

VOL. 3

NO. 38

THIRD SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, MAY 15, 1984

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe there are thirteen ministers and the Premier absent today from the House. Obviously the Premier has to take in the hockey games, he has to tie in his cross-Canada tour so he can get to the hockey game tonight in Edmonton.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is certainly not posing a question and not being relevant to the Question Period.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am just asking the hon. gentleman, is that the purpose of the tour, so the Premier can tie in these little jaunts with the hockey games and the football games? Is that why the hon. gentleman is not in his seat today? Let me follow up with another question to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, Last January or February there was some blasting done on the Terra Nova River, and I wonder if some hon. gentleman over there, I do not know who is responsible for it, but would some hon. gentleman over there tell the House who is responsible for that blasting on the Terra Nova River last January or February when they were blasting the ice out there? Who was responsible for it?

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member permit?

MR. NEARY: Yes, sure, go ahead. Who was responsible for the blasting?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of Council.

May 15, 1984

Tape 1627

NM - 2

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know who is responsible for the blasting on the Terra Nova River, but I know who is responsible for the blasting in the House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has a ready answer to that.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as acting Minister of Forestry I can attempt to answer the question. But if the hon. gentleman is asking about the blasting on a bridge that occurred last Fall and Winter, the bridge was blasted, I understand, by the Bowater company, or a private sector interest arranged through the pulp and paper company because of the dangerous condition of the bridge. And when it was brought to the attention of government a part of the bridge was removed to prevent transportation over the bridge because of the dangerous condition of it and part was left in case that the Department of Forestry could look at the replacement and use part of the old bridge to put a new transportation link in place. And if that is what the hon. gentleman was asking about, that blasting, I think that is the answer to it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has not got the foggiest notion of what I am talking about.

MR. MORGAN: You are talking about blasting a bridge.

MR. NEARY: No, I am talking about blasting the ice to stop the flooding last Winter on the Terra Nova River and Glovertown area.

MR. MORGAN: EMO

MR. NEARY: Alright. Well, who is responsible

MR. NEARY: for EMO? Will somebody put up their hand on the other side, whoever is responsible for EMO today? Is anybody responsible? Is the Province on its own, is it just cast adrift, are we rudderless, nobody on the bridge? Could somebody tell us who is going to answer the question?

MR. MARSHALL: Pose a question.

MR. NEARY: Well, who is responsible for EMO? Who can I put the question to? I will put it to the Government House Leader. He seems to be the know-all over there. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House, the blasting that was done on the Terra Nova River under the supervision of EMO, who was responsible for the blasting and who is responsible?

Mr. DOYLE: Dynamite caused it.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman might be blasted out off the water in the next election if he keeps up his arrogance. Mr. Speaker, who was responsible for the blasting and whom do the people down there have to get in touch with in connection with damage to their homes?

MR. NEARY: A number of homes were damaged last January or February when that blasting was carried out in Glovertown, and a groceteria. Now, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if a survey has been made of the area to determine the extent of the damage and who will be responsible for seeing that the people are compensated for the damage?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that Emergency Measures comes under the Department of Justice. If memory serves me correct, I believe that that blasting was conducted under the supervision of the Canadian Armed Forces. I am subject to correction on that as I am subject to correction at all times. I can see the hon. gentleman is looking despondent and disappointed now because obviously I am right. So it was the Canadian Armed Forces that did the blasting.

MR. NEARY: It was EMO.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, you know, EMO would be in charge of the correlation of the activities out there.

MR. NEARY: It was the EMO.

MR. MARSHALL: Does the hon. gentleman want an answer or does he just want to sit there and emote inanities all during Question Period? If he does, I mean, that is fine, we will sit down and listen to the hon. gentleman. It is Emergency Measures Organization, Mr. Speaker, that was in charge of this.

The provincial director of Emergency Measures Organization is Mr. John Greer, a very competent public servant indeed. We saw him show his mettle, both out there and as we saw him during the

MR. MARSHALL: recent sleet storm.

I am not aware of the specific allegations with respect to the damages to the houses that the hon. gentleman alludes to. If, in fact, they did occur - and the hon. gentleman cannot expect me to be aware of every damage that occurs in all parts of the Province, or any minister, for that matter - but if damage did occur, the gentlemen concerned should get in touch with the director of Emergency Measures, Mr. Greer, and, if they wish, direct their letters to the Ministry of Justice and they will be looked into promptly and assessed as promptly as possible and such action as is necessary will be taken.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what an answer! Is the hon. gentleman aware that three months have gone since somebody went around and visited these homes and asked the people about their damage and they have not seen or heard tell of anybody since?

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman aware that this blasting caused splits in the roof of a mobile home down there, walls have been split, doors have been split, basements have been damaged, Rosedale Groceteria was severely damaged? Is the hon. gentleman aware of this? If he is not aware of this, will he try to find out and inform the people in Glovertown, who had their homes damaged by this blasting, what time they can expect a settlement from the administration there opposite who commissioned somebody, I do not know who, the Armed Forces or somebody to go in and do that blasting?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the situation is as described by the hon. gentleman we will certainly look into it and see what the situation is and take such action as may be required and take it promptly. But I know that the House will forgive me if I indicate that it is very difficult to take seriously what the hon. gentleman represents as being the facts from time to time, because he, Mr. Speaker, is the original purveyor of rumour, Mr. Gossip himself, who brings it before the House of Assembly from time to time whether it has any basis or not. He is like this little boy who cried wolf once too often. I mean, you do not know when to take him seriously and when not. It was just the other day, for instance, with rumours, to show how careless he is— and he still has not taken action with respect to it, as I pointed out in the debate yesterday—how he got up and he maligned a director of the new fish company who is giving his time freely without any reference at all to the basis of the facts. So I do not know whether the hon. gentleman really has a basis in fact. All I can say is

MR. NEARY: that we will look into the matter, we will see if the complaints have not been addressed in an expeditious a manner as possible, as a matter of fact, we will see whether any complaints at all were registered, but whatever it is we will look into it. I would hope that the hon. gentleman is not causing us, though, to look into something which is on the basis of rumour, which is the normal way that he operates in this House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to innuendo and slander and gossip and rumourmongering the hon. gentleman is the king. In Nazi Germany they had Dr. Goebbels, here we have the croaking bullfrog.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, where is the hon. member from down there, the hon. gentleman who represents that area, who promised the people one-forty-fifth of the budget when he was running in the election down there? That hon. gentleman should know something about these matters. And if the hon. gentleman wants me to, I will give him the phone numbers and names of the people who have had their houses damaged. Why does not the hon. gentleman consult with the member for Terra Nova or has he been asleep? We have not heard a peep out of him since he got elected, nothing more about one-forty-fifth of the budget. Mr. Speaker, will the hon. gentleman undertake to get the information for the people?

MR. MORGAN: You will be hearing from him, do not worry about that.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman talks about rumourmongering. Last week he said, 'A high ranking federal official told me there is a secret letter between the federal government and Nova Scotia.'

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is proceeding to make a speech and perhaps he should pose a direct question.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to know when the hon. gentleman will get this information for the House? Will he get it this afternoon or can we expect the answer in the House tomorrow? Because these people have been very patient, they have waited three months and they want to know when somebody is going to get in touch with them on the damage that was done to their houses caused by the blasting in that area.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: It was interesting to see how long the hon. gentleman would go in that refrain. Now the fact

MR. MARSHALL: of the matter is that there were people down, I am given to understand, who inspected the area -

MR. NEARY: They were, were they?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes. This is how fast we get the information you see, Mr. Speaker. This is how effective the government is. There were people down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh,oh!

MR. MARSHALL: We are still investigating as to whether there is any basis in fact. The hon. gentleman gets up and he does not care whether it is rumour or fact anyway. Anyway, I will address my remarks to Mr. Speaker, not to the hon. gentleman. I do not think I will address my remarks to the hon. gentleman until he apologizes to Mr. Pike. So I will address Your Honour instead of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

Your Honour, the fact of the matter is I am advised that the matter is under investigation, that when officials went down from a government department, I believe it was the Department of Municipal Affairs, it was at a time when

MR. MARSHALL:

Winter was upon us, there was a large amount of frost in the ground, it was impossible to assess the nature and extent of the damages involved until the frost had come from the ground, and that is the present situation. It is in hand, it is well in hand, Mr. Speaker, and it will be attended to.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

The hon. the Leader of

the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

I would have expected the

hon. gentleman to apologize for his personal attack, his low attack on me. Now that we have determined the minister responsible, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook). Let me ask that minister what is happening to these claims that are being made by the people in the Glovertown area that their homes and their stores were damaged by the blasting of the ice down there last January or February. What is happening to these? How many claims are there and what is happening to the claims?

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of

Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

An assessment team has

been appointed to go to Glovertown, and not only Glovertown, I think it is Harry's River and Robinson's River, where there has been flooding. They are to do an assessment on the causes of the flooding, the amounts of the claims and to report back to Cabinet. This is in hand, as our hon. House Leader said; it is ongoing and it should be completed very soon.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Now we are getting somewhere. We have established the fact now. There is no innuendo or rumour now, the minister is giving us factual information and I would expect the croaking bullfrog to apologize to this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. minister when these people - because three months have gone by, and these people have not heard a peep from the government - can expect to hear something positive from the minister's department?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure when that team will go to Glovertown but the team has been over on the West Coast. So I would say that in Glovertown it might be only just the matter of a few days or so and they will get around to Glovertown.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. minister another supplementary. Is the hon. minister aware, in fact did somebody from her department already visit Glovertown and have conversations with some of the people in the home?

MR. DOYLE: Yes.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says yes. I am asking the minister. The hon. gentleman should have been doing his duty and not just sit here like a stick of furniture in this House day in and day out and run along like a sheep behind the administration, behind the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). Has somebody already been there and, if so, have they reported back to the minister? What were the reports? And when can the people expect to get a reaction to these reports?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the actual reports but there have been people down talking with those people who are claiming damages from the flooding of the river. But the actual assessment team, that is something different, that is when they go in and they have to come up with the actual amount of the damages. I have not seen the report on that particular one as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Before I recognize the member for

May 15, 1984

Tape No. 1633

SD - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I would just like to take a moment to welcome two groups to the galleries. First of all a group from the Clarendville Town Council with Deputy Mayor Leonard Singleton, Councillor Emerson Barbour and the Town Clerk, Arthur Adams.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): And it is indeed a special pleasure to welcome to the galleries as well a visiting group from the Luther College Choir, Regina, Saskatchewan, under the direction of Mr. Carl Cherland, and accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. Erich Mintzler, and they are visiting the Province as guests of Bishops College Choir of St. John's, I do welcome these people to the galleries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to welcome the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) back to the House, He is well tanned from his trip to Hawaii. We thought he was selling fish. I want to ask him a question concerning the salmon management plan which has been out now for some month and a half. When this management plan originally came to light I think the only well recorded disagreement that the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) had with the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) was that they were going to cut the salmon season by three weeks rather than the two that they had originally agreed to. It seems to me now, Mr. Speaker, that he has seen the error of his ways in that regard and that he has changed his plans somewhat, or his objection to the Federal Minister of Fisheries' plan somewhat. I would like to ask him for the public record is that so? And, if so, would he tell the House what his position is now with regard to the salmon management plan put forward by the Federal Minister of Fisheries?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all may I correct the hon. gentleman in his preamble to his question? The fact is that we at no time agreed to any cutback in the commercial fishery in this Province, and that is on

MR. MORGAN: record in Telexes, in correspondence, in meetings with officials accompanying me, etc.

There was never any time we agreed to any commercial reduction in commercial activity in the salmon fishery in our Province, Mr. Speaker. That was clearly said publicly weeks before the minister in Ottawa announced his programme. And we said the reason why was because we could not agree to any curtailment of the commercial fishery unless certain things were done for conservation purposes in the salmon fishery. I listed these things that had to be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Liberal Party of Ottawa, and the Liberal Government in Ottawa, has put forward a disastrous policy that is going to have severe adverse effects on the commercial salmon fishermen in our Province. There are 4,000 fishermen now having their livelihoods jeopardized by means of a government policy put forward by a party they support, get delegates elected to the upcoming convention, now going out all full-bore, working for the Liberal Party, but they cannot find any way of having their

MR. MORGAN:

party change a bad policy. It is a bad policy. The Fishermen's Union and myself met over three weeks ago and reached an agreement as to what we thought would be a reasonable position to put forward to Ottawa to have changes made. That was put forward in conversation with Mr. De Bane, put forward in telexes to Mr. De Bane in a joint way, signed by Mr. Cashin and myself, and to date there has been no response from Ottawa.

This morning I met with a delegation from the Fishermen's Union, with Mr. McCurdy heading the delegation of fishermen from Grate's Cove and fishermen from the Southwest coast of the Province, from LaPoile district. They met with me to come in and tell me the results of yesterday's meeting in Ottawa with Mr. De Bane. I have agreed not to comment on the results of their meeting, and they have agreed not to comment on the results of their meeting at the present time to give Mr. De Bane at least a few days to analyze the proposal they put forward in conjunction with the Newfoundland Government.

Now, Mr. De Bane is not going to procrastinate beyond the 18th. of May, which is the date we gave him in our telexes, we said by May 18 there had to be a decision, either you are going to change your bad policy or you are going to continue to implement your bad policy and have the repercussions carry on and come in place accordingly.

Now, as of today, Mr. De Bane's office has informed me through the Deputy Minister, Dr. Art May, that the meeting we had planned for Thursday and Friday of this week, in Ottawa, between the federal minister and myself, with the two deputy ministers and other senior officials to discuss the Atlantic salmon policy and other issues, that meeting will be postponed or put off until the early part of next week to give Mr. De Bane and

MR. MORGAN: his advisors ample time,
the next two or three days in particular, to again
reassess their policy, and to reconsider the position

MR. MORGAN:

we put forward, the union and the Newfoundland Government, with regard to the Atlantic salmon policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I tabled in this Legislature a Telex put forward to Mr. De Bane earlier. I also made public a copy of a Telex signed by the union and myself to Mr. De Bane, and everybody is fully aware of what our position is on the commercial salmon fishery. We want it made mandatory that the part timers be taken out of the salmon fishery immediately. They do not need the licences to make a living, they do not need to prosecute the salmon fishery to make a living - take them out of the fishery. They have jobs, they do not need the licences and they do not need to prosecute the fishing industry in many cases. Leave the 4,000 full-time fishermen there and take out the 800 part-timers. That will reduce the catching effort in Newfoundland by approximately 8 per cent to 9 per cent. And that will be our position as a Province for conservation purposes, that 8 per cent to 9 per cent reduction for conservation purposes this year, until we see further things done, the Greenland catch reduced, enhancement programmes put in place.

MR. NEARY: Ottawa wants enhancement programmes.

MR. MORGAN: Never mind talking about enhancement programmes. Ottawa has been talking about salmon enhancement programmes for the last four years and we have yet to see one cent of money from Ottawa put in place for salmon enhancement programmes, for salmon hatcheries, for helping nature with the spawning grounds and these kinds of things. And, until that is done -

MR. TULK: That is our position. And it is a good position.

MR. MORGAN: I welcome the comment that it is your position as well, because I do not think the Opposition and ourselves are far apart on this major issue.

MR. NEARY: That is a long answer.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I agree maybe I am lengthy in my answer, but I will say again that this is the most disastrous policy that has ever come forward from Ottawa on the fishing industry so far in my four years as Minister. This one is having a very severe adverse effect on 4,000 full-time commercial fishermen. It is going to reduce their incomes by as much as 40 per cent this year and that, Mr. Speaker, gives reason for the Opposition and ourselves to join forces and to keep joining forces on this major issue, and with the Fishermen's Union, and hopefully we can get Mr. De Bane and his advisors in Ottawa to change that bad policy.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, it is becoming obvious that the honeymoon between the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) and the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is over and that may be good for this Province. Let me ask to him that it is a disasterous plan and he has indeed been educated by the Liberal Opposition in this Province. But the truth of the matter is it is on record in Hansard, and I can table it for him tomorrow, where he said that he had agreed with the two week ban. There is absolutely no doubt about that. Now let me ask him another question. His meeting with the federal minister has been postponed until next week and one of the demands that he made on the federal minister was that the opening date be moved back to May 18. That was one of the demands. Is that demand still in place? And is what he is hearing back from the federal Department of Fisheries close to the demands that he made some two weeks ago? If not, what actions does he intend to take from there on?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, again I want to reiterate it is not in Hansard, it is not in any record that I ever agreed to a two week delay.

MR. TULK: It is.

MR. MORGAN: It is not in any record of this House of Assembly or elsewhere. I never did agree to any curtailment of the commercial full-time fishermen, I will repeat it again, commercial full-time fishermen. I did agree to curtailment, to elimination, in fact, of the part-time fishery of salmon in this Province. And I said earlier I would not agree, and I say again now not agree to any curtailment unless certain other things were done.

Now the situation at present is this: The federal minister has agreed to send down Dr. May, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Scott Parsons, who is the

MR. MORGAN: Assistant Deputy Minister,
a man from Musgrave Harbour from the hon. member's district,
in fact.

MR. TULK: That will not help.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman can send for
the Queen if he wants to, I do not care who he sends for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Scott Parsons,
who is an Assistant Deputy Minister and comes from Lumsden in
the Fogo district is coming down. I find him a pretty good
man to deal with, but I am convinced he is giving the federal
minister bad advice on this issue. Although two Newfoundlanders
are the senior men in office in Ottawa, here they are advising
the federal

MR. MORGAN: minister on a policy which is going to have serious adverse effects in Newfoundland. Anyway, the minister has agreed to send them down, they are coming down tomorrow, they are coming down to meet with the Fishermen's Union in follow-up to the meeting held yesterday in Ottawa, and then they are going to meet with the senior officials, my deputy minister and other officials in the Department of Fisheries provincially, and this is all being done prior to the meeting between Mr. De Bane and myself. That may be an indication they are considering changes, they are understanding that what we are saying is right down here, sending down these two senior officials for meetings here in the Province the next two days, and then Mr. De Bane and myself will meet shortly after that, the early part of next week. But I say again there is no question in my mind that the fishermen I have been talking to, and I have been getting numerous calls night and day at my home and office, the fishermen are saying quite clearly one thing, unless by this weekend there is a change of policy from Ottawa, they are going to defy the regulations put forward from Ottawa, they do not believe in them, they are bad policy, and they are going to defy the regulations. Mr. Speaker, what my position will be with regards to that kind of attitude will be made known after I meet with Mr. De Bane. I will give Mr. De Bane a chance to assess it, give him at least a chance to meet and sit down and discuss it in proper dialogue and discussion, but after that meeting, if there are no changes made, we will express our position accordingly as a government here. But right now let us give him ample time -

MR. NEARY:

You are encouraging people
to break the law.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman
is saying I am encouraging breaking the law. It is the
people from his district primarily who are saying they are
going to go out and put their nets in the water, the reason
being Mr. Simmons,

MR. MORGAN: their member of Parliament, cannot get changes for them and he is a Liberal in Ottawa. Their member here, the Leader of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, but not an elected Leader of the Party in Newfoundland, cannot get changes for them, and they are totally frustrated with the Liberals, that is the whole issue. Their MHA is Leader of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, Mr. Simmons is supposed to be an influential man in Ottawa as a Liberal, and neither one of them can do anything for them down on the South Coast. They are saying to me, 'Mr. Morgan, we know it is not your policy, we know you have no control over it, we know you are fighting it, but where is our own member? And where is Mr. Simmons? He can be nice in organizing little meetings, but what is he doing for us?' So, Mr. Speaker, if the fishermen do not get results from Ottawa in the next few days through the minister here and the Government of Newfoundland and through the Fishermen's Union, and hopefully with support of the Opposition, if they do not get results I would say the fishermen, in many cases, are indeed going to defy the regulations as a bad policy from Ottawa. They are indeed.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the position of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland and Labrador, and, I suggest to the minister the position of the member for Burin/St. Georges is well-known, it is public. But you have a great deal of problem as a party or as people representing constituencies in this Province, when the Minister of Fisheries from Newfoundland (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Fisheries from Ottawa (Mr. De Bane) are kissing cousins, and that is the real problem with the Newfoundland fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
beautiful people.

They are buddies. They are

MR. NEARY:

There is where our troubles started.

MR. TULK:

And that is where the troubled started.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask him
a supplementary. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the kissing cousin
of Mr. De Bane another question. What is the position of the
minister as regards to commercial salmon fishery and the
sports fishery in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that question was asked because not only did Mr. De Bane put forward a stupid, ridiculous policy on the commercial Atlantic salmon fishery, but also a ridiculous salmon policy as it pertains to the sports fishing. Can you imagine the same policy being applied in Labrador, where there is no interception of salmon going to the rivers in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? The salmon caught in Labrador is not the interception problem of the spawning rivers up in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. So why would he make one universal policy apply throughout the whole region? Salmon fishermen this year in Labrador, sports fishermen, the outfitters, they are going to have to throw back every salmon over and above a certain length, which is approximately about every salmon beyond the poundage of six pounds, approximately, between five and a half to six pounds. Every salmon caught with weight over and above that, thrown them back in the river again! In Labrador? Why in Labrador? It is not making any sense. I can see it in other parts of Atlantic Canada but not in Labrador where the only interception beyond Labrador would be the Greenland fishery. And Greenland fishermen last year had a total catch of a little more than we caught totally here in Newfoundland with 4000 fishermen with licenses. So the Atlantic Salmon Sports Policy is going to have a disastrous effect on Newfoundlanders who are outfitters in the sports business in Labrador. My colleague, a member for Labrador, Minister of Northern, Agricultural and Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) brought this to the attention of the House, I think last week in

MR.MORGAN: my absence, and rightly so. It is a bad policy. Naturally the Minister of Fisheries is going to stand in favour of the commercial fishery over the sports fishermen, naturally I am going to stand in favour of the commercial fishermen, but at the same time I will also very vehemently oppose any policy that is going to adversely effect the sports aspect of bringing tourism dollars and money for the outfitters in Labrador.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICE OF MOTION

MR.MARSHALL: Mr.Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr.Ottenheimer) I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Act."

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.MARSHALL: We might create our own Senate for the member for LaPoile (Mr.Neary).

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

DR.COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, once again a great raft of answers for the Opposition. These questions were asked by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr.Hodder), two questions which I table.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

MR.WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to two questions, Question No. 51 on the Order Paper and No. 26 of April 30 from the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) requesting information on the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

May 15, 1984

Tape No. 1640

ah-3

MR. WINDSOR: I am very pleased to announce that for 1982-83 approved funding for a total of almost \$1.4 million was put forward which created employment of some 174 permanent and four part-time jobs. During that period as well there were write-offs of bad debts of \$177,000, which represents a ratio

MR. WINDSOR:

of 0.8 per cent of the total loans and equity outstanding at that point in time.

Also, I have the answer to a question from the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) appearing on the Order Paper, it does not say which date, but Question Number 10, dealing with Port Atlantis and their proposed development of the Port of Bay Roberts.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the raising of loans by the Province, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! We are discussing the resolution to Bill No. 26.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, yesterday we were debating a bill to authorize the administration there opposite to borrow some \$220 million in this fiscal year. And out of the \$220 million, \$75 million is for a slush fund. They are asking the House for authority to borrow \$75 million and refuse to tell the House what that money will be spent on. The minister in a very vague and general way indicated yesterday that it will be spent on the things that are unforeseen at the moment, that it will be spent to service the deficit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what we are objecting to is the deceitful and the sinister manner in which government is developing this policy. We take this matter so seriously, Mr. Chairman, we consider it to be highly immoral, it is not illegal. The hon. gentleman gave themselves the authority a couple of years ago to do it, but it is unethical and it is immoral, and it is a very dangerous policy. And we take it so seriously that I wrote the

MR. NEARY: Comptroller of the Treasury today in the Department of Finance. As hon. members may be aware, the Comptroller of the Treasury is a servant of this House. This House has three servants, the Auditor General, the Comptroller of the Treasury, and the Ombudsman.

DR. COLLINS: No.

MR. NEARY: They are. They are servants of this House. They do not work for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), they are servants of this House under the Financial Administration Act.

DR. COLLINS:

You have never understood that.

MR. NEARY:

I certainly have understood it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wrote the Comptroller General today and I said, "Dear Mr. Carew" - and I will table this letter in a few moments - "One year ago the House of Assembly passed a loan bill for \$220 million. We were told during debate on this bill that an amount of \$72.4 million was included, to quote the minister," - and I referred Mr. Carew to Hansard, Tape 2485, May 24, 1983, "if circumstances were particularly good it would allow us to pre-borrow for next year." That is what the minister told us he needed the money for, that \$72.4 million last year. "Now during debate" - I am telling Mr. Carew - "on the 1984-85 loan bill in the House of Assembly yesterday, we were astonished to find out that the \$72.4 million referred to in Dr. Collins' May 24, 1983 statement was not used for pre-borrowing purposes. Instead this money was used to finance part of the Province's 1983-84 current account deficit and for other unidentifiable purposes." We still do not know what the remainder was used for.

DR. COLLINS:

He is going to die laughing when he gets that.

MR. NEARY:

Well, he can laugh all he wants but this is a pretty serious matter.

DR. COLLINS:

He will probably ask for a week off.

MR. NEARY:

"Members of the House" - I am telling Mr. Carew - "Members of the House of Assembly were tricked and deceived by the Minister of Finance who obviously was attempting to cover up a much larger deficit in current account than had been budgeted for the 1983-84 fiscal

MR. NEARY: year." And then I ask Mr. Carew, "Under Section 24 of the Financial Administration Act, would you please prepare for us as soon as possible a detailed accounting of how this \$72.4 million was disbursed? We would also appreciate your views on the present administration's sinister policy of inflating loan bills by huge amounts and then not supplying the House with corresponding figures and details of expenditure. Yours sincerely". Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a very simple and clear request that I am sending to the Comptroller General. Let me repeat what it is I am asking Mr. Carew to supply us with. I am asking him to give us, under Section 24, to "prepare for us as soon as possible a detailed accounting of how this \$72.4 million was disbursed." Now is that a fair request, Mr. Chairman? We cannot get it from the minister. The minister told us yesterday that \$40-odd million was used to service the deficit, there was \$13 million cash on hand at the end of the fiscal year and that is \$53 million. Now what happened to the balance? I know the minister has not got it in his pocket but what happened to it? What was it used for? The House is entitled

MR. NEARY: to have the answers to these questions, and seeing we cannot get them from the minister, I have to go to the Comptroller General.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) indicated that the Comptroller General may die laughing at this request. Well, well he may, but the Comptroller General is a servant of this House and we as elected representatives of the people have a right to go to the Comptroller General with these requests under the Financial Administration Act. And we are also asking Mr. Carew to tell us what he thinks of this sinister policy of inflating loans. The government did not need \$220 million last year, but they asked for \$220 million so they could have a \$74 million slush fund in order to cover up for a larger deficit that they were anticipating in current account. And they are doing the same thing again this year; they are asking for \$75 million more over and above that which they require, and the hon. gentlemen over there do not even bother to bring it up at their caucus meetings. I am told by members who sit around the caucus room that they go in like sheep, the Government House Leader and the Premier will get up and spout off, they can say what they like, and hon. gentlemen will believe them and follow along behind them just like sheep. They question nothing. Dummies! They are mute! We may as well have sticks of furniture over there for what use they are. They are useless galoots, Mr. Chairman.

Here we have a situation where the authority of this House, the power of the purse is being whittled away and moved down on the eighth floor of Confederation Building to the Cabinet Room. Why you would not give this crowd a bullseye shop to run, let alone \$75 million of a slush fund. With the track record of

MR. NEARY: that Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) over there, Mr. Chairman, who has been so unrealistic in his estimating, who has only been \$50 million, and \$60 million, and \$70 million out every year in current account -

DR. COLLINS: What percentage is that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the percentage is not what counts. The fact of the matter is that we are having a substantial deficit in current account for three years in a row which means the Province cannot pay its ordinary housekeeping bills. That is what it means.

The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) got up yesterday and went back into ancient history. He jumped over the Moores Administration to get back at the Smallwood administration. They blot out that seven years of the Moores fiasco as if it did not exist. He went back to the Smallwood administration and talked about how the Smallwood administration was responsible for the debt in this Province.

Well, when Mr. Smallwood went out of office the public debt was \$700 million or \$800 million after twenty-three years and all kinds of development and all kinds of projects and things to show for it. But after twelve years of Toryism,

MR. NEARY:

the public debt is now \$3.6 billion - three thousand six hundred million dollars, from \$800 million up to three thousand six hundred million in twelve years, and not a thing to show for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is something to crow about!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: I am going to table that letter now, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I will treasure that letter. I think I might submit it to the Guinness Book of Records, you know, that any member of a Legislature would make such remarks out of apparent ignorance.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that we would not tell him what we were going to use, that extra amount of money put in the loan bill. We refused to tell him. Now, we have told him it is for unforeseen circumstances but he insists that we tell him, nevertheless, what we are going to use it for. So we are going to tell him what is unforeseen. Now, that is exactly what the hon. member expects me to do. I will purchase a crystal ball tomorrow and see if I can get any messages out of that. My interpretation of 'unforeseen' is that you do not know. And the reason why we have it in there is that we know that life is not certain, there are uncertainties in this world, and especially in the financial world these days there are tremendous uncertainties. Every jurisdiction from here to Timbucktoo in the last couple of years have

DR. COLLINS: had unanticipated events occur and we are prudently looking forward to having some flexibility to deal with unforeseen circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member also said that we have that flexibility in there to service the deficit. That is incorrect. The deficit that is projected in the budget is included in the budgetary requirements. The flexibility that we have in there, the extra amount, is not to service that; that is already included in the amount.

MR. NEARY: That is what you used it for last year.

DR. COLLINS: Yes, but you said this year and I am trying to keep some semblance of accuracy in your remarks. You said that this year we have an extra amount of money in there to service the deficit. That is not so. That is already in the amount that is under the category 'budgetary requirements'. The extra amount there is for unforeseen circumstances and similar things. One of them might well be that if we find it to our advantage to what is called 'pre-borrow', in other words, if we think that interest rates are going up and we know we will have to borrow for next year, we might borrow in this year for next year if it is to our advantage in the way that interest rates are going. So that is one of the examples, not the only example but one of the examples, why we need that flexibility.

MR. NEARY: What did you use the money for last year?

DR. COLLINS: I already spelled it out yesterday. The hon. member wrote that foolish letter to the Comptroller General. The poor man! You know, I will have to go down and hold his hand so that he does not choke to death with laughter when he receives it!

DR. COLLINS: He wrote that foolish letter to the Comptroller General and one of the things he says in the letter is that what we are doing is immoral. We used some of the money last year to cover the unanticipated deficit. I wish the hon. member would read things once in a while. Just read under Section 2, subsection (a) of the loan bill, talking about moneys borrowed, it says, 'Such sums of money as are required for the Consolidated Revenue Fund to make good, in whole or in part, any actual or estimated deficiencies between provincial revenues and expenditures, or to provide for expenditures made or to be made therefrom'. So it is not immoral to use the money we borrow to cover the deficit, whether we anticipate it or do not anticipate it. That is the very purpose of raising this money as is laid

DR. COLLINS:

out in Subsection (a) of Section 2 there. So the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is either on some sort of kick that he feels he has an issue and he can beat it up because people probably are not paying too much attention to the minutiae of the loan bills and the financial situation and so on, and he can paint a picture which has absolutely no substance to it but nevertheless it sounds foreboding and it sounds as though there is something terribly wrong. He is either doing that or he genuinely does not understand what is going on. Now, if it is the latter, I think it is a bit pathetic because the hon. Leader of the Opposition is a veteran in this House. He has been through more debates, he has been through more budgets, he has heard more bills presented to him, whether he read them or not I do not know, but he has presented to him more documents than most of the other people in this House put together. If at this stage he still does not grasp the elements of what is going on when we bring in a loan bill or when we bring in a budget or when we bring in supplementary supply or when we bring in special warrants or whatever, if he does not understand these things, you know, I do not know what you can do about it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the debt, he comments on our debt, our deficiency, I should say, and our deficiency is too high. Any deficiency, if it was ten cents it is too high. And this government would only be too delighted to have no deficiency and that is what we aim for all the time and most times we achieve it. In the last few years we have not achieved it. However, Mr. Chairman, we are by no means alone in that. As a matter of fact, our percentage deficits are miniscule compared to many other jurisdictions, and I am talking of even rich provinces like Alberta, rich provinces like B.C., quite rich provinces like Quebec and certainly our sister provinces in the Maritime

DR. COLLINS: area, in the Atlantic area, who had, percentage-wise, massively greater deficits than we had even though their means, even though their per capita income, even though their annual revenues were way in excess of ours. We have to skimp along, we have to try to save every penny, we have to, unfortunately, put a heavy tax effort on our people, all these things because our means are small. Despite that we have kept our situation well under control if you compare it to theirs. Now just look at the cause behind all of this. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) or anyone else in this House does not, for one moment, think that this small Province with our small economy can do much about the general Canadian economy. You know, to expect us to have some controlling influence on the Canadian economy would be like, say, expecting Liechtenstein to go out and lick the Russians tomorrow. It is a similar comparison. So we have nothing to do with the general profile or the general performance of the Canadian economy, and it was the Canadian economy which is at the basis of our deficits. Our expenditures were under control. Our projections were just about bang on, they were within \$1 million, I think it was, and that is on a \$2 billion budget and that percentage, you cannot get any better than that; if you can I do not know how you do it. They were bang on. But they were not bang on in our revenues because the Canadian economy, and hence the Newfoundland economy, really took a serious dip.

DR. COLLINS: We could not control that and I am not pretending that we can and no one in this government is pretending that we can. We cannot control that. We had to be wagged, we are the tail being wagged by the dog in that respect.

I will say this, Mr. Chairman, that most of the drop in revenues were not the result of our projections. The difference between the projections at budget time last year and what turned out to be the case was about \$40 million. There was a \$40 million greater deficit than was projected. About \$10 millions of that was due to our projections, principally on retail sales tax. The rest of it were projections that we received from the federal government, because the federal government give us the projections on equalization programmes, established programme, financing programmes, corporate income tax, and personal income tax. Even though these latter two are provincial taxes, nevertheless they are collected and therefore projected by the federal government.

So they were off by \$30 million when we were preparing our budget last year and what turned out to be the case as the year went by; we were off by \$10 million from what we thought we would collect ourselves and what we ultimately did collect.

I want to reiterate that the problem has been that the Canadian economy took that dip, that more serious dip than anyone thought, and it was a more prolonged negative influence in this Province than almost any other province in Canada. And that is not difficult to understand either, because we are very exposed in this Province to what goes on in the international market and when our economy goes down the federal government tends to bring in monetary policies

DR. COLLINS: which have an immediate effect and a severe effect on the marketing of our goods in international markets, such as our fish and our paper and our minerals and so on and so forth. So it had an immediate effect on us, a prolonged effect and that was the cause of our essential problems.

Mr. Chairman, with those explanatory remarks I am sure there is no other question to arise and I move the adoption of the resolution.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, after just hearing from the red roaring rooster, the red roaring Tory, we can understand why the Province is in such a ridiculous financial mess that it is in. The Province is in an incredible financial mess, thanks to the incompetence and the mismanagement of hon. gentlemen there opposite. And I only wish the Premier was in his seat today, Mr. Chairman, He has gone off now on a jaunt across Canada and tying in his trips with the hockey games so he can attend the play-offs. What a way to govern a Province! And he leaves the likes of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) in charge. And every time the both of them appear on television, I do not think there is a citizen in this Province, in Newfoundland or Labrador, who would not feel like driving their boot in through the television every time they see either gentleman, especially the Government House Leader.

Now, Mr. Chairman, can you imagine municipalities in this Province sending in their budget to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) and saying, 'We have a \$75 million cushion in there.' Can you imagine that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. NEARY: Do you think the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) would approve a budget for the municipalities in this Province knowing that there was a \$75 million cushion in that budget, that they were asking for authorization to borrow \$75 million more than they required for the fiscal year? Mr. Chairman, if anybody would get pains in their stomach from laughing, I am sure it would be the minister if that happened.

Mr. Chairman, let us call a spade a spade. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) needs \$145 million this year to look after the capital works programme. Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the minister asking for? Is he asking for \$145 million? Is he asking this House to approve \$145 million to take care of the capital works programme that they have outlined? No, he is not, Mr. Chairman. He is asking for \$220 million, \$75 million more than they need. That is pretty good budgeting. They would ridicule the municipalities if they did that. The municipalities are now struggling. At their conference yesterday they moved a resolution condemning this administration and condemning the minister, and the minister spoke there and the minister can confirm what I am saying. They are reeling under the policies of this government forcing the municipalities to increase taxes, to impose the property tax and we may have mass resignations as a result of this from municipalities. Not only will be having mass resignations, Mr. Chairman, but a good many councils will not be able to balance their budget. And then we hear the harangue that we just heard from the Minister of Finance.

MR. MARSHALL: It was a well reasoned speech.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it was a well reasoned speech, all right! The real reasons by the way - I hate to have to go over this again - the real reasons for the huge debt that

MR. NEARY: we have are, number one, the biggest blunder in Newfoundland's history, the nationalization of the Churchill Falls, the biggest blunder in our history. If the Tories had not nationalized the Churchill Falls, this year, as bad as the contract is, this year we would have had \$12 million going into consolidated revenue, as bad as the contract is. But, because they nationalized Churchill Falls, instead of having a profit we are having a deficit. It is costing the taxpayers an arm and a leg to amortise the money that was borrowed to nationalize the Churchill Falls Corporation. Let me repeat that again because the media do not seem to have picked that up. This year we would have had a surplus, a profit from the Upper Churchill Falls development of \$10 million or \$12 million if the Tories had not nationalized the Churchill Falls Corporation.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, that would be better than welfare, that would be better than nothing, but instead of that, because of the gigantic, the colossal blunder made by hon. gentlemen there opposite, we are paying out millions piled upon millions to amortize the money that was borrowed.

MR. MARSHALL: We are not.

MR. NEARY: We are so, for the money that was borrowed to pay for the shares of the Churchill Falls Corporation. And the taxpayers are also paying out millions of dollars for these two explosions that were set off on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle, another four or five hundred million dollars. And now they are auctioning off the equipment in Point Amour and in St. Barbe. And the other thing, of course, they squandered and wasted money on was the nationalization of the Labrador Linerboard Mill, \$500 million. These three items alone, these three projects alone have cost the taxpayers of this Province \$1000 billion. And the old red rooster has the face to get up and jump over the Moores administration to try to get back at Mr. Smallwood, who is long gone. Now, Mr. Chairman, they are going to put this bill through, Forty-four against eight. Can you imagine two hockey teams out on the ice, forty-four/eight? Well, that is the way it is in this House. In brute force they will bully the bill through, they will ram it through the House. They will not tell us, Mr. Chairman, what they intend to do with this \$75 million.

MR. CARTER: We did not hear any complaints from you in 1966

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman gave us a couple of details yesterday of how the \$74.2 million was spent. Let us call a spade a spade: What the hon. gentleman is going to do is use this money to service a much larger deficit in this fiscal year than he budgeted for a few weeks ago. That is what the hon. gentleman is up to. There is no point in trying to mislead the House and deceive the people of this Province because we are not going to fall for it. And the Comptroller of the Treasury, the Comptroller General may give me what I ask for and he may not, but I am certainly within my rights under the Financial Administration Act to ask for that information. I will be very disappointed if I do not get it, because Mr. Carew is not beholden to that crowd over there, although I suppose in one sense he is. They could find devious ways, they found ways before, to threaten people and dispose of people.

MR. CARTER: Dispose of them?

MR. NEARY: Yes, and threaten. We hear stories about how they have threatened top officials, Mr. Chairman. And so I do not know if there is any point in belabouring this matter any longer because-

MR. CALLAN: I am going on after you.

MR. NEARY: And I am going to have another little go at it. I am waiting on that transcript of Hansard to arrive so I can quote a few paragraphs to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). It is a pity that the Premier does not think it worth his while to stay in the Province instead of being off wasting more taxpayers' money.

DR. COLLINS: Urgent public business.

MR. NEARY: Yes, urgent public business, the hockey game. He has to make sure the trips coincide with where the hockey games are taking place, and if they are not taking place, he will go to New York to see it, or he will go to California to see the Super Bowl. You talk about lazy and greedy, trying to get his arms around the world. The laziest Premier in our whole history. It takes a lot of energy and a lot of effort to get up and read a speech in Vancouver that is prepared for you. That takes a lot of time and effort, does it not? Why, he could have sent the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) or the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), who -

MR. REID: It does not take much effort to shoot off like you do.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, he should be here in this Province with his sleeves rolled up trying to solve the unemployment problems and all the other horrendous problems facing the economy of this Province.

MR. REID: If you were out of the Province we would be better off.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should go over and look after the hole that he put in that wharf over there when his overloaded truck, his overloaded tandem went down through the wharf. The hon. gentleman should go and look after the holes that he is making in the wharves.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. DINN: Thank God!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GREENING: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be able to make a few brief remarks and comments with regard to the bill presently being considered. It was ironic that during Question Period today the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), the unelected Leader of the Opposition, and the highest paid Leader of the Opposition in Canada, the hon. the member for LaPoile raised a matter relating to blasting on the Terra Nova River in my district. Yet, at the same time, it is of the utmost urgency that the bill pass so that the necessary funds can be made available to the Department of Municipal Affairs to compensate these people in Glovertown who were effected by the flooding and by the blasting.

It is people like the Leader of the Opposition who is stopping this bill from being passed. In fact, I think that the biggest blasting down on Terra Nova was done on December 7 when we blasted the Liberals out of there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GREENING: Now, I am sure we did a good job in cleaning up that mess and I am sure we will do a good job in cleaning up the mess that was caused by the blasting and by the flooding. Meanwhile, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition refers to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) as a red rooster. Well, I think the Minister of Finance has quite a lot to crow about with the budget that he brought down. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to make few comments on this bill that is presently before the House, but before I get into what I want to say about this bill, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) a couple of questions I was going to ask during Question Period.

MR. CALLAN:

but we ran out of time.

Perhaps the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) can tell us whether or not any of this borrowed money will be used to put some people back to work in the South Dildo area. I refer, of course, to the plant in South Dildo,

MR. CALLAN: which was formerly Arctic Fisheries, and then formerly North Atlantic Fisheries, and which, as the Minister of Fisheries knows, is now of course under the umbrella of Fishery Products International.

Now in conversations that I have had with people on the board of Fishery Products International I am told that that ultramodern plant is too big to be efficient and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, this year the only processing that will be done in that fish plant in South Dildo will be the processing of caplin for two, three four, perhaps five weeks.

Mr. Chairman, I am also told that there will be no codfish processing there at all, whatsoever, and if the squid arrive in the Fall, which is highly unlikely judging from the seven year cycle, and judging from the last couple of years I think that seven year cycle reached its peak about three years ago, but if the squid do become fairly abundant I am told that some squid will also be processed at that plant in South Dildo, the former Arctic Fisheries, former North Atlantic Fisheries, now under the umbrella of Fishery Products International.

I want to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Chairman, to comment on the concerns that I have, and the people in that area have, I want the Minister of Fisheries to tell us what is the overall intention of Fishery Products International. The minister has representatives on the board. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that what Fishery Products International are really up to is wherever there is a fish plant where they can skim off some cream then, "Yes, we will get into that sort of processing. We will skim off some profits and we can see how we can do that by hiring the people in the area for four or five weeks if the caplin come." And so the fish plant workers,

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, are faced with a dilemma, they are faced with a problem that they have faced for the past two or three years. Last year and the year before that, and the year before that, these fish plant workers managed to scrape two, three, four, five and some of them six weekly contributions for UIC benefits. And then, of course, Mr. Chairman, what they had to do was hope that the caplin came in the Fall so that they could get another four or five to make up the ten that would entitle them to UIC benefits during the Winter.

MR. CALLAN: But as I have said, during the past three years their big expectation did not come to fulfillment, there were no squid, and so we had these people all through September, October, November, December, January, looking, wondering, searching for a way to get some employment, and some of them were lucky and some of them were not. Some of them, Mr. Chairman, managed in August to get a group formed, or to convince some other community organization to submit an application to Employment and Immigration for a Canada Works programme so that they could get some employment on a Canada Works project that would entitle them to six or ten or fifteen weeks work and, of course, they would be able to then draw some UIC in the couple of months remaining before the caplin arrive again.

Mr. Chairman, the people in that area are very concerned about that. And the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) - the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is not in his seat - I saw him over there nodding approval, yes, this is what Fishery Products International is up to. 'We can make money by having these fish plant workers process caplin. We can skim off some cream there and we can skim off some cream by processing squid. But the processing of the cod in the Summer, we cannot see where we can make any money.' And, of course, the reasons are legitimate why these fish plants cannot make any money, or some of them. But I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this big super company, Fishery Products International, should be concerned not only with looking at whether the figures on the bottom line are black or red. It is funded by the federal government, and I think that that super company, Fishery Products International, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be concerned with more than just whether they will end up in the red or the black, because I think they should have a social conscience. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that they owe something to the

MR. CALLAN: fish plant workers who during the last three years in particular have gone out in June. I understand their start-up date this year hopefully will be June 7. They hope to start up June 7. But I was in South Dildo to a meeting last week, Mr. Chairman, and I am afraid what may happen there is that unless some kind of an agreement can be reached between the fish plant workers, the union that they pay into, and the directors, the principals of Fishery Products International, I am afraid that that plant will not open at all. Because I have heard some of the former employees, the employees who last year got four and five and six weekly contributions for UIC benefits, I have

MR. CALLAN: heard them say, 'If Fishery Products International do not intend to open up this plant long enough for us to at least get four or five months work, then we will not see the plant opened at all.' I concur with their sentiments, Mr. Chairman. I think they are right. And if Fishery Products International can take that plant in South Dildo and for four or five weeks can cream off some profits, why not put it back where they got it? It is the same old argument, Mr. Chairman. It is the same old argument that I have been using regarding dirt roads in my district ever since I came into the House nine years ago. Why is it that this provincial government does not put the taxpayers' dollars back on the Southwest Arm road, for example, where the tax dollars came from in the first place? Why does this government take tax dollars out of fishing towns in Southwest Arm, like Southport, Gooseberry Cove, Hodge's Cove and all the others up there?

MR. DOYLE: Who is the member down there?

MR. CALLAN: You should know, he has been there long enough. He got elected three times, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK: Who is he?

MR. CALLAN: It is the same old argument, Mr. Chairman, and this government, of course, has been doing it to the taxpayers out there. They have been taking their tax dollars and saying to them, 'Well, thanks for the cream. We will put a little bit of calcium chloride on your road to keep down the dust! To keep down the dust literally and figuratively as well, of course, because most people kick up a dust when their roads are in such a tremendous state that

MR. CALLAN: they can hardly get over them
for potholes and so on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: So figuratively and literally,
Mr. Chairman, they keep the dust down. But their tax
dollars go to pave the roads somewhere else. I will
get back to it in a moment, Mr. Chairman. I think my
time is up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The hon. member's time has
elapsed.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, down in Mobile
the goat spoke.

MR. GREENING: Are you diggin' 'em,
Dillon?

MR. NEARY: The goat said, 'Are you diggin'
'em, Dillon?' and he said, 'Yes, and I would be diggin'
more only for you, you s.o.b.'

Well, I have finally got the
member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) to speak today in
this House.

MR. TULK: Very, very briefly.

MR. NEARY: Very briefly, made his maiden
speech.

MR. DINN: There was more in that three
minutes than you have said all session.

MR. NEARY: Yes, there was a lot in that
three minutes. Just go back and get Hansard and reflect

MR. NEARY: upon what the hon. gentleman said. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that the people in Terra Nova district are awfully, awfully disillusioned and disgruntled and disappointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: The biggest disappointment the hon. gentleman got is sitting down here to my right.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to hearing more from the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), but if I were the hon. gentleman, if I were in the hon. gentleman's shoes,

MR. NEARY: I do not think I would go on the personal attack. I do not think I would do that. Now if the hon. gentleman wants to get personal in this House, well, then, Mr. Chairman, we will take the gloves off. Anytime the hon. gentleman wants us to, we will take the gloves off.

MR. GREENING: Is that a threat?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, it is not a threat.

I invite the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - to continue on his trend and I will guarantee you he will get more than he expects to get. I will guarantee you that.

MR. TULK: Who was it?

MR. NEARY: The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening). He got up and he spoke for about a minute and a half and then he collapsed in his seat. But while he was up he did nothing except follow the bad example of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), and decided to personally attack me. Well, if that is the kind of a game the hon. gentleman wants to play, two can play that game.

MR. GREENING: I know you can.

MR. NEARY: And any time at all, all the hon. gentleman has to do is to keep it up, and I will guarantee you that we will show him that two can play that game. But I have no intention of being side-tracked by rabbit tracks.

MR. MARSHALL: Do you have anything new to say on this?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I certainly do, Mr. Chairman, have something to say.

Mr. Chairman, I am just going to merely say this, that the hon. gentleman directly opposite me,

MR. NEARY: when he was on this side of the House, stood against everything that he is now proposing, he fought against everything that he is now agreeing with. The hon. gentleman there opposite fought tooth and nail against removing the power of the purse from the floor of this House. The hon. gentleman when he was over here criticized a previous administration for asking for authority for money that would not be specified for what it was to be used for, the decisions to be made in the Cabinet chamber. The hon. gentleman was against that, and now he is supporting it.

MR. TULK: The great reformer is a reformer no more.

MR. NEARY: In the last seven years they have been chipping away at the authority of this House. They have been moving more power and more authority down to the eighth floor, down in the Cabinet Room. They are getting closer to a dictatorship. We will soon have a complete dictatorship in this Province.

And I heard about the hon. Whiskery Bill over there when he goes to his caucus meetings. They come into the House and they interrupt us, and they try to be smart and funny, but when they go to their caucus meetings they are like sheep. 'Yes, Sir.' 'No, Sir.' The Emperor will get up and make a few statements and -

MR. BARRETT: How can you make comments on something you know nothing about?

MR. NEARY: Because, Mr. Chairman, I do know something about it. Now the hon. gentleman should not be interrupting. If he wants to interrupt he should do it in the caucus room. He should tell the Emperor and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) what an incredible mess they are making of this Province, instead of toddling along

MR. NEARY: like sheep behind the Emperor and behind the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). Every Wednesday, when they have their caucus, you cannot hear a sound. Then everybody is asked, 'Now does anybody have any suggestions to make?'

MR. TULK: No, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Not a peep. Does anybody have any criticism? Not a peep. 'Now here is what we are going to do in the House, here is how we are going to handle 'Neary; here is how we are going to deal with the Opposition.' They play their little political games and they toddle along like sheep, knowing, Mr. Chairman

MR. NEARY:

that the Province is on the verge of bankruptcy, that we are ruined economically, that there is horrendous pain and suffering in this Province, in their own districts, amongst their own constituents. They know that and yet they toddle along like sheep. They are just like Edgar Bergan and Charlie McCarthy; the emperor and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) pull the strings and they are just like little wooden puppets on a string, they toddle along behind.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are members of the caucus who are getting a little more vocal, thank God, they are coming to us and telling us these things.

MR. DINN: Do you have a Code-a-phone?

MR. CARTER: Lies. They must be lies. Terrible lies.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, as I say I do not see any point in belabouring this matter any longer. We are absolutely disgusted. We are concerned with the administration asking to borrow more money than they need. They only need one hundred and forty-odd million - what did I do with my copy?

MR. TULK: \$154 million.

MR. NEARY: No, they need \$145 million.

MR. TULK: Did he change it again?

MR. NEARY: No, but they are asking for \$220 million.

MR. TULK: He told me last week he needed \$154 million.

MR. NEARY: \$154 million?

MR. TULK: Now they have changed it again. Do they know what they need over there?

MR. NEARY: \$145 million is what they need for their capital works programme and they are asking for \$220 million. Now, if the municipalities that are struggling today, and are now coming out publicly condemning and criticizing the administration for the cruel way that they have dealt with the municipalities, forcing them to up their taxes, they say there is going to be no increase in taxes but they forced municipalities to increase their taxes and to impose a property tax. Yes, it is shocking.

MR. CALLAN: Marystown was hard hit.

MR. NEARY: They are all hard hit. And the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), as fine a lady as she is, got a very cool reception yesterday from the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities.

MR. CALLAN: In Gander.

MR. NEARY: In Gander, in her own hometown of Gander. And there is no way that the minister can talk her way out of it, can sweet-talk the municipalities around because shortly after they passed a resolution condemning the administration, saying, "Look, you have treated us harshly, severely. It is cruel what you are doing to us. You are making us take the blame for your mismanagement." They told the minister, "You are forcing the municipalities to take the blame for your mismanagement and your incompetence, and you are forcing us to increase taxes. While you yourselves say there is going to be no increase in taxes, you pass laws in the House of Assembly forcing the municipalities to up their taxes."

But even at that, Mr. Chairman, if the municipalities sent their budgets in with a \$75 million cushion in it, flexibility they call it, they would be laughed out of existence.

MR. TULK: You know, it is criminal what that crowd are putting the Minister of Municipal Affairs through.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Well, we know the minister is going to retire after this session, unless the administration there opposite create an Upper House, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) will retire and so therefore it does not make any difference. The minister is willing now to be the fall minister, the fall guy as we say.

MR. CALLAN: The fall gal.

MR. NEARY: The fall gal, take the wrap for the administration because it does not make any difference she is going anyway.

MR. TULK: Old snake tongue is getting ready to speak.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, I know. I will get him on his feet, do not worry. He will get up and squirt his venom and his poison across the House and set a bad example for the likes of the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), who got up this afternoon and went on the personal attack, which the hon. gentleman will regret. He will regret that, you need not worry about that. That is not the way for a member to make his maiden speech in this House.

MR. TULK: He is not that big.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not. Really, it is not. It is not the proper way for a member to make his maiden speech. The hon. gentleman does not realize that today, but what he has done, he has made his maiden speech and he has set the tone of how he intends to behave in this House.

MR. MARSHALL: A fine start.

MR. TULK: A fine start?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Yes, there is no doubt about it. It ties right in with the hon. gentleman. Look, if there is one thing the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) loves more than being nasty himself, if there is one thing he loves as much as being nasty himself it is hearing somebody else being nasty, especially a new member.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I have listened patiently and quietly to all this nonsense and I have had about as

MR. CARTER: much as I can take, so I am going to make a couple of suggestions here that are not without merit. There has been some talk of an Upper House and, I suppose, this would be a Lower House. I am going to suggest a Lowest House, a house that is really low, and I have a number of people in mind who I would appoint to it. This would be by appointment, where we would hear nothing but venom and dirt all through the day. And the advantage of having such a House would be that by appointing hon. members opposite to it it would save them from writing their stuff all over the walls.

Now, I suggest that if members opposite really want to be productive they should voluntarily agree to some lessening of the amount of money that they get themselves. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), I believe, he can tell us for sure, but I believe he receives an extra \$30,000 a year. Now, he should cut that in half, or even cut it out altogether, because he obviously does not earn it, all he does is tear down and badmouth people.

The Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder) is hardly ever here. He gets paid an extra I think - is it \$15,000? -

MR. BUTT: Yes.

MR. CARTER: - \$15,000 a year for that.

What does he do? It is crazy!

And at the same time this government here has been guilty of wasting some money. They went to all the trouble to have the Mifflin Report done and yet they have not published and circulated it sufficiently. I think it can be copied very cheaply. We do not want a good copy, in fact a bad copy would do, and I would request the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), who has a copy in his desk, to forthwith get

MR. CARTER: his staff to make a couple of hundred copies to pass around.

Since it is a financial bill that I am speaking on, I think I have a certain amount of liberty to speak, I do not have to stick strictly to the point, and I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), when he gets up to talk on this bill, it is my understanding, and I could be wrong, and if I am wrong I will certainly apologize, but it is my understanding that John Doyle, who was supposed to have given a half million dollars to a university residence, never did pay anything towards it, or ~~if~~ if he did pay towards it he only paid a fraction of the amount that he promised, he promised a half million dollars, and yet this house is named Doyle House. It is a house named after a fugitive from justice and I would wonder, if this policy is going to be continued, why we do not have a Sing Sing House and an Alcatraz House?

MR. NEARY: You could walk under a snake with a top hat on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARETER: So these are a few questions, Mr. Chairman, and I would like the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to once again to try to justify all the money that the Opposition gets. I mentioned, the last time I was on my feet, all the money they get for their phone bill, to call all their friends; \$1,000 would do that. But it is a great mistake, a great waste of money and I think it should be looked at very carefully.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, when I stood just now I thought I would get the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to give us some indication of what might happen out at South Dildo at that former Arctic Fisheries plant and former North Atlantic Fisheries plant. The Minister of Fisheries is on the way back now; perhaps he will take a minute or so to at least acknowledge that he has heard and he is aware of the problems out there and that he will try and do something constructive for the worried fish plant workers out in the South Dildo area who, of course, as I have said, for the past three years have not been able to garner enough weeks of employment that would tide them over the Winter months when they are inevitably are laid off. So the Minister of Fisheries is there now and he knows the concerns that I expressed earlier. What I want to do now, Mr. Chairman, is respond to what the Minister of Finance had to say on Friday. Now, Mr. Chairman, those of us who were in the House of Assembly on Friday will remember that the Minister

MR. CALLAN: of Finance (Dr. Collins) in standing to justify borrowing another \$220 million drew an analogy. He said, 'What government is doing is borrowing for the future.' He said, 'It is like a young man and a woman, a newlywed couple with a child or two, instead of that couple, instead of that man and his wife living in a tent for twenty years or so and saving their money, what that young man will do is he will go out and he will borrow the money, buy or build himself a house, and, of course, over time he will pay off his loan.' And he said, 'So it is government and that is why government is today asking permission of the House of Assembly to borrow \$220 million.' Now, if I could have the attention of the Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, I will tell the Minister of Finance what is wrong with his logic. What was wrong with his logic on Friday, the same thing is wrong with his logic now, there has been wrong with his logic over the past couple of years when, of course, he was so many millions of dollars out on his estimates and his projections of what would be coming into the government in retail sales tax and so on. You see, Mr. Chairman, the big difference between this young man and his wife and a couple of kids who decide that they are not going to live in a tent but they are going to go out and borrow money and buy or build a house, the big difference between that and what this government is doing, Mr. Chairman, is very simple indeed.

MR. CALLAN: Obviously, this young man is earning money, he is working. If he was not he would not be able to borrow the money to build a house or to buy it. But, Mr. Chairman, on the other hand, this Province is borrowing \$220 million but the Province is not working, you see, this Province is not working unlike the young man. He is working and he is bringing in a monthly pay cheque whereby he can buy his groceries and buy the other things and pay his light bill and phone bill and he can find some money left over to pay off his mortgage. But this government, Mr. Speaker, is not working. The Province is not working. There are thousands and thousands of people on the unemployment roll and, of course, we are getting little or nothing out of the vast resource that we have offshore. And the fishery, Mr. Chairman, is still in a mess and the Province is not working. And, therefore, Mr. Chairman, the Province when it talks about borrowing is not in the same position at all. There is no analogy really between the Province borrowing and the young man who is working and wants to make a home for his family, you see. If this Province were working, if this Province could look forward in the next twelve months, Mr. Chairman, to revenues coming in from the offshore, revenues coming in from the spin-offs associated with the development of the offshore, and if the Province could see money coming in, then, of course, sure we could pay off our debts. But what is happening in this Province, and it has been going on for a number of years but in particular, Mr. Chairman, it has been going on on a large scale since 1972. This Province now is \$4 billion in debt compared to \$750,000,000 in 1972. The Province is going downhill financially as fast as you can haul a line. And that is what is wrong with the minister's logic in trying to explain why we are borrowing this money. You see, Mr. Chairman, there is no comparison at all whatsoever, and the minister, I am sure,

MR. CALLAN: now that he thinks about it, must realize that he could have taken a lot better other examples than -

DR. COLLINS: No, he has not. You have not persuaded me.

MR. CALLAN: Now, Mr. Chairman, is it possible for this Province to be working? It is not working. Is it possible for this Province to be working? Yesterday the Minister of Finance announced an extra \$6.5 million going into road work around the Province, the by-roads, the secondary roads, I think he talked about. You see, Mr. Chairman, if this government, if this administration were serious and were concerned about getting this Province back to work, it can be done. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) suggested it in his television address which was made in reply to the half an hour address that the Premier made a few nights before. It can be done. All that needs

MR. CALLAN:

to be done, Mr. Chairman, is for somebody to be able to sit down and say, 'We have fought a good fight but we cannot fight forever.' Fighting just for the sake of fighting is no good, it does not do anybody any good. You must be able to accept the fact that 'I have fought a good fight but now it is time that I try to reap some benefits by being nice and by being able to negotiate now that I have shown the other party that we are not going to fall over and crumble.' But no, Mr. Chairman, that has not happened in this Province, it is still not happening and still the Province goes deeper and deeper in debt and, of course, there is no sign of anything for us in the offshore, no sign at all whatsoever. And there is no sign of anything happening in Labrador with the Lower Churchill. All we hear in this Province, Mr. Chairman, is gloom and doom and we hear about taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I have been tempted, and perhaps I will one of these days, either sit down myself or ask somebody in our offices downstairs, to sit down and make a list of the taxes that John Doe public has never heard about. For example, last week I discovered the cost of birth certificates, because over the past several years, and I am sure the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has been involved in this sort of thing, as well, from time to time people ask, 'Would you pick up a birth certificate for me in St. John's?' 'Sure, man! Sure, I will pick up a birth certificate for you.' So you go down on the ground floor to the Registry of Births. And, all along, up until a couple of weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, you could go in and

MR. CALLAN: get a birth certificate, either large size which could be framed, or laminated wallet size.

MR. TULK: Right.

MR. CALLAN: And you could go in and pick that up for \$5. Now, only a couple of years ago it was \$2 or \$3 but it went up to \$5 last year. So, you know, that seemed an awful jump. But last week, Mr. Chairman, I discovered, to my horror, that to go downstairs now and do a constituent a favour by picking up a birth certificate, number one, the price has doubled. That little birth certificate - and I have one in my own wallet, which I will not bother to take out - but that little laminated wallet-size birth certificate jumped from \$5 to \$10 a couple of weeks ago, and now, Mr. Chairman, to add insult to injury, you get an inferior product. Now, the wallet-size birth certificate is not even laminated. So, Mr. Chairman, here are the sorts of things that this government does. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) talked about the Federation of Municipalities being in Gander over the weekend and how upset they are.

MR. CALLAN: And, of course, I talked about how this government is using municipalities as scapegoats for increasing taxes, I talked about it a month or more ago. But this is the ultimate! This is the ultimate insult. You bleed the poor person, somebody who wants to leave the Province, for example, or go to get a driver's licence, somebody who has had a birth certificate and lost it, or is getting the first one, here it has gone up, it has doubled, a 100 per cent increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, I will get back to it, or perhaps I will not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
Shall the resolution carry?

MR. CALLAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, let it carry, for God's sake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.
Motion, that the Committee report having passed a resolution and a bill consequent thereto, carried.

MR. NEARY: I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Chairman.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that they have adopted a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province", read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 26).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act, 1976". (Bill No. 29).

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present this bill on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Energy(Mr. Dawe). This is a bill to amend the Quarry Materials Act. Mr. Speaker, it is a bill to make the provisions of the operation of the bill more certain. Apparently, the people who were receiving quarry licences in the Province were not paying that which they ought to have paid by reason of the fact that it was stated by some of them that the grant which they got included

MR. MARSHALL: the right to quarry so they had a proprietary interest in it and did not have to pay. So the amendment simply reads, "For the avoidance of doubt, where before 1952 there was a conveyance of Crown land by way of a grant to a person and the grant excepts from the conveyance minerals in, on or under the land, the reference to minerals in the grant shall be deemed to have included quarry materials." So that is the purpose of clarification of this particular act, making sure that the levies that are applied to quarry materials will apply and that there can be no dispute with respect to it.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it sounds simple the way the minister presents it but I fear that the essence of what is happening here is expropriation without compensation, in that if there is a right which presently exists by virtue of a grant from the Crown, or a lease from the Crown for that matter, and maybe the minister can comment on this when I finish, if this either has been tested in the courts, and the courts that indicated that quarry material is included, or has not been tested but officials in the department indicate there is ambiguity, then in either of those cases I believe we have a situation where either rights as confirmed by the court or potential rights as indicated by legal opinions are being taken away. And whenever you see legislation, Mr. Speaker, that talks about

MR. BARRY: first of all a retroactive situation where it says, 'Where before 1952, going back twenty-two years.

MR. CALLAN: Thirty-two.

MR. BARRY: Sorry, thirty-two. I am glad we have a mathematician on this side. And whenever you see the words, 'shall be deemed,' Mr. Speaker, you know that there is something tricky afoot. And I would raise very serious questions as to whether this House should engage in retroactive legislation, first of all, which would change the composition of the rights which are contained in grants or leases from the Crown. I do not think there is any great political issue here, but it bothers me that this is done in apparently an innocuous bill with no references by the minister to the fact that we may have a serious principle at stake here. I know that members opposite traditionally have been very much aware of the need to observe the rights of individuals in this Province, they have been aware of the sanctity of contracts into which the Crown might enter, they have been aware of the need to recognize the importance of documents signed by Her Majesty which give certain rights to individuals. And I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can support a legislation that is going to engage in the retroactive expropriation of rights. For example, I would like to ask the minister if it is possible that there have been transfers, contracts entered into by people holding grants or leases from the Crown, is it possible they may have entered into contracts with third parties and received money from third

MR. BARRY:

parties for the sale or the leasing of quarry areas? We may have third parties once removed from the relationship being affected by this legislation. Without belabouring the point, I wonder if the minister might consider deferring the bill to go back and consult with the departmental officials to see whether we are missing something here as to the significance of what is taking place. But on its face it does seem to be something that is going to affect the rights of probably a very great many Newfoundlanders retroactively. I wonder if the minister might check and enquire with the departmental officials before proceeding with the bill as to whether in fact this is the case? I wonder if the minister might consider, if in fact rights are being taken away, whether compensation or at least provisions for arbitration should not be supplied as part of the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, of course, it is a concern to us. The hon. gentleman raises a valid concern. It would not normally be our policy to bring a bill before this legislature which is going to expropriate without compensation. But this has been a problem that has been encountered by the department for some years. And generally, as a matter of policy and as a matter of practice with respect to pretty well all of the instances involved, it has been, I think and I am pretty sure if my memory serves me correct, when this paper was considered in Cabinet, it was indicated that it was pretty well the practice that they would have to pay the normal emoluments for quarry lands. Since 1952 the grants from the Crown have been changed to reflect that, so there is no problem there. Before 1952 there may have been some doubt. Obviously one could not lead in the legislation

MR. MARSHALL: without there
being reason for it.

But we do not deem it to be expropriation without compensation because, by and large, most people have been paying levies and it has generally been accepted as such. And it is what we had thought was an legitimate interpretation of the position prior to 1952 in the pertinent grants. And I realize the position that the hon. gentleman would take to the effect that, well, perhaps that is not something that civil servants, if you like, or politicians or what have you, or the legislative arm for that matter should be sitting in judgment for and it should be legitimately a right that should be tested in the courts and, if they have the right then they were given the right before 1952 and they should be entitled to it.

Normally I think I would agree with him on that premise, but in this particular case it is my understanding that it is merely just to clarify the existing law, by and large, even with respect to the grants prior to 1952, that it had generally been recognized that this was the case. And in any event this is the policy of the government that there should be payments made in every particular instance.

So, you know, that is the situation. I am not aware of any contract with third parties that are going to be effected, but I will certainly make an inquiry about that before the matter goes through Committee and respond accordingly.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act, 1976", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 29).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 20, Bill No. 31.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Shops Closing Act". (Bill No. 31).

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here is putting in an amendment to The Shops Closing Act. As hon. gentlemen are aware, the Pope is coming to Newfoundland this year, and this amendment basically will

MR. DINN:

allow for a municipality in the Province to declare a holiday on the occasion of the visit of His Holiness. And basically the reason for that is that it is very difficult for the government to declare a holiday without declaring it for the whole Province. There are some municipalities that will be participating on specific days during the visit of His Holiness, and this allows for any municipality, in the region or outside the region, if they have a lot of people coming in, or whatever the council itself deems is the will of the people in that municipality, that they will have the right now to declare a special holiday for the visit of the Pope.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we support the bill but we do so after we discussed this today. We thought that the Province should have declared a provincial holiday. We thought that was the proper route to take because, let us be realistic, Mr. Speaker, the visit to this Province by His Holiness the Pope is the event of the century and I believe it should have warranted a provincial holiday. I am hoping that all the municipalities now declare a holiday because obviously the administration there opposite must have had second thoughts about declaring a provincial holiday. I do not know why. Certainly the minister who introduced the bill did not give a very good explanation as to why they did not go for a provincial holiday rather than leave it up to the municipalities. I am hoping that the municipalities all over the Province will declare a holiday in their own areas of jurisdiction. But I believe it would have been appropriate to declare a provincial holiday. I am not going to turn it into a political debate, Mr. Speaker. I do not know why the hon. gentleman had cold feet about it and he should have gone all the way and declared

MR. NEARY: it a provincial holiday. That is what we would have liked to have seen. Now they are going to leave it up to the municipalities, so we will just have to wait and see what happens. It is the event of the century, Mr. Speaker, and no doubt people will want to come from all over Newfoundland. I do not think it makes any difference what religion you are, they look upon His Holiness as a great leader in the world, probably the leading individual in the world when it comes to advocating peace throughout the world, and no doubt people will

MR. NEARY: want to come from all over Newfoundland and Labrador to get a look at His Holiness, if that is possible, if the security is not too severe, too drastic, and they can get within seeing distance. I think they are expecting a couple of hundred thousand people down here at Quidi Vidi for the outdoor mass that they are going to have down there. We are all looking forward very much to the visit of His Holiness. We hope that the weatherman will be good to us and that it will be a tremendous success. But I must say we support the bill. We are a bit disappointed, at least I am, that the administration there opposite did not declare a provincial holiday rather than just leave it up to the municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): If the hon. minister now speaks he will close the debate.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, just to explain to the hon. gentlemen opposite the difficulty we have with, number one, declaring a provincial holiday on this occasion is the fact that some municipalities under the act have the capability of writing in to the minister and being exempt from the Shop Closing Act. So we have 310 municipalities and the last time I checked with the department there were some 35 municipalities that were exempt from the Shop Closing Act and as a result it left it kind of up in the air, the government declaring a holiday and the municipality having certain rights as they exist now. So what we have done here basically, for example, just to give the hon. gentleman an understanding of what is going on here, a municipality like St. John's has the right to declare Regatta Day as a municipal holiday, and they generally declare Regatta Day. Harbour Grace is the same way. Other municipalities have written in and have gotten the authority to declare a day.

MR. DINN: So they have the capability
now, 35 municipalities, of -

MR. NEARY: It is not the same thing.

MR. DINN: - wait now - of declaring a day
and they generally have their day. But since they have
requested to be exempt from the Shop Closing Act, they are
exempt and they do not really have the authority. So if we
declared a holiday, the 35 have already declared their day,
and do not have the capability to declare a holiday in this
event, so we are allowing those 35, along with the other
municipalities who deem it necessary to declare this special
day for the arrival of His Holiness if they feel it appropriate
to do so. So we are kind of on the horns of a dilemma. We are in
the situation where if the provincial government declared a
holiday there are at least 35 municipalities, and
maybe more now, that do not have to comply with that, and it
leaves a discrepancy; Yet these same 35 municipalities
have the capability of declaring one day, and they generally
have that day picked.

So to clear the situation, what we
have done is we have put an amendment to the act which says
that on this special occasion they can declare this day. So
now they have the right to declare one or two or three days,
but on this day they can declare a special day if they so
wish. And, of course, we hope that many of the

MR. DINN:

municipalities will comply with this and declare that day, because I am sure that many of the people in municipalities -

MR. NEARY:

All you are doing is passing the buck.

MR. DINN:

I have just explained to the hon. gentleman now that if we declared a day today, if we as a provincial government declared a day, there would be at least thirty-five municipalities that would not have to go along anyway and it leaves a discrepancy there. Now we are giving them that capability, Mr. Speaker. It is the clearest and cleanest way of doing it and I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Shops Closing Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

(Bill No. 31).

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 7, Bill No. 1.

Motion, second reading of a

bill, "An Act To Amend The District Court Act, 1976."

(Bill No. 1)

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present this bill on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). This is a bill for the establishment of a new judicial post, another District Court Judge for the District Court in Newfoundland. Presently the compliment of the court consists of the Chief Judge and eight others. Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill will enable for it to be the Chief Judge and nine other judges, the appointment of one other judge. As hon. gentlemen can see by Section 2 of the bill, it is intended that this appointment should be a judge who will sit

MR. MARSHALL: with the other presiding District Court Judge in the judicial centre of Corner Brook, within the area served by that particular judicial center. So after the assessment of the case load of the judges that the Department of Justice does from time to time, Mr. Speaker, it was deemed to be necessary to have another judge for the Corner Brook area. This according to my calculations will bring the total number of federally appointed judges in the Province to seventeen, including the Supreme Court Judges. It is a federal appointment. The way in which this operates, Mr. Speaker, under the Constitution is that the Province creates the position, because it is in charge of the administration of Justice, and the federal government then will appoint. Now we may well be in Committee, so I can tell the hon. gentlemen I will be introducing in Committee, Mr. Speaker, a clause, clause no. 3, when we come to Committee, and I would want the hon. gentlemen to note that this bill will come into effect on a date to be proclaimed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and that is a normal provision and particularly necessary in the present circumstances, I would think. So that is the explanation, the purpose of the bill.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, from the explanation given in the introduction of the bill by the hon. gentleman, I do not see too much wrong with it. I presume the work load in the Western part of the Province is the reason that it is necessary to appoint two District Court Judges to reside within the area served by the

MR. NEARY:

judicial centre of Corner Brook rather than have one. As the minister indicated, the Province has to provide the facilities and pass an act in this House creating the vacancy, and then it is up to the Government of Canada, to the federal Minister of Justice to make the appointment. Mr. Speaker, therein lies the mystery. The hon. gentleman said that an amendment will be introduced when we get into Committee of the Whole proposing that the bill take effect at some date down the line to be proclaimed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. gentleman has anybody in mind who may be jockeying for that position, because I can guarantee you this, I can say one thing to the hon. gentleman, that never again will a Liberal Government leave a vacancy when going into an election. It will never leave a vacancy, whether it be in the Senate or whether it be on the bench.

MR. MARSHALL: Aha! Is that not interesting.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is interesting.

MR. TOBIN: Did you get word?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. TOBIN: Did you get word on the Senate?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know it is wishful thinking on the part of gentlemen there opposite. I know it is wishful thinking. They talk about rumourmongering, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman likes to get up and spout off about that great senior citizen's home called the Senate up there in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, here we are not talking about a Senate appointment, we are talking about the appointment of a district court judge.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. gentleman will proceed to have this bill become law, to have it proclaimed immediately, that he will not play politics with it, that he will not just prolong the appointment hoping somehow or other through some kind of a fluke that the government will change and that they will proclaim the legislation after the next federal election, open up an appointment, for instance, for the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). It is not the kind of an appointment that the hon. gentleman would like himself, by the way. The hon. gentleman can see himself on the bench of the Supreme Court.

MR. TULK: Who?

MR. NEARY: The hon. member there opposite. I remember the previous House Leader, his predecessor, Mr. Speaker, jockeyed for years to get on the Bench.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, Judge Hickman was the House Leader here, was he not?

But anyway, he tried for years to manoeuver his way to the bench and then, through a fluke - and it was a pure fluke, Mr. Speaker - he managed to get on the bench.

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow that kind of stuff.

MR. NEARY: Of course, everybody knows that. And it turned out to be a pretty half-decent judge, by the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: I think he is a good judge. We may not have always agreed with his political affiliation.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not unparliamentary. We did not agree with his political association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt at all, there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is looking at this position with a jaundiced eye.

MR. TULK: What position?

MR. NEARY: That District Court judge.

MR. TOBIN: Do you think so?

MR. STAGG: No, no!

MR. NEARY: Yes. There is no doubt about that at all.

MR. STAGG: It has to be the Supreme Court of Canada or nothing.

MR. NEARY: No, no. The Supreme Court of Canada, the hon. gentleman must realize that they are lined up. The Tory lawyers downtown have been lined up for years. So you may as well forget that and you may as well use this as a stepping stone.

MR. MARSHALL: Are you saying there are no Tories on the bench?

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, there is one big Tory on the bench.

MR. TULK: Who? Who?

MR. NEARY: The one I just referred to who got in by a fluke. And there will be no flukes this time. I

MR. NEARY: guarantee you any vacancies around, any vacancies in this Province prior to the next federal general election will be filled.

MR. MORGAN: You can count on that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, you can count on that. You can mark that down in your little book.

MR. PATTERSON: You are going to put 'Leo' in, are you not?

MR. NEARY: So I think that is what the hon. gentleman means.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Speaker, just to put the hon. gentleman's mind at ease, I began a new, young career two years ago when I took over the Leadership of this Party, when nobody else wanted the job, my colleague and I took her over, and a year and a half ago, Mr. Speaker, the fortunes of the Party started on the upswing.

MR. MARSHALL: We saw that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And our problem today, Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot get halls big enough to hold the crowds that come out to our meetings, and the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) should be the first one to realize that. The hon. gentleman should be the first to realize that. Can you imagine 1,200 people turning up at a meeting on the North Shore of Conception Bay to elect delegates to a national leadership convention?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I would like to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that we are discussing "An Act To Amend The District Court Act", and I would ask him to direct his remarks to Bill No. 1.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I was just providing a little background there, Mr. Speaker, who I think the candidates -

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the big crowd you had down on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - may be, Mr. Speaker, for this position. The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) will be right up front, I would say he is probably

MR. NEARY: one of the top three. But there are a couple of other Tory lawyers out on the West Coast.

MR. TULK: What is he talking about? Is he talking about the number of people we had out to a meeting in Burin - Burgeo?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: If you put them all together do you not realize there were 2,000 there?

MR. NEARY: Five meetings, 2,000 people. What else do you want?

MR. TOBIN: On the Burin Peninsula you had 232.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but we had five meetings all over Burin - Burgeo.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
It is very interesting how many people attended certain meetings around the Province, but we are discussing the District Court Act, Bill No. 1.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that my colleague, our spokesman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear myself talking over here.

I regret very much that our spokesman on justice matters is not here today because I believe he wanted to speak on this bill.

MR. BARRY: Are you saying he is going to the Bench?

MR. NEARY: No, no!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) got his name down first. He is looking at this with a jaundiced eye.

But just for the benefit of my colleague who just came in, this bill will open up another position for a district court judge in Corner Brook in the judicial area served from the Corner Brook office.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: We are in debate, but the hon. gentleman is now in the process of carrying on a conversation with his colleague in his own caucus. I mean, let us play the rules of the House properly. If we are going to have debate, let us debate and let us address the Chair, not have a conversation going at the same time he is on his feet.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what I would suggest to the hon. gentleman is that he go down to Bonavista, to that riding, and he call back the provincial public servants who are down there openly campaigning for Morrissey Johnson at public expense, at the expense of the

MR. NEARY: taxpayers of this Province,
recall them or dock their salaries and have them go down
there if they want to get involved in the campaign.

MR. MORGAN: My executive assistant, Sir,
is out there working for me in my district.

MR. NEARY: He is not working for you in
your district, he is down working for Morrissey Johnson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Get your assistant out of there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule
that it is correct that the speaker should be addressing
his remarks to the Chair.

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. NEARY: And so, Mr. Speaker, I was telling my colleague there that while he was out of the House the Government House Leader (Mr.Marshall) introduced a bill to set up another position of District Court judge within the areas served by the judicial center of Corner Brook. And I was just having a few words on this and I invite my colleague who is a lawyer, a solicitor, and a very good one, an outstanding Newfoundland lawyer, counsel, or whatever else you want to call him. Does my colleague have a QC, by the way?

AN HON.MEMBER: No, he does not have one.

MR.NEARY: No, that is right, the last couple of year all the QCs , I think, have gone to Tories, have they?

SOME HON.MEMBERS: (Inaudible) is a QC.

MR.NEARY: No, I will tell you what they do, they throw in the odd Liberal to make it look good.

MR.MARSHALL: Are you saying that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle(Mr.Roberts) is odd?

MR.NEARY: They throw in the odd member, like the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, to try to make it look good, but 95 per cent of the QCs that have been passed out in recent times have gone to Tory lawyers. And I have no doubt but the hon. gentleman will attempt to keep this position open for one of his Tory buddies. The appointment will be made by the federal Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan). The question now is whether Mark will get the opportunity to make that appointment.

MR.TULK: Who?

MR. NEARY: Mark.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Who! Who!

MR. NEARY: - Or will the administration there opposite let this hang over hoping through some fluke that the Tories will form the next government and then they will be able to get one of their buddies appointed. And I would submit that the leading contender at the moment is the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). Now, Mr. Speaker, there will be no problem getting candidates for this job. My colleague is coming now, so now that I have talked long enough, no doubt he will come in and take over and finish the debate.

MR. DINN: And say
say something sensible about this bill.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe he might say something a bit more sensible than I am saying. This job will have no shortage of candidates, because Corner Brook is a beautiful place to live. Western Newfoundland is a beautiful place to live. You know, Mr. Speaker, I have said before in this hon. House and I have said outside of the House that we have two Newfoundlands, we have St. John's and we have the rest of Newfoundland, and that is becoming increasingly evident with every day that passes. The people are grumbling out on the West Coast because they are not getting the due recognition that they think they should be getting and that they deserve. There seems to be some kind of a barrier down here at Donovan's overpass. The administration there opposite think that Newfoundland is inside the overpass, in St. John's, and the Avalon Peninsula.

May 15, 1984

Tape No. 1668

ah-3

MR. NEARY:

I know its a myth, Mr. Speaker, but people think that imaginary barrier is there. Now, Mr. Speaker, there will be no shortage of candidates for this job. They are probably lined up already but

MR. NEARY:

just for the benefit of my colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) when he -

MR. ROBERTS: Who is not a candidate.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman has greater ambitions than that.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! The Senate is one. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is pushing for me.

MR. NEARY: No, the President of the Council, I think, has his eye on the bench.

MR. DINN: That is not nice.

MR. ROBERTS: He has his eye on anything he wants.

MR. NEARY: He is not interested in this job.

And before you came in I was telling him that if we have our way there will be no vacancies. But the hon. gentleman told us when he introduced the bill that there is going to be an amendment to the bill when we get into Committee of the Whole, that it will not become law now, it will be proclaimed somewhere down the road.

MR. ROBERTS: Those fellows are just using Justice for partisan consideration.

MR. NEARY: They are using Justice, that is right, for partisan consideration.

MR. DINN: That is hard to believe though.

MR. NEARY: No, that is not hard to believe.

The hon. gentleman said because of the existing difficulties, and I presume that he means he is expecting a federal general election.

MR. ROBERTS: And therein difficulties.

MR. NEARY: And therein lies the hon. gentleman's problem. And if I were the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) I would not put that job in the oven for Sunday dinner yet, Mr. Speaker, or any other hon. gentleman over there who may have his eye on this position.

MR. TULK: No, I would try to get in the Cabinet if I were you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I were some of the hon. gentlemen out in Corner Brook who are getting the government work, the water reversion case, the gentleman in Labrador getting his \$1500 a day -

MR. ROBERTS: Who?

MR. NEARY: \$1500 a day I am told the lawyer got on the water reversion case, a lawyer in Labrador City, and they have not denied it, by the way.

MR. ROBERTS: That is more than the Feds pay.

MR. NEARY: I mean, we have the money, why should we not pay it.

Mr. Speaker, we are glad that Corner Brook is getting another judge. We think they deserve it. The hon. gentleman when he introduced a bill did not indicate how heavy the workload was in that area but we assume, if they are going ahead with opening up another position, that the workload must be quite heavy in that area. So I will take my seat now, Mr. Speaker, and I will yield to my learned friends, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). I am sure that they will be able to add to what I have already said, being very learned gentlemen and officers of the court and legal counsel and lawyers.

MR. TOBIN: They will not add to what you said.

MR. NEARY: Oh they might. They might add a few pearls of wisdom to what I have already said. But it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman does not have the courage to make this the law, when the Governor

MR. NEARY: comes into the House to have this bill signed into law. He wants to play little games with it. He wants to use the Justice Department to play little political games. Mr. Speaker, I think that is shameful.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, now that my friend and colleague, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the Leader of the Opposition, who has gone before like John the Baptist I would say to him, going before to herald things which may or may not come after him - and I would say to gentlemen opposite that my friend from LaPoile is the best informed layman in this Province with respect to legal matters, bar none. If you were, for example, to compare his knowledge of the law to

MR. ROBERTS: the hon. the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) knowledge of finance, it is like comparing a mountain not to a mole hill but to a negative mole hill. My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is immensely knowledgeable in the ways of the law and of lawyers. The bill itself is -

DR. COLLINS: You know, beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, beauty is in the eye of the beholder and nobody but the Minister of Finance could think that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is beautiful. But the Minister of Finance does and, Sir, that also shows as well that beauty is only skin deep.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from St. John's South has any other lines he wants to feed me, I have half an hour. That is l-i-n-e-s. The gentleman for St. John's South ought to never be confused with an l-i-o-n, that type of lion, but if he has any other lines he wants to feed me, his surrogate, the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is absent, no doubt planting savoury, and the Gas House Gang in the back are taking the day off. It is nice to see them back. It is always pleasant to see them.

DR. COLLINS: I might demolish you a little later on.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman might demolish me a little later on? He has been saying that now for seven or eight years in the House, and hope springs eternal. That is the same as hoping that the tides will go the other way, that the ice will melt tonight. It may. It may. But all experience, all knowledge, all learning -

MR. NEARY: And pigs may fly.

MR. ROBERTS: 'And pigs may fly,' my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us come back, if we might, briefly to the bill. It is very straightforward, it simply adds another judge to the District Court. That will make it nine - ten?.

MR. NEARY: Nine.

MR. ROBERTS: A second one for Corner Brook, there are seven, and three in St. John's. Yes, ten, the Chief Judge and nine others. So this will add the tenth judge to the District Court of Newfoundland. That is a good thing and so we support it. The judge will be stationed in Corner Brook, and, I venture to suggest, that is a very good idea, because I am told that the judge sitting at Corner Brook, Judge Soper, who has been there for I guess twenty years now and is the senior sitting District Court judge in Newfoundland, a very learned and very knowledgeable judge, those of us who have appeared before him have found that out whether he has ruled in our favour or whether he has ruled against us, but he has a very busy docket, a very busy workload and I am pleased that the government have responded to that need by introducing this bill to create the extra seat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I gather from my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that there is to be an amendment to the bill in Committee to make it subject to proclamation, and that is up to the government if they choose to do that. I have no doubt with their overwhelming and overweening majority in the House they will carry the day on it. I say to that, though, quite simply this, that if there is a need for a judge, and the government tell us there is and I accept that, if there is a need for a judge the need is presumably there now or else why are we being asked to adopt the bill? If the need is there now, why are we being asked to approve a procedure which will leave the creation of this court seat in the hands of the Cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council?

MR. ROBERTS: The appointment itself,
of course, rests, under the terms of the Constitution Act,
with the government at Ottawa, the Government of Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, am I being overly suspicious to think that hon. gentlemen opposite who have pinned all of their hopes, all of Newfoundland and Labrador's hopes on a change of administration in Ottawa —

MR. MORGAN: They are going to change the Prime Minister.

MR. ROBERTS: I say to my friend for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) there will be a change of Prime Minister. Canada will have at least two Prime Ministers before this year is over. There are a number of us who are prepared to wager a modest amount that Canada will not have three Prime Ministers this year.

MR. TOBIN: Why?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. TOBIN: Why cannot they have three?

MR. ROBERTS: They could have three but, I say to my friend for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), I will wager there will not be three, there will only be two, the Right Honourable Pierre Trudeau who presently holds the office and one of the six gentlemen currently seeking the Liberal Prime Ministership. I have my own opinion who it should be.

MR. TOBIN: How much would you wager?

MR. ROBERTS: How much would I wager? I will wager what the hon. gentleman earns in a day which is more than he is worth, but I will wager whatever he earns in a day — \$5?

MR. TOBIN: Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: He is on. He is on!

MR. TOBIN: Whatever I earn in a day?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Not what the hon. gentleman is worth in a day, because that is very small. What he earns in a day by the sweat of his brow, I will wager that amount.

MR. TOBIN: You are not just talking about what is earned here, though.

MR. ROBERTS: I have no idea what other sources of income the hon. gentleman has, I could not care less what he earns in a day.

DR. COLLINS: Is that his fee today?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

DR. COLLINS: Is that his fee today?

MR. ROBERTS: Presumably what he earns in a day is what he earns in any day, unless the minister is referring to this asinine system of paying MHAs in large gobbets which only has the effect of giving those of us who were re-elected in general elections, the minister and myself among others, you know, twice a year's salary for one year's work. And the hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, has heard from many of his friends and colleagues about that as have I. It is a scandal and it is a shame and it is a blot upon the escutcheon and it should be ended.

I have no idea what my friend for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) earns in a day. I know what he is worth, but that is another story.

MR. TOBIN: What about you?

MR. ROBERTS: I know what he is worth.

MR. ANDREWS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from - where is he from?

MR. NEARY: Conne River.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, not Conne River. They have thrown him out of Conne River, Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir - the gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), as always, is indulging in flights of fancy.

MR. TOBIN: You lost a wager before and you will lose again this time.

MR. ROBERTS: I have been known to lose wagers from time to time and I pay my markers. I say to the hon. gentleman opposite when he loses I hope he too will pay his markers. I have lost wagers to many and I have collected them from many. I say to my hon. friend -

MR. TOBIN: The last one you lost, I enjoyed it.

MR. ROBERTS: - from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) that if he is not prepared to honour his markers he ought not to be in the business of wagering.

MR. TOBIN: Well, I do not lose.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, fine. I will ask him to have his money ready. New Year's Eve or New Year's Day I shall expect delivery from him of whatever form of species -

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) -

MR. ROBERTS: You have what?

MR. TOBIN: - and then I will pay the bill afterwards.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I enjoy breaking bread with the hon. gentleman nearly as much as I enjoy breaking heads with him.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us come back to the point of this. The government are going to amend this bill to provide that the judge cannot be appointed until they, the government, take some further step. He or she may not be appointed even then because, of course, once the Province creates the position on the court it is up to the Cabinet of Canada, on the recommendation of the Justice Minister of Canada (Mr. MacGuigan), to appoint the man or the woman, a member of the Bar, ten years standing, to be the judge of the District Court stationed, in this case the second judge stationed at Corner Brook. Now, all I say simply is I find this immensely hypocritical of the government to come before the House and say, 'We need another judge in Corner Brook. Let us create the position and ask the House to authorize this,' and turn around and say, 'but we do not need him today or we do not need her today,' as the case may be, 'we are going to make this subject to proclamation.' The same thing is happening in Saskatchewan, where there a Tory Attorney General - I forget the gentleman's name - has decided to reduce the size of the bench. And everytime a judgeship falls vacant, a Section 95 judge, the bench is reduced by that amount.

MR. BARRY: Where is that?

MR. ROBERTS: In Saskatchewan.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Penner?

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, he is in Manitoba. He is an NDP fellow. But the fellow in Saskatchewan, one of Mr. Devine's colleagues, is reducing the bench each time. Why? Because the Minister of Justice in Ottawa, according to the Justice Minister in Saskatchewan, will not agree to make appointments that are satisfactory to the Justice Minister of Saskatchewan. The Constitution says that the appointment of judges is the prerogative of the Cabinet of Canada, the Governor General in Council, Madam Sauve, sitting in Council.

MR. ROBERTS: Obviously, the Cabinet here are of the view that they may be able to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBERTS: Now if my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) and my friend from St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond) would just calm themselves and control themselves a little I can carry on. Obviously the only inference to be drawn on this is that the Cabinet here feel that Canada will have a third Prime Minister this year and that they may then be able to appoint one of their political friends as the judge in Corner Brook. Now, that is all that this amendment is about. I do not find that particularly revolting. I do find it immensely hypocritical and I also find it to be a waste of time because, of course, the Gallup poll - do you know the most recent federal Tory poll shows that the parties provincially, and this is a poll done by the federal Tory Party - hon. gentlemen opposite may judge for themselves where I got the information, but I tell them that it is valid - shows that my friend from LaPoile, as Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), on a voter preference is marginally ahead of the Premier.

MR. TOBIN: Oh, yes!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is quite true. The Tory Party of Canada has paid good money for that poll and that is what it told them. It also says that in an election today the people of Newfoundland and Labrador would vote out the hon. gentlemen opposite and would vote in the Liberals, led by my hon. friend or by anybody else. Now, if the hon. gentlemen want to put that to the test I invite them to try it. All it takes is for the Premier to call upon His Honour the Administrator and advise His Honour to issue a writ, and His Honour will do it, I have no doubt. It is a matter that would require -

DR. COLLINS: After a statement like that you should never complain about my projections.

May 15, 1984

Tape NO. 1672

SD - 3

MR. ROBERTS:

No, the difference between my statement and the hon. gentleman's projections is my statement is honest and I know it to be honest. I will say the minister's projections are not honest. I do not know whether he knows them to be dishonest or not, but he cooks the books frequently

MR. ROBERTS:

and usually very unsuccessfully. But I will say again that the latest federal poll done by the federal Tory Party shows that in an election in Newfoundland today the Peckford administration would lose. There is a message in that, you know. Maybe that explains some of the -

MR. MORGAN:

When was that poll done by the Tory Party?

MR. ROBERTS:

It also shows that my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), if he ran in Bonavista - Trinity-Conception, the odds would be to win. Neither Morrissey Johnson nor Walter Carter will win this seat, but it was a test. I mean, my friend from Bonavista South may have seen polls done from time to time, I assume he has, and his name was put down and like Abou Ben Adhem, it led all the rest. And I say now if the Tory Party had been able to entice the gentleman from Bonavista South to run -

MR. BARRY:

St. John's South and St. John's East.

MR. ROBERTS:

It also shows, interestingly enough, that Jim McGrath is well ahead of John Crosbie in voter popularity in the Province. It is most interesting and most significant. It shows people are a lot smarter than gentlemen opposite think. But it shows that my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), if he were to have let his name stand, or maybe he will even yet let his name stand as the Tory candidate in Bonavista - Trinity-Conception, he would stand the strongest chance of being elected and, in fact, would stand a reasonably good shot at being elected.

We all know what is happening across Canada. The Gallup Poll may have been a blip or it may not, we will find out in a couple of weeks, but the Southam Poll, the most interesting, the private Tory polls are showing the same thing and so are the private Liberal polls.

MR. ROBERTS: So I am not particularly concerned with hon. gentlemen's childish little games over a judge. I regret that the people in Corner Brook who look to the court for justice, will not get speedy justice because the hon. gentlemen opposite are playing games, hoping against hope and against reason that there will be an election which puts them in office - there will be an election - but hoping against hope it puts them in office and that therefore they will be able to appoint one of their political buddies to this position, because of this they are going to deny people justice. I have no doubt that there will be people who will be denied speedy justice because of this decision by the Peckford administration, inspired in this as in so much else by the learned and hon. gentleman from St. John's East, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the Svengali to the Premier's Trilby, the genius behind it all, the mephistopheles to the Faust, as it were.

MR. BARRY: He is not getting fousty, I hope.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I say to my friend from Mount Scio that that is F-a-u-s-t not f-o-u-s-t, although they may be f-o-u-s-t on the other side as well, but the wind is not the right way to enable us to tell that today.

Your Honour, let me say that the real

MR. ROBERTS:

tragedy, of course, revealed by this bill is that this is part and parcel of the whole approach of this administration. They have gambled and lost on every throw of the dice. They have neglected sound advice -

MR. BARRY:

And ignored other.

MR. ROBERTS:

- ignored other advice and gone on in a mad career and they have lost every single throw of the dice and now they are reduced to putting everything on the throw of the dice of the next federal general election in Canada. And, of course, we also saw another throw of the dice last - When was the Tory meeting, last June, was it, in Ottawa? - when we all saw the Premier make a display of himself and endeared himself to the powers that be on all sides in Ottawa, on all sides and factions within the P.C. Party.

DR. COLLINS:

Did he win an election after that?

MR. ROBERTS:

No, he did not win an election after that in Ottawa. There has not been one, unfortunately. The Premier lost the election in Ottawa.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point is, the whole policy of this administration now is reduced to the desperate gamble - the whole future of Newfoundland and Labrador insofar as hon. gentlemen and ladies over there can effect it, is reduced to the gamble of winning the next federal election.

MR. NEARY:

Right.

MR. ROBERTS:

And that, it turns out, may very well be far from a sure thing.

DR. COLLINS:

It could be that that is your interpretation.

MR. ROBERTS:

That is my interpretation because that is what the facts say. These hon. gentlemen have

MR. ROBERTS: nothing else in their quiver, they have no other bows to fit to their arrow. Even the hon. gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) is reduced to that, fed bashing to its ultimate extreme.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, of course, in a way you almost wish that we would get a P.C. government in Canada. If it would not be such a disaster for all of the country, including this Province you would wish it because then we would see - the last time we had a P.C. government in Ottawa, we were not six months into the administration when the ministry opposite were calling one of the Newfoundland members, being a member of the Cabinet in Ottawa at the time, a traitor.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: A nice note to inject into public dialogue, you disagree with somebody and he becomes a traitor. And then we all know, of course, of the immense tactical help which the Premier gave to Mr. Joe Clark, at that time the Prime Minister and the Leader of the P.C. Party of Canada, the immense help he gave him in the election campaign. You know, if the Premier had set out to return Pierre Trudeau to office and to try to elect five Liberal MPs in Newfoundland, he could not have been much more helpful. If we had written the script for him, it could not have been much more helpful. So that shows how they get along.

DR. COLLINS: You have to admit, though, that you were a member of a very naive administration, politically, because the Smallwood administration was famous for its naivety

MR. ROBERTS: My hon. friend from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) says that Mr. Smallwood was politically naive. I will leave that to Mr. Smallwood, and the hon. gentleman from St. John's South may think whatever he wishes; in fact, subject to the rules of the House, he may say whatever he wishes. The fact that he spouts nonsense, utter nonsense for 96.32 per cent of the time by actual count, has nothing to do with it.

Now, the hon. gentleman may go on whatever clinical evidence he wants, he has obviously spent too much time closely examining the clinical evidence of salmonella infections.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us come back to the bill, which after all, is what is before the House.

MR. ROBERTS: The bill itself is completely acceptable, obviously, and I hope all members of the House will vote for it. The amendment is simply but another reflection of the political hypocrisy, the willingness to pervert even the administration of justice to the gross partisan ends. And that is just another example of the paranoid neo-separatism which is what colours and motivates hon. gentlemen opposite. It is paranoid neo-separatism. Paranoid neo-separatism is the doctrine and they themselves are paranoid neo-separatists. And this amendment of which they speak is but another example of that inaction. It is too bad that they cannot restrain themselves from perverting even the administration of justice to such base ends.

Mr. Speaker, with these few brief, conciliatory, lucid and altogether to-the-point remarks I shall gladly resume my seat and hear what other hon. gentlemen have to say on this piece of legislation.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will respond too much to what the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) said because he was not really saying anything seriously. I will respond to what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said about the indication that we are going to put a clause in this to the effect that it will come into effect when it is proclaimed by saying that if they want to examine other bills that have been

MR. MARSHALL: made from time to time, they will find that this is a provision that normally goes in these bills. And because it requires the coincidental co-operation of the federal government and the provincial government with respect on the one hand to the appointment and on the other hand with the creation of the post, it is normal to put this in so that we can synchronize both of them. Now, I will not comment on what the hon. gentleman says about the fortunes of the Liberal party. All I will just say is that I cannot wait for the next election to occur, because I know that we are going to see less Liberals in the House than we do now because the people of Newfoundland, I think, are going to wreck their vengeance on the hon. gentlemen there opposite for the way in which they have not supported this Province in very basic issues. The hon. gentleman can quote all the polls and everything he likes, but there are polls and there are polls and just because he gets up and says something does not mean the situation is so. We will take the hon. gentleman on in a moment, take the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and all the hon. gentlemen. Give us three weeks and they would be wiped out. And there they get up and they brag about that. The last election we saw in this House was the by-election and what happened? The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), who spoke today for the first time in the contemporary history of this Province since Confederation, that district is now represented by a Conservative member in the House.

MR. DINN:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So that is where it speaks. And, as you can see, the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is in a shaky position, he won by the skin of his teeth the last time, I think a little over 100 votes. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), in a Liberal district down in Fogo, won, Mr. Speaker, by the skin of his teeth and we see by a report in the Lewisport Pilot today that he is even afraid to go to his district. It says, 'The people in Deep Bay are disgusted with their MP and their MHA.' And, of course, the hon. gentlemen opposite may not know that Deep Bay is in Fogo district. And get this, Mr. Speaker, the quote is here and they are quoting people in Deep Bay, 'Mr. Baker and Mr. Tulk were both invited to attend the grand opening of our new community hall on April 2nd. This caused them a great deal of concern but neither one of them came. Mr. Baker did not even reply.' Get this now, Mr. Speaker, 'But, Mr. Tulk, the member for Fogo, did reply stating he was unable to attend for fear of being caught on the Island.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is afraid of being caught in his district. And those are the gentlemen on the other side of the House who are contending that they are going to take the Tory Party.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now what consummate knowledge.

It has nothing to do with this bill, by the way. As I say, it is normal and usual to lead in an amendment of this nature. I noticed the difference in the faith of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). The member for LaPoile gets up and says, Look, if you proclaim that they will be appointed right way, because the Liberals never again are going to leave another vacancy for the Tories to appoint, which seems that he obviously knows school is out and they are going to lose the election, and it was the member for the Strait of Belle Isle who tried to come in with some brave words.

So as I say, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing sinister, no ulterior motive in this bill. What is normal and usual is that you put in this provision because it requires the concerted act of the federal and provincial governments to make sure that the facilities are there before the appointment is made and what have you. And that is the whole purpose for it. And if the hon. gentleman wish to look at it, they will see the same provision in all of the bills that have been introduced, and there have been a number of them introduced over the past five years for the creation of new judges, new judicial positions, as they are required.

MR. DINN:

Would the minister permit a question?

MR. MARSHALL:

Certainly I will permit a question.

MR. DINN:

Is there anything in the bill that provides for a new set of knee pads for the hon. Leader of the Opposition for going back and forth to Ottawa?

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, I do not know. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition realizes that school is out. Because I caught a quote he said, he referred to

MR. MARSHALL: the Senate the great senior citizens home. So I gather he has got the message now, he is not going to be appointed. Because he is insulting the institution now, and when he starts to turn that way I guess school is out. Mr. Rompkey has it, or Mr. Roberts has it, or somebody has it, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is going to be left out. They are deluding the hon. member now by giving him the impression that he could beat the Premier, you see. So this is the great con job, Mr. Speaker, The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) gets up and tells the Leader of the Opposition that he can beat the Premier so that -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. MARSHALL: - he will stay here, and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle can scam up and get the senate seat. That really is what it is all about.

So, Mr. Speaker, having demolished the Opposition, I hope, I move second reading of this bill.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The District Court Act, 1976", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 1).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 3, Bill No. 6.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Transportation Act." (Bill No. 6).

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, most of the bills led in by this administration are extremely weighty, but this is one that I would style as really being housekeeping, because all it does really, as the act presently exists, it provides for the appointment of Assistant Deputy Ministers of Technical Services and Administrative Services. And all this bill does now is provide that you can appoint two particular assistant deputy ministers, and it

MR. MARSHALL: provides that such assistant deputy ministers as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order approve.

There is no intention to appoint any further posts but it is just to allow the designation of that deputy minister and his duties to be such, really, as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council decides.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is something new again we are seeing here. New ground is being broken. Now, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) who is not in his seat today is asking, through the hon. gentleman, if we pass this bill, for the authority to appoint as many assistant deputy ministers as they like. No limit. The sky is the limit. Now they have to come back to the House, before this bill was brought in. At present Section (4) of the Department of Transportation Act provides for an Assistant Deputy Minister of Technical Services, and an Assistant Deputy Minister of Administrative Services. This amendment would repeal the reference to two particular assistant deputy ministers and replace it with a reference to such assistant deputy ministers as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may in order approve.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is putting too much authority in the hands of the hon. gentleman. It is another example of how the administration there opposite is chipping away at the authority of this House, removing the authority from this House down on the eighth floor of Confederation Building, down in the Cabinet Room, around the round table in the Cabinet Room. They are getting closer to a full dictatorship all the time, Mr. Speaker. Every bill, every piece of legislation practically that they bring into

MR. NEARY: this House, every money bill, is designed to remove the decision making authority from this House to the Cabinet Room. And it is not right and we are going to keep bringing it up. We are going to keep objecting to this kind of legislation. We are going to keep fighting it until the message gets through to the people out there in various parts of the Province, of what this administration is up to.

I suppose the hon. gentlemen there opposite could argue that they need as many assistant deputy ministers as they can get with the conditions of the roads in this Province. I went down this past weekend, Mr. Speaker, to the community of Terra Nova and I met with a number of residents in that tiny community of Terra Nova that started out as a logging town. A.N.D. Company was responsible for the community of Terra Nova. It was a logging town. It now has probably 12 or 14 or 15 homes. There are a lot of people who have Summer cottages down there, but the point I want to make about the roads, Mr. Speaker, is this, that the part of the highway going down to the community of Terra Nova that falls under the jurisdiction of the National Park, that comes under federal jurisdiction, is in excellent condition. But once you go beyond the boundary of the National Park and you get on the provincial part of that road leading into that community, it is a disgrace, an utter and complete disgrace. And the

MR. NEARY:

people said to me, 'When you go back will you remind the member, the new Tory member, that when he was running down here in the by-election that he told us that this road was going to be paved, even if he had to take the money out of his own pocket to do it?'

MR. MARSHALL:

When was this?

MR. NEARY:

When was this? In the by-election in the community of Terra Nova, the town of Terra Nova. And so they asked me if, at the earliest opportunity in this House, I would ask the hon. member (Mr. Greening) if he is now going to take the money out of his own pocket to pave that road. I forget now the number of miles, I believe it is twelve or fourteen miles of road or something. The hon. gentleman might be able to find a bit of loose change. They were hauling the cars out of the mud down there last Winter.

So, Mr. Speaker, maybe they need all the assistant deputy ministers that they can get to try to get the potholes filled up around this Province, to get the roads fixed up around this Province. The \$6.3 million the hon. gentleman brought in the other day certainly will not go very far in repairing and reconstructing and paving roads in this Province. They promised the people down in Grand Bay West in 1975 -when I first ran in the LaPoile district and defeated the Tory incumbent, one of the promises they made in that election campaign was that they would reconstruct and pave the road to Grand Bay West. That was a solemn promise that they made to the people in the Port aux Basques area. They do not even grade the road now let alone pave it. It is a disgrace, an utter disgrace.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to this kind of legislation. We are not at all happy with it. We think it is whittling away at the authority of this House, taking away the authority from this House and putting it down

MR. NEARY: in the Cabinet room, around that round table down there where hon. gentlemen go into their caucus meetings and sit around like sheep. They are so glad to get inside the Cabinet room to take a look at the big mahogany round table down there, that we bought and put in there, and sit in the nice comfortable chairs, they are so glad to get in there that they can visualize themselves one day sitting there as a Cabinet Minister. They are so glad to see the inside of the Cabinet Chamber that they sit there like sheep and run along behind their leader and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) like little lambs, lambs being led to the slaughter, Mr. Speaker.

I am hoping that my colleagues will participate in the debate on this bill. Tomorrow is Private Members' Day, Mr. Speaker, so we will not see any more legislation probably until Thursday. But I would say that is a good thing because it will give us an opportunity to recoup and to gather our thoughts so that we can fight against this kind of legislation. This is the kind of stuff the hon. gentleman there opposite used to tell us that he was opposed to. Now he sits over there, Mr. Speaker, and tries day in and day out

MR. NEARY: to muster up enough arguments as a rebuttal, our condemnation of this kind of legislation. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) could not care less, because the minister is going to retire, and the minister is not in any hurry to answer the people down in East Meadows who want to become a part of the City of St. John's, and the minister is not in any hurry to tell us what will happen to the Metro Board once they become part of the City of St. John's. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I am going to be here on Thursday or not, I have to go to the Burin Peninsula on Thursday where I have been invited -

AN HON. MEMBER: Invited to a meeting being held in a telephone booth.

MR. NEARY: Yes, there will be a meeting in a telephone booth - to be the guest speaker at a graduation, a high school graduation, -

MR. TOBIN: Oh!

MR. NEARY: - in the district of Burin-Placentia West, Mr. Speaker. And I am glad and honoured to be invited, because the students got together and they voted amongst themselves -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker, the students themselves got together and they voted for the man, the individual that they wanted to come and address their graduation, and I am honoured to say that I am the one that they picked. I may have to leave early on Thursday, so I may not be in the House, but my colleagues will be here to carry on. So just in case something happens, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It is noted that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has adjourned the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

May 15, 1984

Tape 1679

PK - 2

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

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

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

May 15, 1984

*Tabled by Hon
Minister of Finance,
15 May '84*

MAR 29 1984

Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) - to ask the Honourable the President of the Treasury Board to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) the number of individuals hired in the past four years on a contractual basis;
- (b) how many of these individuals are still employed on a contractual basis;
- (c) how many are now permanent employees;
- (d) what Department of Government are these people presently employed?

Answer (1) Treasury Board is not involved in the recruitment of individuals hired by departments of Government on a contractual basis; individual departments carry out such recruitment processes with or without the assistance of the Public Service Commission. The role of Treasury Board is confined to confirming or otherwise the hiring after recruitment, and in this regard does not maintain statistics on those employees.



*Tabled by Hon.
Minister of Finance
15 May, 1984*

Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) - to ask the Honourable the President of the Treasury Board to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

A list of consultants paid for services in the fiscal year 1983-84 and the Departments to which they were contracted.

Answer (1)

The recruitment of consultants is the responsibility of individual government departments; Treasury Board is called upon from time to time to approve such appointments but does not maintain statistics in this regard, whereas no doubt such information is available from the individual departments concerned.

APR 9 1984

ANSWER TO QUESTION # 10

Appearing on Order Paper # 7 of 1984. Asked by
the Honourable the Member of Bellevue, Mr. Callan

QUESTION: Any correspondence, telegrams, reports
and all other documents received from
the Port Atlantis Company concerning
possible oil related development for
the Port of Bay Roberts.

BAY ROBERTS/SPANIARDS BAY
PROPOSED SITE FOR SUPPLY AND SERVICE BASE
DEVELOPED BY PORT ATLANTIS LIMITED

A potential site for the establishment of a Supply/Service Base at Bay Roberts for support of offshore oil and gas activity was originally identified by the Government in October, 1980. A Development Areas (Lands) Act freeze was placed on the site on October 17 of that year, the primary purpose of which was to control speculative dealings in land in anticipation of oil related development. Then in December, 1980, a process of review on some thirty-two (32) sites identified for various onshore petroleum related developments was commenced by the Department of Development which resulted in the designation of specific locations in the Province which were suitable for Development. These sites, one of which was Bay Roberts, were identified after an analysis of prescribed site specific, locational, physical, environmental and socio-economic factors.

Proposals were then invited on March 1, 1981, for development at any of the sites which were identified. Port Atlantis Limited submitted a proposal for Government consideration and on July 20, 1981, a conditional clearance was issued for a two year period for the establishment of a small scale supply base, with necessary land requirements to be negotiated between the developer and the Department of Development. The clearance required that during the two year term, the Company complete an environmental assessment of the project, secure a firm user contract and submit an acceptable development plan.

Port Atlantis Limited was incorporated in St. John's in 1980 for the purpose of establishing, managing and operating a supply service base for the offshore oil industry in Newfoundland. It is owned 51% by SSF Holding Limited of St. John's and 49% by FENCO (Newfoundland) Limited an affiliate of Lavalin Limited of Montreal.

Their proposal was for the construction of a supply/service base located on the Northside of Bay Roberts, with a large industrial park being integrated with the supply base operation. The proposal included a major harbour development, consisting of a breakwater, a cargo wharf with approximately 500 feet of docking face, a supply boat wharf with a docking face of 1,000 feet, as well as a substantial amount of dredging and land reclamation. The developer proposed to locate transit sheds, a ro-ro ramp and mud and cement soils on the reclaimed land.

In the industrial park area, the developer proposed to locate tubular storage areas, open storage areas for other materials, an area for metal fabrication and repair shops, a heliport, a hotel-motel area as well as areas dedicated to office and commercial buildings.

The overall proposal by this developer envisaged a large, integrated operation with diverse capabilities that could eventually provide a total range of supply, service and maintenance to offshore operations. As an interim measure, the developer, under a private arrangement proposed to expand and improve the existing Avalon Coal and Salt Company wharf on the Southside of Bay Roberts so that it could be immediately used as a supply base.

Port Atlantis registered its overall proposal for the development at Bay Roberts with the Department of Environment in early 1981, however, the environmental assessment did not progress beyond the drafting of a terms of reference for the work.

Permission was granted by the Minister of Development for the Company to complete a number of property acquisitions which allowed Port Atlantis to assemble up to 100 acres of the open storage lands. Land acquisition continued until October, 1982 by which time the Company had secured about 70-75 acres adjacent to Bear's Cove.

In June of 1983, the Company was advised that the two year conditional clearance granted in July, 1981 was soon to expire and before an extension to the clearance would be issued, Port Atlantis would have to submit a detailed summary of the activities and efforts in meeting the requirements of the clearance. Since that time, we have been advised that the Company has the project on hold, however, Port Atlantis are still serious and want to make the project work. Contact is being maintained with prospective clients, the oil companies. A formal extension to the 1981 clearance has not been granted, however, since no interest has been expressed in the Bay Roberts site by any other companies, Port Atlantis are still considered to be operating within the 1981 clearance.

The Department is currently re-assessing the policy dealing with onshore petroleum related development sites. A decision on the future status of the Port Atlantis proposal will be made following the policy review.

Answer to Question #51

Appearing on Order Paper #26 of April 30, 1984

Asked by the Honourable the Member for Bellevue, Mr. Callan

QUESTION: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Regarding companies which received funding during 1982-83 from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and whose assets were sold by public auction or some other means to recover part of the funding of such companies, please list:

- a) jobs created and then lost due to failure of the industry; and
- b) revenue received by the Corporation as a result of the companies' assets through public auction or other means.

ANSWER: (Attached)

ANSWER:

SUMMARY OF NLDC
ACTIVITY FOR 1982-83

- . Approved Funding to 10 Enterprises for a commitment of \$1,374,000

- . Estimated employment impact as result of these projects: 174
full-time and 4 part-time jobs

- . Write-offs for the period 1982-83 totalled \$177,300

- . Write-offs resulting in a loss ratio of .8% of loans and equity investment
outstanding

LOANS AND EQUITY APPROVED

1982-83

<u>FIRM</u>	<u>TYPE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF LOAN</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF EQUITY</u>
Glenwood Forest Products Limited	Sawmill	Glenwood	-	\$125,000
Labrador Shipping Company Limited	Coastal Shipping	Goose Bay, Labrador	\$420,000	
Leamington Meats Limited	Meat Processing	Point Leamington, Notre Dame Bay	\$ 73,000	
Newfont Limited	Paper Core Mfg.	Stephenville	\$ 50,000	
Ocean Harvesters Ltd.	Fish Processing	Port de Grave	\$389,000	
P.A. Enterprises Ltd.	Blueberry Processing	Centreville, Bonavista Bay	\$113,000	
G. Pelley Limited	Galvanized Products Mfg.	Springdale	\$ 69,000	
Pioneer Enterprises Limited	Fish Processing	Donovans	\$ 20,000	
Skipper Jim's Specialty Seafoods Ltd.	Fish Processing	Bay Bulls	\$ 40,000	
Terra Nova Power and Development Limited	Peat Moss Processing	St. John's	-	\$ 75,000
		TOTAL	<u>\$1,174,000</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED
SUMMARY OF RECOVERIES FROM DISPOSAL OF SECURITY ON WRITE OFFS
FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 1982 TO MARCH 31, 1983

<u>BORROWER</u>	<u>BUSINESS LOCATION</u>	<u>TYPE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>DATE OF ORIGINAL LOAN</u>	<u>AMOUNT ORIGINAL LOAN</u>	<u>EQUITY</u>	<u>JOBS CREATED *</u>	<u>JOBS REMAINING AFTER SALE OF ASSETS</u>	<u>JOBS LOST</u>	<u>WRITE OFF</u>
Wfld. Paper Converting Co. Ltd.	St. John's	toilet paper mfg.	Sept./78	-	\$42,000	11 (f)	11 (f)	Ø	\$42,000.00
A. Northcott Limited	Lewisporte	secondary fish processing	Jan./76	-	\$30,000	4 (f) 5 (p)	-	4 (f) 5 (p)	\$30,000.00
Vinland Export Co. Ltd.	Goose Bay	Christmas Tree export	Aug./75	-	\$ 5,300	6 (p)	-	6 (p)	\$ 5,300.00
Goose Bay Timber Co. (1)	Goose Bay	sawmill	Sept./78	\$300,000	-	37 (f)	N/A	N/A	\$100,000.00
									\$177,300.00

(1) Unsold to date

* (f) denotes full-time jobs

(p) denotes part-time jobs