORD: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have it from the horse's mouth, and I am not talking about the hon. the Premier.

MR. W. ROWE: That is the other end of the horse.

MR. NEARY: That is the other end of the pony we are talking about. Mr. Speaker, the situation is that ministers have been too lazy, they have been incompetent and negligent in putting forward proposals and plans to Ottawa.

Now I thought that was very important but when I was approached by the CBC reporter, invited to go and do an interview, you know, Mr. Speaker - and not only that, but after getting the Minister of Consumer Affairs, who was hove off in his seat like King Tut, who would not, and the Premier should listen to this, when I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs what Mr. Mullaley's position was, and everybody knows who Mr. Mullaley is, he is the gentleman who owned Affiliated Marine Metals, who is now in financial trouble, who collected the car wrecks around Newfoundland, who took the dollar off the licences of every person in Newfoundland who has a licence - that dollar went to Mr. Mullaley and his company - I discovered during cross-examination of the minister the other day that Mr. Mullaley is now on the government payroll. And, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs to tell me what Mr. Mullaley's job was and the Minister of Consumer Affairs told me that it was none of my business.

Mr. Speaker, look at page 38 of the Auditor General's Report. Just give it to me there. Does the hon. Premier realize what his minister told me, told the House, told the members of this side of the House? Members were told it was none of their business what Mr. Mullaley does.

"Inadequate control over expenditure relating to the abandoned vehicle collection and disposal programme." I will deal with that shortly

MR. NEARY: but the point I want to make now is that that was a most significant point. I understand the gentleman is now, he and his colleague who was in this company, are now watching the cars. They are hired on as watchmen. They are down at the Octagon where the cars are stockpiled working for the Department of the Environment as watchmen. But the minister tells me it is none of our business.

Now, here we are in Opposition asking questions of the government, trying to get information so that the media can pass this information out to the people, and this particular individual who wanted to interview me said, "Oh no, we do not want to interview you about any of these matters, any of these facts that came out; we would like to have a talk to you about the challenge that was issued by the Minister of Tourism." I said, "You have to be kidding! You have to be kidding!" I said, "Is that the most important thing that happened in the House today?" "Well, as far as I am concerned" the lady said, "that is the most important." I was tempted to say, then why do you not go back and finish your high school graduation book but I was a little more kind than that, I said I would not dignify -

AN HON. MEMBER: They have your number.

MR. NEARY: I said I would not dignify that comment. I would not dignify it with a comment. I would not dignify it with a comment, and I said to the young lady, "If you want to discuss matters of importance to the people of this Province, then I will be very glad to go and do an interview," and I declined the interview. So, Mr. Speaker, we can see the attitude of the CBC towards this House.

And, You know, Mr. Speaker, just to reinforce my argument about the news media, and

MR. NEARY: about the opinion - not all of them now, I am not tarring everybody with the same brush, there are some pretty good people in the press gallery, there are pretty good people working in news rooms all over this Province, but they are not all good.

MR. F.B. ROWE: That is why he had one fired.

MR. NEARY: That are not all good, Mr. Speaker, and that is why the hon. gentleman had one of them fired. The hon. the Premier could not take it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Premier took to the television one night and got a little bit of a rough time, a rough ride from the Here and Now crew and the next day the Minister of Transportation and Communications, who is now Minister of Tourism, took to the airwaves protesting to the whole world, to the CRTC about the way the Premier was treated on that programme, and I am told, Sir, that within fifteen minutes after that programme ended the lady was fired. I do not know if it is correct or not, I can only tell the House what I have heard.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Here we go again!

MR. MORGAN: - on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman is referring to a programme on CBC but that is not my concern. My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that the charge has been made that I am responsible for the firing of an employee of CBC. That is totally untrue! It is totally incorrect and I would like for the hon. gentleman to

March 14, 1978, Tape 167, Page 4 -- apb

MR. MORGAN: retract that statement
because I was in no way involved with any dismissal
or any employee of CBC in regards to leaving the
employ of CBC.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: It is a very important point of order.

MR. NEARY: That is just a matter of a difference of opinion. I did not accuse the hon. gentleman of anything. The hon. gentleman is so sensitive, Sir, so sensitive these days. Your Honour know I did not make any such charges.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The matter is one of a difference of opinion, and not a matter on which the Chair can rule.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, thank you for your protection, Your Honour.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great concern and worry to me, Sir, the things that go on in the media in this Province, and this is not a vendetta against the media. Nobody, I suppose, gets treated better by the media in this Province than I do myself. But I am very concerned about the attitude of some of the media, especially the print media, The Evening Telegram I am referring to specifically in this Province, and a column written by Mr. Ray Guy. And I am just trying to find one here, Sir, as an example of why members of this House should be concerned about the kind of stuff that is allowed to go into print in this Province. I read one, it was the last one - what was The Weekend, the 11th?

MR. W. ROWE: Yes.

MR. NEARY: The 11th. Well let us see if I can find it here, referring to my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Premier of this Province. "Good Times Moores and Wedding Cake Man Rowe". Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, "Newfoundland politics needs the biggest gutting, purging, fumigating, scourging, disinfecting, and shovelling out that you could ever imagine."

MR. MORGAN: Ask him to run in the next election.

MR. NEARY: "Yet in a matter of months-they are talking about new members coming into the House - Yet in a matter of months they are as bad as the rest, two-faced, cock strutting, grab-alls. On the evening following a new candidate's declaration to stand for election he should be taken down behind a fish store and a splitting knife held to his throat." Mr. Speaker, just imagine. Just imagine, Sir.

Just see if I can find something by Mr. Wick Collins, that great freedom fighter. See if we can find a couple of quotes from him. I will tell the House why I am making my point now in a minute, Sir. "All these people should be fired because according to Premier Moores they make it too difficult." Let me see, that is not the one I am looking for, which brings me - "Musical chairs will not improve Cabinet". I could tell the hon. gentleman what Mr. Collins thinks of the hon. gentleman who got flicked out of the Department of Transportation.

MR. MORGAN: It does not bother me at all.

MR. NEARY: Let me see what the hon. gentleman was talking about this weekend. Let me see if I can get some quotes. I have all kinds of them here, Sir. I have gone back a year or so and it would make you sick to your stomach when you read some of this stuff, Mr. Speaker, but the House should be very concerned about it. It says, "It does not look too hard a job. You only have to wait until your man is calling the fellow on the other side of the House a red-faced baboon whose mother was married to a guttersnipe." Mr. Speaker, would you think you would read that? That is not a Communist paper you are reading that in, Sir. Is that the kind of a gentleman, Your Honour, is sitting in the Chair? Is that the kind of gentleman the member for Exploits (Dr. Thomey) is? Is that the kind of a gentleman the hon. Minister of Education is?

"When you get up the first time it is what they call your virgin or maiden speech, You can only have that once so it does not matter what you say, the main thing is to get up and say it. Most of them - look, listen to this, Mr. Speaker, just listen. You are

Mr. Neary: talking about Your Honour now. And they are talking about all members on this side. They are talking about my friend, my academic from the University down there. Just listen to this, "Most of them would steal the left eye out of your head and come back for the right one without so much as a blush."

MR. MORGAN: We all wonder why politicians are somewhat -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do you think that that is being published in a Newfoundland newspaper, Sir? "You notice their knuckles and you will see that they are as hard and as scaley as a horse's hoof."

MR. NOLAN: A horse's what?

MR. NEARY: Hoof.

Then they go down - "But after His Honour left, young Billy Rowe had Frank Moores squirming around in his seat like the underwear was on back to front to front."

MR. W. ROWE: I agree with that.

MR. NEARY: "But both sides of the House", he says, "has a collection of nasties. You should go and hear them some time."

MR. NEARY:

The reporters would say, for example, when the hon. member for Bollix Rock gets up to speak they cannot stand him as bad as he is - No, they can stand him as bad as he is because while he is on his feet it means the hon. member for Windy Gut has to keep his gab shut." Beautiful stuff for the young children. Sir, for your children and mine to be learning in this Province! Great! Beautiful stuff to be learning about the highest court in the land. They are talking about democracy and the only institution that is left upholding democracy. "That television broadcast on Monday was for the Throne Speech which is when the government says what it intends to do for the rest of the year. Well, according to what we heard it is not going to be very much." Let us see what else he says.

"So it was with the government which has boozed away - listen to what they are saying about the hon. the Premier and the government! - So it was with the government which has boozed away the effort and opportunity that should have gone into building up jobs for the people of this Province who cannot find work." Then he goes on and he ends up: "But it may take more than thumping and clapping Billy Rowe to protect the fishermen from the decision of the Moores Government who would seem to know little about the fishery.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

I think he is right now, mind you.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mention these few exercises just to show the hon. members of the House, Sir, what is happening in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, and I feel so strongly about it, that the Communist country, Russia - Russia, Sir, Communism which dominates now about one-half, about 55 per cent of the population of the world, when they go in, for instance; and they manage to take over a country like Cuba, they immediately start to take the people out of Cuba, take them away to Moscow, take them to Russia, take them to the Communist countries to brainwash them. And the Communists down in the United States and the Communist Party across

MR. NEARY: Canada - and we saw a little tinge of it here recently at our own university - they are taken away and they are shown how to undermine democracy, how to undermine the legislatures, how to undermine politicians. This is what it is all about. Communists train people - they have schools - they take people from Communist countries and bring them to these schools and they train them on how to undermine democracy and take over a country. You know, Mr. Speaker, I have read quite a bit about what they teach in these schools, and I know quite a bit about Socialism and about Communism, and, Sir, what I have seen in the socialist doctrine, in the Communist doctrine, that this is baby talk compared to what we see right here in our own newspapers. And it is about time, Mr. Speaker, that they started a little self-discipline. If not, Sir, they are going to undermine the only institution, the only bulwark of democracy that we have left, namely the Legislature, the House of Assembly. If people do not like us they can kick us out. If people do not like our policies they can criticize them, condemn them. But, Sir, these are the very same people who talk about character assassination, who talk about bringing personalities into things. It does not happen in this House, Sir. That is a fallacy. That is a myth.

The people in the press gallery up here over my shoulder are there for one reason only and that is to make sure that the information, the things that happen in this House get out to the people, the facts, the information get out to the people. Mr. Callahan gave a speech to Rotary. The other day it was re-published in the Daily News. I read it. The main purpose of the media is to get out information. Has Your Honour ever gone home in the evening and turned on his television to get a report on what happened in this Hon. House during the day? You have two CBC reporters every day sitting up in this gallery being paid by the taxpayers of this country, two, and what do you get? Twenty or thirty seconds on television. What do they have two up there for?

March 14, 1973

Case 169

IR-3

MR. NEARY:

They could send over a clerk who could do the same thing could they not. Is that reporting the House, Sir?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dwell on this matter but I consider it to be most important because if we just ignore it it is going to get worse. The name calling by the two hon. gentleman that I just referred to, Sir, has got completely out of hand and I think it is about time that the news media imposed a little bit of self discipline. And they took a look at the reporting of this hon. house and let the people of the Province know what is going on. The most important thing in this house is not whether you got out in the middle of the floor and did a little tussle or whether you called somebody a name, a dirty name, that is not the most important thing, but that is all they report, is it not? Sometimes in the heat of battle you may just give a fellow a flick, I have often done it myself, but this seems to be the thing that they dwell on, Sir, not the facts, not getting the information out to the people of this Province. And I think the CBC, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which was sent up by Alphonse "Ginnette" as an instrument of national purpose should get back to being an instrument of national purpose and national unity and not sneak their little innuendos into their news stories like they have done so often from this hon. House. That is about the vilest sin that they can commit, Sir, in order to make a member look bad they sneak in a little bit of editorializing. I have seen it and I have been the victim of it and so has every other member of this house. They have got to get in their little snide remark, not a factual news story, which they are supposed to be pumping out, being read by an announcer who never sees it, probably, until it is put in front of him. But they have got to get in their little innuendo to try and make somebody look bad. I do not know what can be done about it, Mr. Speaker, I really do not, I am really concerned about it. I think that the only ones who can do anything about it are the newsmen themselves. Clean up their act and if they are going to report this House, report it. Mr. Speaker, the real danger in what they are doing now is that it is up to the individuals up there in the press gallery to pick out the item that they want to report from

MR. NEARY: the House and if they do not like the colour of your hair, if they do not like your politics, they do not like your religion, they do not like this about you, they do not like that about you, can they sabotage you? Because the danger is that they could pick the item that they want to report and that is the real danger of it, Sir, the real weakness of it and that is why I am in favour of televising, especially the Oral Question Period of this Hon. House and then the people will get a true picture of what is going on, they will get a true picture of what I say here today and what I am going to say about some of the problems of this Province. I am not going to talk about the media all afternoon but it is something that has been on my mind now for a good many years. I have been sixteen years in this Hon. House and I have seen a lot of things happen, and I have seen a lot of members get the knife driven into them, right in between the shoulder blades, when they did not deserve it. Attack the policies, attack the ministry, attack ministers if they are lazy and incompetent, attack the ministry, attack the policies, the platforms but, Mr. Speaker, do not get down this low - some of the quotes that I just gave. I think that is terrible, terrible. I would not let my children read it.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday before the House rose I was zeroing in on ministers for their negligence, for their neglect in negotiating and renegotiating certain agreements with the Government of Canada. And as I said in the beginning when I started this afternoon, there are millions and millions of dollars left on the Ottawa table, Sir. We had an example of that, Sir, on Friday, no later than Friday in the Hon. House; one of the ministers zerved in on - last week by the way, Friday, when the House rose for Patrick's Day - was the Minister of Fisheries, and the Minister of Fisheries got up the best way he could and tried to defend himself. He made a very weak defence in my opinion, Sir. And lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister, I hope the minister will be the first to admit

MR. NEARY: that the honorable gentleman was wrong. Jack Marshall M.P., P.C., who represents Humber - St. Barbe - St. George, Jack Marshall rose in the House of Assembly -

MR. J. MORGAN: You do not know your federal districts.

MR. NEARY: Humber - St. Barbe - St. George -

AN HON. MEMBER: St. George - St. Barbe.

MR. NEARY: All right! JKAY: same thing, rose by any other name. Jack Marshall M.P., P.C., rose in the House of Parliament yesterday during the oral question period and put a question to the federal Minister of Fisheries, the hon. Romeo LeBlanc. And the hon. Mr. Marshall asked Mr. LeBlanc what the Government of Canada was going to do to help the poor fishermen in Newfoundland who had lost gear in recent storms, what the Government of Canada was going to do to replace gear that was lost by the fishermen in storms and otherwise? And anybody who watched television last night would see the sincere answer that Mr. LeBlanc gave Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Marshall acknowledged it, seemed to be quite satisfied with the answer and seemed to be very displeased with the Provincial Government because the answer that Mr. LeBlanc gave was this, and I am only going to summarize what - I do not have his exact wording in front of me. Mr. LeBlanc said that the Government of Canada would be glad to help the poor fishermen in Newfoundland that lost gear and be glad to replace gear that was lost in recent storms but this was a Provincial matter, came under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government and that his government had not heard a peep, not a sound from the Provincial Government, not a request for gear replacement.

MR. NEARY: And then Mr. Marshall, a Tory whom I have a great deal of respect for, rose again to say, is it a fact that you have not had a request from the Province of Newfoundland, from the Provincial Government for a gear replacement program for some kind of an agreement? Mr. LeBlanc said that is quite true, and then Mr. Marshall said well if you did have a request would you look upon it favourably? Mr. LeBlanc said he would, indeed he would. And then Mr. Marshall asked him, well, will you take the initiative? Mr. Government of Canada, Mr. Federal Minister of Fisheries, down there they will not come and ask you; will you go and ask them if they will take a hand out if you give it to them? And he said I will do the best I can, and that is a pretty tricky situation.

When the matter comes under the Provincial Government here in Newfoundland they should be taking the initiative, they should be going up to Uncle Ottawa and saying, Look, we want a gear replacement program. And up to this moment, up to yesterday, the Minister of Fisheries had not approached the Government of Canada or the hon. Romeo LeBlanc.

MR. F. ROWE: They were the ones who had it in their Throne Speech five years ago.

MR. NEARY: And they have had it in their Throne Speech now for the last five years, so I am reminded by my colleague here.

And the same thing applies, Sir, to the agricultural agreement that I referred to the other day, millions of dollars left on the table in Ottawa; cost sharing agreement with respect to fisheries, including boat building, federal subsidies and so forth.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, then I zeroed in on the Minister of Mines and Energy for his negligence in not getting help to cut the timber on the site of the Lower Churchill. Now, I am going to ask the Minister of Agricultural who was in his seat a few moments ago, who seems to have disappeared, but when the ministers are not in the House the hon. Premier speak for these minister's, over in New Brunswick, Sir, the Government of New Brunswick, and I believe the Government of Nova Scotia, have negotiated agreements with the Government of Canada for assistance, for support, federal support to deal with the spruce budworm problem. They have successfully negotiated and requested support, financial support from the Government of Canada to try and do something about the infected wood, the wood that has been affected in the Maritime provinces by the spruce budworm, Mr. Speaker, is there another province of Canada, and I do not care what part of Canada you are talking about, that has as much damage from the spruce budworm as we have here in Newfoundland? And I am going to ask the hon. the Premier now, in the absence of the Minister of Agricultural, what this government has done in the way of soliciting

MR. NEARY:

financial support from the Government of Canada either to cut this wood, to help build woods roads to get at the wood, or to subsidize the cutting of the wood. What has this government done? Have they done anything?

MR. ROUSSEAU: (Inaudible) but we have gotten half of it.

MR. NEARY: I will just yield, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. minister. I am trying to get information, Sir, so that I hope it will filter out to the people. I am satisfied to yield and then carry on with my speech.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: In November of 1977 the four ministers, the four minister responsible for manpower, met in Halifax to try and come up with a formula for the four provinces to go to Mr. Cullen, the Minister of Employment and Immigration in an attempt to secure some of the Canada Works money, the job creation monies of 15 per cent over the minimum wage, and come up with a number of ideas in respect to jobs like the hon. member refers to. One of them was the spruce budworm infection. Another one was the Gull Island cutting. Another one was the subsidy on small boats. And each province had individual ones there. We went together to a meeting with Mr. Cullen on November 16 in Ottawa. Mr. Cullen would not at that time give us any indication that he would put public works money towards this thing but he would consider it in the new budget year. In other words, that the federal works money, the make-work projects would not be 100 per cent like they are now.

Obviously there are certain problems as far as he is concerned and we can appreciate

MR. ROUSSEAU: that, but some of this money should be put into job creation projects like this. The four ministers went together again to Victoria in February. The Manpower Ministers again met with Mr. Cullen and brought the same points that all the ten provinces agreed on. We made every effort to secure some of that money for that. A specific type, that was one of the specific ones and if the hon. member would like to have the presentation by the four Atlantic ministers at the November 16th. meeting with Mr. Cullen tabled in the House I would be only too prepared to do so.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. minister for giving the House that little piece of information but really what I am trying to zero in on is whether or not any assistance has been sought from DREE to help build woods roads to get at this timber or to subsidize the cutting of the timber. Perhaps the minister now who has returned to his seat can tell me if Newfoundland has attempted to get a similar agreement to the one they have in New Brunswick and in Nova Scotia whereby the federal government will assist in the cutting of this timber that is affected by the spruce budworm, and we have millions and millions - well, hundreds of thousands of acres that are affected. Could the minister give us that piece of information? Or have we withdrawn any requests? I will yield and then I will carry on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, there has not been any late agreement signed that we are aware of with Nova Scotia or New Brunswick to salvage budworm killed timber. The federal Minister of Manpower and the federal Minister in charge of Forestry, Mr. Marchand,

MR. MAYNARD: have indicated that possibly Canada Works money would be made available to the Provinces, all four of the Atlantic Provinces, to help salvage some of the timber or to carry out more intensive forest management practices related to combatting the spruce budworm in the short and long-term.

The four provinces are now working with the federal people to try to come to an agreement as to how much money the Federal Manpower Department will make available and under what terms and conditions they will make it available. As soon as that is finalized, if it is, we will be reporting to the House.

As far as the DREE agreement is concerned, we have a DREE agreement under which we are building access roads and a large majority of those roads are being built into infested areas to assist the companies and sawmill operators, the two paper companies and sawmill operators to get into heavily infested areas as a matter of salvage. We have been doing that for a number of years.

MR. NEARY: A very worthwhile piece of information, Mr. Speaker, and I will come back later although I do not know if my hon. friend is completely aware of the fact that in New Brunswick they do have a DREE agreement and have had one for years now.

MR. MAYNARD: A DREE agreement?

MR. NEARY: In connection with building woods roads to the timber that is affected by the spruce budworm.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, so do we. That is what I was just saying.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, ours is a general agreement, I am talking about special assistance,

March 14, 1978, Tape 172, Page 4 -- apb

MR. NEARY: special funding from the
Government of Canada to cut the hundreds of thousands of

MR. MEADY:

cords of wood, probably millions of cords, hundreds of thousands of cords that are affected by the spruce budworm. But I will come back to that later, Sir, because I want to have a few words about the Stephenville Lumberboard Mill before I take my seat and I want to tie in the timber that is affected by the spruce budworm with that project.

But before I get off Ottawa, Sir, and before I get off my attack on the bad blood, the serious relationship that exists between the Government of this Province and certain ministers in the Government of Canada, before I get off of that I want to raise one more matter, Sir, that I think is very significant, that should show the people of this Province the bluff that sometimes is put up by ministers when they lash out and attack the Government of Canada and ministers in the government of the nation.

Now, Sir, the example I want to use now, and this involves the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations - and I am not quite sure if it is the present minister or the previous minister. Who was the Minister of Manpower back in 1976, the Fall of 1976? I believe it was the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Maynard). Well it really does not make any difference, Sir, because one or the other - I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. MEADY: It was the hon. member sitting just to my right now, Sir. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me first of all give the House the scenario of what has happened in connection with the rates of pay on Canada Works projects in this Province. The rate of pay in this Province as well as in the other provinces of Canada, the rate of pay is the minimum wage plus fifteen per cent. The minister says that is correct. I checked this out only about ten minutes before the House opened this afternoon, a long distance phone call between Confederation Building and Ottawa, several long distance calls I have had now.

MR. HEARY:

I heard the other day, Sir - and this is what put it in my mind - I have heard the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan), I have heard one or two other ministers on the government side bellyaching about the rate of pay that is paid to people who are working on Canada Works projects in this Province. The Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan) especially has taken to the television and radio on a number of occasions bellyaching and complaining about the low rate of pay on Canada Works projects in this Province. Now if the minister wants to hear something the minister better come in and take his seat because I have a few words that may open up the hon. gentleman's eyes, Mr. Speaker, and I hope I will never hear another peep out of the hon. gentleman on this matter. Mr. Speaker, is the House aware - and I want to make it clear right from the start that there was no negotiating on this particular matter, there was no bargaining back and forth, no negotiating between the federal government and the Government of this Province on the rate of pay.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh yes there was.

MR. HEARY: No, there was not, Sir.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh yes there was.

MR. HEARY: There was no negotiating, Sir. I, Mr. Speaker, can tell the hon. gentleman there was no negotiating. The Government of Canada took a decision. The Government of Canada said, "We are going to, under our new programme, under our new strategy, under the Canada Works programme which is going to replace LIP, we would like to pay in all the provinces the minimum wage in the different provinces plus fifteen per cent."

Mr. Speaker, back in October of 1976 my hon. friend, I believe, attended a meeting in Ottawa when this matter was raised. Think about it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It could well be.

MR. HEARY: Yes, it could well be. It not only could well be, it is a

MR. NEARY:

fact and it well was. The hon. gentleman attended a meeting in Ottawa along with various other manpower ministers from across Canada to discuss the new strategy of the Government of Canada, to discuss - really it was prior to the introduction of the Canada Works Programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was when?

MR. NEARY: October, 1976. And the Government of Canada came into that meeting and they said, "Mr. Ministers from various provinces of Canada, we are going to change our strategy and we are going to bring in a new programme and we are going to call it Canada Works and all this that and the other thing." But the most significant thing that happened at that meeting was that the Government of Canada said because of the concern in certain areas, certain regions of Canada,

Mr. Neary:

because of the wage levels that were paid by LIP, because of the concern the Federal Government has decided that it might be wise, in their opinion, it might be wise to pay the minimum wage on Canada Works projects in the various provinces, and they later upped the ante by 15 per cent. And, Mr. Speaker, I am told by my usual reliable source that there was no objection from this Province, there was no objection.

MR. ROUSSEAU: That is not correct.

MR. NEARY: That is correct, Sir. If it is not correct let the minister get up and straighten me out.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will get up and straighten you up. This Province does not accept the federal government position -

MR. NEARY: Just a minute now!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Just let me -

MR. NEARY: Wait now! Just a minute now. My hon. friend is trying to straighten me out. I want to make sure the hon. gentleman -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Federal works, the minimum wage plus 15 per cent.

MR. NEARY: All right. Okay. Just let me put the question now to the hon. gentleman. First of all the hon. gentleman does not even remember being at the meeting. I say the hon. gentleman was at the meeting.

MR. ROUSSEAU: When was the meeting?

MR. NEARY: October 8, 1976. And the question is this that I am putting to the hon. gentleman; not what happened since, not because there was flak, not because the people rebelled against the rate of pay they are getting in this Province, \$ 2.50 plus 15 per cent, not that, what happened at that time when the minister and this government had an opportunity to say, no, Mr. Ottawa, no, Mr. Government of Canada we are not accepting that principle because it would discriminate against our workers. Did the minister raise a voice at that meeting in objection?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: That is the question, Sir, and I will yield and I will give the minister a chance to defend himself, and then I will come back and continue with my speech.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: All I can say is this government's position on the minimum wage plus 15 per cent. It is our feeling that because of the uproar created by the provinces that the 15 per cent was added on to what was originally intended to be the minimum wage. Our position is that the minimum wage plus 15 per cent, especially in light of increases in the unemployment insurance payments, are not conducive to taking the type of people we want off the unemployment roll, especially those 12,000 or 14,000 people who are tradesmen, who have no intention of working for the minimum wage plus 15 per cent.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point I am making. My hon. friend now is having second thoughts.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, not now.

MR. NEARY: The question I put to my hon. friend -

MR. ROUSSEAU: This has bothered me for a year.

MR. NEARY: The question I am putting to my hon. friend is this: My hon. friend attended a meeting in Ottawa, and there were other ministers there, and the minister, their counterpart, the federal minister said, Look, gentlemen, Mr. Ministers from various provinces, we are going to change our strategy, and we are going to bring in a new programme, and this is going to be a Canada Work's programme, and we have decided because of our concern in some areas, because of the wage levels that were paid on LIP, we have decided that probably the best course of action to take is to pay the minimum wage and then they later amended it and said, 15 per cent. Did the minister from this Province, did anybody from the Government of this Province stand up and say, Mr. Government of Canada, Mr. Minister, we are not going to put up with this because we have a low minimum wage. We are not going to put up with it because our skilled workers will be forced to go to work for \$2.50 plus 15 per cent. Did the minister

MR. NEARY: get up and object to that? Did he?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The minister was not at that meeting.

MR. NEARY: The minister had the opportunity.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, then the other minister; I do not care which one it was. It is still a representative of this government.

MR. ROUSSEAU: What I am saying is the position that we have, and it has been the position since the other minister was there, and while I am here as well.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the position they have now adopted, because it is a popular issue now -

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have been saying that publicly for a year.

MR. NEARY: - it is a popular issue now, Sir, and that is why we hear the Minister of Tourism out bellyaching, and the news media lapping it up without checking their facts, without checking to see if there was any agreement, and the first knowledge I had of it -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister a question, a serious question.

MR. NEARY: I am not a minister. I wish I were getting the salary.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am sorry. Can the member honestly say that he has not heard me within the past, at least a year, maybe two, not make a statement about the minimum wage plus 15 per cent being non-sufficient to bring people back off the unemployment roll? I wonder if he can say that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is not, that is not how you do things. You do not take to the open air line, you do not go on to score -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Answer the question.

MR. NEARY: - a few political brownie points.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Come on now!

MR. NEARY: When you have the chance to do it is at the meeting in Ottawa, and they should have come back to this Province and said, Look Newfoundland, you are going to be discriminated against, the

Mr. Neary: Newfoundlanders. But no, Sir, not a peep out of the minister that attended that meeting.

MR. F. ROWE: Not a word.

MR. NEARY: Not a word. Not a sound. Not an utterance. Not a peep. They just took it lying down. Now it is a popular issue. Now they all want to get on the bandwagon. Now they are all out bellyaching about it. Anybody can do it now, Sir. But when the time was opportune to do it, when the minister was send up to Ottawa at public expense to protect our rights that is the

MR. NEARY: time they should have done it and they did not do it, Sir. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not saying that this government did it. I said right from the beginning, if hon. members will remember, that this was not negotiated, that this was a decision taken by the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada put out feelers to their ministers, the provincial ministers, and the provincial ministers, especially from Newfoundland, did not react in the negative, they just took it lying down.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right, yes.

MR. NEARY: Now, in order to try to score a few political Brownie points they are out saying, Oh! the Government of Canada is discriminating against Newfoundlanders. Where were they when we needed them? Where were they in 1976 when we needed them? Slackers! Mr. Speaker, they could have done something about it prior to the announcement being made. They could have told the minister then they were dissatisfied with the wage levels that were going to be paid on Canada Works. I am sure my hon. friend has quite a few out in my hon. friend's district of Exploits. And my hon. friend can look at his own administration as being too lazy, inept, incompetent and negligent to do anything about it when they had the opportunity.

Now, Canada Works is in effect now. Now it is too late unless we can do it another year. They had the opportunity, the door was open.

MR. RIDEOUT: We are the ones who are doing the lobbying lately.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. Now they are afraid that we are going to upstage them,

MR. NEARY: we are going to take over the lobby and we are going to get all the credit. Well, Sir, I do not care who gets the credit as long as the people get a fair wage. And the government has been negligent in this regard, and that is not the only one, Sir. The minister, whatever minister it was, whether it is the minister who sits here in this seat or the Minister of Agriculture, but whichever minister it was that minister botched it and botched it badly, just as the minister out to the seal fishery, the swiler, the great swiler - I thought he would be back in the House today - botched it, and had such a critical editorial written about him in The Morning News, the hon. gentleman who took off after he had his vicious row with the Premier over the extension to the hospital in Grand Falls, took off and went and sulked and pouted like a little baby and went and hid away.

The Minister of Tourism, if the hon. gentleman wants to do something about improving Newfoundland's image throughout the world with this gross error in judgement, I call it, when the Minister of Fisheries - I have to come back to my dear old friend again - told us in this House last year that the best treatment for Brian Davies, the best treatment for Greenpeace, the best treatment for the seal protesters was to ignore them. And the minister told us and the Premier told us they would ignore them because all they were looking for was publicity, and then they went and gave them the publicity they needed.

And, Mr. Speaker, we saw - look, I do not know if my colleagues agree with me on this or not but, Mr. Speaker, I have to say it even if I just say that this is a personal opinion. I am sure my hon. friend will forgive me if I say this is a personal opinion, my hon. friend the Leader I am talking about.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Complete freedom.

MR. NEARY: Complete freedom. We have complete freedom. But, Sir, I have to say this, that when I saw that interview on television last night that I felt ashamed of my life as a Newfoundlander, and I am as good a Newfoundlander as anybody in this hon. House or in this Province, to see the way that one of our ministers was behaving.

Mr. Speaker, does your Honour realize, the members of the House realize, Sir, that throughout this world we are spending hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars every year of taxpayer's money to try to bring into this Province tourists. My hon. friend the Minister of Tourism, who goes berserk once in awhile in this hon. House -

MR. MORGAN: You are berserk all of the time.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is spending this year - how much money? How much money is the hon. gentleman spending on tourist advertising throughout the world?

MR. MORGAN: Quite a lot.

MR. NEARY: Quite a lot.

MR. MORGAN: The biggest money ever.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, the Minister of Rural Development, the swiler, did more damage to the tourist industry in this Province the other night on television than the hon. gentleman can undo with his \$300,000 or so that he is going to spend this year, or \$1 million dollars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we had to try to get tourists into this Province

MR. NEARY: and people throughout the world are looking at the likes of that! Laughing at us! They have become so hysterical and created such an emotional atmosphere that they are destroying our reputation throughout the world. They would have been better off, the hon. the Premier and the great swiler - I do not know if they are on speaking terms yet or not. I understand that they nearly had blows. The next bout is not going to be between Spinks and Mohammed Ali, they are going to hire the stadium and it is going to be between our hon. friend the hon. the Premier and the Minister of Rural Development.

MR. FLIGHT: The Swiler.

MR. NEARY: The Swiler. I do not know what name we can put on the - maybe the Colgate Kid. The Colgate Kid and the Swiler. Main bout at the stadium when she starts up again.

But, Sir, it has done an awful lot of damage. I am told that there is a group right now in Europe from Newfoundland trying to sell fish and every place they go people are saying to them, We are not going to buy your fish; you are only barbarians over there, you are uncivilized. And how did this happen, Mr. Speaker? How did it happen? It happened, Sir, through an error in judgement. Although, as I said before, the hon. the Premier's heart may have been in the right place, and the hon. gentleman may have thought that he was going to score major political points, and he probably did with some people, but in the process, Sir, of doing that, of taking advantage for the moment, not looking ahead far enough, not looking ahead long range, they have created an awful image for Newfoundland in the international world and these people who are trying to sell fish are told to go home, forget it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: They completely bungled it.

MR. NEARY: They completely bungled the situation and now last night when I turned on my television, and I do not like these hon. gentlemen from Washington coming around here any more than anybody else, but I am sure that we can talk to them in a civilized manner. One of these gentlemen said - I saw him, he was quoted, he was standing there - I have come here to Newfoundland with an open mind, and I believe the Minister of Rural Development was going to strike him with the gaff. Sure we have an hon. gentleman who was put away for less than that for a month, for thirty days.

It would make you stop and think, would it not, Mr. Speaker? Make members stop and think about just what is going on in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabour the subject because I want to say this, that this side over here - and I committed my hon. friend and my party to maintaining a great seal industry in this Province - we are not going to go off and make fools of ourselves; we are going to make it a real sealing industry by processing the pelts and the skins and the meat right here in this Province. It would have been far better for the administration if they had taken that money that they spent in posh hotel rooms - 180 pounds or \$180 a day and so forth and so on, and the best bistros wining and dining people - it would have been far better, Sir, if they had set up a processing plant in this Province and then let us go off and try to market our product. I am sure we would have no problem to sell the products.

My hon. friend from Nain knows. I have been up and visited my hon. friend and saw some of the things that the native population can do with

MR. NEARY: seal skins, with soap stone and so forth, manufacture products that we would all be proud of and not be ashamed of. That is the way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the funny part about is there are people, I bet you there are people who, if they were here listening to me now would say, 'Oh there you go! He is downing the poor old Premier again. The poor old Premier went off and tried and he is downing him again.' No, Sir, I am not downing anybody because I do not think there is a man in this House on either side who is not disturbed and concerned about what has happened to Newfoundland's reputation as far as the anti-sealing campaign is concerned. It is devastating! It makes me sick to my stomach, but I think the approach could have been better thought out. I believe if the administration had taken the advice of my hon. friend and ignored this crowd that they would just go away. They would go away. All they wanted was recognition. They could not buy the recognition that they are getting now. The publicity they are getting they could not buy it. The platform was provided out of tax money. It was used by the Premier and the government of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now if that does not coincide with your own thinking, Sir, I will make it personal.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is a wonderful statement of our policy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may for a moment switch to another timely topic and that is in connection, Sir, with the strikes in Baie Verte and in Labrador City. I want to tell my hon. friend the member

MR. NEARY:

territory. What I am going to say is of a general nature. I think it is a disgrace, Sir, to this Province, and a very real disgrace to the government and the minister responsible that they have not yet, Mr. Speaker, not yet, despite the questions and the pressure that we put on last year in this Hon. House, that they have not yet implemented their promise to place under one authority, under one umbrella the direction of industrial accidents and occupational hazards and industrial diseases in this Province. They have not yet done it.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, we have two major strikes going on in this Province, representing, Sir, in my opinion, the rebellion of workers against government's failure to enforce proper measures, Sir, to ensure the health and the freedom from accidents of industrial workers in this Province.

The Baie Verte workers, Mr. Speaker, have now been followed by the workers from the Iron Ore Company of Canada in Labrador City, forced to go out on strike, Mr. Speaker, and make no bones about this at all, they are forced to go out on strike because of the failure, Sir, of the present administration to set up an authority to enforce proper working conditions in our key industries.

Mr. Speaker, at the moment the Department of Health is partly responsible for occupational health hazards.

MR. DON. GEMER: No, it is not.

MR. NEARY: It is, Sir. The Department of Health is involved, the Department of Labour and Manpower, the Department of Mines and Energy. Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I checked it only this morning. I do my homework. Whatever else I can be accused of, I do my homework and I asked a gentleman in very high authority this morning if the government had proceeded with their promise to place the enforcement and the authority for industrial disease,

MR. NEARY: industrial accidents under one umbrella and I was told that they had not.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have a Minute-in-Council which says it was.

MR. NEARY: Well the minister may have a Minute-in-Council, the same as a certain gentleman has a Minute-in-Council, to put an extension on this building, but I have not seen the bulldozers out there yet. I am glad the Premier is in his seat because I am going to zero in on that before the afternoon is over, if I get time, and if I do not I will ask him on Thursday.

The minister says he has an Order-in-Council in his pocket. But has the minister taken any action on that Order-in-Council? What action has the minister taken? Mr. Speaker, we have two major strikes in this Province, Sir, and we were promised a year ago, two years ago, and it is really a simple matter, Sir, when you get down to brass tacks for this government to follow the example of Ontario and other provinces and set up an industrial accident safety council or committee or construction safety council, or both, mining safety associations, to be financed out of Workmen's Compensation funds, to carry on educational programmes among both workers and employers and at the moment I mentioned the three that we have, three ministers responsible, we also have an independent organization called Newfoundland -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Newfoundland Industrial Accident Prevention.

MR. NEARY: - Industrial Accident Prevention Association, which gets about \$9,000 or \$10,000 a year from the Workmen's Compensation Board, barely enough, Mr. Speaker, to hold their annual convention. They get together

MR. NEARY:

to discuss policy and to have a few beers, barely enough to do that. I claim that we should have like the police commission that I am talking about, an independent group set up.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We have.

MR. NEARY: Well we have. Well, they are not getting any funding from this government, are they?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, they are. They are an advisory council -

MR. NEARY: An advisory council! An advisory council!

MR. ROUSSEAU: With six members -

MR. NEARY: What authority do they have? Can they walk into IOC and put the boots to them or are they just merely advising government?

MR. ROUSSEAU: They are advising government.

MR. NEARY: Pap, it is only pap, Sir. Porridge, that is all it is. Mr. Speaker, can I get a little nourishment here, Sir? Mr. Speaker, I would say that this advisory council has no authority. It is merely advisory, that is all it is. AS the minister says, no authority, very little funding.

I believe, Sir, along with such an organization, with such arrangement should be kept records of accidents of the various industries so that contributions towards the Workman's Compensation Board funds can be scaled to the safety record of each industry. The minister cannot tell me that that is being done now.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have to contemplate it.

MR. NEARY: Contemplate it! Mr. Speaker, I had to get up here for three or four days in a row to try to pry information out of ministers -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Ask a question.

MR. NEARY: Look, I would like to have a little more information on that.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Ask a question and the question will be answered.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have been here for years asking questions

MR. MEADY:

and I think probably in the last couple of days I am getting more information but I had to try it out. I had to almost whack them over the head. Well I am glad to hear, Sir, that the Workman's Compensation funds in the future are going to be scaled according to the safety record of that company. Did my hon. friend know that? Well we just learned that that is going to happen. I beg your pardon?

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is being contemplated.

MR. MEADY: It is being contemplated. But is there any action taken on it? Does the minister have one of these pieces of paper, an Order in Council in his pocket on that. No. We only know of about two Orders in Council that are floating around so far.

ANOTHER MEMBER: The Orders in Council are there.

MR. MEADY: Yes. I have not had time to read that yet. Maybe I should carry on another day and get back to it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, an industry with a poor safety record or a company with a poor safety record would be penalized, Mr. Speaker, right where it hurts most and that is in the pocketbook. That is the only way, that is the only language that Brian Mulroney and his crowd of desperadoes understand. That is the only language they understand. Mr. Speaker, these two groups of workers today are forced to go out on strike and I would not be a bit surprised but the one in Labrador City - maybe I should not say this, it might be considered to be irresponsible - was provoked. They are going to have layoffs and they are going to have shutdowns and cutbacks in production and so forth and they are having a bad year. So maybe they could not care less whether the men went on strike or not. Maybe they could not. Maybe they do. I do not know. Sir, the only language that Mr. Mulroney and the Power Corporation of Canada and that crowd understand is the pocketbook and that is where you have to hit them. Certainly with the record that IOC has, three accidents last year. Well I had to rush in at the last

MR. WILSON:

minute to try to straighten out that wildcat strike they had down there accompanied by my hon. friend, the member for Tangle River (Mr. Strachan) and the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) and then drag my hon. friend in behind us carrying on negotiations in St. John's.

Let us hope, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is correct, that in this session of the House currently sitting that we will see measures taken, Sir,

MR. NEARY: to remedy what is becoming an increasingly serious problem, Sir, in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to - members might notice that my voice still has not come back. After I left here on Friday I went home and I went to bed and I never got up until yesterday afternoon. I must say I do not think I ever had a worse case of the flu. So I hope hon. members will forgive me if my voice sounds a little raspy again today. But I am doing the best I can so you will just have to bear it.

This afternoon in the House, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition put a few questions to the hon. the Premier followed by my hon. friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) about the Upper Churchill, the re-negotiating of the contract for the Upper Churchill, the development of the Lower Churchill and sort of general questions about the Upper and Lower Churchill. Now we are getting so confused over here with the answers we are getting, Sir, it is like a merry-go-round, we are dizzy. Every time we ask a question we get a different answer. Today I put a supplementary to the hon. the Premier, and I saw my hon. friend the Minister of Justice twiggling because the hon. gentleman knew what I was getting at.

I want to say this now, Sir, something that I have had on my mind for a long time; I want to say this and I am going to out with it now. Since 1972, I think it is, Sir, and before that, 1971 when this hon. crowd were campaigning, and then in 1972 when they campaigned, in 1975 when they campaigned, they campaigned, Sir, one of the major planks in their platform was that they were going to take back the power that was given away by the criminals on this side of the House, given away by the traitors over here, given away by the crooks over here, the power, and why Upper Churchill had been given away. Mr. Speaker, Your Honour knows and hon. members know that Dr. Goebbels I suppose was the greatest propagandist that the world has ever known. Adolph Hitler's minister

MR. NEARY: of propaganda, Dr. Goebbels, the greatest propagandist in the world. Mr. Speaker, their philosophy was that if you told a lie often enough, if you kept telling a lie often enough people would believe it; tell a lie, keep telling it, tell a lie often enough and people would believe it. Well, Sir, this hon. crowd have been - but I am not allowed to say they have been telling a lie. Outside the House - could I say outside the House they have been - No, I cannot even do that.

Well they have been living by the philosophy of Dr. Goebbels. They have apparently have been thriving on his philosophy, Sir, because Mr. Speaker, in actual fact - and my hon. friends if they do a little research themselves on this side, who have taken the abuse and the criticism over the years, the last five years will realize, Mr. Speaker, the significance to the question that I put to the hon. Premier today in this hon. House, the significance of it. I asked the Premier under what authority, I said to the Premier of the Province, under what authority, under what statute, under what law, is the government of this Province taking action against Churchill Falls Corporation and against Quebec Hydro? First he did not know,

MR. HEARY:

seemed to be in the wilderness, lost, did not know - and the Premier is out telling us night and day on radio and television, They are only a bunch of scoundrels and rogues over there, they gave away the power. And I get up and I ask him a very simple question because they are taking action, this government is taking action against the Province of Quebec - or Quebec Hydro rather and Churchill Falls Corporation -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Churchill Falls Corporation and indirectly the -

MR. HEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister is confirming what I am saying, that under the law of this Province, the Minister of Justice -

MR. PECKFORD: Sure that is obvious. It happened eleven years ago. You are way behind.

MR. HEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier and the Minister of Justice have told us that we gave away the power.

MR. PECKFORD: So you did.

MR. HICKMAN: I never opened my mouth.

MR. HEARY: The minister says he never opened his mouth. The minister by his silence has implicated -

MR. H. DOWE: Sure he was the minister at the time.

MR. HEARY: He was the minister. As a matter of fact the gentleman was over here negotiating that contract. And the hon. the Premier, I asked him this afternoon in the House, Mr. Speaker, I said I wanted to ask the hon. the Premier to tell the House under what statute, under what law, this government is taking Churchill Falls Hydro and indirectly Quebec Hydro to court. The Premier shrugged his shoulders and said he did not know. Well I am going to tell the hon. Premier right now.

The hon. the Premier and the government have taken Churchill Falls Corporation and Quebec Hydro to court on a law that was made by this bunch of criminals over here who gave away the power. Is that not right Mr. Justice Minister? Is that not correct?

MR. HICKMAN: One of the allegations contained in the statement of claim has to do with the agreement entered into between Churchill Falls Power Corporation and the Government of Newfoundland, a statutory agreement. That is an over-simplification of the -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is it not a big lie - and I do not care who says it - is it not a big lie for anybody to say that the former administration gave away the power in this Province? Is that not a big lie? Is it not? And I am looking at the hon. the Premier who has made the statement so often and the hon. gentleman now is under a piece of legislation that was passed by this crowd over here taking Churchill Falls and Quebec Hydro to court, the only avenue open to the Province, the only one.

PREMIER MOORES: A re-opener would be easier.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a re-opener on anything - a re-opener on the election in 1975 would be easier.

MR. MORGAN: They gave away the Province. Yes, they gave away the Province.

MR. W. ROWE: The Minister of Justice was in the government at the time - look! - that he was talking about.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me -

MR. MORGAN: I do not care who was in the government at the time. I am telling you -

MR. W. ROWE: Talk to your friend. Talk to your friend, the Minister of Justice.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know - there is no need of losing your cool over it. Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat again, I want to repeat what I said, Sir. It is a big fat lie for anybody to say that the former administration gave away the power in this Province when in actual fact the only recourse, the only course of action open to this Province is a piece of legislation that I have here in front of me, Sir, in case the Premier has not seen it before. It is down in the legislative library. It is in the action that is

MR. NEARY:

taken against Churchill Falls and against Quebec Hydro. It is in the action, the only piece of legislation, the only law.

The only legal way we can get out of it is through a piece of legislation that was passed - the hon. members probably did not realize this - by members on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, do hon. members also realize - and if they do not I will tell them - that if Newfoundland has use for that power, 5,225 megawatts of power on the Upper Churchill that we can take the whole works back, that it is only a lease. It is a lease. The power has not been given away as the Premier has so often taken to the television and said in Dr. Goebbels style. The power is leased. It has not been given away, never given away and any time Newfoundland wants it -

MR. PECKFORD: No, it is not and we are trying to prove that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to try -

MR. PECKFORD: We have to go through the courts and spend money and many, many years in order to get back, to try to get back something that -

MR. NEARY: Who gave the minister that authority? Who gave the minister that authority?

MR. PECKFORD: Anybody can go to court, you know.

MR. NEARY: Who gave the minister that authority? Who gave the minister that authority?

MR. PECKFORD: The system did.

MR. NEARY: The system. What system?

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: The minister would have been handcuffed but for the former Liberal Administration.

MR. PECKFORD: Centuries ago.

MR. NEARY: We gave the minister the authority. We did.

MR. PECKFORD: Centuries ago. We will always have recourse to courts. You believe in that democracy, do you not?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) must be cringing there because the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) knows full well -

MR. HICKMAN: Even your own leader knows that what you are saying now is not good law.

MR. NEARY: It is not good law.

MR. HICKMAN: Exactly.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the only law that we have.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what is not good law? Would the hon. gentleman tell me what is not good law?

MR. W. ROWE: What is not good law is what he drafted up when he was Minister of Justice, when he was suppose to be protecting his -

MR. MORGAN: Throw up something else now.

MR. HICKMAN: In the 1965 agreement, which the hon. gentleman will be more familiar with, and you will find that - Well, why should I? I am not going to let Quebec know what our course of action is -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me -

MR. HICKMAN: - there is more than one string to our bow, and it is -

MR. NEARY: The one string to the minister's bow was the string that was given to him by the Liberal party, by the Liberal government. That is the only string the minister has to his bow.

MR. HICKMAN: You mean by this Legislature.

MR. NEARY: In this Legislature, I have it right here in front of me. And the hon. minister has -

MR. HICKMAN: I hope you are right. I hope the hon. gentleman is right, and I hope that that is one -

MR. NEARY: All right! The minister says he hopes I am right. I am going to ask the minister straight out, point blank -

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - under what statute and under what law and under what authority has the government taken action against Churchill Falls Corporation and Quebec Hydro, under what authority?

MR. HICKMAN: The government -

MR. NEARY: Yes, the government.

MR. HICKMAN: - has taken an action as set forth in the statement of claim against Churchill Falls Power Corporation and Quebec Hydro, and they have set forth several causes of action, one of which is that we have called upon Churchill Falls Power Corporation to give -

MR. NEARY: Under what authority?

MR. HICKMAN: - us X number of -

MR. NEARY: Under what authority?

MR. HICKMAN: May I finish?

MR. NEARY: Yes, but under what authority did you ask the Churchill Falls -

MR. HICKMAN: X number of megawatts under the provisions of the lease. And Churchill Falls Power Corporation, as was made public in here -

MR. NEARY: It is a lease now, I see it is a lease.

MR. HICKMAN: The lease of the waters of the Upper Churchill. The lease.

MR. NEARY: That is interesting. It is not a giveaway, it is a lease.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, hold on a minute.

MR. PECKFORD: Hold on now.

MR. HICKMAN: There is an agreement then a contract entered into between Quebec Hydro and CFLCo; and CFLCo came back and said, and this was made public here, We cannot comply with your request, we are not obligated to comply with your request because, amongst other things, that will place us into breach of contract with Quebec Hydro. And it was on these grounds that a matter that is presently - it was resolved in our favour last week -

MR. NEARY: Well, who provided the recourse to the Supreme Court? Who provided that piece of legislation?

MR. PECKFORD: It was not provided by anybody.

MR. HICKMAN: Anyone can take an action -

MR. NEARY: No, anyone cannot. I am asking the hon. minister how brought the legislation into this House under which the hon. Premier, the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Mines and Energy, the three musketeers right across from me who so often have said, You gave away the power.

MR. PECKFORD: So you did.

MR. NEARY: Who gave it away?

MR. PECKFORD: So you did.

MR. NEARY: We leased it.

MR. PECKFORD: You gave it away.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice knows the difference of that.

MR. PECKFORD: Gave it away.

MR. NEARY: And my hon. friend also knows this -

MR. HICKMAN: That the Government of Newfoundland signs an intervenor in that other contract, too.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend also knows this, that that 5,200 megawatts of power from the Upper Churchill.

MR. PECKFORD: You can use all your weasel words you want.

MR. NEARY: Of that 5,200 megawatts Newfoundland owns, have only leased the 5,200 megawatts, that we can stop that power from being delivered at the Border anytime we want to provided the power can be used in this Province. Is that not correct?

MR. PECKFORD: That is what we are before -

MR. NEARY: Is that not correct? I am not talking to the Yahoo from Springdale.

MR. HICKMAN: I hope the hon. gentleman is right.

MR. NEARY: Well.

MR. HICKMAN: I hope he is, but, you know, I have learned enough now when a matter is in court to wait and see what the judgment is. Last year the hon. gentleman will regard we were accused that we should impose a tax.

MR. PECKFORD: Exactly.

MR. HICKMAN: And I made the comment that a first year law student would know that was bad law, and I was screamed at, and shouted at, but I regret that the Supreme Court of Canada in the recent Saskatchewan case held that our position was correct.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, exactly. So your position -

MR. HICKMAN: So wisdom and prudence indicates that one should wait until the highest court has dealt with it, and I hope the hon. gentleman is

March 14, 1978

Tape 182

PK - 4

MR. HICKMAN: right. I really do. If he is right -

MR. NEARY: I am not a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, but I do my homework,
and for years

MR. NEARY:

I have listened to the big lie and I am not going to listen to it any longer. And hon. members of this side of the House should be proud today to learn, they should be proud to find out that the government, who are accusing this side of the House of giving away the power, that the power is only leased, that the only recourse for action that this crowd have is through an agreement that was brought in by the Liberal government of this Province.

MR. HICKMAN: How long?

MR. NEARY: How long what? How long is a Chairman?

MR. HICKMAN: How long is the lease?

MR. NEARY: I do not know. How long is it? Look, the man that drafted it should know.

MR. PECKFORD: A good question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the lease is as long as we need the electricity in this Province. That is how long it is.

MR. PECKFORD: That means that as long as we need electricity in -

MR. NEARY: Let us get it straight, Sir. Let it go out now across this Province: The power is leased.

MR. PECKFORD: You sold out and you know it. An easy way out of it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not what the Minister of Justice said. That is good propaganda, Sir. It is good propaganda -

MR. WIDEOUT: He is a Liberal I suppose.

MR. PECKFORD: That is why I got out.

MR. NEARY: It is good propaganda, it is good politics -

AN HON. MEMBER: A reformed Liberal

MR. PECKFORD: You cannot weasel out of it. You sold out.

MR. NEARY: In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, in actual fact, Sir -

MR. PECKFORD: They are trying to weasel over there now.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I am not weaseling, I am not -

MR. FLIGHT: He was never a Liberal -

MR. NEARY: We cannot continue to live a lie forever.

MR. PECKFORD: Weasel out of it now.

MR. ROWE: He must have nerves on the outside of his body.

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is that in 1961, in 1961, I think it was, there was some debate in this House over an agreement. It was called the Hamilton River then - Hon. gentleman I suppose are even after forgetting that, the Hamilton River. It was not always the Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this Xeroxed so that the hon. gentleman could get it framed. Xeroxed and framed and hung over the hon. gentleman's bed.

MR. PECKFORD: I forgot more about it.

MR. NEARY: It is a lease and it is a lease that gives the government of this Province the power any time they want to, any time, Sir,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: * Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what they should be doing, and I will show you what they should be doing, Sir, the minister instead of going around with his propaganda about sell-outs and mealy-mouthed about giveaways should be trying to bring industry into this Province, should be trying to get industry to use that power because that power is still ours, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, we own the Churchill Falls Corporation, we own it, the people own it, so therefore we can determine the mill rate. We own the Churchill Falls Corporation, do we not? So we will buy it for what we tell them to sell it to us for. So, Mr. Speaker, the big lie has been exposed.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible) keep trying.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I am not trying at all. I am just laying as it is now.

March 14, 1970

Tape No. 103

AM-3

MR. PECKFORD: Sell-out Neary.

MR. ROWE: What about sell-out Hickman over there?

MR. FLIGHT: Buy-back Peckford. \$175 million for some water ir-

MR. HICKMAN: I was not in politics then.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice says he was not in politics in 1965. When did the hon. gentleman come in politics?

MR. HICKMAN: In 1966. I will never forget it.

MR. NEARY: Let us see if I can see when these agreements were made. I will tell you when they were made. There was an amendment. First of all it was the Hamilton Falls agreement, my hon. friend will remember. It was amended in 1963, amended in 1964, amended in 1966 when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Justice. Amended in 1966, amended in 1969 and amended in 1970. And I can give the hon. gentleman the number of the amendments if the hon. gentleman wants them. The hon. gentleman knows the difference and the hon. gentleman knows it is true.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members should realize this:

MR. NEARY:

The Churchill Falls Corporation at that time was a private company. And in order, Mr. Speaker - and I want to explode another myth and another big lie. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, listen to this - and I have sent to the legislative library and if I have to spend the rest of the week on my feet I will do it to explode the lie, to show that when certain members who are sitting on that side of the House were sitting over here in Opposition that they voted for this agreement, voted for it. I want to get their exact words. They are not available at this moment but I have sent to the legislative library for them.

The hon. member for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy) - I do not know if Your Honour was Leader of the Opposition at that time or in the opposition - the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Wickey), the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Wickham) - yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, they supported -

MR. WICKHAM: I remember speaking. The hon. gentleman may not have been in the House then but do you remember the debate when the main bill went through when a gentleman who has gone to his great reward, who has passed out of this world now, who was in the Opposition - I do not think he was Leader - referred to Brinco as "Punko"?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir. I remember the petition. I remember the Freedom Wagon. I was in the Freedom Wagon and I was almost in it, Sir, when it went bottom up on the way up to Holyrood at the head of the bay. I was almost in it when it got smashed up. That was the end of the Freedom Wagon. The hon. W.J. Brown was a member of this House at the time and they called Brinco Punko. I remember all that. But in the final analysis, Sir, when the package was put together -

MR. WICKHAM: None of us were here then.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, when the package was put together and a nice red ribbon was put on it my hon. gentleman was sitting in the Cabinet.

MR. BECKFORD: Do not try to throw it off on somebody else now. Take your own chair.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to say this for the benefit of the Yahoo from Springdale, that it is not governments who make laws.

MR. BECKFORD: Another great universal truth.

MR. NEARY: I am going to explode the great lie, the gigantic lie. Mr. Speaker, there was an agreement made. Churchill Falls Corporation was a private corporation. They had to get the right to go and develop the Upper Churchill, to put in canals and reservoirs and generators and transmission lines and that sort of thing. Do you know where the right to do that came from, Sir? Does the hon. Speaker think it came from Joey Smallwood? Did it come from the government of that day, the Liberal government, as the Premier so often says, the Liberal government passed this legislation, the Liberal government gave this away? If I can only get the ear of my hon. friend, the hon. the Premier. Does the hon. Premier now say, will the hon. Premier say to me, look me straight in the eye - Mr. Speaker, if I could get the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Maynard) up off his knees, Sir. Mr. Speaker, how often when Mr. Smallwood was sitting over there did we have to take abuse and criticism and snarky remarks from this side of the House, "They are on their knees again." Well, who is on their knees now? The useless, big hulk from St. Barbe (Mr. Maynard). There you go. Everybody have their own private meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. the Premier will look me straight in the eye and say that it was the government who gave away the power, it was the government who gave Churchill Falls the authority to develop the Upper Churchill, the previous government.

PREMIER MOORES: That is so.

MR. NEARY: The Premier says, yes that is so. Mr. Speaker, I did not realize the Premier was so naive because the Minister of Justice (Mr. Wickham) knows the difference of that. The authority

MR. HEARY:

comes from this House, not from the government. Does the Hon. Premier realize that? The authority to develop the Upper Churchill came from this House. Is that correct? Supported by the way, aided and abetted one hundred per cent, a unanimous decision of the House, supported by the Opposition. One of the gentlemen was Minister of Justice over here who is now Minister of Justice (Mr. Wickman) over on that side of the House. Newfoundland's version of Jack Horner.

MR. WICKMAN: I would ask the hon. gentleman to -

MR. HEARY: Newfoundland's answer.

MR. WICKMAN: I would ask the hon. gentleman to check records and see whether or not the then member for St. John's West, who was sitting in Opposition, voted for that bill.

MR. HEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wishes to get up to make a speech I would be glad to hear the hon. gentleman. I would suggest that he do it without whatever that sticky stuff he has in his mouth is because he seems to be muttering and mumbling.

The hon. the Premier, I just asked him point blank, who makes the laws, and he said, oh the government. He agreed it is the government. It is not the government, Sir. And the government did not make that law that was passed here in the House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, the Churchill Falls Corporation was, as I said, a private company and Mr. Rothschild by the way, Edmund de Rothschild, Eddy, one of the, I suppose, greatest industrialists in the world, is he not, Mr. Speaker, Edmund De Rothschild? I wish I had what he carries around in his wallet. It would be enough for me for the rest of my life, what he carries around in his back pocket. Mr. Speaker, that organization, that institution, the Rothschild Institution was a partner in the Churchill Falls Corporation. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that if Edmund De Rothschild, who did not make his millions and millions

MR. MEARY: and millions piled upon millions and probably billions by being stupid, do you think he could forecast an increase in oil prices? Well, the hon. the Premier can sit over there now and scoff and smirk and hurl insults at Mr. Smallwood and at the former administration.

PREMIER MOORES: I never -

MR. MEARY: Oh, hindsight is foresight.

PREMIER MOORES: I never hurled an insult -

MR. MEARY: The hon. the Premier does not even know who makes the laws of this land. The only recourse that the government has is under a law that was made by the Liberal administration. And I hope that lie now has been exploded forever. And the next time that the people of this Province see the Minister of Mines and Energy or the Minister of Justice or the Premier, himself, setting a bad example by saying they have away the power, I hope they will remember, Mr. Speaker, I hope they will remember that some day they will have to face their Maker and they will have to answer for all these injustices, all these - no, you cannot say lies, that is not parliamentary. So, Mr. Speaker, in order for Churchill Falls Corporation to have the authority to develop that, it had to be a law of this House and not a law of the former government. Will members get that in their heads that

MR. NEARY: it was the House. And I am sure, as I say, if Mr. Rothchild had known at the time what was going to happen to price of oil. And Mr. Levesque has now said a deal is a deal, is a deal and the Premier has shifted his ground. First, the Premier said we are going up and we are going to go for the jugular, he was parroting what my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition said, he was going to pull the switch. Pull some switch all right -

MR. W. ROWE: Backed down completely.

MR. NEARY: Backed out. Now, Mr. Speaker, now the hon. the Premier is trying to bargain off the headwaters of the rivers that flow into Quebec, the Gulf of St. Lawrence. I remember when Rene Levesque first came to Newfoundland; he came here, by the way, when he was a Liberal, he came here for a Thinker's Conference over here at the University. I was there, I do not if my hon. friend was a Liberal then or not. But Rene Levesque is a clever, clever politician. No, the Premier of this Province is no match for Rene -

PREMIER MOORES: The last Premier certainly was not.

MR. NEARY: No, well Rene was not there then -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, yes he was.

MR. NEARY: Oh, no he was not.

MR. R. SIMMONS: The elephant and the mouse.

MR. NEARY: Rene was waiting in the wings, but, Sir, the hon. Premier knows that the only way, the only way that the Upper Churchill or the Lower Churchill can be developed is that you have to have customers. The Premier suddenly came to that realization about a month ago, I believe; first time I heard him admit it was about a month ago.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you can only win two or three elections on

MR. F.B. ROWE: By (in audible)

MR. NEARY: No, you can only win - yes, on setting off fire crackers on either side of the Straits of Bell Isle - and you can only win elections by propaganda, by popping out false propaganda and false information, you can only do that so often then somebody is going to bring you right out short in your tracks.

Now, the hon. the Premier had his wings clipped. Now he is sitting down, they are having a sweet talk, he and Rene, sweet talk. Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough about that, I hope I have exploded that lie forever. And the next time the Premier takes to the television, says they gave away the power, remember the laws are made in the House of Assembly and the Opposition at the time, the Tories, the Liberals and Tories voted for it. They thought it was the greatest thing that ever happened to Newfoundland and when I get some of these quotes from the legislative library from my hon. friends who are now sitting opposite! They thought it was the greatest thing that ever happened to Newfoundland. But, now they look back because of the increase in the price of oil -

MR. PECKFORD: No, not because of that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, that is because of that and let the minister get it through his head that the power is leased, the power belongs to Newfoundland, it is leased. You can no more sell it than you can sell a house that you have leased, You can no more sell it than you can sell a house that you have leased - I beg your pardon -

MR. PECKFORD: How about the 65 year contract?

MR. NEARY: It is hard to take, Mr. Speaker. It is hard to take and these people are supposed to be responsible ministers. Look, they are being laughed at. I will tell what people in the international business world think of ministers in this Province. I will give the House an example and I will table it for the information of the House, just to show what they think of our ministers in the international business world, and is it any wonder they are being laughed at, and scoffed at throughout the international business world. Where is it here? The oil refinery, I will take that as an example, which comes under the minister's jurisdiction.

Hon. gentlemen might remember, Mr. Speaker, that I made a statement a short while ago and I said that this Government had joined with the Japs, had joined with the Japanese. Now remember, Mr. Speaker, let me see if I can set the stage as I set the stage for exploding that great lie. And I hope the news media picked it up for once and for all and they will not be duped or conned anymore into this great lie.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have got your number.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me show the House, Sir.

MR. PECKFORD: Number two, loans or credibility.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the oil refinery, Sir, I have a feeling, a very uneasy feeling, that the government are on the hitch of making a deal with Ultramar to get rid of that oil refinery for \$10 million. I have very good reason to think that. And I also have very good reason, Sir, that the Minister of Transportation and Communications, who was Minister of Finance at that time, was a great stumbling block, a major obstruction in the way of getting that oil refinery returned to its original owner. Perhaps the hon. gentleman may wish to rise, Sir, and contradict the statement that I am going to make, but I believe that the hon. gentleman, the former Minister of Finance, deliberately went out of his way to call up the enemies of Mr. John Shaheen to let them know what was going on between the government and Mr. Shaheen, to let them know what kind of proposals Mr. Shaheen

MR. NEARY: was making, to call up the banks and tell them not to give that SOB any money.

Mr. Speaker, you talk about patriotism, talk about patriotism! Mr. Speaker, the minister and the Minister of Justice, these two ministers joined with the Japs, they took \$50,000 out of the public treasury and you have to remember, Mr. Speaker, despite what the minister told us the other day about protecting the local creditors, that was a pile of garbage. Mr. Speaker, that \$50,000 to join with the Japs in putting up \$250,000 to make it \$300,000 will do nothing for the creditors of this Province, absolutely nothing and the minister knew that when he got up the other day and gave me that garbage across the House.

MR. STRACHT: Know what to do (inaudible).

MR. MCGILLIVRAY: \$2 million to improve our (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, look let me say this about that, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Justice, the hon. Minister of Finance, and the hon. Mr. Crosbie, who ran away from Newfoundland, were on the Board of Directors of the Newfoundland Refinery, on the Board of Directors. The hon. Minister of Finance - the former Minister of Finance, Newfoundland Refining, Sir, they were on the Board of Directors when this money was transferred and they are the ones who should be charged with negligence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Never.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are cold hard facts.

MR. SPENCER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Yes, hold on, that is what I would say, hold on, hold on to your drawers, I would say, because I got a -

MR. SPENCER: Order, please! Order, please! I think I should point out, one can realize that something can slip out once but it should not happen continuously and hon. members should not refer to one another

MR. SPEAKER: by anything but membership for the district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: There is nothing to withdraw. The ruling is being made up here to the effect that hon. members should not be referred to by their surnames.

AN HON. MEMBER: Take it back.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaFolle.

MR. HEARY: Mr. Speaker, in 1970, \$25 million was paid out, there was no guarantee, no government guarantee, \$25 million was paid out

MR. NEARY: from the public treasury. In 1971-1972 \$2,859,000 was paid out; 1972-1973 \$1,596,000 was paid out for a total of say of \$30 million, a total of \$30 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, remember 1972-1973 the oil refinery was completed, finished, construction was finished. And the hon. Premier of this Province who was so critical, and his colleagues were so critical of Mr. Shaheen and the former administration, they felt so bad about it, Sir, they felt so miserable about the oil refinery, they felt so hurt, and they were so patriotic, and they were so upset about it that who do you think is down cutting the ribbon for the official opening, who?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Joey)

MR. NEARY: Who?

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. member -

MR. NEARY: Down in Come by Chance for the official opening cutting the ribbon, who, Mr. Speaker? The hon. the Premier, who is now gone out into the back room. He took off. He cannot take it.

Now then, Sir, the oil refinery was put into bankruptcy prematurely. And who aided and abetted the Japanese who were unsecured creditors? Unsecured creditors! The Japanese were promised, from what I can hear for this \$300 million that they put up, they were promised Julianne Lake ore deposits, and that is why they did not mind putting up their \$300 million unsecured credit, and the hon. minister can screw up his face all he wants. I have letters down in my office to prove it.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can do better than that, you can table them.

MR. NEARY: I have tabled them. I tabled them a year ago; it will be two years ago. The hon. gentleman has forgotten about that, where the Premier of this Province went off and met Ataka to talk about the Julianne iron deposits, and the Japanese did not mind putting in \$300 million, but it was unsecured, so it really does not make any difference how much they put in. They did not have sense enough, they were too stupid to get it secured. The only secured creditors

Mr. Neary: are right here in this Province, maybe a few on the Mainland. The only secured creditors mainly, in the main, in the main,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: in the main, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no, no. The secured creditors are in fact ECGD -

MR. NEARY: All right apart from ECGD -

MR. HICKMAN: - Number two is the Government of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Right. And by the way, I forgot to give that total, the total of that now by the way, the total because of the ministers' negligence, because they did not collect the interest, and because the interest had to be added on to the capital cost, I will tell the minister what the total -

MR. HICKMAN: If it had not been changed in 1974 we would be on the hook for the whole works.

MR. PECKFORD: The whole works, that you were a part of back in -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would Your Honour just listen to this. Just listen to this, Sir, because of the incompetence, because of the negligence of the ministers who were on the Board of Directors of Newfoundland Refinery -

MR. PECKFORD: The poor little boy, Grade V Economics.

MR. NEARY: - \$11 million interest, \$11 million interest in 1974-1975 - you cannot blame that on the former Liberal Administration - escaped their attention; they had not even held a meeting of the Board of Directors.

MR. HICKMAN: In 1971 who put the Province on the back of one note for everything?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as of the end of March 1977, Sir, the principal and interest amounts to \$47 million.

MR. HICKMAN: And who -

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, who put the oil refinery into bankruptcy prematurely? The Japanese, aided and abetted by this government.

MR. HICKMAN: It is not so, Sir.

MR. NEARY: That is so, Sir. And now they have joined with the Japs, who were the enemies of the Province, who put the oil refinery in liquidation; they joined with them, with the Japs to try to get an attachment on some of Shaheen's other companies. And I am going to show the House -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I am going to show the House, and here is a letter I am going to table, Sir, and the heading on it is Manning and Carey, and Carey happens to be the Governor of the State of New York. And this was an opinion that was given to Mr. Shaheen after the two ministers that I mentioned behind the Premier's back had taken \$50,000 out of the public treasury to join with the enemies of the Province, the Japs, in taking action against the Shaheen companies. They asked Manning and Carey -

MR. BUCHANAN: That is more Shaheen stuff that you got when you were down in New York.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this information is available in the "S".

Thank God they have

MR. NEARY: freedom of information laws in the United States. We do not have them in Canada. But thank God they do. And now we have access to all kinds of documents that we did not have access to before. And I tell you when I get around to - and I may not end up today, but when I get around to the administration of justice in this Province I have got a few choice words for the Minister of Justice in allowing the RCMP to seek information that was seized by the court. Magistrate Hugh O'Neil issued the warrant to seize information and then the Minister of Justice allowed the RCMP to pass that information on to the SEC in Washington. And now I have got my hands on it, thanks to the freedom of information laws of the United States.

MR. BECKFORD: Sit down and stop making a fool of yourself. Talk about -

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might be interested in knowing the hon. gentleman's name is on one of these sheets of paper that I got from Washington as a gentleman who is so critical all along, so pious of Jubilee and Canada Javelin, bought a few shares at one time and still has the shares. I saw the hon. gentleman's name on the list along with all the other people in this Province. The information should be kept quiet and confidential but the minister - no, there is no secrecy in this Province, Sir. The minister authorized the RCMP to pass the information on to Washington and Magistrate O'Neil had to write a letter saying that he did not approve it. I will deal with that later. I want to deal with the Minister of Finance right now about an opinion, and remember now what I am talking about.

The Shaheen Companies are asking Manning and Carey, and Carey being the Governor of the State of New York, for a legal opinion, and here is the legal opinion. "Mr. Robert E. Walsh, Esquire, Shaheen Natural Resources Incorporated, 90 Park Avenue, New York. Dear Robert, You have requested that I

MR. HEALY: set forth my views on the new action file by the Clarkson Gordon Limited in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, against John Shaheen, Roy Furmark, certain other of the directors, and former directors of Newfoundland Refining Company Limited, and certain other companies controlled by John Shaheen.

"The gravamen of the amended complaint sounded to be filed in the action is that these persons caused NRC to make inter-company transfers at a time when NRC was insolvent and for that reason to set aside such transfers and attach to property transferred.

"The "funds" so transferred consisted in large part of inter-company accounting entries, not involving any actual funds. To the extent that actual funds were transferred, such funds were provided by ten year loans made by the Shaheen companies to NRC for the specific purposes of financing the various activities of the Shaheen companies (indeed the loans were to be paid from the commission sales agreement which was a sign to Shaheen Natural Resources Company in 1969) and would thus appear to have been properly applied.

"At the outset this action appeared to be vindictively motivated by Clarkson itself, not as an impartial trustee, but as a defendant who is retaliating against the action which this firm filed against it in the State Court in the name of SNR Holdings Incorporated, suing on behalf of NRC and Provincial Refining.

"You will recall that Clarkson, which has had full knowledge of the transfers in question since March 1974," listen to this, Mr. Speaker; here is a legal opinion from one of the most reputable legal firms in the United States. "You will recall that Clarkson, which has had full knowledge of the transfers in question since March 1976, having been supplied the information by Newfoundland Refining, and Procon, never made these allegations until after the New York appellate courts had thwarted Clarkson's efforts to take over the SNR Holdings case against itself and co-conspirators.

MR. NEADY:

Having failed in that effort to block the litigation against it, Clarkson is now trying a different political ploy to block or impede the effort of the Shaheen companies to force Clarkson and the other defendants in the SMC holdings case to respond at the bar of justice for their misdeeds against WPC and POC. It is common legal tactic to use such diversionary tactics when a defendant fears a square confrontation in a case brought against him. I hope the House heard that, Sir. 'Further' - and this is the crucial paragraph - 'Further, the Clarkson action is being financed 80 per cent by the Ataka companies' - as I said - 'with the funds provided in all probability by the Furuto Bank which forced Ataka to breach its contract with WPC and POC and which has already illegally converted some \$7.5 million of POC's funds without any objection from Clarkson, and 20 per cent by Mr. Doody, who is the same person who attended the infamous meeting in New York on February 12, 1976 where the illegal conspiracy was finalized to abet the Ataka company's scheme to breach the agency agreement illegally and on the basis of false affidavits to bring ex parte bankruptcy abdication against WPC and POC and cause the appointment of Clarkson to receiver under the first and second mortgages. In summary, Robert,' he says, 'it is my belief,' now listen to this, Mr. Speaker; Your Honour is a lawyer, Your Honour is a learned gentleman, Your Honour is an honourable gentleman - listen to this. This is Manning and Carey, the most reputable law firm in the United States, Governor of the State of New York.

MR. SPEAKER:

You ought to table that.

MR. NEADY:

I am going to table it, do not worry.

My hon. friend does not need to remind me. 'In summary,' he says, 'Robert, it is my belief that this is more of a politically motivated, retaliatory action than it is a justifiable and legally supportable legal action. There is no statutory basis for the cause of action Clarkson is asserting, and we believe it will be dismissed on the papers filed.' And, Mr. Speaker, in front of me I have the decision of the Court of New York. The decision

MR. NEARY: is this, Sir - my hon. friend knows what it is. The court has handed down its decision. Here is what it said. 'I am not sufficiently,' - this is the United States District Court Judge - 'I am not sufficiently persuaded to invoke on plaintiff's behalf the extraordinary remedy that attachment concededly is. Given the foregoing on this record and on the law and in the exercise of discretion the motion for an order of attachment and related discovery are denied.'

MR. DOODY: How much money is involved?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend should know how much money is involved. My hon. friend was on the Board of Directors when these alleged transfers were made, did not hold a meeting of the Board of Directors, and should be arrested for criminal negligence on behalf of the people of this Province. My hon. friend and Mr. Crosbie, who ran away to Ottawa, never even called a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Newfoundland Refinery.

MR. HUN. SHANEEN: - were not on it.

MR. NEARY: The gentleman were honest, Sir. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get back to a few general comments about the oil refinery. The oil refinery today, Sir - it cost about \$200 million to build in 1969. Mr. Speaker, the replacement value to build that refinery today would cost about \$500 or \$600 million - \$200 million in cost. And, Mr. Speaker, the government of this Province are now on the ditch, on the verge of giving it away for \$10 million - and that is not cash, that is to be paid off over a period of ten or fifteen years - to Ultramar. Ultramar want to use it for transshipment, they want to use it for storage, and in the process they will probably dismantle it, take it away and set it up somewhere else. And my hon. friend the Minister of Transportation and former Minister of Finance is aiding and abetting the enemy to do this at every twist and turn. There is another proposal on the table, by the way, an substantial proposal that includes paying off the creditors in this Province. But my hon. friend is not interested in that because that is Mr. Shaheen, that is my hon. friend's enemy. The hatred is so savage that they would rather -

MR. HICKMAN: From who?

MR. NEARY: From Mr. Shaheen. Mr. Speaker, the hatred is so savage, so bitter and so deep-rooted, the hatred of the minister for this particular gentleman that they will not even entertain a proposal - and if the hon. gentleman does not believe me he had better talk to his hon. Premier.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons for giving the hon. gentleman the flick, besides the hon. gentleman being shellshocked after being in the department for a couple of years, was that the hon. Premier did not have elbow room enough; the hon. gentleman was throwing too many obstructions in the way. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is true or not but the reports that we hear of the vicious rows and the low morale in that Cabinet, Sir, would frighten you, and this hon. crowd are running this Province, in charge of this Province!

Anyway, Sir, the oil refinery to build it today would cost about \$500 or \$600 million and they are going to give it away for \$10 million, so I am told, and they are not going to give it away to somebody to start up, start refining down there again, not to somebody who is going to pay off the creditors in this Province, somebody who is going to use it for trans-shipment.

MR. MORGAN: Now we know who paid your way to -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your honour heard that innuendo. Mr. Speaker, did your honour hear that snide innuendo?

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry!

MR. NEARY: Never mind. The Minister of Tourism said, now we know who paid your way to New York. Well, Sir, I would like for the hon. minister to withdraw that, Sir, rather than we have him get up to apologize.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) I know who paid your way to New York.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would Your Honour discipline the hon. gentleman, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: (Collins) Is there a point of order being raised?

MR. NEARY: Well, I am raising a point of privilege, Sir. As a member of this House I am asking for the protection of the Chair and I am asking the minister to withdraw that statement, Sir.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. As I understand a point of privilege—it is simply a difference of opinion, what the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is bringing up, between two hon. members as to who paid for a trip for the hon. member to

MR. PECKFORD: New York some time ago and hence, you know, that it all.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, it is straight innuendo and it is an attack on my personal integrity and my character, Sir, and I demand the protection of the Chair and I ask Your Honour to either have the gentleman retract that statement or be put out of the House.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): Order, please!
The Chair is at a little disadvantage here because the remark that was alluded to was not made within the strict confines of the debate and I am afraid the Chair was not aware of its content. I think all I can do would be to reserve judgement, if I may, at this point in time and refer to Hansard at the earliest opportunity.

MR. NEARY: Thank you very much, Your Honour. As Long as I have the protection of the Chair I am quite satisfied, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that they are in the process of giving away that refinery to Ultramar or to some other company for a song. They should not do it, Sir. They should resist the temptation, resist the temptation. They should resist the temptation, Sir, and they should take the best offer.

MR. MORGAN: You gave away the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You gave away the Province.

MR. NEARY: As soon as I get the protection of the Chair I will resume my speech.

MR. F.B. ROWE: 'Steve' they obviously have all spoken to the Speech in Reply so they cannot speak again.

MR. NEARY: That is right. I need the protection of the Chair before I resume my speech, Your Honour.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the oil refinery at Come by Chance at the moment is in pretty good shape so I am told by the people who built it, the engineers who built it. They told me that it can remain in pretty good shape for another two or three years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, can I have your protection, please, if you do not mind.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: If I had my voice, if I were in good voice today I would not mind.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence which is his right and I would ask hon. members to give him that privilege.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The oil refinery is in good shape, Sir, at the moment and it can remain in good shape for another year or two or three years. At the moment there is no great demand for oil refineries on the Eastern Seaboard of Canada or the United States, no great demand. As a matter of fact, the production in most oil refineries in Canada and the United States is down at this particular moment but it is going to come back, and when it does, Sir, that oil refinery again is going to be valuable and it is going to come into its own so I make a plea, I appeal to the administration not to give it away. It is worth \$500 million, it is a valuable piece of real estate, do not give it away, get the best deal you can and get the oil refinery working, that is what we want. And let the Minister of Transportation, the former Minister of Finance stop making these phone calls all around the world trying to sabotage proposals that can start up that refinery, going out of the minister's way. The refinery is in first-class shape, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it will cost \$48 million to build stacks, to put in the heat exchangers and to repair the defective units and so forth, but all that can be done in due course, Sir, it is only a matter of the government acting in a responsible manner. And if they would just hold their horses somebody is going to come along and take that oil refinery over and operate it.

MR. MORGAN: You are hoping it is John Shaheen.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Why not?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not care who it is. I do not care if it is Satan himself. There was a time when I heard an hon. gentleman make a statement in this House that he did not care as long as they came from this side of the Iron Curtain. Well, I do not care what side of the Iron Curtain they come from -

MR. MORGAN: You only want the one man.

MR. NEARY: - as long as they get her back in operation, Mr. Speaker. And let me say for the benefit of the hon. little narrow-minded, rejected,

Mr. Neary: deposed Minister of Tourism, let me make it clear to the hon. little narrow-minded gentleman that all I want to do is see that refinery operating and I do not care who operates it. I am a spokesman for nobody.

MR. MORGAN: Who paid for your trip to New York?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who -

MR. MORGAN: Your colleague, your leader did not pay for it; he opposed you going down there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who paid for the hon. gentleman's -

MR. MORGAN: He criticized you for going down there.

MR. NEARY: I would like to know who paid for the hon. gentleman's trip by helicopter down to his tavern down in Bonavista - or down in Catalina. And I would like to know who paid for the hon. gentleman's lounge down in an Ex-LOL hall down in Catalina? I would like to know that, but it is none of my business.

MR. MORGAN: It was paid for.

MR. NEARY: It is none of my business no more than it is any of the hon. gentleman's business.

MR. MORGAN: Your party opposed you going down to New York to meet with Shaheen and Doyle. They opposed you going down there, criticized you publicly going down there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I -

MR. MORGAN: Your own leader did.

MR. NEARY: - have the protection of the Chair, Your Honour?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! The hon. member wishes to be heard without comments from the other side.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I can only appeal -

MR. MORGAN: They apologized for you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am only going to ask Your Honour once more and then I think Your Honour should name the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I have to remind hon. members that an hon. member is quite within his right to demand that all members of the House be silent whilst he speaks. The Chair

Mr. Speaker (Dr. Collins): does not like to limit interjections unless it is necessary, but when an hon. member asks that that be done the Chair has no choice but to insist upon it.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. members now have a few more facts before them. They can make up their own minds on what they think should happen to the refinery. Should it be given to Ultramar, my hon. friend's buddies? Or the Roman group for a song, a sale price? Should we hold on to it, try to negotiate a deal with Venezuela, Kuwait, or Syncrude? And when the production of oil starts to pick up again and there is a demand for oil refineries, do all the members think that oil companies are going to go off and build a new refinery for \$500 or \$600 million when there is one down here, just down the road here that they can get?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is falling apart .

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is not falling a part, it is in first class shape.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am told by the gentleman who supervised the construction of that refinery that it is in first class shape; it would cost about \$1 million or \$2 million to start it up again today.

AN HON. MEMBER: You will not believe your eyes.

MR. NEARY: Well maybe not, I am not an engineer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to swing back to one of my old pet peeves, and that is unemployment. Mr. Speaker, we have in the Province today record unemployment. We have more people unemployed, my hon. Leader reminded me at lunchtime, I think it was, that there are, is it 34,000 or 32,000?

MR. W. ROWE: 32,000 now, is it not? I think this time last year.

MR. NEARY: 32,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed at this moment according to the latest Statistics Canada statistics, 32,000, that is

Mr. Neary: 4,000 more than this time last year. I think it is much more than that myself. I think, you know, there - I do not know what kind of statistics they are using, sometimes they call them the sessionally adjusted. They got me so confused, you know, I really cannot figure out what they are doing.

MR. W. ROWE: Thousands of people have just given up hope.

MR. NEARY: I would say there are about 60,000 people unemployed in this Province at the present time. And the government go about, you know, their business claiming they have created so many jobs, this welfare works programme that they have, and so forth and so on, if I can find my unemployment statistics that I have here, or the amount paid out in unemployment insurance over the last few years, I will show hon. gentlemen where the people have gone off welfare. They have gone off welfare all right; they have gone over on unemployment insurance. I will find that now shortly, Sir. They managed to get enough stamps on LIP and Canada Works to get them over to their unemployment. I do not have that in front of me there now, but I have it there somewhere. I will find it in a minute.

But not only that, Sir, we have, as I indicated the other day, a large number of people who have to emigrate to Alberta. We had almost 8,000 manpower mobility grants approved in this Province last year, people moving within Provincial boundaries and moving outside of the Province and so forth and so on. And now on top of that, Sir, we have teachers that

MR. NEARY: are being laid off. Now, Mr. Speaker we are accused over here sometimes of being negative, the Premier when he gets mad he goes berserk, he goes haywire, he has got no other argument, he is licked, he is beaten, all his arguments have been exploded like the great lie I exploded today, He will shoot across and say, they are negative; negativism that is all we get from that side of the House.

But, Sir, in connection with the teachers that are going to be laid off, I took it upon myself, February 22nd., to write Mr. Thomas LaFosse, president of the Newfoundland Teacher's Association, a letter. Because I think, Sir, we are in pretty bad shape in this Province when our skilled tradesmen and our teachers are being laid off. Members know that I have been advocating Grade Twelve, I do not think the teachers can win an argument, Mr. Speaker, by saying that - although it has to be done sometime - I do not think win the argument by saying, well, get the teacher ratio down, get the teacher/pupil ratio down, which is pretty bad in this Province, I know. I think if we are going to uplift and upgrade education in this Province the best chance the teachers have, the best argument they have, the best argument we have as parents and as elected members of the House, as administrators, is to try to get Grade III brought into our schools, to improve the quality of education in this Province. So, I was very concerned about the fact that teachers are being laid off. I think that is the last straw, that is a sign we are in pretty bad shape. And I could see that the situation was crying out for suggestions and ideas; my hon. colleagues, some of them feel that the reduction of the teacher/pupil ratio is the answer.

MR. MARY:

I think it has to be faced, no question about it. My hon. friend predicted there were going to be teacher lay-offs. But I happen to feel personally that the number one priority is the introduction of Grade XII into the schools. So I wrote the President of the Newfoundland Teachers Association a letter and here is what I said. "Dear Mr. LaFosse: As a parent, as a citizen, as a taxpayer and as a member of the House of Assembly, I have a deep sympathy for the plight of the hundreds of teachers presently unemployed in our Province and the fact that the number of unemployed will be drastically increased within the next couple of months by the elimination of teacher positions as well or in addition to the ones, the graduates of the education programme at Memorial University. You know, of course, that for the past several years I have supported, perhaps pioneered the campaign to add Grade XII to our secondary school curriculum. To do so might very well add an overall economy to the Province's education bill. Grade XI graduates who are now forced to leave their homes to attend, oftentimes in vain, foundation year classes at Memorial University in St. John's and Corner Brook could very well and in greater numbers be accommodated in their own homes or nearby communities and thus be better prepared to cope with university life. And certainly I would assume that in terms of dollars and cents it costs less to employ a secondary schoolteacher than it does a university lecturer who, more often than not, has no professional teaching qualifications of any sort. More power then, I say, to the NTA in their campaign to have Grade XII added to our school system. Another area which I would suggest is worthy of exploration by the NTA, and this is something new, would be research into the number of teachers who are by age or in terms of service within a year or two of qualifying for pensions and would be willing this very June to retire as long as there were no loss of pension benefits which they could earn by hanging on to their jobs for another year or two. I hope that you will be able to push the Minister of Education into action on the Grade XII issue. The matter has been under study now for several years and it is

March 14, 1978

Tape 104

PC - 3

MR. NEARY:

high time for a decision."

Mr. Speaker, there is a positive suggestion for the administration to take in connection with this serious crisis that has cropped up, Sir, among the teachers of this Province, and I would like to table this letter, Sir, as a positive suggestion. I know the minister is not in his seat, but I hope the minister will take -

MR. WOODS:

He is over there now; he just

came in.

MR. NEARY:

The minister just came in. I hope

the minister, Sir, will take some action on my suggestion. And,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just to show that we are not always negative on this side of the House I have another suggestion to make in connection with unemployment in this Province. I have a measure that I think should be taken to try to alleviate, to try to help solve the unemployment problem that we have in this Province.

Back in October I wrote the Prime Minister of Canada about the matter of unemployment and I have some correspondence here that is very interesting indeed. I might read just the initial letter that I wrote to the Prime Minister and then his reply so that hon. members can see that we are not negative. We are not negative, we are positive in our thinking.

"The Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario. Dear Mr. Prime Minister: In the matter of job creation may I suggest that the best interests of our Country as a whole, and of our unemployed citizens would best be served by eliminating the local initiatives aspects which have characterized such programmes in the past.

Both LIP and Canada Works set-ups have produced short-term band-aid treatments resulting in a most uneconomical use of both human and material resources, and have both been generally regarded rather contemptuously as short-term bridges to long-term unemployment insurance, itself valued by most as a superior level of welfare.

May I suggest that the interest of Canada as a Nation, the individual provinces, taxpayers and the unemployed themselves, would be better served by establishing a Crown corporation, charged with carrying out efficiently individual major projects in various parts of the country and hiring, from the ranks of the jobless, workers for specific lengths of time. Not only would this result in a much better type of project as compared with the

MR. WEARY: present money makeshifts, but it could ensure that both the managers and workers on such projects were properly selected, instead of, as often happens now, being the prerequisites of perennial lobbyists.

As far back as twenty years ago technocrats forecasted that by the year 2,000 there would be economically justifiable jobs for only twenty-five per cent of our population, the result primarily of advancing automation and technological change.

We must face up to the fact, Mr. Prime Minister, we are already far into the second industrial revolution and that government has the responsibility to cope efficiently with this situation by shaping up permanent plans for providing employment via jobs which in the narrow sense may not be considered economically justifiable.

May I, Mr. Prime Minister, have your reaction to my suggestion? "

And the Prime Minister wrote me back, on January 23, 1978.

"Dear Mr. Weary," he says. "This is in reply to your letter of October 24, 1977 concerning job creation for the unemployed in Canada.

The government and I personally share your concern about the extent to which international, as well as domestic factors make the task of developing viable long-term solutions to the employment needs of Canadians a difficult task. Thus I find your proposal to establish a Crown corporation whose main function would be to create jobs through major projects throughout the country an interesting suggestion.

I have also noted your concern regarding the short-term nature of our current direct job creation programmes. In this respect I should point out that we do not view these programmes

MR. NEARY: as a comprehensive response to the present unemployment situation."

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Perhaps the hon. member would permit me to say that if the business of the House is not concluded by six o'clock I will have to leave the Chair to return at eight.

MR. NEARY: I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman will table the letters?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will, when I am finished with them.

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, Wednesday, at three o'clock, and that this House now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): It is moved that the House is adjourned until tomorrow at three. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Carried.

This House is now adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock.