

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as all members of the hon. House are aware, the strike at the Waterford has now entered its ninth week. The recent discussions between the Waterford Hospital workers, as represented by NAPE, and Treasury Board during the first week in April have ended without success. These discussions were facilitated by the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations who had made an all-out attempt in settling the dispute at the hospital. I am disappointed today in bringing the House up to date to indicate that these talks did break off and there appears once again to be a stalemate between the two opposing sides.

It may be useful, Sir, if I outlined to the hon. House some of the history of the strike at the Waterford Hospital in order to bring the House up to date after our Easter break. On January 21, 1977 government offered revised pension benefits to certain categories of employees in patient care who were employed at the Waterford Hospital prior to January 1, 1960 and who had been employed there continuously since that date. This initial proposal provided for optional retirement when an employee's age plus service equalled eighty. And the accrual rate for service prior to 1967 was changed from one and three-quarter per cent to two per cent per annum. There were sixty-nine employees who would have been able to avail of those benefits, twenty-four of these immediately. The union rejected this proposal. They were all the union people - all in that unit, no management people.

Mr. Doody.

On March 9, government in an attempt to reach a settlement on the pension issue revised the offer to cover employees in the relevant patient care positions who were on staff prior to January 1, 1965, instead of 1960 as in the previous offer. This brought the coverage under the special pension arrangement up to eighty-six employees, an additional seventeen. In addition, the basis of calculating pension entitlement was changed from a five year average salary to a three year average salary. This resulted in improvements in the annual pension benefit in the order of \$600 - \$700 over the previous offer.

In addition to the pension benefits, Mr. Speaker, government has offered contract proposals on all other issues based on the agreement in effect for other hospitals in the Province. The one exception was a provision relating to double shifts. But this provision has been different for the Waterford in its previous collective agreements. The union to date has refused to discuss or consider any of these proposals.

In a further attempt then to resolve the strike situation, government offered arbitration on the pensions issue, only with a special arbitrator, and the pensions issue only, with a special arbitrator to conduct a detailed analysis of the Waterford and the situation in other similar hospitals in Canada. The union rejected this idea. In our most recent attempt at a settlement, government reluctantly, through the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations, has offered arbitration to the union on the outstanding monetary items in addition to the standing offer for arbitration on pensions. We took the step, Sir, very reluctantly because of the repercussions that arbitration has from a practical point of view of committing a government to a settlement which would be beyond their control and in the hands of an arbitrator. Nevertheless we felt that the situation at the Waterford Hospital was serious enough to warrant

Mr. Doody.

us making this last-ditch attempt of having the union return to work and allowing an arbitrator to reach a reasonable binding settlement on the pensions and monetary issues.

Let me read into the record, Sir, my letter of April 5, 1977 to the Honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations regarding my approach to the settlement, a proposed settlement. It reads as follows, Sir: "Reference, Waterford Hospital. Further to our discussion of today regarding the situation at the Waterford Hospital I wish to confirm to you the approach that I am suggesting with respect to a possible settlement for the dispute. Government is prepared to reconfirm its willingness to submit the whole pension issue as it relates to employees at the hospital to binding arbitration. We would like to see the arbitrator granted wide terms of reference which might read something as follows: The arbitrator to look into the pension benefit package as it implies to employees at the Waterford Hospital and to decide upon the type of pension plan which should exist for the employees at that institution, keeping in mind, (1) facilities at the Waterford Hospital; (2) the working conditions of employees at the Waterford Hospital now and in the past; (3)

MR. DOODY:

the physical and emotional strain imposed on employees at the Waterford Hospital by the nature of their duties as compared to those imposed in other hospitals and institutions; (4) the working conditions and pension benefits in institutions in Canada similar to the Waterford Hospital; (5) the relationship between a pension plan for the Waterford Hospital employees and those of employees of other hospitals; (6) the impact of separating out a relatively small group of employees as being special and different and allowing them to have separate pension rights as compared to other employees in the rest of the hospital service.

"We would envisage that the arbitrator would be expected to spend a considerable amount of time in doing up his report and realize the choice of an arbitrator is extremely important. We would agree that the arbitration should not proceed unless both sides agree on the selection of the arbitrator and we would not insist on any time limit in this respect. We would also agree to the need for a person of national reputation, and the sort of names which come to mind would be Judge Emmett Hall, Judge Nathan Green or Mr. Innis Christie. These are people who have a national reputation in the labour relations field, and if they were prepared to perform the duties of arbitrator in this case and were able to devote enough time to it, we would be pleased to agree to such type of person. We would of course be prepared to mutually explore any nominees which the union might propose. Likewise, should the idea of an arbitration broad be more appealing to the union, we would favourably disposed to following such a course of action.

"In addition to reaffirming our agreement to binding arbitration on the pension, we are prepared to submit the monetary items to the same arbitration process. In my view in order to allow the arbitrator as much time as possible to concentrate on the pension issue, we should limit the monetary items to salaries and contract pay. Of course, we have to keep in mind that under the present circumstances

MR. DOODY:

government and the union are subject to the Anti-Inflation Board. In order to facilitate the arbitration process government is prepared to use its best efforts in supporting the results of the binding arbitration before the Anti-Inflation Board if indeed the arbitrator decided to rule on a total compensation package which appeared to be in excess of the AIB guidelines. Obviously we would not be in any position to break our agreement with the Government of Canada, but I would like to reiterate that we would use every effort in supporting the decision of the binding arbitration where this support could be given within the confines of present legislation.

"We would make these proposals predicated on the agreement by the union to return to work after the method of proceeding to arbitration has been agreed upon. We would be willing to meet with you and with your officials at any time in order to iron out the details." Signed by me as President of Treasury Board and a copy to Mr. Pratt, Chairman of the Waterford Hospital Board.

Mr. Speaker, the union has not accepted this latest approach and at this point in time I am really at a loss to understand why they have rejected it and what further steps can be taken to settle the strike. Our offer for arbitration on pensions and monetary issues is in my opinion infinitely better than any arbitration which may result from legislation, since we have in our offer suggested to the union that the arbitrator be a person of national or international reputation and also indicated that the union must agree to his nomination. In other words, there will be no time limit on the choosing of the arbitrator and at no time if it is difficult to reach agreement will government intercede and have the Lieutenant Governor in Council appoint the arbitrator.

It seems to me that hon. members on both sides of the House as well the individual members of the bargaining unit at the Waterford Hospital will agree that there is little else that government can do. I reiterate that we are at a complete loss to understand the attitude of the union and we are extremely disappointed that they have not seen

MR. DOODY:

fit to accept this position which in my opinion is a very major and significant concession for government to have made. We are also disappointed that NAPE have not seen fit to ask the general membership to vote on the matter. Indeed we recently learned of a decision of the executive of the Waterford Hospital unit of NAPE to deny a request for a membership meeting of the local to discuss and vote upon the latest government offer.

I understand that the request for a meeting was submitted to the union branch executive over the signatures of some fifty members of the unit. Under the NAPE constitution and by-laws a minimum of twenty signatures is sufficient to require that a meeting be called. The NAPE local executives refusal to call the meeting appears to be a violation of the union's own constitution and I hope that they will reverse any such decision which may have been made.

MR. NEARY: It was a good statement up to that point but they are interfering with the internal workings of the union. Up to that point it was a good statement.

MR. DOODY: I call upon Mr. Locking and the executive of the NAPE Waterford unit to allow the membership to vote on this proposal by government. And I would ask the members of this hon. House to reasonably and responsibly support me in this request to the leaders of the bargaining unit so that the people at the Waterford Hospital may be given a right to vote on whether or not they want to return to work and whether or not they want to accept our proposed arbitration package,

MR. DOODY: because now the strike has lasted for almost nine weeks. It appears to me that those who are suffering the most are those who have been out without pay cheques for that amount of time.

MR. NEARY: Crocodile Tears.

MR. DOODY: These are the people who should be given the right to decide, Sir. I should also make it clear to this hon. House that government believes that many of those on strike may wish to return to work, and many have indicated their intention to the management at the hospital. We are encouraged that employees are taking this attitude and it makes the denial of a general membership meeting even more deplorable.

MR. NEARY: You are going to break up the union. That is the idea!

MR. DOODY: In order to clear up any misunderstandings that may have arisen over recent statements regarding employees returning to work, let me insure all Waterford workers that they will not lose their jobs for returning to work while others of their unit remain on strike.

I would stress that NAPE does not have the right nor the authority either directly or indirectly to dismiss any government or hospital employee from his position. The right to hire and dismiss employees rests with the Board of Management of the hospital and they have assured us that no employee will be removed from his job for crossing a picket line and returning to work. My main concern at this point in time is to settle the strike. It is clear that government and not the union have continued to make attempts at ending the strike and allowing the employees to go back to work, and our latest attempt is one that should be acceptable to both sides.

It is to no one's advantage for this strike to continue and once again I call upon Mr. Locking and the executive of the NAPE Waterford unit, and indeed the executive of the NAPE union, to be reasonable and responsible and put this latest position to the membership. I am sure that all members of this

MR. DOODY: hon House will await the reply of NAPE. Thank You, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise in connection with the statement that was delivered by the hon. member. The situation within the Waterford Hospital now is one of great frustration as I am sure the minister knows. Feelings are running very high and surely all of us are aware of the fact that when you are into - I believe the ninth week of a strike situation, where people have their mortgage payments, food to buy, heat and light and all the rest, that people can be pretty, pretty touchy, with themselves, with the government, or whoever the employer might be.

It has been suggested, for example, to some of us, by some members of the union that - and perhaps the minister could nod or tell me is I am right or wrong. Did the union in fact offer arbitration to the government some time back - nine weeks ago, eight weeks ago, seven weeks ago, and did the government refuse? No.

MR. DOODY: No. There was no discussion of arbitration to the point mentioned here.

MR. NOLAN: I see.

MR. DOODY: It was repugnant to both sides.

MR. NOLAN: No. I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that there have been members of the union who have told me that they offered binding arbitration, or arbitration of some kind weeks ago and that the government, in fact, turned it down.

Now there is another matter. Usually when you have a situation like this, it is normal to have a sort of an arms length negotiation going on. But what the strikers in there

MR. NOLAN:

are faced with right now - as I am sure the minister knows, is, one, employees of the Province, the policemen, for example, who are in there working; secondly you have members of the Civil Service, including members of the Treasury Board in there, allegedly as volunteers, working, and here you have the same people who are sitting in - I would think on the negotiations. I mean if you have members of Treasury Board who are actually working out in that hospital, it seems to me that I would not have gone that route. I would rather have people who are somewhat removed from it, if they are the ones who are actually involved in the negotiations. The very, very sad thing about this apparently is that we have now come to the point - it is all very well for the minister to state his case, as in fact he should. But we do not have the union's side of it here in this House, and here again the only one apparently, rightly or wrongly, that the union would look upon to voice their case, for example, in opposition to anything that the minister might say, is from, say, this side of the House. And they feel that, you know, the government as the employer has the right to issue official statements and something in the House of Assembly.

So we have, I might say, not heard directly that I am aware of from anyone directly in the union on this matter in the last twenty-four or forty-eight hours, unless the member for Terra Nova might have heard from some one directly in this regard, but I have not. The thing is that it is a sad thing to see. There is something here - I am not suggesting that the minister is not telling all, but I would suggest to him that if Mr. Locking or any other member of the executive were here in the House this afternoon, they may have something somewhat different to say other than what the hon. minister

April 18, 1977

Tape 1611

AH-4

MR. NOLAN: has stated.

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister's statement would have been
better not said, believe me. It was provocative!

MR. NOLAN: Now the other

Mr. J. Nolan:

situation is this: the Mayor of St. John's offered to apparently negotiate and mediate on this situation. Now the Mayor has in past weeks or months, as you know, settled a very controversial strike, the bus strike, namely, in St. John's, and I am really surprised why - I understand that the minister and his Treasury Board officials have merely scorned the offer of Her Worship the Mayor to mediate. The minister did not address himself to this in his statement. Why did he not accept? I mean, is he to give us to believe that all wisdom regarding union negotiations must of necessity reside in this building?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I draw to the hon. gentleman's attention that he is now breaching the rule which would prohibit debate.

MR. NOLAN: Very good, Mr. Speaker.

Now the other thing is is the reference that our friend makes from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and that is to the provocativeness regarding - there is a hint here - you could very easily look at the statement in part which would indicate that, you know, the old divide and conquer. Sure there is some unhappiness within the union, of course there is unhappiness in all union whenever they are nine weeks out on strike, and if you had light bills, heat bills, rent, mortgages falling behind you would be unhappy too.

MR. NEARY: getting the members back to work.

MR. NOLAN: But the thing is if there is any suggestion by the government that they are trying to break this union, they are going to cause one heck of a problem for themselves before the thing is over, and this is not the way to go at it in my opinion. It will be interesting to see how the officials within the union reply to the statement as tabled by the minister. But there is something not right here that we are obviously missing, This strike has gone on far too long. I can never accept the fact that those people who are not used to psychiatric

Mr. Nolan:

training and so on can do as good a job as can those who are trained. To say that there is not a special situation there in the hospital is obviously contradictory by the government in that they found it necessary to put the policemen in there. So this will have to stand for the moment because it is going to be interesting to see how the union reply and particularly to the suggestion here, as our hon. friend indicates, of any possibility of splitting this union down the middle, in taking advantage of people who are unfortunately, in a most unfortunate position at this moment with our income cut substantially.

So we will be commenting on this one later. also, Mr. Speaker, in future days as the strike continues, which by the way we hope it will not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of approximately 200 voters in the communities of Hillview, Hatchet Cove and St. Jones Within. Mr. Speaker, last October or around there, September or October, a contract was awarded for road work, it was a joint contract. It involved road work in Southwest Arm down around Hodges Cove, Gooseberry Cove, Southport, and as a part of that same contract to the same company was the construction of a new access road from the TCH down through Hillview cutting off the use of two existing roads around Hillview to the Trans-Canada, and of course hopefully that would be an access road to the Trans-Canada not only for the residents of Hillview but also from Hatchet Cove and St. Jones Within.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of this petition is as follows: We the residents of Hillview, Hatchet Cove, and St. Jones Within feel that the proposed site for the new road through Hillview will not serve the people of the above named communities any better than the old road now, We will still have the problem of a hill to be faced with during the Winter as we do now. We feel that the old

April 18, 1977

Tape 1612

PK - 3

Mr. Callan:

Cabot Highway that is now cut off by the Trans-Canada Highway, and
it leads to Clareville, should be reopened.

Mr. Callan.

It would save the government a lot of money and would serve us better. Please look into this matter and see if something can be done about it," is the last sentence in the prayer of the petition.

Mr. Speaker, I said that a contract was awarded for this work last September or October. I know it was fairly late in the year. I think the reason for that is probably quite obvious. The district of Bellevue is the second largest district in the Province as far as the number of communities, and there are a large number of communities which have no upgraded or paved roads and the ten or dozen communities around Hillview, down in Southwest Arm, of course, are examples of that.

Even though the contract was awarded last Fall the work did not commence until Monday of last week, a week ago. And here we have, Mr. Speaker, over 200 residents of these communities which are affected by this new access road, here we have over 200 who are protesting to the House of Assembly, and of course the Department of Transportation and Communications, asking that the job that has been tendered and so on and has been let that this not be done, but they have offered an alternate solution to the problem at Hillview.

Mr. Speaker, the question that I wonder about here, and the question that I would like for the Minister of Transportation and Communications to answer, if and when he decides to speak on this petition is: Why is it that the local residents, the people who should know most about what would be best for their community and so on, why the local residents are not consulted sometimes? I remember last year standing in this House of Assembly, when a lot of other members were criticizing the government for its white paper on snowmobiling regulations and so on, I stood in this House and I said that I think it is a good thing, this what we need more of, participation from

Mr. Callan.

the residents who know more about these things than somebody perhaps who sits down here in an office in the Confederation Building or elsewhere.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, about three years ago, I think it was, and perhaps it was four, when Mr. Jim Reid was the member for Trinity South, he came out in the Spring of the year, after the budget was brought down, and he called a meeting and he said to these people gathered, "I have so many hundreds of thousands of dollars for road work for this area of my district, where would you like to have the money spent and how?"

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: Well that is the way the man talked, Mr. Speaker. The question that I would like to ask is: Why is it not possible for the Department of Transportation and Communications to decide, well we will allocate a half a million dollars for road work in the district of Bellevue, say, and then the member for the district, as Mr. Reid was the member for Trinity South at that time, called a meeting at Bellevue as a matter of fact after which the district gets its name -

MR. RIDEOUT: Because you are a Liberal now.

MR. CALLAN: - why is it not possible for me or at least the residents who are affected by whatever the government plans to do, why are they not given the opportunity to have some input and some say into what happens in their communities?

MR. DOODY: You would start the Third World War down in -

MR. CALLAN: This petition, Mr. Speaker, I think has a lot of merit, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Transportation and Communications will speak on it whether it is in support or whatever. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly support the prayer of the petition and I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the petition - how many residents signed the petition?

MR. CALLAN: Two hundred.

MR. MORGAN: Two hundred residents of Hillview, Hatchet Cove and St. Jones within.

Mr. Speaker, I find it rather amazing that this petition is coming forward saying the people of the area are not being consulted prior to government spending money in the area, because the tenders that were called last year - and as I maybe point out, called the Liberal district as well, despite the arguments from the other side in the House of Assembly, there is no work being done in Liberal districts - but this tender was called last Fall, Mr. Speaker, upon the request, not of

MR. MORGAN: the member for the area so much, who was also making representations - sure he was. That is his job as MHA for the area - but representations from a committee which claimed to be speaking for the people of the area.

If I recall correctly a Mr. Vey from Hillview was the chairman of that committee, and I went out and travelled the roads, in fact accompanied by the MHA, the hon. gentleman who brought the petition to the House of Assembly, I travelled over the roads in the Hillview and St. Jones Within and down through Hatchet Cove. And also I travelled around the other way, down as far as Southport, also accompanied by the MHA for the area, and accompanied by in fact a motorcade of cars, because practically every committee member had a car and they decided to drive over the road as well in following the procession. And that request was made strictly by the committee. They wanted this diversion going down from the Trans-Canada Highway down to Hillview, The engineers of course they have to do the engineering design to call a tender, but the request was made by a committee from the area, so-called committee speaking for the people of the area. So I take exception to saying the people were consulted. The government was acting upon requests received from the people concerned, and based on that the engineers drew up the design and also acquired the properties necessary to call the tenders to build a new access down through Hillview.

However, if the residents of Hillview in particular do not want the new access, I do not know what the legal procedures would be to cancel a contract - the contract has been properly awarded to the contractor concerned - but if the people do not want the work to be carried out, what I will do as minister is look at the possibilities through the advisers in the Department of Justice and a possibility of cancelling the contract. But I again repeat, the action taken by this department was based upon

MR. MORGAN: the request of a committee with a number of membership, I think a total ten or twelve people, representation from all the communities concerned, and they made the request to the Department of Transportation requesting that this new access be built. But again now if they change their mind, if they do not want the new access, we will look at the legal ramifications and possibly cancel the contract.

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

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the community of Meadows. It is signed by 176 homeowners and the prayer of the petition is as follows.

"We, the concerned citizens of the community of Meadows petition the Provincial Government to provide the necessary funds for the upgrading and long overdue maintenance requirements on our community's local road system.

"Special attention should be afforded the section of local road leading to the elementary grade, Holy Trinity School. The road to the school as well as the balance of the community's network being in such a ridiculous state rendering them practically impassable," is why this group supported presentations for government was originated.

"We the undersigned hereby indicate our support for efforts to have the provincial government recognize the deplorable insulting state of our community's local road system in hopes of soliciting from government an appropriate contribution towards having same brought up to an acceptable usable standard of convenience."

There is a letter, Mr. Speaker, accompanying the petition. It reads as follows.

"Please find enclosed a petition concerning the increasingly

MR. WOODROW: worsening state of our community's local road network. The condition of the overall system at present is such that some form of resident demonstration seems very likely in the not too distant future, especially in respect to the school board involved.

"It would be greatly appreciated if you on behalf of all concerned, would use the petition in question to lend support to council's efforts to get capital projects financing to enable us to undertake corrective action." And this is signed by Lewis Smith, Secretary of the Council.

Mr. Speaker, as member of the Bay of Islands district I beg the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to give his time and compassionate understanding to the petition, not only

Mr. Woodrow:

to avoid the occurrence of what happened on Farm Road in Gillams last year when just about all of the pupils walked out, but mainly to help the residents of the community of Meadows.

Mr. Speaker, I place the petition on the table of the House of Assembly and I feel sure that the minister will do his utmost - realizing again, as I have said and I keep on repeating, I know, Mr. Speaker, we have fifty-one districts and I do not want to feel selfish when I make this plea to the hon. minister, but as the member for the district I feel that I have an obligation to work on behalf of the people and I give my whole-hearted support to the petition as presented.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition from, I believe, 150 is it?

MR. WOODROW: One hundred and seventy-six.

MR. NOLAN: One hundred and seventy-six residents of Meadows, and obviously the hon. member who represents the area spoke very movingly about the need within the community, and obviously is a man who has a heart who does not take these petitions lightly, and who obviously is attempting, even though there are fifty-one districts - which there should not be, incidentally; no need of it in this Province - but he is obviously interested in certainly doing his best to see to it that those in responsible positions will pay attention to the great need there. I mean, if we have had situations with schools closed in the past, I mean, are we going to sit by now and watch something like this happen again? I mean, how much do the people have to do in order to get recognition for the problems in their area? Is it any wonder oftentimes that people feel that the House of Assembly is irrelevant, that little or nothing is discussed, or at least done here, that is of direct benefit to them or their children or their families or their communities

Mr. Nolan:

And so when the prayer of the petition is so ably presented by the hon. member says "deplorable and insulting" they must know what they are talking about, Mr. Speaker. And, I mean, I thought that the hon. member did a very, very good job in presenting this, and woe betided those who ignore the situation as presented by the hon. member, because there is always a way, not the best way perhaps, but there is always a way for people sometimes to express their feelings when they feel that this situation is ignored.

So I hope that the minister responsible will certainly not let this opportunity pass without rising to the occasion, one, to state quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, that he is familiar with the situation as described so ably by my hon. friend opposite; two, that he has plans to offset some of the problems that are presently in the community concerned, and what is more that he will make it a point of doing something about it right now. Roads are breaking up all over the place. I mean there are places in Newfoundland right now, I mean Dunkirk was only a joke to it, to look at some of the roads. Now I realize that some of it has come about because of the heaving after the frost and so on, and potholes, it is difficult, you can fill them up one day and have them washed out the next, but there are some things that can be done.

Now there have been certain promises made of so many hundreds of roads - of miles of roads going to be paved and so on. Now is the time, Mr. Speaker, for those who uttered these statements to put up or shut up. And if the hon. member opposite, who so feelingly and movingly presented this petition, feels that this is not being done he only has one choice, and that is to cross the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion go by without getting up and saying at least a few words, not in support of the petition because I have not got the programme for the next year fully in hand yet; we have quite a few requests in, I believe the latest figure I got for local roads if we provide the 60 per cent then councils provide their 40 per cent, that it would be something of

Mr. J. Dinn:

the order of \$80 million for the 304, I believe, municipalities in the Province. It is quite evident that we cannot do all of the roads in 1977, Mr. Speaker. Certainly we will look at all of the requests that came in from councils and hopefully Meadows will be one of the successful ones when the programme is announced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of this petition for the 176 residents of Meadows. As the minister suggested there is a plan, of course, that all municipal or incorporated areas can avail of, the sixty-four per cent deal. But of course the point of the matter is that so many councils are not in a position to be able to avail of this kind of structure. They do not have a sufficient tax base to be able to take advantage of this programme with so many other needs of water and sewer, they just cannot avail of the opportunity. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we do have so many communities in the Province with such deplorable road conditions. As the member was presenting his case I could think of just about every community in my own district that I could have presented a similar case for. It is certainly frustrating to the people living in these areas -

MR. MURPHY: Not all of them.

MR. LUSH: Oh, no. I think I said just about all of them, certainly the majority, as the member was talking about, I think he was alluding to local roads. And you know I think it is safe to say that I could say every district in my community with respect to local roads, to say nothing of main roads at all, Mr. Speaker.

You know it is absolutely frustrating, it is disgusting to the people - and this points out the necessity for some sort of long-term planning. If the people only knew as to when they could expect a road to be upgraded and paved I think this would alleviate some of the frustration. But it seems to be done on an ad hoc basis. Every year people hope that this year we are going to get recognized. If not this year, then next year, this sort of thing, and nobody knows exactly when the roads are going to be upgraded. This presents a tremendous frustrating situation to the residents concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the member mentioned in support of his petition the number of school children that have to use these roads. Here again we have this situation almost universal throughout the Province, of people having to use bad roads for kids to drive back and

MR. LUSH:

forth to school. And it is certainly a deplorable situation and I would only hope that the Department of Transportation and Communications and the Department of Municipal Affairs would come together and come up with some long term policy so the people would know when to expect improvements in these conditions.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports By Standing and Special Committees.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have another petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have leave to revert to petitions? Agreed.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought that somebody else might want to speak on the last one so I did not jump up. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here. I think a similar petition to this one was presented, I think, last - well not last week because we were gone last week. Some of us were gone far and some not so far. This petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by forty people who live in Garden Cove in Placentia Bay. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, are members of the Loyal Orange Association. I am having a little bit of a problem today, Mr. Speaker, with some of the words. I lost one of my teeth from my denture there a couple of nights ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go to a dentist.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is the denturists for you.

AN HON. MEMBER: He would not be the only member who went.

MR. CALLAN: They were not manufactured by a dentist by the way.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of this petition reads as follows: "We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the government and the hon. House of Assembly now in session praying that legislation be enacted to have liquor establishments closed on Sundays. We feel that six days per week are sufficient for the sale of alcoholic beverages and we ask that you give this your earliest consideration." This petition, Mr. Speaker, was circulated by the Loyal Orange Association of Garden

MR. CALLAN:

Cove, Number 251 and it is signed by many of the members and their wives and others no doubt in Garden Cove.

MR. NEAPY: How many?

MR. CALLAN: Forty. Actually thirty-nine. Mine made forty.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a similar petition to this one was presented a couple of weeks ago by the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), I believe.

MR. CALLAN: It is my understanding that a large number of petitions will be coming in from the Orange Associations from all over the Province.

Mr. Speaker, they are asking that the liquor establishments be closed on Sunday. In my personal opinion I think this is not a bad idea. One day out of a week is not bad to have these establishments closed. Sunday is not altogether a day of celebrating and people could probably get along without it.

For example, on election day, which is a day of celebrating and so on, the establishments are closed and people live through it. They live through it and perhaps they celebrate doubly the next day depending on how their vote went, and so on.

I know, Mr. Speaker, in my own home community there are two outlets or liquor establishments, one a privately owned club and another one operated by the Lion's Club there, but they are closed on Sunday and the people in that area seem to manage to get along until Monday. They survive until Monday so perhaps people can do without it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition and I refer this petition to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, could we have silence from the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young)?

In reference to the petition so ably presented by the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), and signed by forty members of the Loyal Orange Association in Garden Cove, we are faced - I know that whenever we get into a discussion, whether it be a petition or otherwise on booze in this House, it seems to be a great occasion for jocular remarks back and forth

MR. NOLAN: and so on. Well that is fine, but here again we have a situation that alcoholism is one of the most serious problems we have to face today in this Province and in all of Canada. So it is no laughing matter. There is many a home broken up in this Province because of booze, we know. It is a situation that is not to be taken lightly. We have at this moment - I know of instances, as I have already mentioned in this House, where parents have had to send, ask, plead with clergymen to go into various booze emporiums and get their children out and so on. Well, you can say it is all the parents' fault that they do not have any control, discipline is gone and so on, and there is something to this.

But there is another little matter, Mr. Speaker, and it is one we have to address ourselves to. We are not, really, in this House as people who attempt to get things done, to finance the situation in the Province, and the many, many things that have to be financed, that we are arms-length on this situation. The fact is that the peddling of booze contributes substantially to the income that this Province receives every year. As a matter of fact, it was interesting to note, I believe, recently in an editorial that the minister - I forget his title now, in the P.C.Tory government in Ontario, Darcy McKeough - Darcy McKeough suggests that liquor be turned over to private enterprise. I do not know if the minister is familiar with it.

MR. DOODY: No, I have not been invited to join the company.

MR. NOLAN: No. Well, he is certainly suggesting it and I doubt whether he would do so without considering the advice from the Minister of Finance in this Province, with his remarkable record on finance and so on, I am sure he would want to seek his advice first. But anyway,

MR. NOLAN: this is not something to be taken lightly. It is all right to joke about it. Those who like to have a drink and so on, no one is preaching prohibition, nor is the Loyal Orange Association, in this particular instance. They are talking about Sunday. Many of us, when we were growing up, of course, you could not do anything on Sunday. If you wanted to go play a game of soccer you were looked upon with some askance. But perhaps the pendulum has gone too far the other way.

Now how do you go about remedying the situation? It is easy enough to be against something, but I obviously have to think of hotels, clubs where at least one time some of their licences were dependent on whether food was sold.

MR. NOLAN: I do not know if that still exists or not, does it? But that is something you would have to consider. No one is suggesting here that anyone or everyone who has a drink has an alcoholic problem. But we have a very serious problem in this Province and in this country as it relates to alcohol. And the member mentions a very good point; It is very, very important to close the bars down on election day. Now why is that?

Are they afraid enough people will get drunk and realize what they are doing? Is that the problem.

MR. DOODY: And not run.

MR. NOLAN: And not run, yes. So let us not look with too much levity on this situation; it is obviously one that is very close and very sincere from the people concerned who signed it, and others who did not sign it. You do not have to be a member of the Loyal Orange Association to be concerned about the alcoholic problem we have in this Province. And it is going to be interesting to see when the minister brings in his long-awaited budget as to how much he will provide this year to help set up the necessary facilities, skill, personnel, advice, consultation to those who have a real problem with alcohol. And this is not something we can ignore, it is alright to say that every bottle that goes over the counter out there, and which they are jacking up the price of all the time, I understand -

MR. DOODY: Just to discourage drinking.

MR. NOLAN: Just to discourage drinking! Yes, I am sure, I am sure. We now have a government who is attempting to finance this problem by lotteries - the next thing we are going to have slot machines down in the lobby. You will not be able to get in the elevator unless you pull the one-arm bandit to keep

MR. NOLAN: this crowd going.

MR. DOODY: It is nearly as bad now; you cannot get in there at all now.

MR. NOLAN: Well, that is another matter. Maybe the minister would prevail upon his colleague to get the elevators fixed. They never seem to be working, some of them. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we certainly support the prayer of this petition from the LOA in Garden Cove.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member from Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in support of this petition as well. Certainly a recognition by the Orange Association of Newfoundland that the problem of alcoholism is becoming increasingly more intensified in this Province, and to the extent that it is a very serious problem particularly among our young people. I was reading an article just some weeks ago published in the Atlantic Advocate, I think it was, and they were doing a study of the problem of alcoholism across Canada. And Newfoundland outstripped everybody in this drinking habit. I think in every kind of alcohol, be it beer or the stronger type, that we consumed more per capita than any other area in Canada. More beer, was it? And even beat the North West Territories which we have ordinarily lost to. But in last year I think we beat the North West territories. And also the article pointed out that there was an increasing number of people becoming addicted to alcohol, particularly among our young people. And it illustrated the vast number of people that are drinking now of junior high and high school age.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I should point to the hon. gentleman that the subject matter

MR. SPEAKER: of the petition, as I understand it, is not alcoholism or overall policy of distribution of alcohol. It relates to Sabbath Day observance. It is about the closing of alcohol outlets on Sundays, and although the previous speaker did make some references in a more general context he did, I think, relate them to the subject matter. And those general comments having been made, I think that we would be acquiescing in a change of the rules to allow comment on a petition, the subject matter of which is the closing of certain establishments on Sundays, to translate that as the problems of alcohol in general and the revenue generated thereby.

The hon. member.

MR. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that I think that in closing establishments on Sunday, whereas I am sure they will not cure the problem of alcoholism in the Province, but I do believe that it would have the affect of diverting

Mr. Lush.

the attention of people to look for other alternate sources of recreation, if you will, or spending leisure time profitably on one day in the week, and this could probably have a large affect on determining, or helping people to restructure other types of activities for other days in the week. I think it is most important that we see this connection that even though it is one day in the week that this will help people to come to grips maybe with trying to find other sources of enjoyment at least for one day in the week.

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting the prayer of this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in total agreement with the petition presented by the hon. member, my colleague. Now, Sir, we have federal Members of Parliament putting on a great campaign against pornography obscene literature, obscene shows, magazines and what have you. But one of the most damaging to our society, one of the most damaging effects on our society today I think is alcoholism - and I do not want to get into the realm of debate on that one particular item - but I think, Sir, in supporting this petition I feel strongly that our society is going to have to go back to the basic concept that we were all brought up to - I hope we were all brought up to - and remember this, Sir, that "six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work and the seventh day is the Sabbath and keep it holy." I am a strong believer in that concept and I think this is the place for members to stand on their feet and be counted whether we believe in keeping the establishments open on Sunday or whether we are men enough to come to grips and unanimously agree that all liquor outlets should be closed on the Sabbath Day.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the unanimous consent of the House, Sir, to make a very important motion?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have the consent?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, No!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes!

MR. NEARY: Members obviously want to know what it is about, Mr. Speaker. It has to do with changes in the unemployment insurance regulations proposed by the House of Commons. So if I could have - it will just be very brief. I just want to make a suggestion to the House and hope to get the unanimous consent of the House on this.

MR. SPEAKER: If it is agreed, then the hon. gentleman will read the motion and then hon. members may say whether they grant leave or not. If it is not agreed, then obviously the hon. gentleman will not be able to read his intended motion.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. speaker: "WHEREAS the Newfoundland House of Assembly in session is concerned - I presume they are concerned - over the ravaging effect of the changes in the qualifying period for unemployment insurance benefits, the effect it is going to have here in this Province - I would suggest, Sir, that we just take a few moments to pass a telegram that I have. I will read the telegram if I can get the unanimous consent of the House to pass this telegram, to be sent off by the House to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau. "The members of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador unanimously reject the concept behind the extended period of qualification for unemployment insurance benefits as negative, unconstructive and of dubious economic value. The proper course for the Government of Canada to take is to curtail,

Mr. Neary.

through a two-pronged attack, the number of those dependent on unemployment insurance benefits by more thorough investigation of applicants for benefits and policing those benefits, while at the same time undertaking a federally directed programme of job creation aimed at providing year round employment for those presently receiving unemployment insurance benefits as well as for any other citizen who wishes to contribute to national productivity instead of rotting and eroding in enforced idleness through no fault of his own.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I propose that we send off that telegram because I do not know if members are aware or not, Sir, that Newfoundland stands to loose I think it is in the vicinity of \$28 million as a result of the changes in these regulations, plus the fact, Sir, that forty-seven, I think -

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I think we have the wording, phraseology and all, of the telegram that the hon. member wants to send as a motion from this House of Assembly - the arguments for it and so on you know is another matter - so therefore I think we are in a position on this side of the House to decide whether or not we can ~~just~~ put the thing to a vote right now and do it, and I just ask for some concurrence from the official Opposition to see how the position stands from their viewpoint.

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

MR. NOLAN: I see no reason at the moment why we could not support the situation. As I understand it the members of the House of Assembly in Newfoundland and Labrador reject the concept behind the extended period of qualification for unemployment insurance benefits is negative and unconstructive and dubious economic value. Now any number of people in all parties I believe in the House of Assembly have expressed some strong opposition to this situation; one, regarding the extension of the time worked to benefit from unemployment insurance. The other thing is, and I am sorry I was absent, I do not know if the minister mentioned it but that being so I heard a figure today from someone of how much money would be lost in terms of income coming into this Province -

MR. NEARY: Over \$30 million.

MR. NOLAN: Over \$30 million. Now this Province is certainly in no position to scoff at \$30 million or anything like it. So I think Mr. Speaker, I assume I speak for the members, my hon. friends, when I say yes we can certainly support the motion.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion here amongst - if the hon. member had given us some time, there might be just minor wording changes, the whole concept is sound -

MR. NEARY: The Speaker will have to get the wording anyway.

MR. PECKFORD: - so that we would agree with the concept of sending the telegram and getting along the lines the lines that have been suggested by the hon. member, but we would reserve the right to change some of the phraseology in the resolution or the telegram. So if it is agreeable to all the other members on the other side, we would agree with the concept of the telegram going forth and for the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), and myself or whatever, afterwards agreeing on the proper verbage to be used in the telegram.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that it is Your Honour who will have to send off the telegram -

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - on behalf of the House, if it is the unanimous decision of the House. So the wording, this is just merely an outline of a telegram, it is not meant to be the final draft, Your Honour will have to work out his own wording along the principle that is outlined in the telegram.

MR. SPEAKER: What I would suggest, perhaps the three hon. members, or whoever is on the drafting committee, if they wish make a draft and then submit it to me.

The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. DAWE: I rise to support the principle of this action by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I know we are all aware of the difficulty in finding employment in Newfoundland at the present time. And indications are that things are not going to be too bright this coming Summer and naturally for people to qualify in Newfoundland so they can obtain I think it is twelve weeks -

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. DAWE: - twelve weeks would be most difficult and I would like to support the principle of this and go on record as well in congratulating and supporting the federal member, he is my federal member, Mr. David Rooney -

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. DAWE: - for the position he has taken, although against a government motion, against a government measure in the House of Commons, the attitude he has taken and that he realizes, I am sure as well all do, the problem with employment in Newfoundland and in supporting this proposal of the hon. member I would like to place on record as well my support for our hon. member, Mr. David Rooney, for the position he has taken in this regard in the House of Commons in Ottawa.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, is back ~~from his jaunt~~ in Europe, since the House last sat, I wonder if the minister could tell us just what transpired, what countries the minister visited? Did the minister find ships suitable for the fishery? And now what is the next step to get these vessels in operation, to get them over here into Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, we did visit several countries in Europe having meetings with fishing interests, groups, and ship owners or at least fish processors. We did identify a number of ships that are, we think, capable of prosecuting the fishery within the 200-mile limit. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I can take a minute and explain to the hon. House the situation in that within a few months, probably two months, Canada will be establishing what will be the total allowable catch of fish within the 200-mile limit for 1978. We all know that in 1977 the total allowable catch that was established by ICNAF and agreed to by Canada amounted to 160,000 metric tons of cod in the Northern areas. 100,000 tons of that quota have been harvested by foreign countries, licenced by Canada and for which Canada, indeed Newfoundland, have not received one cent benefits. In other words, we have licensed foreign interests to harvest 100,000 metric tons of fish out of a total allowable catch of 160,000 without accruing one dollar benefit to this country.

The Newfoundland government have on two occasions contacted Ottawa, once by letter dated February 16, which I am prepared to table by the way if the hon. member so wishes, in which we expressed the wish that if in fact Canada was going to establish a total allowable catch that would provide maybe a surplus, or at least a TAC that was in excess of the Canadian fishing effort, we contend that there should be economically motivated conditions to every single pound of fish that was harvested by foreign interests, there should be motivated conditions accruing to the benefit of this country.

On June 30 or there about, Canada will be establishing the TAC, the total allowable catch for 1978. We have wired Ottawa to the effect - and a copy of this telegram has been tabled - we have wired them to the effect that there should not be any doubt at all, that if in fact there is any doubt as to the stocks being able to sustain the 1977 total allowable catch, then the government in Ottawa should consider maybe putting a ban on foreign fishing efforts. And certainly

MR. W. CARTER:

not to take any chances and that they decide in favour of the inshore and the Newfoundland and Canadian fishermen.

Our reason for going to Europe was to line up ships that would be available if and when we needed them. In other words, if Canada establishes for 1978 a total allowable catch that will be in excess of the Canadian fishing effort, which in 1977 was approximately 60,000 tons, then we want to be in a position to say that if that is your wish to establish that quota and if that quota is in excess of what we can catch, then we want to be able to say that we can provide the ships to catch that fish, to land it in our Province and to provide jobs in our Province for our people. These ships, we hope, would be considered as part of the Canadian effort. That is what we mean when we say that we might have to charter ships that would qualify this Canadian fishing effort, on which there would be serving to some extent Newfoundlanders, and like I said, landing their fish, part of this so-called surplus in our Province for the benefit of Newfoundlanders and indeed for all Canadians.

We recognize the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot build ships overnight to acquire that kind of catching effort, to increase the Canadian effort to that extent. And we are talking now in terms maybe of 30,000 or 40,000 additional metric tons of fish. To increase our effort cannot be done overnight. It will take probably months and years to get plans in motion to get ships started and on stream. Therefore the only solution to the problem, if it is found indeed that there is a surplus, is to maybe arrange charters. And to answer the hon. member's question, we did yes identify a number of areas where ships can be

Mr. W. Carter:

acquired by charter and by maybe other means that can be used if and when we need them to prosecute the codfishery in the Northern parts within the 200 mile limit.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Could the minister tell the House when the minister refers to "We may have to charter these ships, there are other means", to whom is the minister referring? Is he referring to private enterprise or is the minister referring to a Crown corporation? Who is going to do the buying or chartering of whatever it is that is going to happen? Is the government going to buy these ships directly and set up a Crown corporation to operate as a trawler fleet? Can the minister be a little bit more specific and give us a few details of the 'we'. Who are 'we'?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not able now to enlighten the hon. member to any great extent as to what I mean when I say "We", But there could possibly be certain things happen within the next thirty days that will I am sure answer that question for the hon. member.

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

MR. SPEAKER: One final supplementary, and then the hon. member from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister tell the House if the Premier was in Europe with the minister, and if so, I asked the minister to tell us what countries the minister had visited, and what is the next step to get these ships, apart from whatever that mysterious who is going to charter the ships in between, does the Government of Canada have to grant a licence or anything for these ships before they are brought over here? And are we going to get our own shipbuilding programme going in this Province, in Marystwon?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out the need to keep a supplementary question as in fact a question and not a series.

MR. NEARY: I can only get one shot away, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, the Premier was in Europe and did attend meetings with - at least I did attend meetings with him and certain interested groups in the U.K. with respect to the chartering of ships and other matters pertaining to the fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Were there any deals made?

MR. W. CARTER: No. I did visit, I think, four countries in Europe, the U.K., West Germany, Holland, and Portugal. No commitments had been made to any person or any group of people or any country. Where do we go from here? Ottawa will have to answer that question, Mr. Speaker, because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER: No, no! I think the hon. member knows as well as I do that Ottawa sets the quotas, they establish the TAC, they issued licences for the harvesting of that fish. Canada will have to define their Canadian fishing effort, for example, will they in fact look upon a charter arrangement as being truly a Canadian fishing effort? That is Ottawa's decision, not ours. If it were in our hands we are ready to move now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: We can make a decision on what we should -

MR. NEARY: I hope you are not letting foreigners come over here and operate.

MR. W. CARTER: No, no! No we are not asking foreigners to operate these ships -

MR. NEARY: Who is going to operate them?

MR. W. CARTER: Every discussion we have had, Mr. Speaker, we have made it quite clear -

AN HON. MEMBER: A supplementary?

MR. NEARY: But who is going to operate them?

MR. W. CARTER: Allow me to answer.

MR. NEARY: Yes, okay tell us.

MR. W. CARTER: Every discussion that we have had with every ship owner in Europe that has been first and foremost, that Newfoundlanders would be on the ships, maybe not the entire crew but certainly partially crewed by Newfoundlanders.

MR. NEARY: Ah, ha!

MR. W. CARTER: No! No "Ah, ha!" You do not -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I must point out to the hon. gentleman to my right, and in so doing to the hon. minister and to all hon. members that when in giving an answer there are sort of a series additional questions and answers that becomes a sort of mini debate and that would deprive other hon. members the opportunity of asking questions.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: So the hon. gentleman should not intervene with additional questions, and if he does the hon. minister should not answer them.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, maybe you will permit me to answer the last, and I think a very important part of the hon. member's question and that is concerning the future of our shipbuilding programme. We will be discussing the possibility of engaging the building of ships to replenish the fishing fleet. I have a meeting, at least I am scheduling sometime within the next ten days or two weeks with representatives from the fishing industry to discuss that very matter, to find out exactly

MR. W. CARTER:

what their plans are, and what their future requirements will be by way of new ships to replace in some cases rapidly aging ships, ships that are now nearing the time when they will have to be taken out of service, but certainly that is our long-term plan that we get involved in the building of ships. When I say, we, I mean the Province. The Province would have to, I am sure, assist in many ways. And we have already had a circular sent to all of the major processing companies requesting their views on their ship, or at least their harvesting capability, how much more they will be requiring, the age of their ships, the carrying capacity and pretty well all matters relating to their catching effort.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, recently it has been reported - the Minister of Education addressed the NTA convention - it is reported that he apparently agrees with the Dean of Education at Memorial, the departing Dr. Ivany, about those who are not actively engaged in education, in teaching and so on, should not more or less be meddling or commenting on it. Would the minister now care to qualify exactly what he means by this situation? Are all of us to be silenced in the House of Assembly on matters of education? Is that what the minister is getting at?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am perhaps a little delighted to have the opportunity to respond to that question. I think - the fact was that I had addressed the NTA by way of greetings prior to Dr. Ivany's speech, and I had mentioned two main points. They always castigate me a little for being long when I am bringing greetings, but it is the only opportunity I get to speak to the NTA. And I spoke about our educational costs relative to provincial priorities, and the other thing I talked about was quality education. And in the latter part, quality education, I stated that I was not at one with those people

Mr. House.

who said that the quality of education was deteriorating . But I did recognize that quality education was the top public concern across Canada. And in my remarks there at that time I felt that educators must respond to the issue and inform the public as to what is going on and to invite public involvement in education. I said the public and the legislatures are asking it, and we have got, as educators, to respond to it. When Dean Ivany spoke, of course, as guest speaker he gave a speech which either I myself or some of the other educators who were there, some people who were not directly connected with the NTA, incidentally, either I misunderstood what he was talking about or else the public who reported it misunderstood it in its totality. And perhaps his emphatic way approach was partly to blame for this. I have to refer to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) here. He did mention -

MR. NEARY: That is all right, boy!

MR. HOUSE: - what he called a Nearyism, and he said the people are giving simplistic answers to very complex problems, and that was the only reference.

MR. NEARY: That was his interpretation?

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

Well anyway, what I gathered from his remarks, Mr. Speaker, was that education in philosophy and in implementation is very complex, very intricate, and professional, and it does require, of course, the expertise that other social professions require, a neurosurgeon, doctors, because you are dealing with minds; you are dealing with learning theories and so on. So obviously there is a different business for the top educators than there is for the other people. So I gathered that. He was talking about that, that the development of programmes and methodologies and specific direction must be the responsibility of the people with expertise.

MR. NOLAN: Did you agree with him or not?

MR. HOUSE: I agreed with him on that, but just wait now.

That is what he was talking about. Now he was not saying, well, you cannot

Mr. House.

have anything to say about education. He was saying that the -

MR. NFARY: We are paying for it so we do have a right. -

MR. HOUSE: Yes, that is right, and I agree with him. But what I am agreeing with is that education is a very complex problem, and that if we do not recognize the fact, if we do not recognize the fact that the implementation of programmes and approaches is the work of top professionals, then we are paying a lot of professional people high salaries without giving them a mandate.

MR. HOUSE:

Now that did not say that I was against the public having input. I am crying out all the time for the public to be concerned about education, to have input into education, and I believe that educators have to be accountable. But I said there are different degrees of business. So I did not agree with him. If he said—which he did not say — he did not say nobody should have anything to do with it but top professionals. He said that there is a role for the top professionals, and that is a very professional role. Certainly there are interests and concerns that need to be expressed and we invite that through our school boards, our structures.

So I agreed with what Ivany said in gist. It was not that I was against the public not being able to criticize and that sort of thing. The public should criticize and educators should be accountable. But education is just as professional as is medicine or any of the other top professions.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for Terra Nova for a supplementary.

MR. LUSH: A question to the hon. Minister of Education.

In view of recent statements from our Newfoundland teachers to the effect that many of our students are taking courses, particularly in mathematics, which are not challenging to the students nor are the courses preparing our students to enter the labour force or indeed for future education.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

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

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand that the hon. member is asking a supplementary question? And if I understand correctly, I would submit from what I have heard to date of his supplementary question that it really is not a supplementary to the original question which had to do with certain statements by a leading educator in the Province and by the minister, and that he is branching out into a new area of education which does not warrant or justify it being called a supplementary to the original.

MR. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. gentleman in asking a supplementary that it has to be what the supplementary is, is to ask for information, further information, and it must be something which does come out of or is closely related to the answer, because it is a supplementary question to that particular answer. I would also point out, and this will be for all hon. members, that in putting any oral questions, supplementary or otherwise, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except in so far as may be necessary to explain the same. I recognize the hon. member for a supplementary, if he wishes.

~~Mr. Neary~~
MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member for Terra Nova does not have a supplementary I will -

MR. LUSH: You can go. I will get a chance later.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister of Education aware, Sir, that for years now the department has been using a slogan for Education Week, "Education is everybody's business", and if so how can the minister make a statement that he made a few moments ago that I cannot understand anyway. How can the minister make a statement that it has to be a professional - the professional elite have to make these decisions - when the minister's policy, philosophy of the department is, "Education is everybody's business."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am having it very difficult in communication. I guess I am a bit conscious of the fact that as an educator I used to overdo it sometimes. I feel that I would not have to overdo it now. I am not saying that education is not everybody's business, I said different degrees. Well, let me give you an example; I do not think that the general public is concerned. I think they say. Look, we must have special programmes for our special education children because they are not, for instance, being able to be educated by the conventional means, so you have to get some programmes to meet their needs. What I am saying is that is a complex problem and the programmes and the implementation of them must be the work

MR. HOUSE:

of top professionals. Sure the public can criticize them and tell us they are no good and offer suggestions, but it is the top of these professional people that you have to depend on in that.

MR. NEARY: How do you become a professional in that sort of thing?

MR. HOUSE: A professional in that sort of thing is from five to seven years training and teaching and learning experience.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they have it all.

MR. HOUSE: No, they do not have it all.

MR. NEARY: You are talking about teachers. We are talking about bureaucrats!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I consider the exchange of further questions and answers to be an abuse of the rules. If any other hon. member has another question? The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Finance. Could the hon. minister tell this House what was the amount of the slush fund used by the former President of Labrador Linerboard, and could he indicate if this was used primarily for company business, and was it over the amount of \$500,000?

MR. DOODY: What?

MR. MCNEIL: I will repeat the question if you like.

MR. DOODY: Repeat the question.

MR. MCNEIL: What was the amount of the slush fund used by the former President of Labrador Linerboard?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: A slush fund or a slash fund?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, You just referred to a number of sections in Standing Orders of the House, from 25 to 31 dealing with questions and on 25 (a) "But in putting any such question or in replying to the same, no argument or opinion is to be offered."

I would say the terms used by the hon. member in putting his question, for example in using the words "slush fund" does put the opinion in there which is unnecessary in answering the kind of question dealing with the content that he wants to get answers to. It is 25(a) and I think Standing Order 31(c) also refers to the same kind of thing "In putting any oral questions no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same. I suggest that the question as posed in its present form by the hon. member is out of order for that reason.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, the question put by the hon. member is not out of order. He is asking if there was a slush fund item one and whether it amounted to \$500,000. It is as simple as that and the hon. minister is charged obviously on a question like that to get up and provide

MR. NOLAN: charged, obviously on a question like that, to get up and provide the necessary information. It is a simple question asked by the member.

MR. SPEAKER: On this specific point of order, it would appear to me there is a definite rule that a question is not to be phrased in such a way as to suggest its own answer. And as I understand it, the connotation "slush fund" has a connotation of an improper use of money. And if the hon. gentleman is asking about certain funds for which a Crown corporation is responsible for the disposal of, then he would have to put his question in such a way as to not make the innuendo of improper use of public funds. So it is a question of the phrasing of it. The term "slush fund", as I understand it, is certainly used in terms of public trust or public monies, does have the connotation of an improper use.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, what was the amount of money used by the former president of Labrador Linerboard for personal plus business reasons and was it below or above?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: To the best of my knowledge, and the best of the knowledge of the other members of the board, Your Honour, the manager and chief executive officer of Labrador Linerboard Limited was paid a set salary plus expenses. There was no fund set aside for his own private purposes, and certainly there was nothing in the nature of \$500,000 or anywhere close to it to my knowledge. If there was or if there is some evidence to suggest that there was, I would be very happy to receive it. But certainly there was no such fund and no such - That amount is astronomical. You know, if there is something like that going on we would be very, very happy to hear about it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY:

While we are on the matter of the Linerboard mill, would the minister tell the House what future there is now in the Linerboard mill? Did the minister receive the report yet of the Advisory Committee? Will we have the budget next week? Is the report in? Will a decision be made on the Linerboard mill?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! I must insist that when an hon. member is recognized for a supplementary that it should be one question.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I tried to keep track of it, Sir. It was going pretty quickly there for a while. Is there a future for Labrador Linerboard Limited? Yes, I sincerely hope so. Do we have all the reports in from the Advisory Committee? No, we do not have them all in. Will there be a budget down before the end of the month? Yes, the target date is the 28th of April. Will we necessarily have all the information related to Linerboard Limited before that budget comes down? No, it is not necessarily so. But there may have been other little questions thrown in there which I missed, and I would certainly welcome them.

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay. That was a supplementary if there are some other hon. members who wish to ask questions.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question to the Minister of Tourism in his position as acting Minister of Health I do believe. Could the minister - The minister has probably seen the recent statement by the Newfoundland Association of Registered Nurses that they are prepared to stand by their original statements a few days ago of child abuse. I believe at Exon House.

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister has made some statements on that over the last few days. Could the minister tell the House whether or not any consideration has been given to having any sort of inquiry into those charges so that at least the public mind can be laid to rest as to what exactly is happening rather than just the statements from the minister? Is there going to be any sort of inquiry into those charges, those very serious charges?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I held a number of meetings over the weekend and met the executive of the Newfoundland Nursing Association today, and about all I am in a position to say at this point in time is that certain matters were brought to my attention and I am taking a look at them now, and a more definitive statement will be made as quickly as possible as soon as I am in a position to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Fisheries. In the minister's reference to the tentative pinpointing of ships available in Europe, could the minister tell us what type of vessels he surveyed or looked over or made arrangements, tentative arrangements - what length of ships, are they reinforced so that they could operate on the Hamilton Bank?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not qualified to look at a ship and tell you if it is capable of fishing on the Hamilton Bank. But what we did do is talk to the various ship owners and we have asked them to compile an inventory of their ships and the capability of their ships. But certainly for talking about providing catching effort to penetrate the ice covered waters of the North, then we are going to need ice

MR. CARTER: reinforced ships. And that is one of the requirements that we attached to our talks, that we would be given information on ships owned by the various companies in Europe, those especially that would have ice reinforced capability.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The original questioner, a supplementary.

CAPT. WINSOR: Would the minister consider hiring or chartering or renting, or whatever the term may be, ships other than the reinforced for navigating in ice? Because I think it is very important to get the vessels to operate where our own vessels cannot operate now.

MR. W. CARTER: Did you say can or cannot operate now? Can?

MR. MURPHY: Cannot.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, that is the idea of it, that we now have eighty-seven ships. Most of them are not - I do not think any of them are ice reinforced. These ships are only capable of fishing in certain areas. Certainly they are not able to fish within the confines of the Hamilton Bank area during the Winter months. Primarily we are interested in acquiring, maybe by way of charter, ships that are ice reinforced, freezer trawlers, with a 200 foot class, 250 foot class that could fish in areas that are now inaccessible to the Canadian catching effort and the Newfoundland catching fleet.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile and then the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when the minister discussed this matter with his colleagues in Cabinet, before the minister and the Premier went overseas to look at these ships, obviously the government must have had something in mind. They must have had some instrument whereby there were going to charter these ships. Would the minister tell the House how that is going to be carried out? How the chartering is going to be arranged? Will it be directly with the government or will it be with private industry in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, until certain decisions are made in Ottawa and certain discussions are held, which will be held shortly -

MR. NEARY: But Ottawa is not going to charter them.

MR. W. CARTER: I think the hon. member will have to be patient and certainly within another few weeks I think the entire picture will unfold, and then he will be -

MR. NEARY: When the budget is brought down?

MR. W. CARTER: No, not necessarily. But there are certain things we have to do, Mr. Speaker, before we can talk about - or at least getting down to that type of detail. And like I said earlier, and I am not trying to pass the buck, but Ottawa will naturally play a very important part in what happens within the next few months with respect to the maybe chartering of ships from Europe for the Newfoundland fish harvesting sector. But certainly that is something that will be unveiled, I hope, during the present session of the House. And I think that given time, I think the explanation will be very satisfactory.

MR. NEARY: But the time is now.

MR. W. CARTER: It will be received by the House and certainly to the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order (1) - the Address in Reply.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order (1), Address in Reply.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had adjourned the debate.

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. clerk, I wonder, tell me how much time that I have got left in this debate?

MR. SPEAKER: Eleven minutes, I am informed.

MR. NEARY: Seven minutes, well, Sir, I do not even have -

MR. SPEAKER: Eleven.

MR. NEARY: Eleven minutes - Oh! Well I can do a brief recap then, Sir. We have established a number of facts in this sub-amendment that we are discussing in connection with trying to bring about an investigation into the tripling of the cost of the Carbonear Hospital and the unrealistic escalation in the cost of the Health Sciences Complex. I have tabled a number of documents, Sir, in connection with the two projects and I have established a number of facts. Fact number one, Sir, that contracts were awarded on both projects without calling public tenders. Fact number two, there are cost plus contracts on both of these projects and Sir, there have been extensions of contracts almost to the point where it is completely irresponsible. The contractors have been given almost a blank check in the extension of some of these contracts and we know that the cost has escalated beyond people's wildest imagination.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have tabled a number of documents. I have tabled a receipt from the Progressive Conservative Association whereby Mr. Richard Greene acknowledged \$52,600 from Scrivener. And I tabled a copy of a check for \$50,000 around about the time that negotiations were going on for a new agreement with Scrivener. And I also tabled a copy of a check issued from the United Trust Fund, which is the Tory campaign fund, paid out to Mr. Andy Davidson who was the project manager at the time, Sir, for slightly over \$28,000 - \$28,500, I think it is.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other facts now that I would

MR. NEARY:

like to lay out for benefit of the hon. members. I would like to - Mr. Speaker, the government, the Premier and the administration have been quick to respond to commission of inquiries into allegations of the purchase of land at the Gros Morne National Park when the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture wanted his good name upheld. And then, Sir, the Premier was quick to react to the silly coloured television controversy, a commission of inquiry, only \$1,300 involved. So far I have pointed out to this House there were millions of dollars of taxpayers' money may have gone down the drain in extravagance and waste. Mr. Speaker, I have tabled all the information, Sir, that I wish to table at this particular time. But I do wish to say this, Sir, in connection with the accusations of skulduggery, influenced peddling, kickbacks, shake-downs; in connection with the Carbonear Hospital and the Health Sciences Complex that the Premier's name has been bandied about and other hon. members. But the Premier's name especially was bandied about.

On May 10, 1972, I am told that Mr. Greene, who was the party bagman, requested \$6,000 from Mr. Andrew Davidson, from Scrivener, requested \$6,000 to help pay the expenses of a trip for the hon. the Premier and party to a cruise around Greece. The hon. House will remember, Sir, that the hon. the Premier and several ministers and party did go off on a cruise there a few years ago to Greece, two or three years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: That has nothing to do with it.

MR. NEARY: It has all to do with it, Sir. The \$6,000 that was requested on May 10, 1972 by Mr. Greene, the party bagman, was asked, the company was asked to issue a bank draft that could be cashed anywhere in the world.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can you prove that?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, it can be proven by just going to the East End branch of the Bank of Montreal and getting a copy of the bank draft

April 18, 1977.

Tape 1627

RH - 3

MR. NEARY:

that was issued, drawn up on the East End branch of the Bank of Montreal. The sum of \$6,000 was given to Mr. Greene, who was the party bagman. But lo and behold, Sir! Where was that international bank draft cashed? It was not cashed over in Greece or in Europe.

Mr. Neary.

It was cashed down at Terra Nova Motors to buy a car with an open bank draft, cashed at Terra Nova Motors, a St. John's automobile dealer, and at that time Mr. Greene -

MR. MORGAN: Who are you charging when you say, Mr. Greene?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I am not charging - the money was not used for the purpose for which it was collected to help pay for the Premier's -

MR. WELLS: How can a car pay for a trip to Greece?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously is not listening to what I said. Do I have to spell it out?

MR. MORGAN: Who is making the dirty charges?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Davidson Scrivener was asked for \$6,000 donation to help pay for the Premier's trip to Greece, Premier and party, trip to Greece. It was asked in the form of an international bank draft, and the bank draft was drawn on the East End branch of the Bank of Montreal and passed over to Mr. Greene, who was the party bagman, and it was cashed down at Terra Nova Motors.

AN HON. MEMBER: What happened to Greece?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, this Buick electra automobile was purchased from Terra Nova Motors around the same time that that bank draft, the draft was cashed. Now, Sir, that drags the Premier's name into it. So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit, Sir, to this hon. House that for the sake of good government, of protecting the taxpayers' money, of good government, and for the sake of the integrity of the Tory Party, the Progressive Conservative Party in this Province, and for the sake, Sir, of the hon. Premier's reputation, that the government should be quick to respond, just as quick as they did to the Gros Morne National Park accusations that were made, and the coloured televisions, and get on with this enquiry, this investigation into both of these projects. Now, Sir, the Premier indicated to me a short while ago that he may have some problem in getting the right kind of person

Mr. Neary.

to carry out this kind of a fact finding mission, if you want to put it that way, this kind of enquiry. Well, Sir, I have done a lot of research over the Easter holidays on this particular matter, and I have written the Premier a letter and I have outlined to the Premier - I have given the Premier three names - the names of three people, two Newfoundlanders, and one gentleman who is not a Newfoundlander, that could do - all outstanding men, all highly qualified, all experienced in investigation, all experienced in accounting and construction, top-notch men, and I have written the Premier and I have submitted the names of these three gentlemen to the hon. Premier just in case the hon. Premier may have some kind of a mental hang-up of some kind of a psychological hang-up about coming into the House and saying, We cannot find a man suitable to do the enquiry. Now, Sir, I suggest it would not be fair for me to give the names to the House. I have given them to the Premier, and I hope that it will be helpful to the hon. Premier in making up his mind to carry out this enquiry.

One other fact, Sir - and I do not have very much time left - but one other fact that I want to mention before I sit down, and that is, Sir, that one of the companies that benefited greatly, especially from the Health Sciences Complex, is one of the companies mentioned in A, B and C in the Auditor General's Report; namely, Noel's Electrical which did all the electrical work over here at the Health Sciences Complex. And there was a little bit, Sir, there was a little bit of, shall we say, questionable negotiations carried on there when the party bagman at the time demanded a substantial amount of money for the Tory treasury. I think it was in the amount of \$250,000 and at the time -

AN HON. MEMBER: Can you prove all this?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I can prove it all.

- and at the time, Sir, negotiations were going on with a number of electrical contractors, including Canadian Comstock,

Mr. Neary.

which was one of the biggest electrical contractors in the whole of Canada, and they refused point blank to have anything to do with kickbacks in the way of political donations or any other form of donations. So, therefore, they were kicked out of the picture altogether, and the contract was given to Noel's Electrical. I do not know what the price was. I do not know if there was any price. I am not making any charges, Sir. All I am doing is asking this House to get the facts. That is another reason why we need a thorough investigation into this whole matter of the Health Sciences Complex and the Carbonear Hospital. And, Mr. Speaker, we do know of one fact that I want to re-emphasize, to drive home, to rivet home, the necessity

MR. NEARY: for this enquiry is the fact that the Minister of Public Works, a former minister in this House, the Minister of Public Works and Services, the hon. Val Earle, now no longer a member, admitted in this hon. House that two contracts at least - and that is in Hansard, Sir, the records can be checked - that at least two contracts were awarded on the Carbonear Hospital without calling public tender. One went to Babb's Construction and I forget who the other one went to. My understanding is that Babbs did not have the expertise to do the work and they had to sub-contract it out. So, Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a need in this Province for a commission of enquiry we have it now.

I do hope, Sir, that in the interest - and I, in my own personal opinion, nobody on the opposite side of the House is involved in this. That is my opinion.

MR. J. CARTER: You are certainly good at digging up dirt. Maybe you could investigate it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could do a pretty good job. The hon. gentleman does not do too bad at digging up dirt himself with his hands down in the savoury patches over there.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is no laughing matter, it is no joke, Sir. There is necessity here for an enquiry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lay your charges.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the government will respond, that we will not have to get down to a knock down, drag 'em out political partisan debate in this House. We have kept it on a pretty high plane so far.

MR. HICKEY: This is a high plane?

MR. NEARY: This is a high plane, Sir. I could table other documents if I wanted to, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to do it at this moment, but if I am forced to I will, Sir. I am hoping the government will respond just as quickly as they did to the colour television sets and to the enquiry into the Gros Morne National Park. I would expect every member on both sides of the House to support this sub-amendment.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment to the Throne Speech to delete all the words after 'that' and replace them with the following: "The House condemns the failure of the ministry to prepare and to present to the House - I am sorry, I have the wrong one. Here we have it - "Specifically demands the government forthwith set up a royal commission to enquire into and report upon all the circumstances surrounding the donation of \$52,600 made to the Progressive Conservative Party by the firm of Scrivener Projects (Nfld.) Limited, such commission to have all the powers that may be conferred upon commissioners under the Public Enquiries Act, Chapter 314 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1970."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in reference to this situation, the tripling of the costs of the Carbonear Hospital plus the immense escalation in costs of the new Hospital over here on the campus, and if you are prepared to accept the fact that the hon. the member for LaPoile did not have the cheques forged and the other documents that he tabled forged by someone, if they are accurate, and obviously they were, we are informed, provided by Mr. Davidson or one of his agents, a man who was very closely connected with Scrivener in this Province, and since there have been suggestions that

MR. NOLAN: certain amounts of money have been paid - we now hear that another amount \$,600 was changed down at Terra Nova Motors. You know, you do not go down to Terra Nova Motors just to change a \$6,000 cheque - and also bearing in mind, Mr. Speaker, that there are hon. members opposite who are quite concerned about this, there is no way in God's world, including the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), that he can vote against an amendment such as this. Not and stay in the House, surely.

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible) so far all we have heard is the (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: He tabled the cheque.

MR. NOLAN: The hon. member knows very well there have been certain documents tabled. Whether they are sufficient to convince the hon. member that there is reason for such an enquiry will be interesting to speculate on in days to come. But the situation is there is a lot of money involved here that is public money. No one in this House can say that there was anything wrong, but when we have public enquiries on, say, the Gros Morne expropriation and so on, if you hasten to the bit on items like that, how can you possibly ignore some of the suggestions that have been made regarding this?

There are hon. members opposite who are quite concerned about this situation. They are not saying that anyone is guilty of any wrongdoing, but what they are saying, privately, is that there is sufficient information there to make them wonder and they would like to have some

MR. NOLAN:

of these questions answered. We are talking about one heck of a lot of money. We are talking about situations now where we have firms involved. We have the name of a prominent lawyer involved and so on. And I think the only way to clear this up is to have the inquiry that is called for in the amendment as proposed in the sub-amendment. So I hope that the hon. members opposite, one, will not remain silent on this. At least let them have the guts to get up, Mr. Speaker, and say "No, this is wrong. There is nothing wrong. This is just normal practice" and so on and then vote against it. It is as simple as that. And then the press and all the people in the Province will have an opportunity to judge the gentlemen accordingly. But if they attempt to ignore this one then I suggest that they do so at their jeopardy. If the hon. member, for example, of St. John's North (Mr. Carter) feels that the copies of the checks that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tabled and so on are forgery, they are fakes and this, that and the other, let him prove it and that is the end of it. But if he is not prepared to do that, then I would suggest that he will have to certainly, one, address himself to the situation because there is too much involved to merely ignore it; and secondly, to vote for the amendment. Not only that, if we are to believe, as we must, the comments by the hon. member that he has already forwarded the names, suggested names at least, of a number of people, I would think, who might serve on such a commission and so on to the hon. the Premier. It would be interesting if there is an inquiry, and say the hon. member from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), as an example, votes against it, then how is he going to live with that one in his cabbage patch? So we are going to be watching very closely Mr. Speaker. Fifty-two thousand six hundred dollars is not hay. That allegedly was donated to the Progressive Conservative Party. We are now told that certain amounts were demanded and refused by a very prominent company. Put them on the witness stand, where they can be

MR. NOLAN:

free to give evidence under oath, and this is the only way it can be done. Bring Mr. Davidson to the witness stand and anyone else who may have been involved and whose name may have been mentioned here in this House. But it is certainly nothing that you can sweep under the table, not and get away with it. People are too sceptical about politicians anyway. And if we attempt to avoid this one then we are merely digging out own graves here in this House. I think that if the full facts do come out it may lead to one thing and that is a complete change in the total financing situation of political parties in this Province of all stripes. And that is going to come eventually by enlightened minds in the future whether you like it or not because I think eventually the public and the people will certainly demand it.

Now it is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to prolong the debate on the amendment. But I do hope that members opposite will address themselves to it. It is all right to say to the minister or the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) "Prove it, prove it, prove it!" Well let them prove that the documents he has tabled are wrong, they are forged, they are faked and this, that and the other. That being so, the matter can be dropped right there. But unless they are prepared to do that, their silence, I am afraid, will condemn them, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a couple of minutes to make a few very short remarks on this sub-amendment because, Sir, it is something that I believe, and my colleague made reference to it, it is something that I believe hits at the heart of our political system. I do not want to get political or talk in partisan terms about this sub-amendment, calling for an investigation into the more than \$52,000 allegedly made by Scrivener to the P.C. Party. Now it is all right to shout back and forth, Sir, "Prove it!", and all this kind of stuff.

Redempt
MR. NOLAN:

But the way I understand the way the thing has gone this last few days is that the receipt has been tabled in this House by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). That receipt has been acknowledged as being authentic by the lawyer, Mr. Greene, who I understand used to collect money for the governing party now on the other side. So, you know, for to shout across and say, "Prove it! Prove that the thing was done," well it has already been admitted. The receipt has been tabled. The gentleman who signed the receipt says that it is a good one, that the contribution was actually made. Now that in itself, Sir, says to me, especially when we consider the fact that projects escalated so much in which Scrivener was involved, projects like the Carbonear Hospital which tripled in cost, was that all due to inflation? Maybe it was, maybe it was not. The cost of the Health Sciences Complex has gone so high, Sir, that it is almost impossible to imagine the figures anymore. Is that all

MR. RIDEOUT: due to inflation or are there other factors involved. There are a number of questions that must be answered. I believe there are a number of questions that should be answered. The gentleman from LaPoile has presented some proof and somebody, Sir, should be able to tell the people of this Province whether the facts as he has brought them out in this House are true or not. Somebody should tell us. The government hastened very quickly and I believe rightly so to set up a commission of inquiry into the famous or infamous tv set business that was brought up in this House a few days ago - did not waste any time at all doing that. I understand from my colleagues who served in this House previously that the government hastened very quickly to set up a commission of inquiry into the land expropriation in the Gros Morne National Park region when the integrity of the present Minister of Forestry and Agriculture was questioned with regard to that deal. Rightly so, that is what they should have done.

Now, Sir, the name of the Premier has been kicked around in this particular deal, the integrity of the government has been kicked around, the integrity of the PC Party has been kicked around and it is time for those questions to be answered. Now I feel very strongly about it, Sir, because this whole system makes me sick, of running out - I am not blaming the government, the PC Party on the other side. Our party was probably just as bad when they were over there and it is just as bad probably all across Canada, but for once in our lives, Sir, let us do something for God's sake to clean up the system. Every now and then when you talk about political kickbacks and political financing it almost makes me feel, as a member in this House, like crawling under the seat and being ashamed to be seen.

AN HON. MEMBER: You too!

MR. RIDEOUT: Because how did we get here? The party that I represent was given contributions by somebody. Obviously they were expecting something in return for that. The party that is

MR. RIDEOUT: now the government on the other side were given contributions by somebody and whether they twisted arms to get it or not maybe a question. So the whole system, Sir, at times makes me stomach sick to even think about it, it stinks. Let us start to clean it up.

There is a greater principle involved in this little sub-amendment here than just saying the Tories went out and twisted arms and got \$52,000 from Scrivener. There is a greater principle. The whole financing of elections, the whole political system as we know it is in question in this Province. People are talking about it and doing it rightly so. The integrity and honesty of the Premier and the government that he leads and of the party that he leads are also being questioned by facts, I suppose as far as I know, presented to this House. So clear it up. It has been done before - a couple of instances that I have mentioned. So let us get on with it. I support the call for a commission of enquiry. Let us get on with cleaning up our political system and that is really the question that underlines this sub-amendment.

Sir, I support this call for a commission of enquiry and I hope that people on the other side will do the same.

MR. SPEAKER(DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentlemen opposite since we started on this sub-amendment this afternoon and much of what they say is extremely valid. As I understand the situation of the sub-amendment and of the discussions and arguments that have been put forward by the other side and so on, as I understand government's position the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services who is presently not in the House, unfortunately, is to make a very detailed comprehensive statement as it relates to the allegations made by the hon. member for LaPoile both as it is reflected in the sub-amendment and the discussions and arguments that he put forward as a result of the

MR. PECKFORD: sub-amendment. The hon. minister is not in his place today and I understand it will be a number of days before he will be. The hon. Premier is on his way back from Europe and will hopefully be in the House tomorrow. So we have undertaken to provide the people's House, this House with a complete and full statement as it relates to the Health Sciences Complex, the escalation of costs, the negotiations of agreements with the Scrivener group and other groups or whatever to indicate the diligence with which government undertook to ensure that we were getting a good and decent deal as it relates to the Health Sciences Complex and other projects that were ongoing around the time referred to in the statements by the people opposite, by the hon. members opposite. So that is the position where it stands right now.

Now this government, Mr. Speaker, has a pretty good record when it comes to trying to

MP. PECKFORD:

to, as the hon. members have already mentioned clearing the air on the number of allegations that have been made by hon. members or by people outside of this House. We did very early in this administration establish, as everybody knows, a public tendering act which has served this province very well over the last four or five years. It has been a very magnificent piece of legislation which, on the one hand has allowed us to boast about that kind of principle and at the same time it has also caused a lot of problems for the administration as every citizen of this province can recognize especially when one gets into tendering on major projects in which there are firms outside of this province and firms inside this province. Newfoundland firms versus, if you will, alien firms, or mainland firms or upalong firms. When you have bids coming in that are extremely close and trying to determine and agonize over the legal implications of not going with the mainland firm because you think you can get more Newfoundlanders employed by going with the Newfoundland firm and all that that implies.

On the one hand that the principle is sound and all the rest of it and one that we obviously support and took the initiative on bringing into this House and getting it passed, it also has caused many problems. In the same as we can indicate to the people of this province the moves that we made as it relates to hiring practises within the public service, as it relates to the whole Newfoundland and Liquor Corporation which years ago was abused politically many, many times and we all can relate our own little stories about that. So on many, many fronts we have in the past four or five years gone a long way through legislation, through restructuring of government agencies to making them free from any political interference. On the particular one that is now mentioned, as I say, the hon. minister of Public Works and Services and/or the Premier will be commenting in

MR. PECKFORD:

detail on the allegations, on the escalation of cost and all the rest. Then, then when that statement and position of the administration is put forward it is only then that we can fully evaluate the validity or necessity of the kind of enquiry that the hon. member for LaPoile is asking for in his resolution. To do otherwise would be flying in the face of reason - the hon. member for Stephenville, I am sorry - would be flying in the face of making decisions without having all the facts and both sides of the story told in this House. So on that basis this side of the House cannot support the sub-amendment at this time because government has undertaken and will provide a comprehensive and complete statement on the issue in this House either the minister of Public Works and/or the Premier within the next few days, hopefully, when these gentlemen return from work that they are now engaged in.

That is the position of the administration. Hon. members on this side of the House are as concerned as hon. members on the other side of the House when allegations of this kind are made which tend to reflect upon, as the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay said, on the integrity of the party that we are a part of, the government that we are a part of, as individuals, members of the House, and all the rest of it. I, for one member, speaking on behalf of the ministry am very concerned about it as well. And we will see and analyze our own positions as relates to this matter when the administration's complete and full statement is made regarding the allegations in the sub-amendment. At this point in time we find ourselves unable to vote for it until we have presented to the hon. House through the minister of Public Works and Services, who in the first instance is responsible, the position of the administration.

MR. NOLAN: When is that going to be?

MR. PECKFORD: Hopefully this week.

MR.SPEAKER: Hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR.LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I stand to support the amendment. The minister makes some good and makes some valid points. But, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House still contend that if the minister is, and the government are so intent upon clearing up some of these allegations or some of these doubts raised by the amendment that it is the feeling of this side of the House then they should do as the amendment suggests and that is to

Mr. Lush.

set up a commission to look into the entire matter, the entire circumstances surrounding this situation and to clear the air once and for all. Mr. Speaker, it is a situation that certainly demands this kind of action. The minister has previously given statements which I think, previous to the amendment, which illustrates that this side of the House and certainly the person that moved the amendment is not satisfied with the explanations to date of the minister respecting this particular situation. And the only way to do a thorough job, the only way to do a complete job, to clean up all the suspicion around this particular situation is to do as the amendment suggests and that is namely to set up a commission that will have all the powers conferred upon it by a commission under the Public Enquiries Act and to look into all the matters, and all the circumstances surrounding this particular situation.

And as the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) alluded to, that it is a matter of principle. The government now have the opportunity to clean up this situation, if you will, and Mr. Speaker, they have looked into, as we have said before, smaller incidents, particularly the incident of some days ago of televisions which is nothing at all compared to this particular situation, and a government that will act so quickly to clean up a situation like this, one would think that they would want to act very quickly in this particular kind of a situation. And they now have the opportunity to do something for politics in Newfoundland. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has raised a lot of facts in his particular speech today and previously when speaking to this amendment. And, Mr. Speaker, if that is left up in the air, if that is just left unsolved, if that is left to stay where it is, I think that there is going to be a lot of doubts in the minds of the people of this Province, and I believe it is incumbent

Mr. Lush.

upon the government to clear up those matters once and for all and, Sir, if there is nothing to fear, if the government have nothing to worry about, then I see no reason why they do not act according to the amendment to set up a commission and to look into all matters surrounding this donation by Scrivener, and to prove to the Newfoundland public and to prove to this House that everything was indeed above board. To not do so, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, would certainly leave a lot of doubt, and a lot of suspicion in the minds of the people of this Province, and I believe that the government now have the opportunity to prove otherwise, and to clean up politics in this Province. And I believe it is incumbent upon them to act according to this amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. DAWE: I rise, Mr. Speaker, in voting against the sub-amendment.

I have been a member of this House for ten years, and I listened to similar allegations when I sat on the other side of the House as I am listening to here today. And while the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has brought forth facts that I am sure all us members do not like, under our democratic system this is the way party funds are raised, and always have been raised since Confederation.

MR. NEARY: But I am not criticizing that.

MR. DAWE: And I know myself, I probably owe my election as well as several members of this House, on both sides of this House, owe our election or probably party funds were provided in a similar manner as this. And that while I wish to make that point, Mr. Speaker, this is a situation that will come up again some time in the future.

Mr. Dawe.

And the only way as I see it that any government or any party can rid themselves of similar allegations in the future is that some way will be provided, that the elections of the various members will be provided from funds from this House.

MR. DAWE:

I sincerely hope and trust that probably during this session or before the next election is called, I would like to see a select committee of both sides of the House be set up and that when the next election comes around that ways and means will be found so that at least the major funds for elections will be provided by this House.

MR. NEARY: That is not the argument we are using.

MR. DAWE: I agree it is not the argument. But I say this will come up again. It has come up here several times. And to me there is not sufficient evidence to warrant this commission at this time. As previous Speakers have pointed out, the minister when he is ready is going to prepare a detailed statement on this matter before this House and then we can judge its merits or otherwise.

But I would like to say and impress on the government that in future these things will come up again. And the only way that I can see that this can be prevented, as I say, is some way funds will be provided from this House that will control and provide for elections. We ran, as you know, as a Liberal Reform Party. And the main plank - the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is not present in his seat today, but as you know the main reason why this party was formed and the main platform, plank while we were a group in the last election was because of this similar situation. And, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I will be voting against the sub-amendment. But I would like to implore government, between now and the next general election, to find some way to provide funds so that a similar situation will not come before this House again. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

MR. J. CARTER: This sub-amendment -

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

Order, please! I believe the hon. member has already spoken in this debate.

MR. J. CARTER: Not on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, but you may check. It was a long time ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am informed by the table that the hon. member did speak in the debate on March 10.

Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is as set forth in the sub-amendment and I do not believe it is necessary for me to read the sub-amendment unless hon. members so wish.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour of the motion please indicate by saying "Aye", those against by saying "Nay". In my opinion the "nays" have it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Divide, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The members have been called in, so if the hon. members wish to take their seats in the meantime.

MR. SPEAKER(DR. COLLINS): Order please! The question before the House is the sub-amendment .

Those in favour of the motion please rise:

Mr. Nolan, Mr. Lush, Mr. Neary, Mr. Flight, Mr. Callan, Mr. Rideout, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Winsor.

Those against the motion please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, the hon. the Minister of Rural and Industrial Development, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. the Minister of Education, Mr. Young, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Goudie, Mr. Windsor, Mr. Cross, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Carter, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Dawe.

I declare the motion lost.

The question before the House is now the amendment . Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour please say "aye." Those against "nay." In my opinion the "nays" have it.

The motion before the House now is the motion for the adoption of the Throne Speech.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are now back to square one. We are now debating, Sir, the main motion - the Address in Reply. And, Mr. Speaker, the first thing I want to deal with is a couple of matters in connection with my own district of LaPoile. As hon. members know the new district of LaPoile, the electoral district of LaPoile stretches from Cape Ray to Grand Bruit. Three communities in the district are isolated. The only way you can get there is by

MR. NEARY: water. The mainstay of the economy of the district of LaPoile, of course, is the fishery. I would estimate, Mr. Speaker, that about 60 per cent of the economy of the district of LaPoile depends largely on the fishery and the other 40 per cent is CN. So, Mr. Speaker, I have personally, as the member of the House of Assembly for the district of LaPoile, I have an interest in two really, two of the major items of discussion in this Province from time to time. Number one the future of the Canadian National operations and job security for Canadian National employees and the other,

Mr. Neary.

of course, is the future of the fishery in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to mention a couple of weaknesses in my district at the present time, and one has to do with municipal government. The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing for some time now has had a proposal in front of him from the community of Burnt Islands in my district to have a town council established in that community. At the moment there is no form at all of municipal government in that community. And as a result of there being no municipal governing body, of course, the community is suffering badly. There is no control over dumping. There is no planning. No control over building. And so, Mr. Speaker, the community is just generally, I suppose, I could say suffering, because of the lack of municipal government. The people have indicated that they will now go along with the government and the recommendation of the Henley Royal Commission, that they will accept -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Whelan Royal Commission.

MR. NEARY: The Whelan Royal Commission, excuse me. The Henley is on my mind these days because the minister is trying to foist regional government upon the people in this area.

AN HON. MEMBER: They do not want it.

MR. NEARY: They do not want it, Sir, and I will deal with that later when I get an opportunity, when we are dealing with that commission. But the Whelan Royal Commission recommended that in communities with a certain population that they take a town council in preference to a community council or a local improvement district. I believe community councils are going to be wiped out altogether eventually. They will be wiped out or local improvement districts. And so the minister's predecessor insisted that the people of Burnt Islands have a town council. Well they finally got a petition. They got a majority of people to agree to that, and the petition has been in the

Mr. Neary.

hands of the government, the minister now, for some time and the minister indicated to me that the decision has now been taken, that the community of Burnt Islands is going to get a town council, and it is only a matter now of gazetting the incorporation of the town, and then it becomes legal, and they can start operating, and they can hold their first election then as soon as the matter is gazetted. The people will be able to hold a town council election in Burnt Islands and elect their first council by secret ballot in a democratic way. And I think this is the way that it should be done, Sir, despite the fact that I have been trying to light a fire under the minister for some time. I did not take any sides at all in the controversy. I tried to steer it down the middle. I think it is political suicide for a member of the House of Assembly to get involved in a community council versus a town council or a local improvement district. You cannot win in that kind of a situation. But I am glad, Sir, that the decision has now been taken. I want to thank the minister for dealing with this matter during the Easter recess. I would think with all the major problems, with all the problems of major importance that are facing the people of this Province, Sir, that a town council for Burnt Islands would be very low on the list of priorities. But now it has been approved, I understand, and it is only a matter of it appearing in the Newfoundland Gazette and then the people can go ahead and elect their mayor and the councillors.

And this is going to be good, Sir. This is going to be good for Burnt Islands. Burnt Islands is a thriving community. The mainstay of the economy of that particular community is the fishery. The fish plant burned down there a few weeks ago, Eric King Fisheries. I am glad to report to the House that as of today Mr. King will be cutting herring in his emergency operation that he has managed to establish

Mr. Neary.

in the herring plant. The herring plant was right next door to the fish plant that burned down. He has now established a temporary, an emergency operation, so that the fishermen in the community can keep on fishing, that they can land their fish, and that it will be partly processed in Burnt Islands.

MR. MORGAN: Where does he operate from?

MR. NEARY: He operates from Burnt Islands, Eric King Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: He was not always operating from there.

MR. NEARY: Well he was operating in a fish plant which burned down, and now right across the way, only probably less than a couple of hundred feet away was the herring plant. So now he is going to operate in the herring plant on a temporary basis. The electricity hookups were supposed to be made today and if everything

MR. NEARY: is in order and he can get the approval of the Provincial Fisheries Department and meet the federal requirements and then he should be cutting herring tonight in that plant. All the plant workers should be back to work today or tomorrow. It is only, as I say, a temporary operation so the plant workers will have to operate on two shifts rather than one as they did previously. So that should be good news for the Minister of Fisheries.

But, Sir, they needed municipal government in that community in the worst kind of a way. Now that have gotten it, Mr. Speaker, I expect to see great things happening in the community of Burnt Islands. I do not know if any members have ever had the opportunity to visit that part of Newfoundland but the terrain is terribly rocky down there. It is very difficult for people to get good drinking water and that is one of the big problems in Burnt Islands. They still have to carry their water in buckets. The Government of Canada, DREE, put an industrial waterline there last year costing, I believe, over a couple of million dollars - was it? - down to the fish plant, the Eric King Fisheries, the herring plant, so you have a good foundation now for a water supply for Burnt Islands, and I am hoping that in the not too distant future that a proposal will be coming forward from Burnt Islands to the minister to hook into that industrial water supply. There is plenty of water there for everybody. I hope to see at an early a date as possible a community water supply in the community of Burnt Inlands.

Incidentally, the minister may be interested in knowing that this committee of concerned citizens, since they circulated that petition and held these public meetings in connection with the town council,

MR. NEARY: that they have now formed a volunteer fire brigade, and they have raised, I believe, \$4,000 or \$5,000 in the community to help the fire brigade. So there is no end, Sir, to the things that can be done now when the local people take the initiative.

There is no shortage of leadership there. The leadership, believe it or not, started to surface with the talk of a town council. Prior to that you could not hardly get anybody interested in doing anything in the town, a handful of people, the same people doing it over and over again, and all of a sudden emerges what I consider to be excellent leadership and I can see the makings there of a good town council. So, Mr. Speaker, Burnt Islands, if everything goes well, God willing, Sir, Burnt Islands should be in fairly good shape over the next few years, especially as the economy is based on the fishery. Because as I have said so often in this hon. House, Sir, that in my opinion the lifestyle, the whole lifestyle and the whole economy and the future of Newfoundland lies in the fishery and the fishermen on the Southwest corner of this Province are the finest in this Province. They are not gentlemen fishermen. They are not fellows who go out and fish for their eight stamps or their twelve stamps or whatever the case may be. They are not the kind of fishermen who will go to the Fishery Loan Board and get a longliner that costs \$180 thousand or a couple of hundred thousand dollars and haul it in on shore five or six or seven months out of a year and never meet their payments on it. They are not that kind of fishermen, Sir, they are the kind of fishermen who fish twelve months out of a year. They fish year-round. And when we have \$30 million worth of longliners on shore on the East coast of this Province, longliners that could fish year-round, as the minister

MR. NEARY: knows, here you have fish plants on the Southwest coast hungry for fish and you have fishermen who can make good skipper-men who cannot get a longliner, cannot get a boat. They have them in Burnt Islands at the present time.

I have had a good many discussions with the present Minister of Fisheries about this. George King is down in Burnt Islands fishing all his life, fishing in a small boat. He brings in more fish in a small boat than half the longliners in this Province, and the man cannot get a longliner - well he is working on it now. He may get it eventually - he cannot even get a licence from the federal fisheries people to drag. He cannot get a drag licence, an otter trawl licence because they say, Oh, you did not have one before you are not a full-time fisherman. Well I would like to know what he is.

MR. NEARY:

You got Jack King the same way. I could go on. You got about ten men. You have ten solid fishermen, full-time fishermen, fishermen who are motivated by productivity in Burnt Islands alone that cannot get longliners, that cannot get a license to drag. If they had the longliner they could probably do other forms of fishing. They do not have to get the otter trawl license because I believe the minister will agree with me that the otter - you can only put in about every second one or every third boat in the Gulf, especially in the Bay St. George area. Every second boat, say, should have a drag license, the rest of them should be Danish seining or jigging or whatever other way they catch the fish down there. But you cannot have all otter trawls. But, Sir, you can have more than are there now. We have to increase the catching capability of that community, in that area. And while you have \$30 million worth of longliners hauled up on shore on the East Coast and have been on shore since last, say, October or November and are not in the water yet and some of them have not been in the water for two or three years - they tell me around the Bay you can go over, you can find longliners with all the latest navigational equipment on board, sonar systems, two sets of radar on board, all the latest equipment on board. They have been in on shore now for two years. And that is why the other day I said - the minister was away, he probably did not hear this - that I suggested before one cent is spent out of that \$35 million on longliners that an inventory be done in the whole Province to find out our catching capability at the present time. Are the longliners being utilized to their maximum capacity?

Mr. Speaker, I contend, and this may be a new innovation and it may be a break with tradition, but I believe the minister will agree with me - as a matter of fact I heard the minister, I believe, on one occasion mention it in this hon. House, that we have to get away from the traditions of fishing on a part-time basis, fishing in the Spring of the year and going

MR. NEARY:

ashore in the Fall. The boats are too expensive. You can never get your investment back on these longliners if that is what is going to happen and some just fishing long enough to get their stamps. You have to utilize what you have. And so we have to do an inventory, in my opinion, of all the longliners that we presently have to see if they can be moved. Mr. Speaker, if a man goes to the Fishery Loan Board and he wants a longliner, the Fishery Loan Board should say to him, "Well now how long are you going to be fishing out of a year?" Well if the fisherman says, "I am only going to be fishing from the middle of May till the end of October," then he should be given the longliner for that length of time. And then after that he should be given the opportunity, the owner, the first skipper-man should be given the opportunity to say, "Well, all right, now at the end of October you take your longliner and you go down on the Southwest Coast because you can fish year-round down there." And if he says, "No, I do not want to go I want to follow the tradition of Newfoundlanders, Newfoundland fishermen want to go ashore in the Wintertime, snuggle up to the fire and watch Another World." Fine, but take the longliner and give it to somebody down here who does not have one, who can operate one, who has the qualifications, cannot get one and let him fish it in the Wintertime and then bring it back again in the Spring of the year and give it back to the original owner.

MR. WOODROW: It is not very practical.

MR. NEARY: Not very practical.

MR. WOODROW: I heard you say that.

MR. NEARY: It is not practical.

MR. WOODROW: It is not practical.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it is not practical. We will have \$30 million worth of longliners in on shore on the East Coast while my fish plants down there are hungry for fish.

MR. WOODROW: Who would own the boats?

MR. NEARY: Who would own the boats? The government would own - whatever the mystery organization the minister is talking about. We were once going to set up a Crown corporation. Maybe we should have went ahead with it. It was the best idea the government ever had and they chickened out. They were talked out of it by the plant owners. Let the government own the longliners and let the fishermen lease it for six or seven months and then lease it to another fisherman down on the Southwest Coast for the rest of the time. But keep the thing operating. You cannot have a longliner worth \$200,000, \$250,000 tied up for five and six months out of a year. It does not make sense to the hon. gentleman, does it? It is not practical.

MR. WOODROW: Are you referring to boats already owned?
Fishermen rent or own boats now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am talking -

MR. WOODROW: You want to make a clear slate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are boats now, there are boats now, now on shore that have not been in the water for two years. The license is

MR. NEARY: tied up for twelve months, not only the boat. There is a freeze on licenses as my hon. friend knows - drag licenses -

AN HON. MEMBER: I know it myself. I was -

MR. NEARY: And, Sir, when a fisherman goes for a license the federal authority should say to him, "How long are you going to be fishing?" "I am going to be fishing five months." "Here is your five month license." Do not tie it up for twelve months like they are now. Write him out a blank cheque and say, "Here, boy, you have a license now. You can fish for twelve months if you like." The most of them are only fishing for five or six months. That license should be given for the length of time a man is going to be fishing and then taken and given to somebody else the rest of the time when they can fish. I am not going to work out the details in my speech but I could. If I could sit down for a couple of hours I could work out the details of it but it is not my place to do it. I am just arguing a principle and if that does not make any sense to the hon. landlubber from Bay of Islands well then, Sir, I hope before I am finished I can convince him because I think it is a good sound principle. As a matter of fact the minister agrees with me.

MR. WOODROW: What are you hinting at that I am a landlubber? You know I get seasick I guess.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the boats can be moved, can be mobilized, moved around various parts of the Province and they can be fishing year-round and so before we start spending another \$35 million on constructing longliners let us find out what we have. Let us find out how we can get more utilization out of these boats. Let us find out how we can use them on a year-around basis and we should do the same thing with our dragger fleet. Obviously the minister, from the question I put to the minister today, has the information on the trawler fleet already. And then, Sir, let us find out the capability of

MR. NEARY: our plants on shore. Let us find out where we should move these boats, where the fish should go. That is very important.

MR. W. CARTEF: We are doing that.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon.

MR. W. CARTER: We are doing it.

MR. NEARY: The minister is doing it. I am glad to hear it because that is absolutely essential also, Sir. I understand, and I believe it was from a statement again that the minister made - I am not sure if it was in his Harbour Grace speech or here in the House - that the fish plants in this Province are now only operating at forty per cent capacity.

MR. W. CARTER: Less than forty.

MR. NEARY: Less than forty per cent capacity.

MR. W. CARTER: Closer to thirty.

MR. NEARY: And so - Well, it is closer to thirty the minister says and I believe him. I believe it, Sir, because we have that problem on the Southwest corner of this Province. While you have boats tied up, longliners on shore, licenses tied up for twelve months out of a year you have plants, and not only that you have the fish. They never saw such a good year for cod as the minister knows on that Southwest corner. Now they are going into grey sole and herring and then they will get back to cod again. And I do not know if members are aware of it, Sir, but in the Wintertime the fishery on the Southwest Coast is at its peak. That is the best time the fishery is on the Southwest Coast in the Wintertime when everybody else is on shore and that is why I say you should move your longliners, move your catching capability back and forth.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You are in real trouble on that one.

MR. NEARY: I am in real trouble?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You are not in your own district you know.

MR. NEARY: Where am I in real trouble too?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Because it is so impractical as to be foolish.

MR. NEARY: Is that so? What is impractical about it?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Nothing impractical about going around the Cape. You do not take a fellow from up in Leading Ticks and have him fish out of Rose Blanche.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you know the hon. minister makes a statement off the top of his head. Obviously the minister -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I just came back from my riding and I -

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister obviously has not been listening to me or does not understand the principle that I am outlining here, Sir. I am talking about mobilizing the longliner fleet. You can do it, Sir,

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I know.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say this first of all to answer the minister that you can go down in St. Mary's Bay and you can go down off the Southern Shore sometimes and you will find fishermen from my district of Margaree, Burnt Islands and Rose Blanche chasing the fish. They will come down on the East Coast to catch the fish.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The Pettens go down fishing in Notre Dame Bay.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know there are -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Who does it?

MR. NEARY: I am not talking about the isolated cases, Sir. The fishermen in the Southwest corner of this Province will chase the fish but there are other fishermen who will not, or so-called fishermen. They will get their longliners and they will get preferential treatment over the full-time fishermen, the man who is motivated by productivity and six or seven months out of the year the longliners are on shore. Does the minister think that is right?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What do you do with them? Do you pass a law in the legislature saying to go fishing on the Southwest Coast?

April 18, 1977

Tape 1639

JM - 4

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. No, siree as far as I am concerned it is a free country. I am not the kind of a fellow who will say that you should grab people by the scruff of the neck and say you have to do this, you have to break with tradition but what I am

MR. NEARY.

saying is this, that when a fisherman goes to the Fishery Loan Board that the Fishery Loan Board should say, How long are you going to be fishing? I am going to be fishing six months, Sir. Okay, you can have that boat for six months. We will lease it to you. But after six months it has to go somewhere else, because we want that boat that cost the taxpayers of this Province a substantial amount of money, we want that boat to fish at least ten months out of a year, eleven months out of a year, just be in on shore long enough for its annual refit. Now what is wrong with that principle? Could the minister tell me? Is there anything wrong with that?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You should lay down conditions that he has to go fishing elsewhere, you say.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, he does not have to go. Nine chances out of ten if he had the opportunity he would go, but if he does not want to go, Sir, that is fine boy, you go ashore but your boat goes or the taxpayers' boat goes. Now what is wrong with that principle?

MR. WOODROW: He would never own his boat. He would not be able to take any pride in it.

MR. NEARY: He would not be able to take any pride in it. Sir, you know, I anticipated that argument, Mr. Speaker. I anticipated that argument when I made my original statement that when you change the skipperman, they are not going to look after the boat and all that sort of thing. Well, Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman, the landlubber that just made that statement realize that every boat in the world changes its skipper? The CN, CN that operate on the Gulf, that operate the coastal boat service, the skipperman changes every two weeks. Does he not look after the boat?

MR. WOODROW: Essentially what I mean is that these people work to get that boat. They want private enterprise.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. Well the captains own -

MR. WOODROW: Private enterprise.

MR. NEARY: - the captains own the CN boats do they? The captains own the CN boats?

MR. WOODROW: That is a different thing. That is a different thing altogether.

MR. NEARY: It is a different thing altogether. I see.

Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is not practical, Sir. But I am prepared to give it a try. And I would say that you could probably persuade a good many skippermen to go with the boat, because they are interested in making more money, too, and they are interested in owning their boats and paying them off. But the way they are going at it now it is only the taxpayers who will lose, because you have got these boats. Thirty million dollars I am told by the minister tied up on the East Coast and fish plants hungry for fish. So we are not utilizing, Sir, the boats. I know there is an argument against - I know what the Minister of Rural Development is thinking about. Over in the minister's community of Upper Island Cove you had fishermen with small boats who operated in Lower Island Cove, operated in the trap season, probably operated right up to September, October, and then went ashore for the Winter. That is all right. Well and good. And, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister saying, the hon. minister who is responsible for Industrial and Rural Development in this Province, is that minister saying that now that we have provided big boats with all the latest navigational equipment that they should also be hauled in on shore for five, six or seven months out of a year? Is that the way the minister is protecting the taxpayers' investment in the fishery of this Province? If the crowd, Sir, if the crowd that have gone ashore in the Fall of the year want to go ashore, let them go. Well, so what! Let them follow tradition. But certainly we will never get the production. We will never get our productivity up. We will never establish the fishery on a sound basis with that kind of attitude and that

Mr. Neary.

kind of thinking. Of course, they would not be doing any more than we do in this Legislature. Shut her down whenever you feel like it. Open up in the Wintertime, shut her down in the Summer and the Fall of the year. Mr. Speaker, we should be concentrating on productivity. And as I say, Sir, in my opinion the whole future of this Province hinges on the success of the fishery and the working out of a good fishery policy. And if the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development does not think that there is need for an inventory of all the longliners that we have in this Province to see how many months out of a year they are being used, and if they can be moved and if some of the skippermen who own these longliners are prepared to move them, go with them and fish in other parts of the Province, then I think we would all be better off. We have to get away from this foolish nonsense of fishing five or six months out of a year.

Now on top of that, Sir, in addition to that you are going to have to get the kind of boats that the minister - that we were trying to get information on today. You are going to have to get bigger boats. You are going to have to get trawlers

MR. NEARY:

trawlers and draggers I will deal with that now in a few minutes but I got sidetracked there I was talking about Burnt Islands. I would hope, Sir, that the minister now, the minister of Municipal Affairs now will take a good hard look at trying to establish a town council in Isle aux Morts. At the moment there is a local improvement district there and in my opinion, although the gentlemen that are on the local improvement district are doing the best they can under the circumstances, I believe now there is need for a town council in the community of Isle aux Morts. The same thing in Rose Blanche. I think, probably, with the introduction of the water supply that the minister should take a look, once that job is done, that project is over with, the minister should take a look at establishing a town council in the community of Rose Blanche.

In Cape Ray--there is no municipal governing body in Cape Ray and some form of regulatory body Sir, is needed in the community of Cape Ray. In Fox Roost, Margaree same thing. All they have there is a local water committee. So I would hope now, Sir, that the minister would have his officials in the Corner Brook regional office take a look at establishing a town council in all the larger, especially the larger communities, they are pretty well all large communities in my district from Cape Ray to say Rose Blanche. It is badly needed and I think it is the only way, Sir, that the communities are going to be properly regulated. They are dumping now helter-skelter all over the place, there are all kinds of dumps that are eyesores, there is no rhyme or reason to where the building is going on. So I would hope sir, that the minister now, that this is only a beginning in Burnt Islands, will carry on and not let up until all these communities that I mentioned from Cape Pay to Rose Blanche have a community council or a town council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the fishery again for a moment there are four fish plants in the district of

MR. NEARY:

LaPoile, four fish plants. The one in Port aux Basques is operated by T. J. Hardy, the one in Margaree is operated by Gabe Billard. Then we have Eric King's fisheries in Burnt Islands, then we have T.J.Hardy's fish plant in Rose Blanche. Even though Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a few moments ago that 60 per cent of the economy of the district of LaPoile is dependant on the fishery, only three of the plants that I mentioned are operating on a year-round basis. The other two—I am sorry I did not mention the plant in Isle aux Morts, Connors Bros— but only three out of the five Sir, are operating on a year-round basis. Even though they are operating on a year-round basis Mr. Speaker, that does not mean that they are operating at maximum capacity. They are only operating one shift. They could be operating two shifts or even three shifts if necessary. But the plant in Isle aux Morts and the plant in Pose Blanche are only seasonal operations. I already dealt with the one in Isle aux Morts, that it was taken over recently from Nelpack Fisheries by Connors Bros. That plant is only operating during the herring season.

Now, B.C.Packers, which is a Weston owned company— Weston seem to own all the, pretty well all the outside companies that are operating now in this Province. That operation right from the beginning Sir, has been operated as a seasonal operation set up mainly to exploit the herring industry in this Province and when they clean the herring off the Southwest coast they shut her down every year. I think Fishery Products at one stage got into processing groundfish but somehow or for some reason or other they dropped it. They dropped it at a time when the price was, you know when the markets were in pretty bad shape. But now, Sir, it only operates anywhere from ten to twelve to fourteen weeks a year, a beautiful plant. The minister and I were in it and we saw it. I have been in it several times. The minister was good

MR. NEARY:

enough to come there on one of his visits, one of his three visits to my district to take a look at that plant. It is a beautiful plant and all the equipment for processing groundfish is there in the plant and is all stored, in storage .

Mr. Speaker, the group of concerned citizens in Isle aux Morts, the people who have set themselves up now to try to duplicate what is happening in Burat Islands, take the initiative, try to get something done, put the pressure on the operators and on the politicians and on the government to try to

MR. NEARY:

get that plant to operate twelve months out of a year so far, Sir, have run right up against a stone wall. And all I hear is statements, "Oh, Connors Brothers are the biggest canners, they operate the biggest canneries in Eastern Canada." Well so what? So what? They operate it over in Lark Harbour over in New Brunswick, but are they going to operate it in Isle aux Morts? They will not say. They will not give the people of Isle aux Morts a straight answer. They are playing a cat and mouse game with the people of Isle aux Morts. And the people had their hopes built up. They were expecting big things. They were told about Connors Brothers, this great company that are big in canning. They are not only going to process herring now but they are going to start canning for the underdeveloped countries of the world and all this sort of nonsense. Instead of increasing, Sir, the employment at that plant they have laid off most of their permanent workers. Now they may take them back on again when the herring starts to run, around about this time. And they will be working and the plant will be back in operation for another ten or twelve or fourteen weeks. I say, Sir, that this House and this government and this crowd on this side of the House should frown on that sort of thing, that we should condemn that kind of an operation in this Province, these people coming in here and exploiting one aspect of the fishery, namely the herring and then taking off and just leaving a skeleton crew in the plant for the rest of the year. It is not good enough, Sir. And I hope that the minister can use his good offices to get Connors Brothers, B.C. Packers, Weston's or whoever they are, get them to make a commitment to operate that plant twelve months out of a year or kick them out. Form a producer's co-op, if necessary and let the people of Isle aux Morts operate it themselves. Mr. Speaker, how demoralizing is it for these people to be sitting there? They have more unemployment in Isle aux Morts than any other community in my

MR. NEARY:

district. The potential is there. If the people have the catching capability the potential is there. The experience is there. The expertise is there. The plant workers are there. And here they are looking out their windows all day long at this beautiful plant laying idle. I am sure hon. members know how demoralizing that can be for a community. And only a short distance away Gabe Billard cracking right on her, cannot get enough plant workers certain times of the year. Down on the other end Eric King Fisheries cracking away, T.J. Hardy down in Rose Blanche in the same boat as Isle aux Morts. I am hoping now that is in the process of changing, a beautiful plant, it was built by the people of this Province, operating twelve and fourteen weeks out of a year. I hope Mr. Hardy now is in the process of making some changes in Rose Blanche because that is the mainstay of the economy of Rose Blanche. You cannot have people going up on the Great Lakes, and young people being forced to leave, go away to Toronto and up on the Great Lakes, you cannot have that, Sir. If we are going to build up the fishery in this Province we have to keep our young people in these communities. The other day I was in the airport in Stephenville. I think I met twenty young men, twenty from Burnt Islands on their way back to join their boats on the Great Lakes. They go up every year. Right along the Southwest Coast you will find quite a bit of this. They are real seamen. They are not afraid of the water. And I was chatting with these young men, some of them not so young, but mostly young men in the airport in Stephenville, and I asked them if they had an opportunity to earn a living would they stay in Newfoundland. Everyone to a man say yes and they would stay in Burnt Islands. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, hon. members may be interested in knowing that at least two of that group leave their ship at Christmas or before Christmas, come back to Newfoundland, take over a longliner in Burnt Islands and go and fish all Winter. One of these

MR. NEARY.

gentleman I know well, if that gentleman went to the Fishery Loan Board and said, "Well, what about giving me a longliner, they would say, "No, no longliner for you because you are not a full-time fisherman, you are working up on the Great Lakes." The man has been doing that practically all his life, fished full-time, got a little older, got married, needed more money to buy a house and so forth, went up on the Great Lakes, stays there, before Christmas comes back, goes aboard of a longliner and fishes for the whole Winter. Now

MR. NEARY: that is the kind of initiative that we need in this Province, Mr. Speaker, not the kind where you lash it out, provide all kinds of gear and equipment and longliners and everything else to be used four and five and six months out of a year as my hon. landlubber from Bay of Islands would like to see happen, likes to see the old tradition continued. Let us not increase our productivity aided and abetted by the Minister of Rural and Industrial Development who does not think we can break with tradition. The gentleman who is supposed to be attracting industry, building up the rural parts of this province does not think we can break with tradition. I am in trouble because I suggested it. Well, Sir, I would be in trouble with my conscience if I did not suggest it because I think it is a very fine idea and I am surprised to hear the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development take such a negative attitude saying that the fishermen would prefer to go ashore in the Fall of the year rather than fish year round.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Some are beginning to rise, you are in trouble on it. You have accusations on your back and old 'Johnnie' is not going to get involved in it. You can get yourself out of this one.

MR. NEARY: The only ones I have on my back, Sir, are the ones that do not want to fish year-round.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You have accused them all. You have smeared them all.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I have not smeared anybody.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You have smeared all my people. I will get even with you on the Northeast Coast.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a very sound principle and here you have a Minister of Industrial and Rural Development, Sir, who is supposed to be promoting industry in this Province, condemning that sort of thing. The minister should be up supporting it,

MR. NEARY: saying, "Yes this is a good idea, let us utilize our boats, and before we start building new ones let us make sure we are using what we have."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister has come in, the Minister of Fisheries has come in for some strong condemnation from those who think that the pen is mightier than the sword, recently, about not having a fishery policy. The minister has been accused just by carrying the plans around in his vest pocket, flying by the seat of his pants. And I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that that is true to a certain degree. We have not had a fishery policy in this Province in twenty-eight years.

AN HON. MEMBER: How did John Cabot get here?

MR. NEARY: Twenty-eight years. Well we have not had one for 400 years. I do not expect the minister to change -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The last one was in 1496.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir, we have never, never, never had a fishery policy in this Province. I could see signs of the minister trying to put together a fishery policy. And no doubt probably in due course the minister will be able to come into this hon. House and lay out long-term plans for the fishery. I said when the minister was appointed that I am prepared to give the minister a couple of years. Only five minutes left. My God where does the time go?

MR. DOODY: If you were sitting on this side listening you would know.

MR. NEARY: That the minister may or may not be able to put together that fishery policy certainly will not put it together with the thinking of his colleague down there, the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development who believes that everybody should be a part-time fisherman. We will never get the fishery, Sir, developed on a sound basis that way.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in my own district of LaPoile there are two or three problems in connection with the fishery. It has to do with the fish plant in Isle aux Morts and

MR. NEARY: the fish plant in Rose Blanche. The catching capability, the minister is also working on that I believe to a certain degree. I am an impatient fellow, I like to see it done quickly. I know the minister is working on it, that the catching capability of the operators on the Southwest corner will be increased, improved over the next several months. But we are going to have to go a lot further, a lot further than we are now.

If we had the catching capability on the southwest corner and the plants operating say at seventy-five per cent capacity or eighty per cent capacity, you would have full employment, Mr. Speaker, on the Southwest corner of this Province. And that is why, Sir, that I am such a firm believer in the future of the fishery, why I think that our whole future and our whole lifestyle should be based on the fishery.

There are a number of other problems, Sir, I was hoping to get into the CN situation at Port aux Basques, I guess I will have to leave that for another time. Maybe we will get another sub-amendment or an amendment so I can have a few choice words on CN. And so, Mr. Speaker, there is - rather than open up a new topic I will just take my seat, Sir, and give the hon. member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) who has been jumping up and down all afternoon like a jack-in-the-box, trying to get his two cents worth in, has been mute since the hon. gentleman got elected to the House. We have not heard a peep out of the hon. member. Now he is going to get up I suppose and condemn the Opposition, tell us what a foul crowd we are over here, always condemning the government, never constructive. The hon. member probably knows that I have put forward a proposition to the government, to the Premier to set up a productivity council in this Province,

MR. NEARY: It has fallen on deaf ears. Is that not constructive? Is that negative? Oh I can hear the minister now getting up, the hon. member who was almost a minister, if the hon. member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) had not gotten the nod, the hon. gentleman would have been in the ministry now, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. But I am sure we are going to hear strong condemnation now of this side of the House for always being negative, nothing positive. Well if the member is so anxious to get up let him, I do not believe the member has spoken since he came into this House.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You will not give him the chance.

MR. NEARY: No, I want to tantalize him a little bit.

MR. LUSH: How about the telegram to the Prime Minister? Is that going to be done today?

MR. NEARY: No. No. The telegram to the Prime Minister will be done, I presume, as a matter of form. But the member now instead of condemning the Opposition let the member get up because the member is so close to the Premier, in the Premier's Office and tell us what plans this government has to deal with inflation, high unemployment in this Province. Let the member get up and make a constructive contribution to the House and tell us about regional government down in Mount Pearl. Are they going to accept that?

MR. NEARY: Are they going to have that shoved down their throats or are they going to get a chance to do it, to accept it in a democratic way?

MR. DOODY: We will send you over a note.

MR. NEARY: Let the hon. member straighten that one out. Is it going to be foisted on them? Are they going to get a chance to vote on it? Or will this super government of whatever it is they are called, this tier system, will that be imposed on them? Let the member straighten that one out.

Mr. Speaker, it being six o'clock may I move the adjournment of the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman, I think, has about thirty seconds.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. The hon. member moves the adjournment.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House on it rising adjourn until three o'clock tomorrow Tuesday, and that the House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, April 19, 1977, at 3:00 p.m.