

VOL. 4

NO. 5

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
10:00 A.M. - 1:00 P.M.  
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 8th., 1978

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of some 302 residents of Gaultois. "We, the undersigned residents of the town of Gaultois, Hermitage Bay, of the full age of eighteen years or over do hereby petition the House of Assembly in regular session to hear the prayer of our petition which follows." And the prayer reads, Mr. Speaker, "The town of Gaultois, although incorporated in 1962, has been the centre of commerce for Hermitage Bay for 160 years. Due to the effect of this commercial activity based almost exclusively on the fishing industry, it still continues to be the main centre of the fishing industry for this area. Its effect still radiates East and West for some considerable distance and requires that movement of people be made from time to time and continuously. As Gaultois is on an island it therefore follows that any movement of persons must be by boat or air. The water route is obviously the more reliable until a highway is provided. We submit that a capable ferry service should be provided to operate on a regular basis between Long Island and Hermitage, and that the people of Gaultois are being discriminated against by its absence for so long."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the prayer of this petition, which is backed up, incidentally, by a letter from the Lion's Club indicating where only recently—a few days ago; last Sunday—the Gaultois Lion's Club travelled to Harbour Breton for its own meeting. And for this occasion eighteen members had to travel the three miles of water in one boat, a small boat at that, at a time

MR. J. WINSOR: when weather conditions were not that ideal. The Lions Club is backing up this petition very strongly. Also the town council has written the Minister of Transportation and Communications with reference to this. I have also communicated with the federal member, Mr. Jamieson; copies of that telex have been sent to the Premier, the Minister of Transportation and Communications. They are thoroughly aware of the need for it, I am sure. I find it very difficult to understand why Gaultois is being discriminated against, the only populated island, as far as I know, that does not have a daily service of some kind for the people to commute back and forth between the Mainland.

I would take the case of Woody Point and Morris Point in Bay of Islands, and not begrudging my hon. friend anything at all, he spelled out for us yesterday some of the goodies. Now there is a ferry going between Woody Point and Morris Point but there is also a road. We have neither and I think it is time some action was taken on this.

I would ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Surin-Placantia West.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition. First of all I was born and reared on an island. I know all the inconveniences. I know the inconveniences of being isolated by a channel of water. But I was a little farther away from the Mainland. I was sixteen miles, just a little shorter, but even so, especially on the Southwest Coast. The people can

MR. P. CANNING: endure a lot of anxieties, Sir, during storms and illness and accidents. So it is very important that these people should get this ferry or some connection, a good connection to the mainland.

AN HON. MEMBER: We cannot hear you.

MR. P. CANNING: Do you want me to repeat it? I do not mind. When rising to support this petition I said I rise to support the petition. First of all, I was born on an island and I know all the inconveniences, all the anxieties it caused, what dangers are experienced on these islands if there is an accident when you have to go by sea, especially on the southwest coast, the area of which he speaks which is as rough or perhaps rougher than Placentia Bay. I said I was farther from the mainland, I was sixteen miles. And I know exactly what it is like to be on an island, people with sick children, if you had an accident it was possible you could be there eight or ten days and neither a helicopter or any boat of any shape could approach this islands. So this to me is of utter importance. I was just going to say, secondly, I suppose it is probably a dual responsibility, federal and the provincial. but if it is provincial responsibility, Mr. Speaker, I am sure to get sympathetic hearing from the other side of the House because if they are not the only thing I could tell them is to put some money where their mouths are because since the islands of Placentia Bay have been resettled all we have heard from the government was what a terrible thing, how criminal it was to encourage those people or turn these people off the islands, which they say, which never happened of course because the people who are enduring those worries and dangers and whatnot wanted to get off them, went of their own free will, and they are better off by leaving. Mr. Speaker, I take much pleasure and I do hope that of all the petitions that came to the House since the House opened,

MR. CANNING:

this one will, I would say, have top priority and I hope it will get the attention of the provincial government immediately. Today, I hope, they will go and try to do something about it, because I have been trying to put across to this House where we hear every other day of that terrible government which was so criminal, no consideration for the people, you know, and well. I just forget the things they said. No consideration and criminal. I suppose that is enough.

Mr. Speaker, I lived on those islands and they were decentralized. They relocated. And when they were relocated, Mr. Speaker, they had telephones, they had roads, cars driving, and a mile and a half was all the road that was there, they had a modern fish plant of that day, they had a good school, they had every convenience. But then that did not make up for the other worries the parents would have, and people living on those islands.

I wholeheartedly support this petition.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my hon. colleague, Sir, on behalf of his constituents, the people who live in the community of Gaultois.

Like the hon. gentleman who just spoke, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the problems and the frustrations of isolation, having also been born and raised on an island right out in the middle of Conception Bay. And believe me, Sir, I think that we are probably all amazed in this day and age that people who live in an isolated part of Newfoundland should have to bring their problem before this House in the form of a petition when we have a government which is spending so much money on frills.

MR. NEARY: If they would cut out some of the frills they would be able to provide the ferry service to Gaultois that is so necessary.

The frustrations, Sir, of living in isolation are immense indeed. As my hon. colleague indicated, take sickness or accident. There is an industry in that community, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: There is a big industry there. There is no unemployment in Gaultois. There is a big industry there, and what

MR. NEARY:

happens if there is a major accident? It could happen at any time and that used to be always our fear on Bell Island: if an accident occurred or if somebody got seriously ill and the weather is bad and you cannot get a helicopter or a plane in there and the boat cannot run what happens, Mr. Speaker? There are periods of very, very deep anxiety I am sure in that community as there was in ours and still is on Bell Island even though there is a hospital there, Mr. Speaker. So this is an urgent matter, Sir, and I might point out for the benefit of my hon. friend that it falls under provincial jurisdiction. It is an intra-provincial ferry service and there is a great battle going on between the Province now and Ottawa over the ferries that operate in this Province. Back several years ago the former Premier of this province managed to unload the ferry service onto the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada resented it because they claimed that intra-provincial ferry services come under the Province and not under the Government of Canada. And the provincial government of that day managed to get a fair amount of assistance out of the Government of Canada to operate two or three ferry services, including the one I referred to on Bell Island. But there is always a battle going on of whose jurisdiction the intra-provincial ferry services come under and I believe as other people do that it comes under the provincial government and it is the responsibility of the provincial government to provide, to subsidize, to provide this ferry service to Gaultois. I hope, Sir, that the Minister of Transportation and Communications will rise and tell us now because this is an urgent matter, something that cannot wait, that some of the frills will be cut out in this government and that they will go on and implement this ferry service that is so necessary for the safety and security of the people who live in that community of Gaultois on the Southwest coast.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

December 8, 1978

Tape No. 163

ah-2

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have spoken with eloquence in support of this petition and I do not need to repeat what they have said except to say that I think the points that they made were well made and the points which they made deserve a hearing.



Mr. Roberts: I would like to bring in another point in supporting this petition, I think there is a moral issue involved in this as well, in that a little more than five years ago this week there was a by-election held in what was then the district of Hermitage. A number of us in this House have very warm and very favourable memories of that event; a number in the House may have warm and not so favourable memories of it as well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: You mean the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford).

MR. ROBERTS: The by-election was held in the district of Hermitage and the community of Gaultois was then part of that district. It is now in a different district because of the redistribution that subsequently occurred. In that by-election the Premier of the Province and a number of his colleagues on a number of occasions promised the people of Gaultois that there would be a ferry service between their island and the community of Hermitage itself, which is their mainland terminus on the mainland of the Island of Newfoundland itself.

I think, Sir, if for no other reason than the fact that the government did make a commitment, made a commitment openly and publicly, they made it to try to win votes, but that should not take away from the probity or the honesty or the integrity of their commitment. But for that reason alone I would hope that the Minister of Transportation and Communications, newly come to the portfolio - there have been five or six ministers between him in 1978 and whoever happened to be the minister of whatever the department was then called back in 1973 - but the minister, if for no other reason and to honour a commitment made by his Premier and by his colleagues in the Cabinet, should honour that commitment. The case speaks for itself. The case, Mr. Speaker, of the needs of the people of Gaultois is adequate in itself. But if the ministry, particularly the minister, should not think that that in itself the merits of the case are sufficient to carry the day, then I would suggest that simply the old-fashioned concept of being a man of one's word, and being a man of integrity, and being a government of integrity, and being a government that keeps its commitments should carry the day and

Mr. Roberts: provide the people of Gaultois with the ferry which they deserve, and the ferry which they were promised.

I support the petition, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, having worked in that area for almost eight years, I am well acquainted with the problems that people have travelling between Hermitage and Gaultois. In fact, in that time during my day there were no roads there and we had to travel from Harbour Breton to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Would the hon. gentleman -

MR. WOODROW: May I speak in silence? What have you got against me? I am speaking on behalf of a man in this hon. House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: If you do not speak -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, as I said, having worked there and knowing the difficulties. At that particular time we had to travel-in fact, from Harbour Breton we had to take a boat, as the hon. member knows, from Landing Cove over to Dawson's Cove and a truck and then down to Hermitage and on over to Gaultois. The people, in fact, they certainly travel under most difficult conditions and you really have to be there, you have to be there, you have to be in Gaultois to know how difficult it is, the hardships people undergo in getting back and forth. And I admire, I have always admired the hon. member from Hermitage-Harbour Breton, I think it is, the right name, and he is sincere and honest. I knew him when he was down there working at the fish plant. And as the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said, you know, it is true that down in Gaultois everybody is working and I certainly feel that they deserve a ferry and I hope that it will be looked at in a very serious manner and I support the petition one hundred per cent.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Day de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege affecting a member of the House of Assembly. I sat back and allowed the other hon. members of the House to continue in support of the petition because I thought it was an important petition.

Sir, I rise on a point of personal privilege regarding an article in today's Daily News which I shall quote and which I shall table. The headline is, Sir, "And he responds,"

MR. F. ROWE: "Tourism Minister Jim Morgan has accepted a challenge from Liberal M.H.A. Fred Rowe and has repeated charges outside the House of Assembly that Mr. Rowe 'used the fisheries conference for political purposes by pressuring John Dustan of Saga Communications into contributing campaign funds to the Liberal Party.'"

"Mr. Morgan said information contained in a letter tabled yesterday from Mr. Dustan 'was in direct conflict to what we had talked about earlier.' 'Whoever we are! 'Mr. Morgan said he was even told by Mr. Dustan that the opposition member 'mentioned the amount of money per employee that should be given.' Mr. Morgan said the figure was \$100 per person.

"Mr. Morgan said he is prepared to undergo polygraph (lie-detector)" - I do not know which lie he is trying to detect, Sir -

MR. F. ROWE: "tests 'to prove I told no lies'. He said, 'Mr. Dustan approached me on this, I did not approach him.' Mr. Dustan was unavailable for comment."

Sir, I flatly reject that statement. It is another untruth, Sir, and it is not at all consistent with the document I tabled yesterday: number 5. "Mr. Rowe applied no pressure to me" - this is a letter signed by Mr. John Dustan - "Mr. Rowe applied no pressure to me, and, in fact, did not even solicit funds." So, Sir, if I did not even solicit funds, how could I ever possibly get into the details of how it is going to be done? It is not logical, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when one rises on a point of personal privilege, one has to establish a prima facie case and move the appropriate motion. I am not in a position, Sir, to do that at this moment, at this early hour of the morning, because of the fact that I have just read The Daily News, and I just wish to point out to Your Honour that I do not wish to sleep on my rights. I am bringing the matter to Your Honour's attention at this point in time so that I will not be caught sleeping on my rights, and I would like to inform you, Sir, that I am now in the process of gathering together the appropriate evidence for the purpose of proving that what the minister stated in The Daily News is another example of the numerous falsehoods that he has uttered in this House of Assembly and outside the House of Assembly.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will hear the hon. member, then I will be in a position to make a ruling. I will say this to hon. members - will the hon. gentleman please take his seat - I will say

MR. SPEAKER:

this for the general guidance of hon. members to my right and to my left, I think there is perhaps an increasing frequency, a tendency for hon. members not to take their seat when the Chair interposes or is making a ruling. I am sure there is nothing willing or planned about that, it is inadvertent, but hon. members should certainly observe that practice.

I will hear the hon. gentleman to my left. I will then, I am quite sure, be in a position to make a decision, because the process we are in now is where an hon. member gets up and submits what in his opinion is a prima facie case. If there is an affirmative ruling, than that gives precedence, priority to a motion which might come in. If there is a negative ruling, the matter is disposed of.

I will hear the hon. gentleman.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: Before the hon. minister rises, I have a point of explanation. Your Honour, I hope I made it clear that obviously I could not pursue the full course of the point

MR. F. ROWE: of personal privilege here this morning. I was simply, for the want of a better expression, giving notice that I wish to pursue this matter at a later date but I did not want to be caught sleeping on my rights because I did not bring it to Your Honour's attention at the earliest possible moment simply because of the fact that I have obviously to gather documentation and evidence and proof before I make any wild statements.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. minister, I will just say that actually the hon. member did in a very precise and appropriate manner submit the kind of submission which is appropriate at this stage, because at this stage there is no argumentation, no requirement for tabling, no submission of evidence as such. He pointed out the subject matter that he was concerned with and gave a reference to the quotation in the Daily News and that in fact is irrespective of how much opportunity the hon. gentleman had to do further research there would be nothing further required at this moment. I will hear the hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I say first of all I do not think there is a matter of personal privilege because what I said in the Daily News is accurately reported; it was said outside the House of Assembly both to the electronic media and to the press media; it was said outside the House as challenged by the hon. gentleman who now put forward his point of privilege. If that is the case, if points of privilege are being recognized of that nature, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was accused outside the House of lying to the House by the same hon. gentleman so therefore I made my same statement I made in the House outside to prove I am not lying to the House and if the hon. gentleman has any recourse it is action outside the House of Assembly, I am not standing on immunity of this hon. House. I am pointing out there is no matter of privilege. Everything I said in this session of the House of Assembly in this assembly,

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have said outside the House of Assembly, "therefore if the hon. gentleman feels the privileges of the House and him as member of the House have been breached, he should take action outside the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am now in a position to give a ruling on this. First I will refer hon. members to May, page 346, and this very succinctly states the obligation of the Chair in this matter and it reads, "As a motion taken at the time for matters of privilege is thereby given precedence over the pre-arranged programme of public business, the Speaker requires to be satisfied both that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to



MR. SPEAKER: justify him in giving such precedence, (or, as it is sometimes put, that there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed): and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity." We will certainly concede that latter stipulation there of the earliest opportunity. Therefore, what I have to address myself to is whether the area of privilege is involved or sufficiently involved to give priority to a motion which might be subsequent thereto, in other words what is frequently called a prima facie case. It is not for the Chair to decide upon the accuracy of the inaccuracy of allegations which may have been made by one hon. member against another hon. member. Privilege would come into the area if there were an allegation-or could come into the area if there were an allegation of a wrongdoing, of something which is wrong, something which is improper in the parliamentary sense. Now whether an hon. member solicited funds or pressured for funds or for political purposes pressured so and so for communication, for a contribution to a certain party, whether he did or whether he did not there is no allegation of impropriety, there is still a difference of opinion with respect to alleged facts. Just one brief quotation and this is from the fifth edition of Beauchesne page 114 and I think this puts it very succinctly, at least the last sentence, "It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted but it is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permitted. On rare occasions this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident." And I think that is the situation we are in. There is no allegation of impropriety, no allegation of deceit; we are apparently left in a situation of accepting two contradictory accounts of the same incident and Beauchesne refers to that possibility. So as strange as it may seem that is the position we are in and I think that one would dispose of the matter that way.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will  
on tomorrow move the following resolution.

Whereas the Come By Chance area of this Province is suffering  
extreme economic hardship because of the continued closure of the  
Come By Chance oil refinery;

And Whereas unemployment is at an all time high in this area

MR. CALLAN: and whereas the closure of the Come By Chance refinery has left the government and the taxpayers of this Province holding the bag for some \$60 million, be it therefore resolved that a select committee of the House be set up immediately to ascertain all the facts pertaining to the proposal to purchase the refinery and make recommendations to this House on a non-partisan basis on what the Committee feels is the best offer in the interest of all the people of this Province to re-open and reactivate the refinery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question number (8) on yesterday's Order Paper. It was asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and the question asked me to lay on the Table of the House plans or arrangements for parking, either free or on a flat rate basis, to Public Service employees who will be relocated in Atlantic Place in downtown St. John's.

The terms of the lease by the St. John's Development Corporation agrees to provide thirty free parking spaces in the parking garage.

MR. NEARY: Is that typed?

MR. BRETT: No, I do not have it typed as such. But anyway as I said, the terms of the lease agreed to thirty free parking spaces in the downtown garage but no decision has been made to date as to what government will do with the remaining parking spaces that will be required. I expect to bring the matter to Cabinet very shortly. I am looking at the federal parking policy with respect to their employees which is that they will provide free parking space for five per cent of their employees. That would include the senior staff, messengers who find it necessary to use their cars several times a day -

MR. NEARY: That would be about sixty to seventy -

MR. BRETT: No, the thirty spaces that is being provided would amount to approximately five per cent.

MR. NEARY: How many are going down to Atlantic Place?

MR. BRETT: Approximately 500.

MR. NEARY: I heard there was 1200.

MR. BRETT: So that 30 would be approximately five per cent. But anyway no definite decision has been made but it will have to be made within the next month or so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Housing I think has an answer.

MR. HIGNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to supply an answer to a question raised by the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) some days ago as regards to whether the Province has taken up or used all the money available under the Central Mortgage and Housing programme, the RRAP programme I believe it was, and the member indicated that according to information he had received, or a statement made by the corporation, the CMHC, that all the money was not used. I would like to inform him and the House that not only

Mr. Hickey: have we used all of the money, which was somewhere in the vicinity of \$4 million, but indeed we have projects ready and are looking for some \$600,000 to \$800,000 in addition. I would like to inform my hon. friend as well that the statement made, I think, was certainly ill-founded and confused inasmuch as I believe and I understand there is some money which might well go back to the Federal Treasury as applies to the urban areas, and especially in St. John's where the NIP programmes are in effect. And this programme is a very difficult one—and I do not mean in any way to cast reflection on the city who has total responsibility for this, we have no responsibility whatsoever it being a federal programme - but that it is a very difficult programme to manage and as it applies to the urban areas the ground rules are quite different, and in this regard we are working with Central Mortgage and Housing in an effort to get them to be a little more flexible in using this money in the urban areas. So I would hope if we give some back this year certainly next year we will have the ground rules changed to the extent that there will be indeed no more go back.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before I put my question to the Minister of Justice, Sir, the Acting Premier, I want to congratulate The Daily News on their follow-up story as a result of a question asked during the Oral Question Period yesterday on the First Arabian Corporation's visit to Newfoundland. I want to congratulate The Daily News, especially John Furlong, on the follow-up that he did on that question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice, the Deputy Premier, Sir. In view of the serious revelations at the Mahoney Commission of Inquiry yesterday concerning the role played by the Premier and two Cabinet ministers in authorizing the rental of government office space in Corner Brook over the recommendations of the Department of Public Works Leasing and Rental Officer, I would like to ask the minister whether a similar arbitrary procedure was followed in his government's rental of space in Atlantic Place at considerably in excess per square foot of the competing tenders?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the second part of that question would be more properly directed to the appropriate minister. The first part of the preamble in the question I would think would be more properly held over until we get the findings of Mr. Justice Mahoney after he has had an opportunity to review all of the evidence given under oath.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will direct a supplementary -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: - to the minister who is responsible for Public Works, Sir. Would the minister tell the House if the same procedure, and that is the Premier and the ministers overruling the public servants, was the same procedure followed in the case of Atlantic Place where the contract for the rental of office space for the government employees was given to a bidder who submitted a bid much higher than the lowest tender? What happened in this case? What procedure was followed?

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

MR. BRETT: A decision to rent space at Atlantic Place, Mr. Speaker, was made by the Cabinet, not by the Premier or any one individual. And while the bids received from the St. John's Development Corporation were slightly higher than other bids received, it was a better bid when you consider that we could move five departments into the one area, and that was the whole intent in the first place, to try to consolidate five or six departments

MR. BRETT:

that we have scattered all over St. John's to get them all into one area. So in view of this, the bid from Atlantic Place was better.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Do I understand, then, what the hon. gentleman is saying, that the Public Service, the people in the Department of Public Works, had no input into the decision to rent that office space at Atlantic Place, that it was strictly a political decision?

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, The Cabinet of the Province makes the decision, not civil servants.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: That was not the question, Sir. The question was, Do I understand from the hon. gentleman's answer that the Public Service were not asked for or did not volunteer any input into these tenders? Tenders were called, tenders were received and then they had to be considered by somebody. Do I understand - and I just want to get this clear - from the minister that the Public Service, the people in the Department of Public Works, had no input into the renting of space at Atlantic Place, that this was a political decision?

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

MR. BRETT: The senior civil servants of the Department of Public Works had considerable input. They prepared the tenders, they made the recommendations to government, and the recommendations made by the senior civil servants were considered. And it was through their recommendations that the decision was made to go to

MR. BRETT: Atlantic Place.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman be prepared to table the recommendations of the appropriate officials of the Department of Public Works in connection with these tenders?

MR. BRETT: I will take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. That will not preclude the hon. gentleman from getting back later.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, as a result of yesterday's disclosure, the Minister of Justice, I think, indicated to the House that he was going to wait until the Mahoney Commission of Inquiry submitted their reports, even though we now know, to put it mildly, about irregularities and improper procedures, the minister says he is going to wait. Well, can the hon. the Minister of Justice assure the House that when the Mahoney Report is submitted that it will be made public, that it will be tabled in this House? And will the minister take immediate action on that report after it is made public and tabled in this House or would he prefer that either the Leader of the Opposition or myself remind him of any commitment that he might make in this House?

MR. HICKMAN: What?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the hon. gentleman to undertake to give the House a commitment that the report will be made public, that the report will be tabled in this House. And will the minister take immediate



MR. NEARY: action upon any recommendations or any facts of irregularities or improper procedures or any crimes that may be committed? Will the minister then take immediate action? I am trying to get a commitment from the minister to the people of this Province, to the House that action will be taken.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, when we get the report, when government receives the report of Mr. Justice Mahoney and the Mahoney Inquiry, it will be dealt with effectively, properly, quickly -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Like all the rest.

MR. HICKMAN: I am still waiting for a request from the hon. gentleman opposite for action with respect to the last inquiry, the one by Chief Justice Furlong.

MR. NEARY: What? Which one is that?

MR. HICKMAN: The one you did not like the outcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Fisheries. I am sorry I was not able to give him notice of it. I tried to reach him by telephone before the House met, but was not able to do so.

My question arises out of the somewhat tangled affairs of a company

MR. ROBERTS: which I believe is or was known as Cow Head Fisheries Limited. It may have changed its corporate name. This company, Mr. Speaker, if I may have just a word of explanation, this company this Summer purchased quite a quantity of fish along the Northern Peninsular, on the Western side in the district of St. Barbe and in my district. I believe they purchased around 10 million pounds of fish, purchased it as agents for the Canadian Salfish Corporation and/or Fishery Products Limited. The salfish went to the corporation and the fish that was processed in fish plants went to the Fishery Products organization.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is that the company, Cow Head Fisheries, has paid some of their bills with cheques which have now been returned by the banks, have been dishonoured, not been paid and the bank in the normal course are coming back on the people involved and the people involved have been in touch with me. Some of them are stuck with as much as \$4,000 or \$5,000. I do not have a list. I have asked for one. I am told I will get it. I will get what information I can and I will make it available to the hon. minister. My question is, is there any way the minister can see the government becoming involved in this? I understand from my own research that the Cow Head Fisheries have no assets sufficient to cover these cheques, have no expectation of getting any assets. In fact I understand the broad arrow has been stamped on them by the Internal Revenue authorities and National Revenue authorities. So is there any way in which the government can act—because the problem will be next year when the fishermen go to sell their fish, and 10 million pounds is a great proportion of the fish caught in that part of the Northern Peninsula, Mr. Speaker. They are not going to sell for anything less than cash or a very good cheque indeed - is there any way the government can step in and intervene, either to correct

MR. ROBERTS: this or to prevent it happening again?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and the matter of course he raised is a very unfortunate one. The operator of the Cow Head Fisheries died suddenly some months ago and left the company in a rather chaotic condition. I do not know really what we can do. I have asked my people to take a look at it. As a matter of fact, it is rather ironic that the gentleman that I assigned to look at the Cow Head Fisheries situation, who spent some time down there, was the late Mr. Rupert Prince. Of course we all know that Mr. Prince too died suddenly just a few days ago. But again I have asked my people to take a look at it and to find out what, if anything, we can do. And it is a very serious matter. The company did in fact purchase from fishermen around 10 million pounds, which is a sizeable production and certainly one we cannot do without on that part of the coast. But I can assure my hon. friend and the people who are affected by the plant closing that we will do all we can to ensure that there will be a buyer in the area and if there is any way at all we can help, within the regulations and the law, certainly we will do it.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister. I wonder if he could communicate whether the government would contemplate taking any steps to ensure that this does not happen in the future? Now I am not suggesting we bond fish company or require them to put up deposits or something, but the problem is a serious one. Fishermen sell their fish in good faith. In due course they get paid and of course a great feature of the Saltfish

MR. ROBERTS: Corporation was that fishermen were guaranteed that they would be paid for their fish at an agreed upon price. And here because of the intervention of an agent - and I do not use that term in its legal context, Cow Head Fisheries may or may not have been in law an agent of the corporation - but because of the interposition of Cow Head Fisheries between the Salfish Corporation and the fishermen, several fishermen, it may be, I am told, as many as 100 in all along the entire coast, are out of pocket substantial sums of money which represent a large part of their year's earnings. The banks are not going to make it good, obviously, That leaves us with either the government or the fishermen or the Salfish Corporation bearing their loss. Is there any way that that loss can be spread around? It is an awful blow to a fisherman to see twenty or thirty per cent of his year's income gone in the form of a cheque that has been dishonoured because the company cannot pay it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, fortunately this sort of thing does not happen too often. This is one of these rare cases where certainly in the past five or ten years -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) down in Labrador South.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, the fishing industry is reasonably prosperous right now and not very often does a company go bankrupt and I suspect that were it not for the sudden passing of the operator of that plant that this would not have happened. But certainly I am prepared to have my people take a look at it and if there is some way that a company can be bonded or the fishermen's wages guaranteed I will certainly look into it and see what can be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Tourism, who is not in his place right now. He was a few minutes ago. I do not know what he is doing but that is

MR. CALLAN:

the former Minister of Tourism who is now occupying the present minister's chair. Perhaps, the Deputy Premier can answer the question. As I say, I would much prefer to have the Minister of Tourism himself answer the one or two questions that I have. I was going to ask the Minister of Tourism whether or not he had a poached egg for breakfast. I noticed egg on his face when he was in earlier but of course that would be unfair because poaching as he knows is illegal in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would hope now the hon. gentleman will proceed to a question.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, my question comes from page 9, paragraph 5 of the most recent Speech from the Throne. They all look alike but the most recent one on page 9, paragraph 5 where it says, "Measures will be devised to combat," it seems like a big fight, "flagrant extensive poaching, and game laws. will be rigidly enforced." I want to ask the Deputy Premier, I suppose, since the Minister of Tourism is not here, I want to ask what measures does government have in mind to combat what they call the 'flagrant, extensive poaching' that is going on in this Province - I am not talking about eggs. I am talking about game, wildlife. What measures does the government have in mind?

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN:

Would the hon. gentleman repeat the question because I really was not paying - I was being distracted and I am not sure if it deals with eggs or wild games for the Liberals.

MR. CALLAN:

Wildlife, wildlife, what measures.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask -

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary.

MR. CALLAN:

Well, I do not know if it is a supplementary or not but let me repeat the question on page 9, paragraph 5, chapter 4, verse 2, 'why beholdst thou the mote'. It says, "Measures will be devised to combat flagrant, extensive poaching, and game laws will be rigidly enforced." It is under wildlife. They are talking about the poaching of wildlife that is going on in this Province

MR. CALLAN: and government plans to use some measures - metric measures I assume? What kind of measures? What measures?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. FICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the government views with the gravest disquietude any flagrant poaching that is carried on with respect to our wildlife and areas that fall within the jurisdiction of the Province. And we will see to it that the laws are enforced fairly, equitably and in the best interest of not only protecting our wildlife but anyone else who may be within gunshot of the hon. gentleman opposite.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary. The hon. gentleman for LaPoile after the supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Justice this question -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this a supplementary?

MR. CALLAN: That is what it is. In view of the fact that it was this government that started the crazy mess when they introduced the draw system for big game licenses and therefore completely confused and utterly tormented hundreds and thousands of hunters who had hunted all their lives and who have not been successful in obtaining a big game license for the past five or six years, in view of that fact, which has completely turned them off, and in view of the fact that it was this government that last year introduced a

Mr. Callan: hunter capability programme - this year they call it a Hunter Safety; last year it was a Hunter Capability programme which had no instruction given, just a test. If you go to take a driver's test you get instruction, if you go to school and you take an exam you get instruction, but no instruction, just a test, which again many honest, decent, qualified hunters failed because they did not know what the test was all about and so they failed it, honest people who had hunted for years and years, in view of that second fact, and also, Mr. Speaker, and especially in this year, the 100th anniversary of the introduction of moose to this Province, in view of the fact that there is a total lack of education to the people in this Province, I ask the minister does he not agree that government, this government, this administration must accept a large part of the responsibility for the poaching the flagrant, the intensive poaching that is going on in this Province? This government is to blame for the poaching. They have left the hunters with no other choice. They cannot get a licence legally.

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

The hon. gentleman had a fairly long preamble before he got to his question. There is no need for one after the question.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I thank the hon. gentleman for the supplementary question and his attempt to answer same. I have to confess that I do not know what the question is, but my interpretation of the preamble is that some people failed in the Hunter Safety programme test. But if hundreds failed thousands passed, and if thousands passed the test, if thousands passed the test -

MR. PECKFORD: He is against women, boy!

MR. HICKMAN: Women?

MR. PECKFORD: Matrimonial property law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am being harassed. I must have the protection of the Chair, because the hon. gentleman over there may have some bow and arrow that he is going to aim at me, and I am particularly concerned about that because I suspect he did not pass a Hunter Safety test himself.

MR. CALLAN: That is what you think.

MR. HICKMAN: But on the assumption -

MR. CALLAN: The minister had to go back and try a second time, the Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKMAN: Who me?

MR. CALLAN: We saw him on television.

MR. HICKMAN: The only time I ever -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: In any event, Mr. Speaker, I have heard nothing but applause and accolades for the government in its introduction of the Hunter Safety programme, because obviously -

AN HON. MEMBER: Where have you been?

MR. HICKMAN: Where have I been? Well, I have to confess that I have never tried to shoot a moose or a caribou in my life. We have got a fair herd of caribou now on the Burin Peninsula. I think they are protected; certainly they are safe from me, I can tell you that, and that I have no intention to go out trying to shoot one of the poor animals, and I am certainly not going to take that Hunter Safety programme because I will fail it. I know I will fail it. I do not know how to hold a silly gun. I do not know what to do with the trigger so I am going to fail. But I do congratulate the thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders, both men and women, who passed this very proper and so widely approved and widely acclaimed test.

Now what the Hunter Safety programme has to do with poaching is beyond my comprehension. But I gather again from the long preamble, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen want a detailed response to this. I can see the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) nodding



Mr. Hickman: in agreement. I am assuming that anyone who fails the Hunter Safety programme then is qualified to poach. But how can you poach if you cannot shoot?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: - how can you poach if you do not know how to pull a gun and aim it in the right direction, which this failure of the test would have proven beyond all reasonable doubt is the case. Now with that very lucid and short and clear explanation, if there is any other information that the hon. gentleman would like for me to give to the House, either he can do it by way of a written question or maybe another short supplementary.

AN HON. MEMBER: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I had indicated I would recognize

MR. SPEAKER:

the hon. member for LaPoile next followed by the member for St. John's West.

MR. NEARY:

The Minister of Public Works just went by the door, Sir. I hope he will come into his seat because I have a couple of more questions I want to put to him about Atlantic Place. I will start off by asking the hon. gentleman if in accordance with the agreement to rent space in Atlantic Place that all the government has done is to rent four floors that could be described as a shell, it is just a shell, there are no partitions up or anything like that. Who will be responsible for putting up the partitions and the painting and decorating and the electrical and the plumbing? Who will be responsible for this work? Is it correct that the thing now is just a shell? Somebody has to now turn it into office space. Who will be responsible for that work?

MR. SPEAKER:

Minister of Public Works.

MR. BRETT:

The Department of Public Works will be responsible, Mr. Speaker, but that is standard procedure. If the government were to rent office space that had anything more than the four walls and the ceiling and the floor then the rate would be much, much higher. The same thing is true of GEM Holdings where we are renting two floors. It is the same thing; you have your four walls.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Would the minister indicate to the House how much these changes and renovations are going to cost the taxpayers of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT:

I do not have the answer to that question now, Mr. Speaker, but I will take notice of it and try to get it for the hon. gentleman.

December 8, 1978

Tape No. 175

ah-2

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if any of the work has already been allocated to any company, any electrical companies, any mechanical companies, any construction companies, or will public tenders be called and the contracts awarded to the lowest bidder?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, public tenders are now being prepared. We expect to call tenders on December 20th and I would assume they will be awarded to the lowest bidder.

MR. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Sir. Can the minister assure the House that public tenders will be called for 100 per cent of the work, apart from something that the government may do itself, the government employees may do, 100 per cent of the work that is necessary to be done to convert this building into office space?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT:

I will answer to the best of my knowledge, Sir. Tender will be called for 100 per cent of the work. At the moment we are preparing tenders for the three floors only because originally we were not aware of the fact that Transportation, Communications and Public Works would become one department. It was intended that Manpower and Labour would go to Atlantic Place but now they are going to GEM Holdings and Public Works and Services and Transportation and Communications are going to Atlantic Place, therefore we have had to make some changes in our plans. So first we are calling tenders for three floors and later on we will call tenders for the other floor.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary question. A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman really raised this question, Sir, as a result of his answer. Did I understand correctly

MR. NEARY: from the hon. gentleman that a whole floor in Atlantic Place that is being paid for by the taxpayers of this Province will be left vacant for an indefinite period of time? That was the implication that the hon. gentleman gave in his answer, Sir. I want the hon. gentleman to clarify it. The hon. gentleman said only three floors would be converted into office space at the moment, that the Department of Transportation was not going in there as originally planned and some other department and, that nothing would be done with that floor for a certain period of time. Well then do we get a credit for that from the owners? Will the government kick itself in the rear end for making a mistake and renting too much space in the first place? Very poor planning, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. BRETT Mr. Speaker, that is not correct at all. What I mean is simply this: Tenders are being prepared now for three floors. Tenders for the other floor could follow

MR. BRETT:

within a week after that. There will be no space left vacant. We require all four floors. It just means that tenders will be ready for the three floors before the fourth one, that is all.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member realize that the last time I recognized him it was on a final supplementary? And I would put our practices in doubt if we were to have two finals.

The hon. the member for St. John's West, I have indicated I will recognize, and then the hon. the member for St. George's.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Finance. I addressed the question yesterday to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and when we passed on a request that the Virginia Park Homeowners Association be financially assisted in preparing their very necessary case to seek appropriate compensation, and they need certain technical assistance in getting their case ready and they need some cash, and the Minister of Consumer Affairs said he was not a spending department. Now there are only \$3.5 million in the Budget for Consumer Affairs, but I was wondering if the Minister of Finance could look through the Budget, look through the money that they have, and direct the appropriate department, whether it be Housing or what, whether he would be prepared to find the cash to enable the government to give a grant to this Homeowners Association to prepare their case in the same manner as they fund other organizations to prepare their case, like the Federation of Municipalities, and so on, to prepare their case when consumers are being ripped off?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the only way I can answer the question put by my hon. friend is that it is not our intention to supply any money, at least under the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. There is no provision by which we can do that. However, one suggestion I have, and I have instructed my officials to make this information available to the Homeowners, and I will be making it available to them in more detail, is that the case is being documented, and well documented, by my officials and I might say that that has been ongoing since back as far as August when my predecessor, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, whose district, in fact, Virginia Park is in, saw to it that some initiatives were taken then in preparation of any case that might be made or it might be necessary to make to CMHC. That work is ongoing, and I can assure my hon. friend that I have some of it, one aspect of it, wherein it is fairly well documented. And in response more definitively to his question, I can tell him that we, ourselves, I am now able to say, have some concerns because something in the order of thirty units may be involved, for which the Province has a 25 per cent equity, and for that reason we have been documenting a case on behalf of the provincial government and likewise we will provide any assistance necessary, any of the staff that are necessary, the engineering people, any other professional people that are required. We will be making it known to the Homeowners, if they do not already know, that my staff stands ready to assist in any way, shape or form in terms of a solicitor, in terms of engineering people or anybody else that is required to put forth the strongest case which will be taken at least on their behalf, by myself if necessary, to the federal minister if we do not meet with success when we go to Central Mortgaging and Housing.

MR. SPEAKER:  
St. George's.

The hon. the member for

MRS. McISAAC: Mr. Speaker, my question is really for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, but since he has not been here this week, I will direct it to either the Deputy Premier or possibly the Minister of Rural Development, or whoever can answer it.

It is with respect to a vegetable marketing agency, and in the past few Speeches from the Throne it was demonstrated that the government intended to set up a purchasing and marketing agency, which has not to my knowledge been done, but I would like to know if

MRS. MCISAAC: the Vegetable Marketing Associates Limited, who have their headquarters in Botwood, is in any way connected or representing the purchasing and marketing agency that was supposed to be set up by government? If so, I would like this information. And if not I would like to know if there is any government money involved in setting up this Vegetable Marketing Associates Limited in Botwood, and if so how much?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take note of that question because I have not heard of the organization the hon. member is referring to. But I will ask someone in the Department of Agriculture to dig out the information and hopefully we can have it before the House adjourns next week.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 1.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 1.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act to Facilitate The Development Of The Hydro-Electric Power Potential Of The Lower Churchill River Basin," carried. (Bill No. 6).

On motion, Bill No. 6 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 2.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Increase Of Pensions Act, 1961," carried. (Bill No. 2)

On motion, Bill No. 2 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 3.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fire Prevention Act," carried. (Bill No. 3)

On motion, Bill No. 3 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.



MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 4.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Consumer Affairs And Environment Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 5)

On motion, Bill No. 5 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN:

Order 1, the adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 1, the adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, before I adjourn the debate yesterday, I was talking about the matter of federal/provincial relations and the matter of consultation between both governments on matters of importance such as the fishing industry. I have only got a few minutes of my time left so maybe I can conclude my few remarks by elaborating still further on that very important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday that it is going to be awfully difficult for any Provincial Minister of Fisheries, whether it is in Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, or any of the other Atlantic Provinces, to develop the kind of harmonious relations with the federal minister that maybe in the view of some people is desirable and necessary and I am not blaming the federal minister for that. Of course I am not blaming the provincial ministers either.

Maybe the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we are at times, as the press sometimes say, at loggerheads maybe proves one thing, that we are all maybe trying too hard to do our respective jobs. And the federal minister of course is responsible for the administration of the fisheries policies of his government on the broad prospective, on the Atlantic Provinces prospective. With respect

MR. W. CARTER: to the provinces then of course we have certain responsibilities as well, certain jurisdictions and we must have greater concern for what happens in our respective provinces than of course we would with respect to that which is happening in other parts of the Atlantic Canada. And again I make no apology for that fact. But certainly I believe that a matter - Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, is one of the last storehouses of

Mr. W. Carter: renewable resources probably on the North American Continent. Certainly one of the greatest. One resource of course that is very important to all of us, a renewable resource, is the fishery. Fish is to Newfoundland, not as much to other Atlantic Provinces, but certainly to Newfoundland what wheat would be to the Prairie Provinces, oil and gas to Alberta, the manufacturing industry to Ontario and Quebec, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, we cannot possibly afford the luxury of just sitting back and allowing all of the decisions that are made affecting that very important industry to be made in Ottawa without due consultation with the Province or without allowing the Province to have the proper input into the decision-making process.

This government, Mr. Speaker, as the records indicate we are putting a lot of emphasis on the development of our resources. For example, in 1950 the net expenditure, both under current and capital account, on fisheries development was \$129,000; in 1971, the last year of the former administration, the total or at least the net expenditure under all headings by that government on fisheries was \$2.3 million, a little more than \$2.25 million. In 1978-1979 the net expenditure under current and capital accounts on fisheries was \$18.5 million, an increase, Mr. Speaker, like I said, from \$2.3 million in 1970-1971 as opposed to \$18.5 million in 1978-1979.

And so the story goes, Mr. Speaker, This government we have been criticized by members opposite for maybe being too aggressive, maybe doing things that we should not be doing, maybe encroaching on jurisdictions and in areas where we had no business encroaching, certainly in view of the hon. members opposite. But again, Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for that fact. I believe, that we have a responsibility, and as minister I have a responsibility to take whatever initiatives we deem necessary to ensure that the fishing industry is properly developed and developed of course for the benefit of our Newfoundland people.

I get very little consolation, Mr. Speaker, from the fact that many thousands of tons of our fish continue to be harvested by foreign countries within our 200 mile limit, the reason, of course,

Mr. W. Carter: being given that we do not have the necessary harvesting capability to harvest the total allowable catch that is there to be had. And I do not think, Mr. Speaker, we can allow that situation to continue. I think we have a responsibility, a very serious responsibility and an obligation to ensure that we do provide the necessary catching effort in order that some day down the road, and hopefully not in the too distant future we will be able to harvest, if not all certainly the largest part, the majority of the allowable catch is that will be established by our scientists between, at least within our 200 mile limit.

The federal scientists, Mr. Speaker, project that within six years our fish stocks will increase in certain areas, in certain species by about 400 per cent. And certainly the provinces have an obligation to come forth with plans, proposals that will ensure that as much of that fish as possible is landed in our Province for the benefit of our people.

The plan that we announced just recently, Mr. Speaker, will do just that. It is a long range plan, one that will take us into 1985 and beyond, one that covers everything pretty well from the harvesting sector to the processing sector, secondary processing, marketing, and, of course, promotional campaigns that will be undertaken commencing in 1979. And that is the sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, that the provinces should be doing. And I am rather amused sometimes to read editorials in certain newspapers, and one in particular; we were criticized for dearing to come forward with a plan, and maybe in being a little too aggressive

MR. W. CARTER: while the same people who were editorializing a few months ago complaining that the Province did not have a fishery plan, and that kind of inconsistency, Mr. Speaker, is rather amusing. The fact of the matter is that we have put together a plan. We are going to take certain initiatives, just about all of which are within the provincial domain in terms of jurisdiction. And we have consulted with Ottawa. I tabled a document in the House a few days ago in which I indicated or at least I listed the sequence of events that have taken place in the past twelve months with respect to our anxiety or at least our desire to consult with Ottawa and to keep the national government fully up to date on the status of our plans and exactly what we were doing and how we were thinking. In fact, I made reference then to a letter that I sent to my counterpart in Ottawa back before these studies commenced, last February sometime, requesting that he allow his Director General in the Province, Mr. Len Cowley, to serve on a steering committee that was put together by our department to guide the various studies that were about to be undertaken. Regretfully, Mr. Speaker, Mr. LeBlanc did not see fit to accede to that request. Maybe he had his own reasons for it, I do not know, but certainly we would have welcomed the presence of a senior federal official on that steering committee.

We forwarded to the departments concerned in Ottawa, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion and to the Department of Fisheries, copies of our reports, both reports, just twenty days after we received them ourselves. We received these reports, Mr. Speaker, the final draft on September 1st, I believe it was, or September 4th, and twenty days later both were sent to the federal government departments concerned as well as to the Fishermen's Union and to other sectors of the fishing

MR. W. CARTER: industry, the Fresh Fish Association as well as the Salt Fish Processors Association. So I do not know what else we can do, Mr. Speaker, in terms of consultation. I sometimes get the impression that some hon. members and certain other people outside of this House attach a definition to the word 'consultation' that is absolutely unacceptable to me. I had no intention of doing what some people suggest maybe we should be doing. I think that Newfoundland has certain rights as a Province. I think we must protect those rights, we must not allow ourselves to become totally subservient to any other province or to Ottawa. I cannot for the life of me see other provinces, Quebec included, or the Prairie Provinces or Alberta or Ontario allowing undue interference by their national government into their economies. It is rather unfortunate, I suppose, in a sense that the fishing industry with its divided jurisdiction is difficult to administer in the Province without some overlapping of jurisdictions. But an industry, Mr. Speaker, that plays such a dominant role in the economy of our Province, affects the lives of almost every single Newfoundlander, an industry that accounts for the largest number of people in terms of employment - the single largest employer of people - an industry that will determine the future well-being or otherwise of the 300 or 400 Newfoundland communities that depend on the fishing industry for their existence, it is unfortunate that maybe there is such control over certain aspects of that industry resting in the hands of the federal government. Because the provinces must have the right to do their own thing in certain areas, and certainly when it comes to matters affecting the economy of the Province such as that affected in such matters as the fishing industry, then we must be able to make certain decisions ourselves and to do our own thing. Mr. Speaker, I think my time has just

MR. W. CARTER: about expired but I want to stress once more, Mr. Speaker, that I am rather proud of the fact that Newfoundland is now progressing to a point where we are the envy of other provinces in terms of fishery development. I was rather flattered the other day in Ottawa to have been approached by the new Premier of Nova Scotia, Premier Buchanan, who asked me would I be satisfied to have a long chat with his Minister of Fisheries, if he were to send him down here. The Premier of Nova Scotia, he wanted to get a few ideas as to how they should go about maybe putting some of their plans together and getting their thinking straightened out as well.

MR. S. NEARY: Did you get them out of the gulf and out of the Bay St. George area?

MR. W. CARTER: The matter of the gulf fishery, Mr. Speaker, is something that has got to be of concern to most Newfoundlanders, certainly people in the fishing industry. We did discuss the problems that are looming in terms of the condition of the stocks in the gulf area and at that time we did, in fact, agree to support the Minister of Fisheries in his desire to take some kind of action to ensure that the stocks were protected and that overfishing would not do to that area what it has done to so many areas around the Province. The lesser of two or three evils Mr. Speaker, was to maybe impose a moratorium or a freeze on new entrants, fishing in the gulf for a two or three month period. I reluctantly agreed to that proposition for the gulf area only and the idea was that there would be a freeze placed on the new entrants into the gulf area for a three month period to give the scientists a chance to have another look at the figures and re-assess the data that is being compiled with respect to the condition of the stocks in the gulf area.

MR. S. NEARY: Has it ever been public?

MR. W. CARTER: Oh, it has been made public. I have announced it myself, the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa announced that fact, Mr. Speaker, that all of the Atlantic Provinces ministers reluctantly agreed to that proposition. There were a number of alternatives and that was the least objectionable as far as I am concerned and as far as my

MR. W. CARTER: Atlantic Provinces counterparts were concerned. I repeat, it was only going to be for a two or three month period, I think February was the deadline. That, of course, would not have seriously affected the fishing in that area because as we all know during that time of the year because of climatic conditions, ice conditions that the fishing activity is pretty well at a minimum.

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. W. CARTER: The upper part up off the Port au Choix and that area there is very little fishing -

AN HON. MEMBER: Where? In the gulf?

MR. W. CARTER: I am talking about down on the southwest coast of the Province. Of course, there is a lot of activity there but again it would be very unlikely that too many people would be affected by that freeze in such a short period. It would not affect it all.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Sure that is the peak season in that area, the south shore area.

MR. W. CARTER: No, but it would not have affected, Mr. Speaker, the existing fishermen, the fishermen who have licenses to fish now in boats, it would have only affected, for that three month period, people who wanted to get into the fishery, new entrants. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the federal minister saw fit to impose a total ban on new entrants on the Atlantic coast with the exception, of course, of Labrador. Again, maybe it is necessary, I do not know, I am certainly not in possession of sufficient information, scientific data to -

MR. S. NEARY: Are you for it or against it?

MR. W. CARTER: I would find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to support that proposition. I am not in possession of all of the facts, the scientific facts that one would have to see to make that kind of a judgement -

MR. R. SIMMONS: Did you make a judgement anyway?

MR. W. CARTER: It might well be, Mr. Speaker, that the federal minister -

MR. R. SIMMONS: The minister made a statement on it.

MR. W. CARTER: I made a statement on it and I repeat now I have strong reservations as to the need for imposing that kind of a freeze on new entrants.



MR. S. NEARY: Would the minister explain that strong reservation, what that means?

MR. W. CARTER: On the basis of the information that I have, Mr. Speaker, at my disposal I could not support that kind of a freeze on the fishing industry on the whole Atlantic Coast. I find it difficult Mr. Speaker, to reconcile myself -

MR. S. NEARY: You have an open mind, you could be convinced.

MR. W. CARTER: I repeat if there is sufficient scientific data, Mr. Speaker, that would justify that kind of action it might well be I could go along with it. But on the basis of what I know now -

MR. S. NEARY: You might be persuaded. The name of the song - what is it?

MR. R. SIMMONS: Almost persuaded.

MR. S. NEARY: Almost persuaded.

MR. W. CARTER: Well, no,

MR. W. CARTER: not really, not quite, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Almost got lost.

MR. W. CARTER: I find it difficult to reconcile that kind of action.

DR. KITCHEEN: Bad policy.

MR. W. CARTER: I find it difficult to reconcile that kind of action when I hear reports from Fogo Island and from most communities on the Northeast Coast that last year was a bumper year, certainly no scarcity of fish in that area. I find it difficult to accept that position and I have said this publicly, when we realize, Mr. Speaker, that foreign effort continues to ravish the resources within our 200 mile limit. We have been told that you cannot, of course we all know that you cannot, catch codfish twice, and if you catch it on the Hamilton Banks, or if the foreigners catch it on the Hamilton Banks, that fish will not come ashore to be at the disposal of the fishermen on Fogo Island, on the Northeast Coast. But yet, Mr. Speaker, in 1976, 70 million pounds of fish, 35,000 tons will be caught by foreign effort within our 200 mile limit. And, in fact, if you were to include the most Northern areas you can add to that figure another 17,000 metric tons, another 34 million pounds. That would be close to 100 million pounds of fish that will be caught in 1978 in the area between Northern Labrador and off the Southern tip of the Avalon Peninsula, caught by foreign vessels.

My position - I made my position quite clear, I think, when the minister in Ottawa announced his intention to impose the freeze. In my view they should, rather than putting a ban, maybe, or a freeze on our Newfoundland fishermen, except, maybe, in the Gulf area for a short period, that they should maybe put a moratorium on any further foreign fishing effort within our 200 mile limit until the stocks have been sufficiently rebuilt, to avoid that kind of a freeze on our own fishermen. That was my position then and that is my position now.

MR. W. CARTER: It seems rather ironic, Mr. Speaker, that we should be talking about putting a freeze on Newfoundland fishermen on our Northeast Coast, while at the same time within a few miles off our shores foreign vessels can continue to fish and to harvest and take back to their respective countries huge quantities of fish for the benefit of their own people, fish that, in fact, should and could be landed in this Province for the benefit of our Newfoundland people. That is the sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, we have to take a strong hard look at.

Another matter, of course, is the business of fleet replacement. I am not aware of any definitive policy yet having come from Ottawa with respect to fleet replacement. Certainly there is no policy from Ottawa dealing with fleet expansion, and I am not suggesting that we should expand the fleet to any great extent, but there are areas where the fleet can be expanded and certainly we must start now to replace the fleet. We have in this Province a lot of vessels that are pretty well beyond their retirement age and unless we plan now to build new ships I am afraid that when the stocks are rebuilt, say in 1985, that our fishing fleet will be depleted, and we will then be forced to defer to foreign countries in the harvesting of that regenerated resource. And if we do that, of course, that will be a very unfortunate matter.

We in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, not to mention the Atlantic Provinces, we should be laying about anywhere from seven to ten keels a year for trawlers if we are going to keep abreast of what we have at the present time and ensure that by 1995, which is the date that the stocks will be substantially increased, that we are going to be able to harvest that resource. And if we do not take that action now, if we do not start now to acquire additional fishing effort and to ensure that existing ships as they leave the service are replaced, well then I am afraid that we will be back where we started at that time.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

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

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, there is very little in this Throne Speech that has anything to do with the people of this Province, with the hopes and fears and concerns of the people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not you slide back and go cuddling up to 'Morgan'. Do not do that or we will be in deep trouble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have silence from both sides of the House while I am speaking?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member is asking that silence be observed while he is speaking which is his right.

The hon. member.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, the past week we have not heard a debate on the Throne Speech, we have heard an abuse of the privileges of this House by people who are interested more in their personal selves than they are in the people. I wish to convey a message to the members of this House from the constituents that I represent, a message that was conveyed to me loud and clear as I knocked on their doors this Summer, and that message is this, "We want our business looked after and look after your business somewhere else." All these attacks on people and the innuendo and the honour defences and the honour, get that out of the House. Let members duel outside like they did 200 years ago if they are interested in that junk and let us get down to the business of the people of this country, let us get down to the honest, decent concerns of the people and they are very real concerns. There is nothing in this Throne Speech about jobs, nothing in it. That is what concerns the people of this Province and that is what concerns the people that I represent, jobs. Nothing in there about jobs. A few long-range, long-winded things about jobs, but nothing there. There is, thanks to the hon. member for the Opposition, the Leader who brought in a private member's bill on unemployment, the opportunity to debate this in this session. I will defer my remarks on unemployment until that time and we hope that we can come up with some thoughts about what should be done to curb the unemployment

DR. KITCHEN: problem in this Province. It has to be done. There is nothing in this Throne Speech or very little about another major concern of the district that I represent and that is the cost of living. The cost of living is a major problem with most people. How to cope with the increased cost of oil, how to cope with the cost of keeping themselves warm. There are many people this Winter in Newfoundland who will be cold and if the Minister for Mines and Energy had his way they would be even colder because there would be a three cent increase in the price of gasoline. That is not the way we want this Province operated, we want the cost of living controlled. We saw the other day that the federal government decided that they would freeze rents, they would freeze the rents on low income and senior citizens housing. Now that is what we want. We want rents frozen. We want the cost of rental down, We want things kept down. We do not want them to go sky-high. And that was a good thing from the federal minister and a bad thing from a provincial minister.

The Minister of Labour says, "Yes, we are going to increase the minimum wage by ten per cent", from \$2.50 - he might, he is not sure, he may not increase it at all yet, a possibility that they may increase the minimum wage by ten per cent, ten per cent, from \$2.50 to \$2.75. Big deal! The minimum wage has to be increased substantially. I am not prepared to say what figure but it has to be increased substantially more than 10 per cent -

MR. PECKFORD: Go away, Mr. Vague.

DR. KITCHEN: That is not vague. - substantially more than the 10 per cent proposed by this government, and it has to be done soon, because too few people can live in this Province, can live and pay their bills and stay above water. The cost of living is heavy. We have a Department of Consumer Affairs. They do certain things fairly well; they look after the landlord and tenants and things. I am not sure that is the department that should be looking after it but they do not do very much else, the Consumer Affairs. I have asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs time after time to take some action on various

DR. KITCHEN: things. He has no power, no power in the most serious area, one of the most serious areas of this Province. I would like to see the Minister of Consumer Affairs, for instance, ban the use of certain types of bricks, in this Province, for house construction. I wonder why it has not been done. When we try to ship our potatoes up to the Mainland they ban the potatoes. We cannot ship potatoes up. We have to get this soap from Prince Edward Island all the time to eat. We cannot ship our potatoes but they can ship this inferior brick down here. If the Canadian Standards Association is not prepared to butt in and stop it then the Minister of Consumer Affairs should go in and put in a little clause. He does not have to bring in a great big law controlling all building products, just brick. There are good bricks made in this Province, there are good bricks made in Nova Scotia but we do not want inferior bricks being

DR. KITCHEN: used, being used for ordinary people in this Province to have to put up with the nonsense when they fall apart. That should not happen. And it is a responsibility of the government and of the Department of Consumer Affairs to deal with matters of that type. We have to do it. I do not want to speak too much about Consumer Affairs; there is another area that I really want to get into in a minute.

Another area is recreation.

These are concerns of the citizens that I represent. Recreation is a major problem in this city. It is much more of a major problem in a city than it is in rural areas where you have many ways of exercising and getting around.

When we were growing up there was no need for any recreation programme, we made our own. And many people in rural areas make their own recreation programme, and properly so, but in the city where people live together in large quantities you have to have an artificially contrived recreation system.

Now, what has happened in this Province is this: We have an Aquarena up in the West end: it is a great thing for those who can afford to use it - \$1 to swim plus the use of a car. But the opening of that Aquarena forced the closing of the Mundy Pond swimming pool. This is a great Boys' Club that is going and why should one interfere with the other? Now they hope the City Council will take it over, but the City Council have decided that they are going to cut services this year so that they will not have to put up the taxes. They are going to cut services, and the people who are going to be affected are people who have marginal incomes, low-income families who are going to be restricted by that.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have to have a good, strong recreation department, not the

DR. KITCHEN: tail end of another department. We do not even know where the Recreation Department is now. We could not find out what minister was looking after it. One time it was the tail end of Education, then it became part of Rehabilitation - God knows where it is now! It is going into Tourism. I believe it should be afforded greater status than that and made into a proper department with an appropriate Budget to do the things and to coordinate the activities, particularly in the city. There is no need of the Province competing with the city and the city competing with the beer companies. We should take Recreation from the hands of the beer companies, who are doing a reasonably good job under the circumstances, and put it in the hands of a Ministry of Recreation.

I want now to speak on, next to jobs, the most serious matter that is confronting the people of this city, in my view, and certainly the people that I represent, and that is the question of Housing. This is a very serious problem. It is a very serious problem because of a number of reasons; one reason is there are not enough government subsidized units in this Province and in this city. The calls that I get daily - I have them piled up on my desk now that I cannot handle because the House is in session, I cannot handle them, piled up, calls about Housing. 'Can you get me into St. John's Housing apartments? I cannot afford to buy heat. I want to get into a place where the heat is subsidized. Can you do it for me?' You phone - 'We will do what we can, but we only have so many units.' This is a very serious concern. And also, it is not only the people who are in the - it is the cost of heat. The cost of heat is driving the cost of accommodation up very, very high. And many, many people, coupled with the unemployment situation in this City, very serious in this city, the number of people



DR. KITCHEN: unemployed in the district that I represent when I checked a year ago was about 1,000 - 1,000 young people mostly. This year it has gone up. My best estimate now based on house to house visitation is something like 1,200 or 1,300 people, mostly young people. It has gone up 30 per cent higher in one year. Now, I do not care what Statistics Canada says or what anyone else says, I am talking about when you go from one house to the other, who is working, who is not working. And they say, 'There are two of

Dr. Kitchen: our young men not working, and there was a girl she got a job in the Village Mall the other day.' Thank goodness for the Village Mall something opening up so it will give people a job here and there. But the problem is unemployment among young people now and that makes the housing problem much more serious because the income is not there, and it is much more difficult. If the unemployment problem was solved then the heating crisis would not be very serious because people who are working with good wages would be able to pay the price of heat.

Now, let me speak a bit more about housing.

I believe that one of the most serious problems with housing and how to correct it is that there must be in this Province, in this government a strong Department of Housing. Housing, much more even than recreation, cannot be the tail of Municipal Affairs or anything else, it has to be a strong powerful department. It has been the tail of Municipal Affairs, that means that Municipal Affairs, which is a heavy department, has had to ignore housing, virtually ignore housing and give her off to Crown corporations. We have given it off to St. John's Housing Corporation, Newfoundland Housing Corporation, St. John's Housing Authority, which is a half-assed, half federal, half provincial corporation with responsibilities to themselves rather than to anyone else.

We have City Council involved in this through RRAP money they get from the federal government, virtually directly, but not quite directly. We have Heritage in there too fooling around in the housing field. We have all sorts of people in the housing field but we do not have a Department of Housing. We have a minister now, And I want to congratulate the government. It is not very often I get a chance to congratulate this government, but I am going to do it now. I think the creation, the appointment of a Minister of Housing is a good move, it is a first-class move and this government has got to be commended for that move. I commend them. Now that is not enough. Having a minister is no good, you have to have a department, there has to be

Dr. Kitchen: responsibilities, there has to be a deputy minister, there has to be a good budget, a good solid budget. It all has to be there, and the powers have to be laid out. Because there has to be somebody in the Province who is in control of housing. You cannot have a half a dozen agencies operating there with gaps and overlaps and things like that, inconsistencies in policy.

Let me give hon. members some of the inconsistencies in policies that I have observed over the past few years. There are a great number of inconsistencies in policies between the various housing corporations. St. John's Housing Authority has something like 1,600 units in this city; St. John's Housing Corporation has about 650. Let me give you some - the Housing Corporation operates a number of houses in the city. Let me look at the rates, for example, of the two authorities to just give you an idea of what goes on. The St. John's Housing Authority, their rate system, what a tenant pays, depends upon his income to some extent. In some units, and the rent is pretty straightforward, they pay up to 25 per cent of their income. But in some areas now - if you live in some parts of the housing area you pay that and your heat is provided. You move in another part of the city, your rent is slightly reduced but you pay your own electric heat. And some people who are living in some housing units in this city paying their own electric heat cannot afford to live in them, they want to get into the other units where the heat is provided for a slight fee. And that is very important.

There is inconsistency even within the same authority in the amount of money that a person has to put out for his house including heat, and that should not be. That should not be that way, there should be the same policy regardless of where you live. People should not be always petitioning the authority to have to move back and forth, that is wrong, it is not fair, it is not fair and the authority gets tired of people trying to get transfers. But I can appreciate the problem of the employees there who are doing a very good job under very difficult circumstances, but there is inconsistency.

Dr. Kitchen: But let me look at the St. John's Housing Corporation where many people who are not necessarily poor live, the Housing Corporation not the Authority. They have their own 650 or so apartments, they are the ones that run Elizabeth Towers and they run other parts. I was just looking for the sheet of rates there, I have them here somewhere, I would like to read them out. For example, you can get a three bedroom apartment with heat from the St. John's Housing Corporation for \$245, which is less than subsidized people are getting it for. Now that is not fair. People who are getting subsidies need to be subsidized. But many people living in St. John's Housing Corporations are getting very good salaries and do not need subsidized rent. It is not fair. It is not fair for two government housing agencies to be operating different policies. That is not fair. And

DR. KITCHEN: then of course there are people who are living in Elizabeth Towers who are paying, in my view, much less than they should be paying for the type of accommodation that is being provided there. There is a lot of inconsistency within authorities and between authorities operating in the housing field in this Province.

Now, let me give you another example of inconsistencies. You say, "Well the St. John's Housing Authority is half federal and half provincial, there is not much we can do about that." There is. But there is another inconsistency and that is within the same Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. Let me give you an example. I was in Goose Bay recently. We had a meeting up there and the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was there and after the meeting we were all occupied, people wanting to tell you various things, and a certain item was brought to my attention there. They said, "Look, as Goose Bay closes down people who are living in Newfoundland and Labrador housing units find it impossible to live in Goose Bay." They say this. The rents are \$185 and up each month, but when you add light, and heat in the winter, you can go up to \$400.

Now then, where is the inconsistency there? Well the inconsistency of that, when Labrador Linerboard mill was closed in Stephenville, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation instituted for a year or so a system of reduced rent based on income, a system similar to that used by the St. John's Housing Authority.

AN HON. MEMBER: And they should continue to do so.

DR. KITCHEN: And they should continue to do it and extend it in Goose Bay. Any area where the government owns houses should have a consistent policy throughout, I think, particularly in disaster situations. It has to be fair and that is why we need a strong Department of Housing with a minister and a staff who are

DR. KITCHEN: on top of the situation and who do not have to be negotiating from one authority to the other and trying to figure up the complete schemozzle that housing is at the moment, everybody working hard, everybody frustrated, and the people not properly served. There are too many inconsistencies.

Let me give you another inconsistency.

In the city of St. John's, if you live South of LeMarchant Road you can get RRAP money to fix your house. If you live North of LeMarchant Road you cannot do it. Now you try explaining that to somebody on St. Clare Avenue who has been waiting months and months for NIP money. You cannot explain it because it is not fair and should never be allowed to happen and would not be allowed to happen if we had a proper Minister of Housing in this Province who would conduct proper negotiations with Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you say RRAP or NIP?

DR. KITCHEN: I am talking about RRAP, RRAP money, I should have said RRAP if I did not. Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programme.

MR. DOODY: Both applies.

DR. KITCHEN: Well, the same thing applies but I am talking about housing and the getting of money to fix up your house with low interest rates, with most of it repayable but some of it not repayable. And it is not fair. It is not fair. And it should not be left to the city to decide these priorities. It should not be. There is no reason why people on St. Clare Avenue should do without and people on Monkstown Road should have it. That is foolishness. It should be the same policy and it should be based on need as well as on area, to some extent. I can see the necessity for some areas to get NIP but I do not see why the RRAP money should be that way. And I believe a strong Minister of Housing, a strong Ministry of Housing here, a strong Department of Housing, would straighten it out quite a bit.

MR. KITCHEN:

Another question that bothers me very much and bothers the people that I represent are these subsidies, the senior citizens accommodations. A senior citizen who goes to live in an apartment house that various people operate and there are many senior citizens apartment houses, you go there, the building is subsidized in the construction and your rent is subsidized if you go to live in them. But many senior citizens prefer to live in their own houses, which they have developed and built with their own hands over the years. Now the children are gone and they still have their houses and they like living there. That is home. That is where they have their furniture around and people can come and go and it does not cost very much to upkeep because they own it. But the point is they have low income and when the roof goes, or the door goes, or something else happens that has to be fixed they cannot get it fixed, they cannot afford it. So there is a great tendency to have the - or they cannot keep it warm. They cannot keep it warm. They cannot afford to heat it. They cannot afford to live there so they have to move into - there is no subsidy for them. See this is the point; there is no subsidy to live at home but there is a subsidy to go to a place they do not want to go in, where somebody is making a good profit, perhaps some legal corporation downtown who owns this or some other developer owns a set of apartments, subsidized by the federal government to build and subsidized for people to go in and live and yet there is no comparable programme within the Province by which a senior citizen can get a few bucks to keep his house warm and stay home, less, perhaps, than it would cost to go into a senior citizens home.

Now I am not suggesting that there is no need for senior citizens homes. Do not get me

DR. KITCHEN: wrong, but I think there should be a consistent policy there so there should be an element of choice, that a person who wants to live at home and can get some cash, perhaps less than the cost of going to a senior citizens home, but he should not be forced to by circumstance when it will cost the government less for him to stay where he is. It makes no sense.

Now these are five or six inconsistencies that I have pointed out here in the whole question of housing.

Let me talk about this question of Virginia Park. I find it very, very strange - and I do not want to make an attack on anybody - that the former Minister of Housing, who is the member for the district, was unable to come to grips with this problem and deal with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Garbage!

DR. KITCHEN: I cannot see why it could not be done. The Minister of Housing should be in a position if anyone is, to get the thing going. Why should these people have to go and hire a lawyer and get the C.B.C. going and contact this side of the House? There should be a Ministry of Housing, a Department of Housing - and I meant no personal slur at the minister - it is just that the Department of Housing should be there for people to come to and say, 'Look, boy, we have problems with our housing. How about telling us what to do and giving us a hand to do it?' Let us do it now rather than have to say, 'Well, it is a federal responsibility and I really have to get on with municipal affairs,' and honestly having to do that.

Now this is serious. And let me add another point, that I feel too that one of the good things that we have had -

MR. NEARY: What about the vacant apartments down at Pleasantville? What about -



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

The hon. member is having difficulties. Order, please!

MR. NEARY: What about all the skulduggery with the A.B. Walsh company?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Table the report about the investigations going on when the minister was head of that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order! I do have to ask hon. members not to interfere with the hon. member when he is clearly having difficulties in making his remarks heard.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, there is another point that I would like to make concerning the Ministry of Housing and that concerns a very good practice which has crept up and was introduced, I believe, by my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) when he was the Minister for Social Services, and that is the establishment of an Appeals Board - I believe that was where it was introduced - whereby people on social assistance who felt that they were discriminated against by the department or were treated unfairly could go and put their case before people who worked in the department. I have used that myself for constituents and I have found it to be a very worthwhile procedure where you have three people, one of whom is a social services recipient, and they go through the case and they make a ruling. Sometimes it is ruled in favour of the social services person and sometimes it is ruled in favour of the department, but there is a diversity of ruling and for many people it is basically a good procedure. And the same procedure is used in unemployment insurance. I do not believe it is a very effective procedure, in my view. I have had very bad results in appealing there. I think it is not nearly as good as the social services one, and

DR. KITCHEN: that is the federal one, but the social service one is reasonably good, I think, I have found it to be so. I would like to see the same thing instituted as far as Housing is concerned, with the St. John's Housing Authority.

There are people, you know, who feel that the St. John's Housing Authority is discriminating against them, and they say, "Look, we have tried," - and I do not know if they are or not but when I look at it sometimes I am on the side of the person looking for that house. I believe that sometimes they have waited too long. And I am not charging personal animosity on the part of the people administering this, but sometimes civil servants see things one way -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

DR. KITCHEN: - and they do not always see it the way other people see it. And I believe that there should be an appeals procedure outside the Housing Authority whereby people under certain extreme circumstances can appeal their case and get their rating changed so that they can move in.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

DR. KITCHEN: these are a number of points that I have made with respect to the Department of Housing and how it might be improved. But I do believe, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that we have, in this House, to set up that department appropriately with the proper funding. Now, I believe it needs a debate, appropriate debate on this before it is properly set up. I believe that the House Leader on the government side should bring in a bill to properly set up this department. We do not have to close Tuesday. Who cares if we close Tuesday? Most people get two days off, they get the 25th of December and the 26th. That is all I need. I do not even need that. I am prepared to come back here Boxing Day if you want to, I am prepared to stay here all night, all night next week -

MR. NEARY: Come back the first of January.

DR. KITCHEN: - and we will get this good housing bill passed. But I am not prepared, I think, to let things just go through. I would like to have a good housing bill introduced, a good debate, let us keep the House open, let us keep it open, let us put it on, let us debate it and have it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: And then we will have a Department of Housing that my constituents can relate to and can be properly served by, a housing policy in the Province that is properly put together, a housing policy that when it has to be negotiated with Ottawa is properly negotiated, a housing policy which has some value to the people in the Province. In that way I believe we will partially solve one of the major problems. Now, it is never going to be solved - that is only part of it, I am speaking on behalf of the consumer of housing. Now there are other problems as everybody knows concerning the construction of housing and things of that nature. I do not know if that should be the property of the Department of Housing or not, I am not sure. I am taking it from the consumer end of it more than I am from the other end of it. Undoubtedly, there are other parts of housing that have to be looked after other than the consumer end.

DR. KITCHEN: But the more serious question though has to do with the unemployment because unemployment makes the housing problem that much worse. If you have a fair job, good money coming in then you can provide your own housing reasonably well. But the problem is, Sir, there are a great many people in this Province, in this city who have no jobs, people who are on social assistance, people who are at jobs which do not pay high wages, people for whom the minimum wage is not enough to keep the house warm. Last Winter I was called upon by many constituents. I visited them and found out that they could not keep their houses warm, they had to turn off their heat during the day, put it on for cooking and go around with mitts on and go around - not everybody but a substantial proportion of people were in that situation. I am sure that other hon. members here must have had the same situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. T. HICKEY: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to make a few comments with regard to the full-scale debate on housing. Would my hon. friend agree that a bill be put through while we sit now simply to set up the structure of the Department of Housing and if necessary let a full-scale debate take place in a month or two from now when a major piece of legislation comes through under the title of a housing act, a housing bill?

MR. S. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (YOUNG) A point of order has been raised.

MR. S. NEARY: That is a rather hypothetical question. Sir, it is a very unfair question to put to my hon. friend. My hon. friend is a member of a caucus and what the hon. gentleman is asking my hon. friend to do is divulge the discussions that take place in the Liberal caucus. The hon. gentleman should be ashamed of himself putting such a ridiculous question to my hon. friend.

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

MR. T. HICKEY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (YOUNG) The hon. minister on the point of order.

MR. T. HICKEY:

My hon. friend is rather sensitive and touchy. Is there not independence of mind over there? I am not asking my hon. friend any question. I already know where he stands on this. I asked my hon. friend who has expressed a very keen interest in housing. Now if the two hon. gentlemen do not agree well then you know whether you can afford that luxury or not, It is something else. That is too bad.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I feel that is not a point of order and if the hon. gentleman for St. John's West wants to answer the question he may.

Hon. member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN:

In response to the question, I have to

DR. KITCHEN: say that that should be the subject of negotiation between the two House leaders. It is not really a point that I would have to comment upon but I would like very much to have this Department of Housing set up and set up properly and with all the powers and funds that it properly deserves. I think that everybody on this side of the House, if I may presume to speak without a caucus on this matter, would go along with the same thing. We want a Department of Housing and we want a good Department of Housing and we want some discussion as to what the proposals are.

Now I want to - gee! I want to throw one more bouquet at the government and then that is the end of the bouquets. But the bouquet is a partial one. During the last session of the House, on a private members' resolution, I introduced a bill, a resolution I guess, calling for the government to - which was not debated, we did not get to that one - to implement a programme of free, medically prescribed drugs for old age pensioners and for those who are chronically ill. Now that was a resolution that was introduced as a result of discussions that were held with many people, a resolution that came from a policy conference that we held in our party sometime before that. At the same time the Senior Citizens' Association were pushing for that. Now I see in the Throne Speech that the government is prepared to do more than just lower the cost of drugs, by making generic drugs possible, by 5 per cent by introducing a bill, they say, that will reduce the cost of medically prescribed drugs by a major portion. I do not know what that is yet, it is fairly vague, but I think it is a good point. We have to subsidize this and I think the government deserves some credit for bringing in a bill that would lower the cost of drugs substantially. Because the government is going to pick up the tab in a major part of the cost of medically prescribed drugs for senior citizens, that is a good thing.

DR. KITCHEN:

I would like to comment further when I see the context of the bill and perhaps we can amend it from a major part to the whole shot. That is what I would like to see, where the government pays the total shot for the cost of drugs for old age pensioners and for other people who are chronically ill with large drug bills, because it is the same thing. It is a very serious problem, a very, very serious problem from the point of view of people affected.

I am glad the government changed their position from one session of the House to the next, within a few months, on this point. Now I would like for them to move a little bit further, but we will debate that when the time comes.

Now, in the Throne Speech a number of points, I will just pick out a few here now that I wanted to comment on. One, is this Labrador Development Corporation. I am a bit nervous about the Labrador Development Corporation - what is it? - the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, for a number of reasons: One, is that it departs substantially from the concept that was adopted in this House of Assembly last session. We decided here, through unanimous resolution, after considerable debate, that the concept for development of Labrador would be the use of hydro electricity as a power source to process materials within Labrador. Now the corporation that is established is interested in one thing only and that is the development of the Lower Churchill. And that is wrong. You cannot develop the Lower Churchill, or should not, we must not because we have decided we would not, we must not develop the Lower Churchill by itself, we must develop the Lower Churchill in conjunction with iron, in conjunction with other processing industries. And the priority, I believe, in Labrador has got to be, one of the priorities, further development on that port.

Now, I was not particularly impressed

DR. KITCHEN: with the statement there on the port - and I wish I could find it here now. We will find it - Yes, it says, "The government has taken steps recently towards the creation of a year-round deepwaterport in Labrador. The demand for such a port is coming from potential heavy industry based on energy from the Lower Churchill possibly the development of offshore oil and gas and the development of vast iron reserves in Western Labrador."

Now, I would like to ask the minister responsible, when he gets a chance to speak again,



Dr. Kitchen: what steps have been taken here towards the creation of a year-round deepwater port? What steps have been taken here? It is one thing to speak about it in the Throne Speech and it is another thing to see some action in this regard. I believe that as far as that port is concerned it is urgent. It is not something that - nothing can happen unless we get that port in Labrador, nothing can happen industrial wise. We are going to have to ship everything South to Quebec unless we can ship it East through us. We have got to get a port if we are going to use iron ore, if we are going to process iron ore, if you are going to have any control that port comes first. And I would like to see studies undertaken now, funded now on that port where we can decide whether it is going on the North side of the bay, of which Goose Bay is the inside part, or whether it should be in the Straits or where it should be. That has to be decided. The whole transportation policy hinges on that in this Province. Wherever it goes and we cannot decide here, it is not for us to decide here, perhaps - maybe it is for us to decide here - but we should certainly have whatever studies are necessary - put into place now, now so that we can decide on this port. If no port is possible - suppose no port is possible, then this whole concept of Labrador development that we have agreed on here in this House is an incorrect one and we should stop it, stop beating our heads against the wind, if that is the case. If a port is possible studies should be carried out, serious studies, whatever the cost might be it does not matter, it has to be carried out and we have to decide where it goes because the transportation policy hinges on that then, the rest of the transportation policy.

If it is out towards the coast then we have to think in terms of railroads. If Goose Bay is the possibility, then that may be even better. I mean, if we can get that in the Goose Bay area that means that transportation to the water is cut down, we may not need a long railway, the whole price becomes feasible.

AN HON. MEMBER: The railroad may be the answer.

Dr. Kitchen: The railroad may be the answer. We mentioned that at the meeting the other night in the West End of the city, that the future of the railway in this Province is great. There is a very good future in this railway, not only on the island but possibly in Labrador, but it all hinges on, in my view, a large part of that hinges on where this port goes. And studies should be instituted not just one series of things to see if we can keep Lake Melville clear, but whether or not where a major deepwater port is, what are the specifications? It bothers me to see that the oil rigs are being supplied largely from the Island part of the Province. That is not the way to develop Labrador by operating out of Botwood, with all due respects to Botwood, nor from St. John's. We are not going to develop Labrador by operating out of the port of St. John's, that is not the way to do it. We are going to develop Labrador, largely, by operating out of Labrador ports. And we have got to get a port there and we have got to make use of whatever facilities there are there.

It is wrong for us to take steps now to develop the oil industry on the Island when the oil is North because any steps, any capital expenditure that goes on here precludes the same thing from going on North. Once this part of the Province gets established it becomes much more expensive to develop the North, and we have to be careful of that. I believe that steps have already been taken that will be hurtful for the development of the North through pressures from various business groups, perhaps, who are interested in their business rather than interested, totally, in the long-range development of the Province. And the whole thing, in my view, hinges on that port, and where it should be, and/or if it is feasible even, and full speed ahead on that point. We have to have full speed ahead on that point, or else there can be no Labrador development. But there can be limited development within this Province unless we are going to use that Quebec route completely. If we are to avoid the Quebec route then we are going to have to get a port if that is possible.

Dr. Kitchen: And I believe we have to institute very seriously that. And I think that is the top priority. It is the top priority. It is more of a priority than the development of Lower Churchill power. There is lots of power in Labrador, and there is lots of developed power. The problem in Labrador is this, that we do not have the power. If we take that power then we put off the development of the Lower Churchill project. I am not arguing against the Lower Churchill project. What I am arguing for, is that there should be more attention paid to putting that port there, and that is possibly more important. But in terms of time that is the crucial decision that has to be made, whether or not that is feasible and possible and where it goes, where it goes. There are three or four possible locations that have been mentioned; One in Goose Bay one is the Straits, and one is further out the Bay. Maybe there are other locations, but that should be sort of thought of.

DR. KITCHEN: And how can we develop any transportation policy in this Province unless we have that focal point decided on right away? And it has to be decided on because that is the future. There is no future in this Province apart from what the Minister of Fisheries is trying to produce and the rest of us are trying to produce in the fishery. Apart from the fishery in which there is a future for a number of people - we are not going to be able to employ the whole population of Newfoundland and Labrador in the fishery. I feel that is a fair statement and I do not want to downgrade it but the vast future for the millions of people who could live in this Province in prosperity and health and housing, rests in Labrador and it rests on the development of these resources in their proper way and it rests on the proper steps being taken now before it is too late.

If the oil industry develops and everything that happens is that the oil is brought to some other place we lose oil processing. That is an important consideration too. It is not just a matter of getting your royalties from the oil companies, the oil policy has to include a policy based on the decision as to whether or not we are going to have oil refined in this Province, our oil refined here, the oil that is off the Labrador coast refined there. That is another decision that has to be taken if it has not already been taken in the wrong direction. There are certain major considerations that should be debated in this House of Assembly having to do with employment and it all hinges, in my view, on the development of Labrador, or a large part of it does. There are some people who feel that we can achieve joy in Newfoundland through handicrafts, little industries and things like that. Well that is fair, we can develop a lot of little industries and we will employ a number of people but the basic industrial strategy for this Province, the job strategy, the employment strategy has got to be based on the processing of materials in Labrador for the future, that is the future for the Province. We have to take the appropriate steps now and I am afraid that we are not taking the appropriate steps. Going ahead and exporting Lower Churchill power to the United

DR. KITCHEN: States and the Maritime provinces on long-term contracts, which is probably all that will be possible, is not the right course of action. It is not the right course of action, it is the wrong course of action. The jobs are in the processing of the materials and that means that the power cannot be exported but has to stay. We cannot process anything unless we have power and the power has to stay. Contracts entered into with other people to export power - now once we get the Lower Churchill developed that is it as far as cheap power is concerned. I do not even know that. That is not particularly cheap, but you cannot talk in terms of very many other sources of cheap power, you are getting into the far removed expensive power then. Labrador resources are not inexhaustible. Some people feel that they are inexhaustible, that we can do what we like and they will always be there. If we use the Lower Churchill there are other rivers we can use then so it does not really matter what we do but that is wrong. These other rivers are more expensive to operate, more expensive to get onstream, they are a lot more expensive so we have to be very careful of how we develop the Lower Churchill. And we cannot, we dare not, we must not export power to the United States or to the other Atlantic provinces, that is not the priority. The priority is to determine whether an industrial future is possible in Labrador and a port is all essential. Therefore, we have to get the port concept straightened out first. If it is possible. great! If it is not possible, then maybe we are going to have to let the power go South because there is no point in processing it there. That may be it or we may have to use the railway from Labrador down through but that is the point.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, there were many things said by the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) that were good observations with respect to the Throne Speech. There were many things

December 8, 1978

Tape No. 190

ah-3

MR. MARSHALL:

that I would disagree with but at least he drew issue with the issues. Now on the Throne Speech itself there are matters in it with respect to the Lower Gull, with respect to Labrador Linerboard, other items with respect to the fishery that

MR. MARSHALL: I shall reserve comments on until specific bills are brought before the House in this session, because I think that they will be the main debates in this session, particularly the ones with respect to hydro power and the Linerboard.

Certain things have been said by persons on both sides with respect to the Throne Speech, that I do not propose to go into at the present time, but I did notice that everybody on the opposite side got up and said there was nothing said about unemployment. There was nothing said about unemployment, Mr. Speaker, but there was a great deal said about employment, and all one has to do is just look at the programmes that are there with respect to the Linerboard mill and the other items. But I would say we will go into those later on.

The main thing that I wish to speak about, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech today is the matter which was drawn very forcibly to the attention of most members of the House of Assembly even though it has been a matter of which they have been aware for some period of time, at the meeting last Tuesday night at the Canon Stirling Auditorium, and that is the threat to the continuance of rail services in this Province by the Canadian National Railways. Now this was dealt with, as I say, in that meeting very effectively and there was comprehensive press coverage on it and it culminated in the resolution proposed and passed unanimously by the House. The resolution shows the recognition of the downgrading of services here, which is not something that we need to debate, I think that is self-evident, that the services of the railway, everyone will agree, have been downgraded over the past decade and we are now in the position of the threat of losing the railway in this Province.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, I think we should turn our minds - and I think when we are talking about employment, and that is an issue we are all concerned with - we should turn our minds very definitely towards this problem; it should be of paramount concern to this Legislature and we should inquire into the reasons why and what can be done about it. Now there is no use talking about back reasons, but I feel, myself, that one of the biggest basic reasons as to why we are in the position with the railway at the present day goes back to Confederation itself when we gave this decision to a Parliament up in Ottawa, many miles away, where we only have seven members - we only have seven out of two hundred and sixty-five members, and consequently we have, as effectively as those members and past members have attempted to represent the Province and the Province's interests over the years, it is to be borne in mind that we have at the best only had 7/265ths of a say.

There are lots of things that could be said with respect to the Terms of Union itself. We are talking about the past, I know, but there should have been a much greater effort by those people who negotiated the Terms of Union to cement the rights of this Province and the obligations of the federal government much more firmly than they have so that the federal government would not be able to wheedle out of them as they have been over the years. And indeed, as you look back over this historically it probably gives a great deal of - if you look at the whole terms of Confederation, in my opinion, it gives credence to the position that had been taken many years ago that it would have been better for the Terms of Union with Canada to be negotiated with a government, one government to the other, rather than a group of appointed individuals who certainly were



MR. MARSHALL: Newfoundlanders, but they did not have the sanction of the people of the Province, they were merely appointed. But that is in the past.

There was a term in the Terms of Union, Term 33, which specifically gave the railway of this Province to Canada. Now that is the first point I want to make. They did not give it to the Canadian National Railways, but the government of this day gave the railway to the Government of Canada. Term 33 says, "The following public works and property of Newfoundland shall become the property of Canada when the services concerned are taken over by Canada subject to any trust existing in respect thereof and to any interest other than that of Newfoundland in the same, namely," The Newfoundland Railways is listed, the Newfoundland Hotel and other items. So we gave a railway. Other provinces of Canada joined Confederation and got a railway, and this was one of the major causes why Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia joined the union of Canada in the nineteenth century,

Mr. Marshall: that they got a railway. We had a railway we gave it to them, and now it is, really, being taken away and this is a very serious situation. And I feel that the resolution passed by this House is very well taken. And I do not think that it should be brushed under the table that what the Canadian National - what the Canadian Government is doing through the Canadian National Railway really constitutes a unilateral breach of the Terms of Union with Canada. Surely to heavens we should not have to sit back and take a breach of a solemn obligation of that nature, a breach of the constitution as far as we are concerned. And certainly, whether we are P.C.'s or whether we are Liberals, whether we are inside of this House or whether we are outside of the House, whether we are on the Island or whether we are on the Mainland of Labrador, surely to heavens the people of this Province should not have to suffer at this stage yet another unilateral breach of the Terms of Union with Canada by the federal government.

MR. NEARY: That could not (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Now what is the real reason really? The Government of Canada, as I say - the obligation is between Canada and CN. I will get to that in a moment - between Newfoundland and CN, but the Newfoundland Government gave this not to Canadian National but to the Government of Canada. And in my mind right from the first, Canadian National did not wish to have this railway and consequentially failed miserably to execute that duty. It was forced to take on the task, and it took it on unwillingly. It was a railway, you must remember, that was not similar to the rail services that they were used to on the Mainland, it was a narrow gauge railway, they were confronted with marine services of the nature which they did not have to cope with on the Mainland, which was something that they did not particularly like, it was, as I say, forced on them. They were confronted also, at the time, with a rail service that was much more essential to the lives of the people of this Province than rail services were in any other part of Canada, and that was particularly so before the Trans-Canada went through.

Mr. Marshall: So it is obvious that they did not want it, it is obvious that CN could not cope with it, it is obvious that CN did not then, does not now, and shows no sign in the future of understanding its function. It then proceeded to downgrade the rail services, downgrade them in a way that the railway became inefficient because there was not enough capital contribution to upgrade the railway. And this was, as far as I can see, their entire modus operandi with respect to the Newfoundland railway.

The federal government is guided, I think, in this case by the CNR. I have participated in a government that has replaced another government and I have seen the effect of advisors on the government, the sway that they have on government itself, and the great difficulty it is of government changing the course of a country or changing the course of a province in the face of advisors who stubbornly stick to the same positions that they had before. So I feel that the federal government has been really bamboozled by its advisors, the Canadian National Railways, in this matter.

Now, how do we deal with it? We cannot merely leave it to the federal M.Ps. There are only seven of them in Ottawa. And I might say and I think this can be taken as note that the ones who are the most vocal with respect to the passenger service in Ottawa at the present time are the present P.C. members. But we must do it, not just by the M.P.s themselves, we must do it by the Province. And we do this by, I think, this government taking it up as a matter of high priority at the First Ministers' Conferences that seem to be in profusion, or what have you, but certainly it should do it by insisting that the federal government, and not the Canadian National Railways comply with the Terms of Union of Canada. And I think that the federal government and the Provincial Government have got to come to grips with the fact that Canadian National in this Province has not wished to deal with the railway services here, has not been able to do it, and has not really got the will to do it. The top management of CN has shown a defeatist attitude towards a railway in this Province, sometimes even

December 8, 1978

Tape 192

PK - 3

Mr. Marshall: contempt such as I have never seen before. the  
meeting there the other night when Dr. Ban Deen or Van Deen or whatever  
his name is the President of the CNR -

AN HON. MEMBER: Vand - V-A-N-D.

MR. MARSHALL: well, whatever his name is, the President of the CN was asked to a meeting about the future of CN, convened by representatives of thousands of workers in this Province and their families and he had the unmitigated gall and the contempt to send a wire saying he could not get there. Not only did he do that but he did not even sign the wire. Members will remember, people who attended the meeting that Dr. Van Been or Ban Deen, or whatever his name is, that the gentleman had an executive assistant or an executive vice-president or somewhere down the line actually wire these people and said that he is sorry that Dr. Ban Deen cannot be at the meeting and if that really does not show contempt -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) with Otto Lang.

MR. MARSHALL: - well Otto Lang was not there but I think his name was released on the telegram. But that just goes to show the attitude of CN towards this Province, I mean, one of his executive assistants could have at least put his name on the telegram if that was all he could do. It is also shown by their contempt, I think, in recent years the CN's contempt; they are in this Province, they had a mandate, they were delegated by the federal government to acquit the obligation of the federal government, their refusal to submit to the Provincial Public Utilities Board here with respect to the regulation of their rates. Now here they come in and they are supposed to provide a service in this Province and they have the unmitigated contempt and gall to turn around and say we are not going to comply with the rules and laws of the Province that are in vogue in this Province.

Also, furthermore, not only has CN been able to con the federal government into believing that the Newfoundland railway should be abandoned, as obviously it has, but it has also, I am afraid, been able to spill this over on the community here in the Province of Newfoundland. Because, unfortunately, there are a substantial number of people, whether we like it or not, of Newfoundlanders who wonder as to whether or not the railway is viable and whether the

MR. MARSHALL: railway should be saved or whether we should go to highways or what have you. And this has been done, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, this had been achieved by the CN's policies. Now, I do know myself from what I hear, from experience that the CN and let us face it, from time to time has not operated all that efficiently. And the costs of transportation have been rather high and part of this has been the user pay concept that I do not purpose to get into now. But also part of the reason has been the loss and damage to goods which have occurred in their transit within the Province of Newfoundland. Now, how can, if there is any blame at all or if, as I say, from time to time it is just an efficient service, how can it be it with respect to the employees? How can there be any improvement or how can there be any efficiency if CN has for the past fifteen or twenty years adopted a policy so that it makes every single employee of the CN get up every morning and wonder whether he has got a job that day or not. The essential element has got to be that these people have the security of knowing that the railway is, in fact, going to continue, that their jobs are going to be there and that a large amount of it depends upon how hard they work and how they possibly can work and what they can do about it.

It is also my opinion that the major cause the federal government has been overlooking for years. It has had commission after commission on transportation. The Sullivan Commission allegedly looked into transportation in this Province but there was no inquiry and, indeed, the federal government did not want an inquiry into what I consider to be the root cause and that is the effectiveness of the operation by the senior management of the Canadian National Railway on this Province itself. Obviously, it would not do it because no government will enquire into its own Crown corporations because they stand replete in the confidence that these fellows are doing a great job. It comes back to the same thing about the con job, if you want to use that word 'con job' or the reliance, let us put it that way, that elected officials and particularly ministers of the government, have from time to time been

December 8th., 1978

Tape No. 193

DW - 3

MR. MARSHALL:

put on there, permanent civil servants or they are permanent members of the Crown corporation themselves. So I think in that respect the Sullivan Commission was completely deficient. Now, I think that there is no reason why this railway should be operated, myself, by the Canadian National and this is the point I am trying to make. The obligation of the federal government

MR. MARSHALL: under the Terms of Union was to operate that railway. It has chosen over the years, since 1949, to delegate that to Canadian National Railways. Canadian National Railway has failed abysmally in carrying out its duties to the federal government, not to us, because it is the federal government that has the duty to operate the railway. And what I feel the federal government should and must do and consider, is to remove the Newfoundland Railway from the jurisdiction of Canadian National Railway, to establish a federal, and I am not saying that the Province of Newfoundland take it over because it is the federal government which has the obligation to establish a new, separate, Crown corporation, federal Crown corporation, specifically charged with the operation of the railway in Newfoundland and specifically charged with making it viable, specifically charged with restoring confidence of the people of Newfoundland and the general public in the railway itself but most importantly, specifically charged with restoring the confidence of the people who work in the railway, that the railway itself can become a very vital and viable means of communication in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is beyond belief! Now, when I say this I want to point out that I am not talking about the local management here, and specifically Messrs. Burgess and Greene of the marine dock and the Canadian National themselves who - I know Mr. Greene is a Newfoundlander, I think Mr. Burgess is as well, is he not? Certainly if he is not he is certainly a Newfoundlander by adoption - because they certainly have the interest, and I know, themselves, they are trying to do their utmost as to what they can do here.

But the problem lies in the fact that Canadian National's head office, its policy making decision is in Montreal and in Moncton.

MR. MEARY: That is right.



MR. MARSHALL: And these people do not - they do not live here. They never understood the railway. They cannot understand it now. They seemingly attempt to downgrade it and take a defeatist attitude and say that a railway cannot work in this Province. A railway can work anywhere else and there is no reason why it cannot and it should work here in the Province of Newfoundland. But it is much easier on these people, Mr. Banteen's or Vandeen's or whatever his name is in Montreal, and his troop to press little buttons down here, they do not have to face the people. And certainly, obviously, his lack of desire to face the people was certainly shown patently in his disgraceful telegram which was - he could not condescend to have it signed himself, it had to be signed by an executive assistant - to the workers the other day.

So what we really need here, is a new Crown corporation by the federal government, set up with a new attitude and a new spirit of determination to make this work. We need the top type of people that we possibly can in the senior management and we need them resident within the Province of Newfoundland, i.e. it on the Island of Newfoundland or Labrador

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now we are not getting this and the unfortunate part about us that we have all been brought up - and there were not too many of us in the House, there are a few who were able to vote on the issue of Confederation - but we have all been brought up, spoon-fed on the thought that what we should do is we should - the greatest blessing in the world after life itself was Confederation. And certainly Confederation has been a good thing for this Province. But the time has long since passed for us to continue to take that subservient type of attitude, for the people of Newfoundland to be just merely content with baby bonuses and old age pensions and what have you, and the time has now come to take the protection for the people of the Province as we ought to have and to require that the Terms of

MR. MARSHALL: Union and specifically that of Canada - well it is the Canadian National Railway now. What I am asking is that the Canadian National Railway no longer be the Canadian National Railway in this Province and that we get some people who can operate it.

Now, it is ludicrous for persons to say that the railway cannot be operated in this Province, that the federal government cannot acquit its obligations. Here is the federal government with its budgets of millions and billions of dollars and they should be reminded that the little Island of Newfoundland that was on its back, that did not have the taxing power, that did not have the source of revenue prior to 1949, that was in a very, very poor state relative to the rest of Canada, was quite able to operate that railway over a long period of many years, without there being

MR. MARSHALL: any threat as to the abandonment of the railway itself and surely to heavens we have the right to expect that the terms of union are complied with and when I go to a meeting as I went to a meeting the other night and I see it filled up with numbers of people who are working in the rail service themselves who do not know when they go home the next day whether they will have a job or not. When I look at the terms of union with Canada and see the way that they were written and the fact that the protection that ought to have been taken when the terms of union of this Province were negotiated is absent and we are today feeling the effect of it and we sit back like little lap-dogs from time to time and just say the greatest blessing after life itself is Confederation. That is not good enough and I strongly recommend to this government that it take the initiative, it is the other party to the agreement, the federal government is the other party to the agreement. Never mind CNR, CNR have shown their lack of bad faith in this Province but I would strongly suggest that the government adopt this particular attitude with the federal government and require the railway to become operational and viable in this Province by dismissing those people in the Canadian National who have been operating it and who cannot obviously cope with it and set up another group.

Now we cannot depend, Mr. Speaker, as I say - let us face it you cannot depend - the duty is on the federal government to carry it out but the duty to kick up the traces on it as far as I am concerned lies with the provincial government. Because as effective as the PC members have been in Ottawa over these past period of years in connection with this matter we have got to remember we only have seven members in the House of Commons itself. So that is the point that I want to make on that. It is disgraceful and as I say we have grown to be a country like lap-dogs and we sit down and we see the basis on which we join the Union of Canada unilaterally abrogated by one government and we sit back. Are we really content to

MR. MARSHALL: allow this to continue on, are we content to live forever as recipients of baby bonuses, old age pensions and equalization payments? We deserve much more than that and we agreed to much more than that when we joined the union with Canada.

Now there are a few other matters that -

MR. SIMMONS: Would the member indicate where he would see the coastal boat system fit into his suggestions?

MR. MARSHALL: Well the CN marine operate the coastal service.

MR. SIMMONS: I realize that but in terms of the member's suggestion would he see that as being part of the new corporation?

MR. MARSHALL: Most definitely. The entire responsibility has to be taken by our government, the federal government but the responsibility that the federal government has got to execute, they have got to execute it in this Province and not up in the board rooms of Montreal or in Moncton. Another major complaint that we have, they talk about the viability of these services, when you make a claim you go from St. John's, to Moncton, to Montreal if it is a substantial claim - over the years the CN have been evacuating people from Newfoundland and they are working up in Moncton itself and these jobs belong in the Province of Newfoundland. Not so much that the jobs belong really in the Province of Newfoundland but how can you execute a service when you are 1000, 2000 or 3000 miles away? And I am afraid that many of these people who have been attempting over the years to carry out the duties that were delegated to them by the CN, instead of being miles away are really planets and space years away from this Province.

Now there are other matters on

MR. MARSHALL: the Throne Speech that I just want to touch on before I get into another matter in the time that I have allotted. As I say there are things in this Throne Speech which are excellent. This is an excellent document not of unemployment but of employment and we will have a really good opportunity I hope in this session of the House starting off on seemingly such a good way for a half decent debate , for good debate with respect to the fisheries, with respect to the hydro and with respect to the Labrador Linerboard mill. There will be bills brought in on hydro, there will be bills brought in on the Lower Churchill Development Corporation.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: Well there have to be. There is one on the Order Paper right now if the hon. member would like to look at it. I assume that is the bill relating to the agreement because

MR. MARSHALL: Any agreement of that nature obviously can be made by the Cabinet but has to be sanctioned by the Legislature as I assume it has to be if made by the federal government, sanctioned by the Parliament of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: And it is the same way with the Labrador Linerboard. I have not seen the arrangement with Abitibi, but this I do know, that there is no agreement that can be finally binding until it is brought before this House and has received the approval of the House. This was the agreement that the government made when the unfortunate circumstances arose that the Linerboard mill had to be closed down, and anyway, it is not a case of whether the government made a commitment or not, it is just the way in which government works. So we will have an opportunity to discuss that in the future.

But there are a few things in the Throne Speech that I do want to draw comment on. I think the idea of the resource development bank that appears there to consolidate all the modes of giving out loans for resource industries is a good one, but I would just make a suggestion to the government that a resource bank should not be like another secretariat, filled up with an awful lot of persons, and it should be kept as small as possible. There should be one or two people in authority there who are able to make decisions, and to make decisions right away and to requisition from Treasury Board cheques for the amounts of the loans that are approved so that it does not get in the labyrinth of government red tape in the Confederation Building or whatever other buildings we have in order for that to be successful. So I do not think it should be a large group.

MR. MARSHALL:

There is a question that perhaps somebody can answer in the time for questions if the minister concerned is not going to be speaking in the Throne Speech debate, and this is with respect to liquor advertising. I, myself, have found that liquor advertising, particularly the type of advertising that goes on during the hockey games where a fellow is supposed to be a great hero if he

MR. MARSHALL: Has a bottle of beer to be sort of repulsive and I think this type of thing should be curtailed. But I wonder along with it if the government has now re-examined its position in any way with respect to the drinking age. And whether the government is going to consider if it is necessary or not to raise the drinking age where it lowered it a little while ago. Because there have been some comments to the effect that this might be having some adverse effect.

Now with respect to grade twelve, I would like the Minister of Education in due course, if he could address himself to the - to be a little bit more specific on that and to give us more details as to exactly what grade twelve is going to entail. I think the general public would like to know as to whether or not it is going to be compulsory for matriculation for a person to get grade twelve, whether or not a person can still go from grade eleven to Memorial, or if he gets grade twelve does he go from grade twelve to Memorial into his second year instead of into his first year. I would also like to know myself whether the minister has addressed himself as to the effect that this will have on Memorial University itself and the enrollment of Memorial.

I am told by persons whom I have reason to place a good deal of confidence in the information that I have gotten that this year there are a number of places - that the residences in Memorial themselves that are vacant. And as a matter of fact the opinion was then expressed to me and I do not say it for the truth of the statement but just by way of asking the question to the minister himself, that in fact it has gotten to the stage where almost a full residence might be able to be closed down because of the numbers of young people who are now turning today to the trade schools and other vocations rather than Memorial where Memorial has been viewed in the past. I think wrongly as a spring board for a person to be able to get



MR. MARSHALL: a greater degree of monetary benefit when he gets his job. And if that is so, and if this is going to have an effect, and this is where I think control of government on university is necessary, and this does not interfere with their academic freedom or not, are these residences if there are in fact beds vacant, are the residences

MR. MARSHALL: going to be made available there for trade school students who otherwise would have to find accommodation elsewhere at a much more expensive area and for other groups seeking their education. But I know the Minister of Education will like to speak on that.

Now there are just a few more words I have in another vein, Mr. Speaker, before closing. The hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) mentioned about matters of abuse of privileges of the House, and I wholeheartedly concur and agree with his comments at that time. A fair amount - some time has been taken, let us put it this way, in this House already by issues of this nature, and let me say at the outset, you know, the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), that I do not myself concur with any allegations made with members unless they are completely relevant, and unless they are proven, if anyone has anything to say against any member of this House which is of relevance that I think it should be brought before the House itself and not left to other areas where you can only get a breakdown in the decorum of the House.

But may I say in relation to the Minister of Tourism that I did not understand the minister - and I do not want to get into this debate that went back and forth - I did not understand the minister to be making any charge at the particular time when he got up, the minister was merely asking questions. I did note -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: - that, you know, the Opposition sits over there - I just want to give a message to the Opposition now - if they feel aggrieved and they want to shed crocodile tears, if you like, and they get upset about these things, let me tell you what I feel, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MARSHALL: is really the source of this.  
I do not think that the Opposition is in any position at the present time to take up matters of this nature, to get really upset about them as they have. I mean, we can all get upset about them. But they should not get too sanctimonious about it because after all

Mr. Marshall: the same Opposition which was prepared to make allegations approaching bribery, insinuations really of bribery against the Premier of the Province with respect to a television set, and then an inquiry was held and they did not even have the good grace to get up in this House and apologize after the Chief Justice of this Province found that things were so different.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The present Leader of this Opposition, I am saying this along the lines that you reap what you sow really. The present Leader of the Opposition made allegations against the Premier in this House and I heard him myself of lying, not telling the truth. And what could be more serious than that, and when it was determined by established parliamentary procedures that he should -

MR. NEARY: A Kangaroo Court.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, yes the same parliamentary procedures that were complied with in the House of Parliament, Mr. Speaker, last night, that this should be rejected. He not only refused to apologize, but he managed to dupe seven or eight of his followers into repeating what I consider to be a most scandalous allegation and choose to sit across the House. And this is the same group of people who now ask us, who now ask us in this House, Mr. Speaker, for fair play and what have you. They will have fair play, but they should realize that the ball bounces in two directions as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: This is the same leader as I say who talks about privacy, and well he might talk about privacy. But there was not much said about privacy when the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) in private conversations in the last sessions of the House when he condoned his Chief Lieutenant bringing that before and tabling it before the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We get on with the same thing about charges and that, because this is where charges lead. We had the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) -

MR. NEARY: Hear it comes again.

MR. MARSHALL: We had the member for LaPoile -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: We had the member for LaPoile, Mr. Speaker, get up in this House and make an allegation not in the House outside of the House, but he has done it many times in the House, with respect to the former President of Labrador Linerboard mill, now the federal member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) with respect to innuendoes.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, no innuendoes.

MR. MARSHALL: Innuendoes.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir..

MR. MARSHALL: Okay well he said -

MR. NEARY: No way.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay let him say what he says are facts-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - touching upon the conduct of that member which happened to be not coincidentally maybe. The same type of garbage that he gets -

MR. NEARY: No, Sir! No, Sir!

MR. MARSHALL: - circulated to us,

MR. MARSHALL:

along the same lines from a fugitive for the Minister of Justice or his representative -

MR. W. ROWE: Facts put on the table.

MR. MARSHALL: - down in Puerto Rico and the hon. members there opposite say and appeal to us for fair play.

MR. NEARY: That is right. I put out the facts.

MR. MARSHALL: We get the same thing.

MR. MARSHALL: No accusations.

MR. MARSHALL: The members for the Opposition -

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

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

A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman in his remarks there a few moments ago made a false statement. The hon. gentleman said that I threw innuendo. Well I want to correct that, Sir, I want to say no there was no innuendo. There were charges and accusations made, backed up by factual information, documentation that was laid on the Table of the House, not innuendo. The evidence is there, Sir, it could speak for itself. No innuendo.

MR. SPEAKER: On this matter, obviously it is not a matter on which the Chair can rule. It is a difference of opinion with respect to facts or alleged facts. I would ask hon. members not to interrupt during the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I accept then rather than innuendo - it makes it even more diabolical - that it is stated as a statement of fact and happens to be exactly along the same tenor as the garbage we got from the fugitive from justice come to us in the mail yesterday. The same time with the Opposition itself we saw last session as well which I thought was diabolical - these are the same people who called for fair play in the House - where statements were made with reference to the Director of Air Services. And there is a question on the Order Paper today as to who replaces the Director of Air Services, that he was supposed to be taping conversations. Do you remember that and

MR. MARSHALL:

what happened then, that that individual had chosen to resign his job rather than take it. This is the type of slander. Now I say to the -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, Sir, is trying to slander a member of this House. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out for the benefit of members of the House - and I have already conveyed this piece of information to the Minister of Transportation - that the former Director of Air Services, Mr. Ted Pearcey, met me two weeks ago at the Holiday Inn and apologized to me for any inconvenience or any embarrassment that he might have caused and lays the whole blame for his trouble on the shoulders of the present Minister of Transportation and Communications. I ask the hon. gentleman, Sir, to withdraw that statement.

MR. F. ROWE: Present or past?

MR. NEARY: In view of the new evidence, Sir, that I have put forward -

MR. F. ROWE: Present or past?

MR. NEARY: No, the past Minister of Transportation and Communications -

MR. MORGAN: Which one?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Doody.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And, Sir, I ask the hon. gentleman in view of the fact of this new evidence that has been presented, this apology made to me personally by Mr. Pearcey

MR. NEARY:

that the hon. gentleman withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There in fact is no point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well how do you get them to -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

When there are differences of opinion between members then they are canvassed in debate. When the hon. member speaks in the debate he may take violent issue with what the hon. gentleman said, may contradict everything he said and say that everything he said is not factual, is not accurate. And as long as he does not accuse him of willful misleading then he may do it. But there is no point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member can speak in the debate if he wishes to. So I am just going to conclude this Mr. Speaker, by saying that this is the same group that now appeals to the sense of fair play in this House. And the reason why the House from time to time appears to be the way it is is because of the instances that I have given.

MR. NEARY: What about the (inaudible). How did you save them from that?

MR. MARSHALL: Let us get away, as I say, from the derogation of this House and let it start as I say -

MR. NEARY: You were not particular (inaudible).

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

MR. MARSHALL: - in the house of Opposition itself.

Now, you know, the hon. member for LaPoile - they had trouble with the Leader of the Opposition. He is not here today. It is too bad he is not. He was here earlier. That he is taking his advise from his chief lieutenant, the member for LaPoile over there who is the de facto leader and this is the reason why he is being led astray. As government House leader I had occasion to have very good relationships with the gentleman when he was Opposition House leader and he is a different character now because he is sitting there, he is not doing really what he wants to do. He is doing really



MR. MARSHALL:

what the member for LaPoile urges him on. And anyone who wants to know how the public views the Opposition -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: - then all they have to do, Mr. Speaker, is observe -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - that up at the meeting, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - up at the CN meeting the other night when they turned to have a representative of the provincial Liberals speak, who did they turn to but none other than the de facto leader, the hon. the member for LaPoile. And that is really, I think, to a large extent what is really wrong with this House. So when the Leader of the Opposition - I do not approve of allegations being put across this House unless they can be verified. There is no point of it. There are other issues. There are issues of unemployment and what have you from time to time to be discussed. But the fact of the matter is when the hon. gentlemen there opposite start crying their crocodile tears if -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

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

MR. MARSHALL: - if the hon. gentlemen should realize the saying that you reap what you sow and they are certainly reaping what they are sowing and they cannot stomach it, Mr. Speaker. Make no wonder they cannot stomach it because they -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - were the perpetrators of it themselves for such a long period of time.

With respect to the hon. and gentle member from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) I say with respect to the hon. - I do not see what the hon. gentleman was really talking about

MR. MARSHALL: talking about he spent most of his time in his Throne Speech talking about, I understand, alleged allegations, that he attempted to get political contributions from a firm at a certain function. Now that is not, Mr. Speaker, the greatest crime in this world, that has not been a function that the Liberal Party certainly has been unused to for a certain period of time, and I do not really see why the hon. gentleman would really get upset, all that the hon. the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan) was doing was making a statement - he got up and he denied it, he got very prickly about it, but I do not really think that it makes all that much difference because the people of Newfoundland are going to expect no different from the Liberal Party, in Opposition, then when they were in power and this is the way in which they carried on before so I do not think that the hon. gentleman should be there jumping up and down in the seat as a result of it.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about A.D. Walsh now, your buddy, in your pocket.

MR. MARSHALL: This is another thing now, the hon. -

MR. NEARY: Tell us all about it -

MR. MARSHALL: Now see, the innuendo - there you go, tell us - the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please! I must insist that when the Chair interposes, the Chair cannot acquiesce in its call to order being ignored, to do that is to undermine the authority of the House and that is the only authority I have and the authority I exercise but I cannot acquiesce in that. I would remind hon. members that where as the matter now to which reference is being made may have two aspects, one: Royal Commission Enquiry, there is also an aspect which could be subjudice or which is subjudice and I draw that to the hon. member's attention.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I was just about to sit down anyway but the hon. gentleman cast an allegation across the

MR. MARSHALL:

House then - another innuendo that

he is doing from time to time -

MR. NEARY:

Just telling it like it is.

MR. MARSHALL:

No I - if the hon. gentleman could

hold his tongue for just a moment - the fact of the matter is that there

are many times that as any lawyer who carries on any kind of a practice

has numbers of qualifying shares, sometimes one and sometimes two -

MR. MARSHALL: and I must have, but I will not brag of the number because that will show the number of the clients I have had over the past twenty years, but now you can anticipate every time the hon. gentleman, who does not know the difference, goes down in the registry and he is looking for something and he sees something and he is on to the press, that the member for St. John's East is a share holder in this and a share holder in that. I can inform this hon. House that I have no beneficial interest in any shares except in one company and that is in my conflict of interest statement and for the edification of the House there happens to be a company called Tiggs Limited - Tiggs, Mr. Speaker, happens to be the name of a dear deceased cat of mine that I had when I was a much younger person, I decided to perpetrate the memorial of his name incorporating a company Tiggs Limited. So if the hon. member wishes to kick around my dead cat the hon. member can. But the hon. member is not entitled - and he is entitled because he will do it because he likes to vent his spleen and he remembers the Miflin enquiry and he wants to paint everybody else with the same brush but he can look pretty hard and far when it comes to the member for St. John's East. I guarantee you he will find nothing - he will find some qualifying shares and maybe that will give him a great deal of zest to make other releases from time to time, other nonsense releases that he makes from time to time

MR. NEARY: Did you not hold shares for seven years?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, for seven years, some of them for twenty years.

MR. NEARY: That is not what the Registrar of Companies said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: Is that right?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. MARSHALL: That is right. Well I do not really choose to debate with the hon. member because really the whole text of my reason for this last part of my debate - my advise to the Leader of the Opposition is that when he gets in the mud he is going to be covered with it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: Mr. Speaker, speaking of getting down in the mud I think that is about as far down in the mud now as any of us can expect to ever go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: I have I guess to congratulate the member on his attitude towards the CN and I am certainly glad that he agrees with the Opposition's viewpoints on it. I am sure that is where he got his idea. He certainly did not get it from the bunch of deadbeats on the other side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: I have never in my life seen such a display of, I do not know what you would call it because -

MR. NEARY: Hypocrisy.

MRS. MCISAAC: Yes, that is exactly what it is, hypocrisy. A bunch of -

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

MRS. MCISAAC: Is that unparliamentary?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. lady, please take her seat. Just quite recently and indeed it was not the first time that term is regarded as unparliamentary.

MRS. MCISAAC: Okay Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that term. So I will probably use another term, one I think that the Premier used. What in the world did he call them? Mugwumps.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MRS. MCISAAC: He referred to some people, politicians as mugwumps. Well I have never seen a better display in this last couple of days because we had the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) and the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) who I have had a lot of respect for and to see those two gentlemen come out and speak in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I guess they just delivered the speeches. I am sure they did not write them because they could not not having the feelings that they have about the present administration. So they must be mugwumps. And mugwumps in case anybody wants to know what a mugwump is, the Premier calls mugwumps politicians who sit on the fence with their mug on one side and their wumps on the other.

MRS. MCISAAC:

And nobody knows better than the Premier because he has got them all over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: And the member who just sat down, a perfect example of a mugwump, to get up and attack the Opposition today for the job that they are doing. Thank God we have got an Opposition who is -

MR. NEARY: You are not allowed to protect the public Treasury.

MRS. MCISAAC: - loyal enough to dig in to what is going on.

MR. NEARY: Let that crowd loot the public Treasury and you are not supposed to do anything about it.

MRS. MCISAAC: I have always tried to be charitable in this House and tried to keep it clean.

MR. NEARY: Let them loot the public Treasury.

MRS. MCISAAC: But you just cannot sit here and take that kind of stuff without, you know, passing it back across the House. The member is pointing to the clock. I think I have a little bit of time left, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOODY: Why do you not adjourn now?

MRS. McISAAC: No I cannot adjourn yet, I am not ready to adjourn. The member was speaking of his dead cat - there is more than his cat that is dead, the whole works is dead - a perfect example of life after death is over there. And with that statement, Mr. Speaker, since the hon. members over there are so anxious to adjourn -

MR. NEARY: It makes no difference to us.

MRS. McISAAC: Well fine, I will not get off on the speech from the Throne but I just wanted to get them couple of points across - that if we sit here in Opposition and we are attacked for doing our job, I think the members of the Opposition are doing a splendid job and bring out the facts and bringing out the truth in the interest of the people of this province and it is time that we cleaned up this province, cleaned up this government and gave the people decent government and maybe next year when the election is called it will be a lot cleaner than it is right now and with that remark, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has moved the adjournment of the debate. Hon. Minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at three of the clock in the afternoon and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: I second that this House adjourn until Monday, next, at three p.m. Those in favor 'aye', contrary 'nay' The House stands adjourned until Monday at three p.m.