

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

3:00 - 6:00 p.m.

February 11, 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 Fisheries.

HON. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to acquaint the House with the activities of the Fisheries Loan Board, especially the last meeting of that Board which was held recently. At that meeting sixty-six applications for loans from fishermen were approved, totalling close to a half million dollars. For the first ten months of the present fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, 803 loans have been approved with a total value of \$8.5 million, which is exactly double that of the previous fiscal year.

The Board, Mr. Speaker, was established in 1951, twenty-six years ago. Since that time 5,085 applications totalling \$27.5 million have been loaned to fishermen for the purchase of longliners, for the repairs of longliners, for the purchase of electronic equipment, and engines etc.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues opposite will be interested to know that the money that has been loaned since 1951 totalling, as I said, \$27.5 million, 78.3 per cent, I will repeat, 78.3 per cent of that total has been made since the present government took office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: I should point out too, Mr. Speaker, that 1976 was a bumper year as far as the Board was concerned with 30.5 per cent of the total monies loaned by the Board since its inception in 1951 being made in that year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Bounties, Mr. Speaker, on small boats have increased up to 215 per cent over last year, where \$90,000 was given to fishermen against \$200,000 for the first ten months of the present fiscal year.

Mr. W. Carter:

I think, Mr. Speaker, another statistic that augers well for the fish business is the fact that the average age of our fishermen has dropped in the past four years from forty-five years of age; now it is thirty-five.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The average age of fishermen. Do you mean all fishermen?

MR. W. CARTER: No. This, Mr. Speaker, is the average age of people, skipper men, applying for loans with which to buy boats. And I think we can assume that these would probably be older on an average than the average age of the shearmen on board the boat. But I will repeat, in four years the age has dropped from an average of forty-five years down to thirty-five years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the minister say whether there were enough to make that pretty representative of the industry at large?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How many person were involved in other words?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the Board accepted up to the end of January, the present fiscal year, 1,096 applications. So that is a pretty -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Eleven hundred.

MR. W. CARTER: Eleven hundred applicants.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And at least five years before how many?

MR. W. CARTER: I do not have the average here, Mr. Speaker, but the previous year the fiscal year of 1975-1976 the Board received, I believe, well it actually did receive 520 applications, so the number of

MR. SMALLWOOD: About half.

MR. W. CARTER: applications have exactly doubled in the past twelve months, and the actual money loans has pretty well doubled as well.

Another interesting point, Mr. Speaker, is that the Loan Board, which is limited in staff, limited by its regulations, dealing with people that have very little security to offer, and it is

Mr. W. Carter;

interesting to note that the record of repayment is 97 per cent; in other words, in twenty, what? twenty-six years, since 1951, the total write-off of bad loans amounted to 3 per cent of the actual money borrowed. So I think, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that not a record for Maritime Canada?

MR. W. CARTER: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is probably a record in any financial lending institution in Canada. Now

MR. CARTER: I am not sure of that but I would suspect from that 3 per cent that our fishermen are good paymasters and that the loans given, like I said totaling \$27.5 million, 70 per cent of which, by the way, have been given in the past five years. I think this speaks well for the fishermen of our province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every Newfoundlander can feel very proud of that.

MR. CARTER: Very proud, and that, Mr. Speaker, I think will dispel any suggestion on the part of my colleagues opposite that the present government is ignoring the plight of the inshore fisherman. I think the fact that we have approved that many loans, \$8.5 million in the past ten months of the fiscal year, I think proves that fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we are very pleased that the Loans Board of the Department of Fisheries is still operating. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing exciting about it. It is just following the course which has been laid down by the previous government. It was the previous government who initiated the Loans Board. It was the previous government who had made the loans available in order that the fishermen could have changed their type of boat from the ordinary trap skiff to a longliner. And I would ask the Minister now what proportion of that money comes from the federal government?

MR. CARTER: None!

CAPT. WINSOR: None! All right, we will accept the fact that none of it comes -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, now!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member.

CAPT. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

But the alarming thing about those loans, Mr. Speaker,

CAPT. WINDSOR: the minister did not spell out for what purposes. How many longliners have been constructed within the last two or three years? Because it is very discouraging when we hear of so many of the shipyards closing down. Who is doing the building of the longliners now? Are there any being built? If so, where are they being built? In what direction are those loans made, are they made for gear, construction of smaller boats other than the type of the longliner or for the longliner or the longliner type vessel? Those are some of the questions I would like to direct to the minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon minister of Public Works.

MR ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, as I Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations I have a short statement here but I would like to preface it with a few verbal remarks. For some time I have been extremely concerned about hiring practices in, coincidentally, my district but in the area of Labrador City and Wabush. That concern I think is shared by many people across the province, specifically in Labrador West and many of the people who now live there are of course becoming permanent, but most of the people are from the various districts of the other fifty members of this hon. House of Assembly. I think that successive governments have attempted to cope with the problem of employment practices especially in Labrador West and with the purchase of materials and services from this province in their own way. And in five years I have attempted to deal on an individual basis with individual companies as an MHA, as a member of Cabinet and on behalf of government, and in those three capacities to try and point out to them the various problems that we encounter in this province and hope that they would be understanding. In many instances companies have co-operated to some extent but now and then the problem becomes out of proportion, there is always a little bit of chicanery and other problems involved.

During the last few months things have come to my personal attention which may be of some isolated to members of this House of Assembly and to the people of this province which if it is tied into a package

MR. ROUSSEAU: indicates that something is drastically wrong in respect to the content in Labrador City, Wabush of the working man and where he is from, and in the purchase of goods and services from this province.

I am completely disconcerted with the reintroduction of the work permit by the province of Quebec, which a few years ago when I was Minister of Manpower had the opportunity to talk to the then Minister of Labour, Mr. Cournoyer, the work permit was removed, was removed for a short time and was reintroduced shortly again. And of course, I think the hon. members of the House know the nearness we share in Labrador West with the Quebec border.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I had five constituents served summonses by the Province of Quebec because they worked in Mount Wright a few years ago, and I have attempted to rectify that through my colleague, the hon. Minister of Justice, and in my capacity as a minister in various federal-provincial ministerial meetings I talked to my counterpart from Quebec and suggested that there has to be some amount of co-operation at least between the Province of Quebec and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador in that area of the Province where we are so close.

But all the little things that we hear from time to time taken together, which has solidified and crystalized in my mind needs some action. Accordingly, on my own initiative and with the concurrence of government which is permissible by law, I am today announcing the appointment of the hon. Mr. Justice Rupert W. Bartlett as an industrial enquiry commission to investigate employment practices in the Labrador City - Wabush area and to make recommendations to the minister aimed at eliminating those problems.

I have given Mr. Justice Bartlett the following terms of reference: number one, to examine the ratio of Newfoundland and Labrador workmen employed in Labrador City - Wabush, in relation to workmen from outside the Province. Two, to investigate the incidents of "contracting out" by mining companies in Labrador City - Wabush and the impact that has on the employment of workmen from within this province. Third, to consider and recommend on the feasibility and practicability of introducing some system of work permits to apply to work in Labrador, for to examine current regulations concerning the registration of foreign or extra-provincial companies operating within the Province and recommend such changes as may be deemed necessary. And five, to make recommendations to the hon. the minister on such other matters as the commission may deem necessary with respect to the problems of Newfoundland workers in Labrador.



MR. ROUSSEAU: I intend as a minister of the department, and government does, to give all possible assistance to Mr. Justice Bartlett. I would certainly hope that his findings will be speedily received by me and I look forward to receiving them and such recommendations as he may make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

X  
MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I think that members on all sides of the House will welcome the announcement that Judge Bartlett, not Mr. Justice Bartlett, Judge Bartlett of the District Court of Bonavista - Trinity Conception, an eminent citizen of this Province and an admirable jurist and before that a distinguished member of the Bar, and briefly, but with distinction, Sir, a member of this House.

I think all members will welcome the news that Judge Bartlett has been appointed by the Cabinet at the request of the minister to carry out this very important study. It is certainly one which has been oft requested. There has been considerable controversy over the last few years as the minister adverted in his introductory remarks, and I think the right and proper way to approach it is to appoint a commissioner to look into the matter, to get all the facts, and when we know exactly and precisely what the facts are then I would think we shall see exactly what remedies are needed and the pressure necessary to produce these remedies, the public pressure necessary will thereby be generated.

I think that Judge Bartlett is an admirable choice, a fair minded man, impartial, diligent and knowledgeable and I am sure he will give us a -

MR. ROUSSEAU: A Newfoundlander.

MR. ROBERTS: Well he is a Newfoundlander, yes of course, from an extremely distinguished family but one with a long connection at least with Coastal Labrador because of course Judge Bartlett accompanied his father, Captain Bob Bartlett, north on many of the

MR. ROBERTS: expeditions, the Polar Exploration Expedition in the 1930's, I believe it was. Judge Bartlett was quite a young man then.

I may add also a former law partner of the present member for St. John's East, a gentleman with wide connections in the community and a very distinguished record indeed.

So we welcome the appointment of it. It is a very important topic. Any member who has had any experience at all with Western Labrador knows that there are very deep feelings among people there, the business community, the labour unions, all interested groups and bodies in the area, this feeling that contracting out is working to the disadvantage of our Province and to the advantage of another Province, the feeling that our workmen, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, are being discriminated against in favour of workmen from another Province and the way to get at it is to get the facts on the record and then we will be in a position to see what should be done.

So, Sir, I welcome the minister's initiative and congratulate him and as always I hope that we will have a quick report and that speedy and effective action will follow that report.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, just before we do this -

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

MR. ROBERTS: - there is a very minor point but one which could conceivably be of some importance. I have just been reading yesterday's Hansard, and I am not sure of the procedure on this, but there is quite a grievous error on page 576 reporting the speech of the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), his discussion with the gentleman across the House. It has substituted improperly the name of the gentleman from Menihok where it should show the name of the gentleman from St. Barbe. And in view of the fact that this historic document, Sir, will be in the Archives and other places, I do think - I do not know what the procedure is, perhaps Your Honour could tell us - it should be corrected. It is just a straight error on the part of the transcription.

MR. SPEAKER: I will draw that to the attention of the Editor of Debates.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the following reports to table: The Annual Report of the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission; amendments to the Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance; <sup>Beneficiaries</sup> and the Fisheries and Enquiries Regulations; amendments to the Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance (Insured Service) Regulations; and amendments to the Mental Health Regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Your Honour, I table the Special Warrant, Rural Development, \$500,000 for the funds required for the subdivision 1606-04. That is the \$500,000 to provide the additional funds to be used as loans for special assistance for the sawmills, the programme that was announced by the hon. minister a day or so ago.

MR. NEARY: When was the Special Warrant announced?

MR. DOODY: The date of signature by his honour was February 10, 1977.

MR. NEARY: Is it proper to have Special Warrants when the House is in session?

MR. DOODY: Three days. You have three days grace, I have been told. Three days from the time the warrant is issued to the time that it is tabled.

MR. ROBERTS: But it is proper to adopt the report even while the House is in session.?

MR. DOODY: Yes, to my amazement. I did not think this was so. But I have been told by my very high paid and efficient advisors from Justice and other places that this is indeed correct. If it is not, I will take it back again and put that \$500,000 back in the public purse.

I also have to table under Section 45 (2) of the Financial Administration Act, "The department is required to report to the House of Assembly within fifteen days after the commencement of each session all temporary loans raised under Sections 44 and 45 of the act." That is a long comprehensive list of loans and repayments which are probably of interest. We also have to table under Section 51 of paragraph (3) of the Financial Administration Act, the guaranteed loans paid in part or in whole since the last sitting of the House. Once again this has to be done within fifteen days of the opening of the next ensuing session.

MR. ROBERTS: Has Bide Arm been brought up yet?

MR. DOODY: No, Bide Arm - that was last years. We did that one.

MR. ROBERTS: It has been paid off?

MR. DOODY: Yes, we have paid that one off, and have taken a little mortgage on it instead, a very little mortgage.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) an asset (Inaudible)

MR. DOODY: No, there is a little footnote on the prospectus.

Carol-Wabush Co-op; Hotel Buildings, Paragon Hotel Buildings Limited are the three that are listed here.

MR. R. MOORES: Are these payments under guarantee?

MR. DOODY: The amount guaranteed in the first instance, Carol-Wabush, was \$250,000. Payments made during the period 5/12/75 to now, \$238,430

Mr. Doody.

which is the amount that we had to pay. We recovered the difference, which was minimal.

MR. ROBERTS: We definitely paid the full loan.

MR. DOODY: Yes, for all practical purposes.

Hotel Buildings Limited, there is \$1.3 million repaid on the \$9 million guaranteed, and Paragaon Hotel Limited, \$400,000, payment made to \$32,195.

MR. ROBERTS: The \$1.3 million, is that a one year payment?

MR. DOODY: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Is there no recovery?

MR. DOODY: That is the difference in the recovery and the payment that we had to make, another great deal.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICES HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave, Sir, to reply to a question asked of me by the member for Fogo district (Capt. Winsor) concerning an item that appeared on page ninety-three of the Auditor General's Report concerning

MR. W. CARTEF:

the leasing of cars, the cost of which was I believe about \$7,000. Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is that these cars were leased by regional representatives operating in the outlying parts of the Province who were engaged at the time in work with respect to the gear replacement programme. The period, Mr. Speaker, for the leasing was I believe seven months. A request was made of the car pool for cars. Unfortunately none were available, particularly for that period of time. And if the mileage, Mr. Speaker, that was used was paid for by their private cars the cost would have exceeded the actual rental of the two cars in question. This was not on a strict so much per mile. It was, I understand, on a monthly basis and like I said it was for a lengthy period during which time the people concerned were quite actively involved in work in connection with the gear replacement programme.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I should point out maybe that all references made to the Department of Fisheries in the Auditor General's report are being responded to by my officials. It was done so some weeks ago. I am sure that the members opposite will have a chance to examine the responses that we have made, which in my opinion were satisfactory, when this matter comes up before the Public Accounts Committee. Certainly there is no attempt to cover anything up as certain members today have been suggesting in the news media. All - I repeat - all references made to the Department of Fisheries in this report have been satisfactorily responded to by my officials.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DOUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple here. First of all, I undertook on behalf of the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) on this question of Dominion Stores the other day that I would take it up with Dominion Stores which I have done. I would like to just show the consistency of this government, that is not only the large

MR. ROUSSEAU:

Industrial area of Labrador City and Wabush but any six or seven or eight employees is also a matter of concern to this government.

I have written the district manager of Dominion Stores, and I am going to put on record the letter because the gentleman puts on record his thoughts as well. "Dear Mr. Armsworthy: I am writing to express not only my concern but the concern of government over your announcement yesterday of the phase out of your St. John's accounting division with the consequent loss of employment in this Province.

"Under normal circumstances I would expect a Company such as yours to exercise the common courtesy of informing the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations of any impending abolition of jobs so that we could endeavour to find alternate employment for those affected. To say the least, your failure to inform us of this action is inexcusable and more especially that you did not provide information on the proposed action when my Deputy telephoned you on February 8 when, in fact, you made a public announcement of your decision a few hours later. It is that type of lack of consideration for the consequences of loss of jobs and unemployment which moves Governments to introduce legislation to restrict such actions.

"I shall be contacting your Divisional Manager on this matter in the hope that a repetition of this does not occur."

I have written Mr. Winneau, the Division Manager in Halifax. "I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have sent to your District Manager, Mr. C.F. Armsworthy, here in St. John's.

"Needless to say, it is upsetting to Government in a province such as ours with extremely high unemployment when large, well established companies such as yours, fail to inform us of impending changes in operations or structure which could result in further unemployment."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: And, Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to ~~come~~ up with one set of responses to the Auditor General's report. I had

MR. ROUSSEAU:

time this morning, because I spent the whole morning over in the Department of Manpower. But between the other little problems I had a chance - and I am going to read this into the record. I have already given a copy to the hon. member who has been asking the questions, and I presume it is a question that has been posed for prior notice.

First of all, the payment without appropriation for unused accommodation, to read it into the record, because yesterday I gave what I thought was an accurate answer. This department did not provide in its 1975 and 1976 estimates for the payment of expenses incurred for rental of a trailer at Wabush because under normal circumstances there would be no charge to government. In this case the occupant of the trailer was an employee of the department. On October 25, 1974 he resigned to accept a position with the Department of Education. It was the department's intention to refill the position immediately but a suitable candidate was not found until January 13, 1975. He came on staff on February 10, 1975 and following a period of orientation and training at the St. John's office and moved to Wabush in May or 1975.

It was our experience that housing was at a premium in Wabush and to relinquish the lease on the trailer would have put us in a position whereby we may not have been able to offer suitable accommodations to our new employee and thus be unable to provide a service to the Labrador area.



Mr. Rousseau:

as hon. members know there are 460-odd apprentices with the Iron Ore Company of Canada, and some 60 with Wabush Mines, 550 apprentices certainly have a right to the services of an apprenticeship officer.

The period between October 25 and December 29, 1974 the plumbing fixtures in the trailer froze, which is not unusual in that temperature and climate, and cracked, necessitating major repairs. The only other employee in our Wabush office was a clerk-steno who could not be expected to conduct a check on the trailer. With the exceptionally cold climate experienced in Western Labrador in the Wintertime one would have to maintain almost hourly checks to ensure that the furnace was operating properly. This would have cost more in wages for a watchman than the amount paid out in repairs.

The second matter, the unsatisfactory control of a consulting contract: The Auditor General's report made reference to the fact that a consulting contract for the Buchans Task Force was not awarded to the lowest bidder, since bids range from \$14,500 to \$23,628, and in actual fact the award was on the basis of a bid of \$20,000. Selection was based on the content of the bid, and the understanding of the job involved as assessed by knowledgeable and technical persons in that field. The fact that work commenced before the formal agreement was entered into does not, I submit, in any way violate the Financial Administration Act, since in fact Treasury Board had already approved the Task Force Budget which included funds for the consulting contract.

The Chairman of the Task Force insisted on a formal agreement, but because there was a severe time constraint for completion of that study work was commenced pending drafting of a former contract by the Department of Justice. The consultant was advised by the Task Force without prior knowledge or approval of the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations or Treasury Board, to proceed with the work on the understanding that the cost would not exceed \$37,000. Their decision was based on the fact that a partially

Mr. Rousseau:

complete study was useless to the Task Force and, in effect, a waste of the original \$20,000. Furthermore an informed opinion after appraisal of the job being done by the consulting firm gave advice to the effect that the completed project would be excellent value for the amount of \$37,000.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Justice.

Could the minister please bring the House up to date with respect to the situation in Western Labrador at the Iron Company of Canada operations in Labrador City.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the latest report that I have had on

the situation at Labrador is that there are thirty persons on the picket line, and things are peaceful at this time.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in light of the news reports overnight of the, shall we say, difficulties which have occurred, and in light of the fact that apparently there is a work stoppage underway, call it a strike, call it what one wishes, is the minister now in a position to tell us when the Industrial Enquiry Commission which he announced in the House the other day will, in fact, be appointed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I indicated to the House last week, Mr. Speaker, that

I would hope to engage a suitable person within one week, and I am still working toward that deadline. I am awaiting, hopefully, an affirmative reply from a very suitable person hopefully over the weekend.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, has the minister given consideration to a broadening of the scope of the enquiry, a request, which I understand, has been made by the union involved, but if it has been made formally to the minister or not I do not know. But has the minister given consideration to broadening the scope of the enquiry beyond the aspects he announced the other day? And if so, what is the result of his consideration, Sir? Will the enquiry be broadened?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, with the present situation that is existing right there now that I want to be in a position to make a very definitive statement on the broadening of the enquiry other than to say I am working toward that end.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from LaPoile. A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House on whose request the seventeen, I think it is, ~~extra RCMP officers were sent into~~ Labrador City? Did the minister take the initiative himself? Was it at the request of the company or the union, or anybody in Labrador City? How

MR. NEARY: come these seventeen RCMP officers were sent from Corner Brook to Labrador City?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, and I cannot be absolutely definitive on that, I was not aware that the seventeen men had gone into Labrador City until I received a call from one of the radio stations this morning.

Last night I communicated with the - because I had heard that there was some difficulties in Labrador City - I communicated with the Chief Superintendent, the Commanding Officer of the RCMP in Newfoundland and asked him to keep a very watchful eye on the situation. He assured me he was already doing that, and that is a judgemental decision that does not need ministerial approval, that he would make certain that an appropriate number of officers and men from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police would be in Labrador City to meet any exigencies that may or may not arise.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister then tell the House if the RCMP can move their constables, their police, around the Province without consulting, without the approval of the minister. Is the minister telling us that the RCMP did this on their own or was it at the minister's request?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. NEARY: I mean the minister is doing some pretty fancy figure skating on thin ice, you know, who authorized it?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I feel that as a responsible member of this House, and as a responsible minister I should be very careful and guarded in my comments on a situation that at this time has not been absolutely resolved.

MR. NEARY: Well if you did it admit it, that is all.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I say in answer to the first part of the question from the hon. member for LaPelle that if emergency

MR. HICKMAN: situations arise, or if in the opinion of the officers on the spot that additional men are required to meet any circumstances in Newfoundland, the RCMP do not have to come to me, nor do they.

I can think of several cases in the last two or three years, one not too far from my own district, where I was totally unaware of the fact that additional men had been moved in -

MR. NEARY: That is like locking the doors in Confederation Building when the minister's own constituents are in.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the minister's executive assistant working?

MR. HICKMAN: I am sorry to disappoint the hon. gentleman from LaPoile, but I did not ask that the additional men go in.

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

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works and Services and I refer to page 109 of the Auditor General's Report.

With reference to companies "a", "b" and "c", can the minister tell the House if he knows the names of the companies? Are they well established, reliable companies, and not just some little outfit in the basement of a house or something like this?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will take the question under advisement. I gave the House an undertaking yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that I would between today and next Friday table the complete replies to both departments under my jurisdiction in respect to the Auditor General's Report. I had the opportunity to do one this morning. I have one more obligation left. The Department of Public Works and Services will be done in its entirety sometime between today, and obviously not today, and next Friday. That commitment I made at the House and I intend to honour it.

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

Is the hon. gentleman's question in respect to the Auditor General's Report?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this question, and the fact that these three companies received something like thirty-nine per cent of a total maintenance expenditure, we would very much appreciate a full report on that.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member is impugning my integrity. I made a commitment to the hon. House and I just suggested to the hon. -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are tender today.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am not sensitive at all. I just suggested to the hon. House that I would between today and next Friday give a complete report from both departments. I have done so in one instance because I had the opportunity this morning. I shall do so with the other one before next Friday. That commitment I made and that commitment I intend to honour. Simple.

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

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Sir, is the minister aware of the fact that an Order-in-Council was issued in October, 1975, which ordered that a pilot project be undertaken at a school involving the use of four extra buses at an additional cost of \$60,000?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I think I am aware of it. I think it was issued in 1975. It was the four buses involved in the pilot project in Holy Spirit School in Long Pond, Manuels, I think, and this was to try to clear up some of the problems they were having there. It was a very dangerous situation on the road and we were trying to use some student monitors on these buses and we have to have more buses available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MP. POWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister aware that the Department of Education acted without authority in processing these particular grants for the particular school board in question and that the school boards had not submitted information pertinent to the transportation as required by regulations?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of references to that particular thing in the Auditor General's report. It was done during the school year. It was urgent that we do it and of course we could not go through the proper channels and proper procedures. There are a number of cases where school boards have not submitted their detailed routes that is supposed to accompany the applications and, of course, we have continued to pay until these came in. The Auditor General suggests that we not pay. But that is outside of the regulations but we felt it was the honourable thing to do.

MP. POWE: A supplementary. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that public tenders were not called for this particular amount of money. Is that correct?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of whether public tenders were called or not. I think it was negotiated with some existing operators.

MR. POWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further supplementary.

MR. POWE: Sir, could the minister undertake to find out whether or not tenders were in fact called for this amount of money? And could he

MP. ROWE:

also undertake to table the names of the companies or people who in fact got this particular job for \$60,000? I say that realizing full well that it was a worthy project.

MP. HOUSE: Yes.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Conception Bay South and the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MP. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Would the Minister of Mines and Energy inform the House if he has made any attempt to convene a meeting of the oil companies to try and work towards one price for gasoline and heating fuel right across this Province, North, South, East and West, have a uniform price right across the whole Island?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will take that matter under advisement and reply in detail to the hon. member on Monday or Tuesday of next week.

MP. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the minister's answer and I wish to debate the matter during the Late Show on Thursday coming.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Social Services regarding, I believe, a petition that I have been told was presented to the minister some time ago - I do not know exactly how long ago - from the residents of Virginia Park concerning a number of problems they have down there with the heating and so on. I attempted to contact the minister this morning on this. I did notify his secretary. And I am wondering if he is in a position to provide any information on that since they have been calling me and others here in the building.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this particular petition was actually presented to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is his district.



MR. BRETT: Yes, it is his district. That is correct. It arrived at my desk on February 4 which is seven days ago. The prayer of the petition is that this department would grant an increase in the allowance for heat and light to a number of people, I think it is something like sixty, living in subsidized rental units in that area. All of these units are electrically heated. The letter from the member for the area points out the hardship, I suppose, being endured by some of these people.

In answering your question, Sir, I would like to say, first of all

Mr. Brett.

that we are extremely cognizant of the difficulty that people, who are dependent on social assistance, are experiencing during the Winter months, and always have, of course, and in spite of the fact that rates have increased considerably during the last four or five years, as a matter of fact the short-term rates have increased by over 100 per cent, and long term rates by almost fifty per cent. And in spite of that these people are still not receiving enough, and I think if there is anything that both sides of this House agree on, it is the fact that these people are not getting enough. It is rather ironic though, Sir, that the Auditor General should rap my knuckles, because I am not taking enough money back from these very same people. It is impossible for any department to make policy for any one group of people in any part of the Province. Our policy naturally has to be for all the Province.

MR. MURPHY: Except for Labrador.

MR. BRETT: Well, yes, we do make an exception in Labrador. We do give -

MR. MURPHY: Ten per cent.

MR. BRETT: - ten per cent more, I think.

But there is no allowance for fuel as such right now, or clothing. You know, it is all included in the cheque. And, as I said, Mr. Speaker, even though we have been able to increase the rates so much in the last few years, we are cognizant that it is still difficult. And we hope that we can continue to increase it as the years go by if, of course, the financial conditions in the Province will allow it. But I cannot at this moment, government cannot, make an increase for any one group of people.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: And I am just attempting through a supplementary, I must admit, Mr. Speaker, to convey to the hon. minister the fact that I called him this morning, but what I neglected to mention was that I also tried to contact the member in which whose district it is, because I think it is a matter of courtesy to do so, and I would want that clearly understood.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, still with the Auditor General's Report and still with a question in relationship to the consulting firm that is working for the Buchans Task Force and in relation to the fact that the question answered by the minister - again where they had been awarded a tender for \$20,000 and had submitted a bill indeed for \$37,000 and were paid \$37,000 - the minister in the answer to the question stated that an informed opinion, after appraisal of the job being done by the consulting firm advised that this be paid. Now I am wondering if the minister is in a position to tell us whose informed opinion it was that would allow a contractor who had agreed to \$20,000 to put in a price of \$37,000? Whose informed opinion was it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the consultant was told by the Task Force that he might proceed from \$20,000 to \$37,000.

It was not done without approval by the Task Force that the cost went from \$20,000 to \$37,000. He just did not go and do the extra work and build an extra \$17,000. He was given approval by the Technical Sub-Committee, and in turn ratified by the Task Force, that he could proceed to an amount of \$37,000 for the job. The technical advice and knowledgeable people referred to in the statement refers to those engineering people who were associated with the Buchans Task Force, some of whom were officials of the various departments who participated in the Buchans Task Force, but he did not go from \$20,000 to \$37,000, the consultant, on his own. He was given approval by the Task Force, without approval from the department or from the Treasury Board, to proceed to \$37,000 when the information that the Task Force had was that \$20,000 would not cover the full scope of the study.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: The Auditor General also says here that with respect to the consulting firm that two of the terms of the agreement were;  
+ (1) that no work to be performed or expenses incurred for which payment would be requested in excess of the total amount of \$20,000 without the prior approval of the minister." I think the minister said that they got the approval of the Task Force. How come they were allowed to go this direction? It says here, "Without the approval of the minister."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The hon. member is reading correctly what happened. I think it is all right there, that the Task Force proceeded without approval from the department, from the minister, from Treasury Board or from any official. Such action, I can assure hon. members, will not happen again. The mistake has been brought to the attention of the people involved. And the obvious concurrence prior to increasing that amount from \$20,000 to \$37,000 should have been acquired from the department and the Minister and Treasury Board, but it was not.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: <sup>MR.</sup> Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Pecreation and Rehabilitation. Could the minister tell the House if the government intends to introduce legislation that will restrict the brewing companies from using their company name in sponsoring sporting events or supporting teams?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Pecreation and Rehabilitation.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that question involves a very detailed issue which is being discussed, has been for some time in fact, with the federal Minister of Health. I am not in a position at this time to give any definitive response to the hon. member. But it is a very important question and hopefully can be answered in due time.

MR. MCNEIL: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. MCNEIL: If the government intends to restrict the brewing companies from the sponsorship of sporting and team events, will the government make additional funding in the event that the brewing companies totally withdraw from sponsorships?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOP: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries, again arising out of the Auditor General's report, where a duplicate payment of \$348 was made for car rental, duplicate bounties of \$12,800 made to fifty owners of small fishing boats and payments totalling \$420 were made to boat owners who were not eligible

CAPT. WINSOR:

to receive bounties at all; can the minister give us an account of why those overpayments were made?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTEP: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that as notice. The answer I am sure is available. I cannot just talk out of my memory right now. I do not have a list in front of me of all the answers. But like I said a moment ago, that all of the references to the Department of Fisheries in the Auditor General's report have been responded to by the officials of my department, are now in the possession of the Auditor General, and I am sure can be scrutinized by the hon. member when it appears before the Public Accounts Committee. But meanwhile I will endeavour to get that answer on Monday for him.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

CAPT. WINSOR: Would the minister undertake to inform the House when he makes that submission whether or not any effort will be made to collect these overpayments?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTEP: Mr. Speaker, I will go further. Maybe on Monday I would be able to table for the information of my colleagues opposite and the House, answers to all of the questions raised in the Auditor General's report with respect to the Department of Fisheries.

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

MR. P. MOORES: A question for the hon. Minister of Social Services with regard to the job creation programme for that department. Would the minister be prepared to lay on the table of this House the exact criterion other than the able-bodied assistance claimants that determined where the projects were located?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BUNTT: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

MR. P. MOORES: A supplementary. If so then, Can you be more specific and say when? Can we expect it next year or next week?

MR. YOUNG: Next whenever it is finished.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South. I presume the hon. minister has not answered, which he is not required to, and I therefore call upon the gentleman whom -

MR. WHITE: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I noticed the minister getting up when you -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Then I will ask the hon. minister did he intend to answer.

MR. BRET: I was.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRET: I do not suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it will take twelve months. I do not see why it should. There are five special projects officers and they were the ones in consultation with various people in committees throughout the Province who came up with these programmes. I would assume that they could get the information within a few days, probably some time next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South, followed by the hon. gentleman for LaPoile.

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

MR. NOLAN: A question for the hon. the Minister of Finance, and I believe still President of the Treasury Board, and it is in reference to what authority, if any, would the Auditor General have in examining the accounts at Memorial University? For example, you see great scrutiny of the various departments of government. Why for example, would you not have Memorial University audited and presented in this way by the Auditor General? If the legislation is not there, authority to give the Auditor General such authority, has the minister and his staff considered giving it to him?

MR. WHITE: And all Crown corporations.

MR. NOLAN: And all Crown corporations, for that matter

MR. DOODY: Yes, the first point is well taken.

The university is not a Crown corporation, it is a private institution which receives annual grants from government.

Granted these grants make up a large portion of their budget.

In fact, the Auditor General does indeed audit the books of the Memorial University and I would be only too happy, if it is the wish of the House, to table the last financial report the Auditor General has done for the university. I can assure you that it is not done in the detail that this is done.

MR. NOLAN: That is what I am after.

MR. DOODY: The university has a way of doing things which is not quite the same as the ones that you and I are used to in this hon. House, but nevertheless the Auditor General does do an audit every year on Memorial University's accounts and I would be only too happy to table them here if it is the wish of the House.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: I am sure the minister realizes what I am after, -



MR. DOODY: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: - and that is that if a minister of the government, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Public Works or anyone else, is exposed to this kind of scrutiny, why is it that in our wisdom we have decided to eliminate such scrutiny by the Auditor General of Memorial University? You can call it a private institutioun paid for out of public money or any of the other Crown corporations, and would the minister consider this being done in the future and if not, why not?

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

MR. DOODY: The minister is quite willing to consider it and has considered it and is quite happy to consider it. I think, personally, that it might be a very useful exercise. I feel reasonably certain that you would run into a considerable amount of opposition from the university and the people who would would run the opposition. As some people have said, "So what?" Well, that is something that has to be weighed as it goes along. I personally have no bias against an indepth analysis or criticism of the Auditor General's looking at the university. As a matter of fact, it might be a very useful exercise from an accounting point of view. What it would do with the academic freedom that the university has enjoyed over the years, and which I think is part of the history of universities generally, is another matter, and one which I do not feet competent to comment on. My only real close association with the university has been to watch a basketball game once or twice, so the academic freedom thing is something that I am not all that familiar with. But then the accounting bit, I am completely in agreement.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice, Sir, if he would tell us with reference to the Auditor General's Report on page 8, as a result of several

MR. NEARY: fraud and misappropriations  
investigations several staff were involved in providing  
accounting and consulting services for the Department of Justice,  
would the minister tell the House how many cases of fraud, and  
how many cases of misappropriation, how many scandals are under  
investigation at the present time?

MR. HICKMAN: I have not the foggiest idea,  
Mr. Speaker, nor should I

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.  
Would the minister then give us a progress report on the fisheries  
scandal? How is that coming? Only two charges have been laid  
so far, when will other charges be laid? It is awfully slow  
progress, is it not?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, and I said this very  
deliberately and very seriously, the hon. gentleman from LaPoile  
knows this as well as I do, that it would be absolutely  
unthinkable, unforgivable, and I am sure Your Honour would not  
permit me, to comment on any matters that are before the courts,  
nor, indeed, should one comment, in my opinion, on investigations  
that are ongoing.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall allow one supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Can the minister tell the House if  
that is the only case of fraud and misappropriation of funds that  
is being investigated, the fishery one? Are there others besides  
this? If so, would the minister, as minister of the department,  
must know what other frauds and misappropriations of funds are  
being investigated,

MR. NEARY: Is that the only one? Is there any in connection with the Linerboard mill under investigation, or the logging operations in Happy Valley and Goose Bay? There must be, the minister must have that information.

MR. MURPHY: Some dirt on the go.

MR. NEARY: There is.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: I cannot, and I should not, and I will not identify investigations that are ongoing, because one does not know what may result from such investigations. And I am not going to be placed in a position where I can ever be accused, by a statement in this hon. House, prejudicing the trial or the fair trial of a person who may subsequently be charged. It is something that is just, you know, not acceptable to any court where we have the British system of justice. I will direct the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that there were two or three investigations that have been public knowledge by virtue of the fact that there were statements made in this House at the time they were initiated in connection with one, two or three vocational schools.

MR. SPEAKER: Time for one further question. Hon. member for Trinity-Bay De Verde.

MR. ROWE: I have a question for the Minister of Education, Sir. In view of the fact, Sir, that on December 3, 1975, a payment of \$1,800 for services provided was paid to a public relations firm with respect to school taxation, Should the minister indicate whether public tenders were called for this, and if not why not, and what was the name of the public relations firm or firms?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this was a - I do not know the name of the firm, number one; it was a firm done to do some consulting work for school boards really, for the school tax authorities which are of course servicing school boards. And there was no subhead under which to pay that and it was felt at the time, by Treasury Board and by the department, that since it was a service to school boards

MR. HOUSE:

indirectly it should come from that vote. Of course we recognized it was not a proper thing to do and it is against the law? Well I do not know, it is indirect service to school boards, because the school tax authorities are created by the government on behalf of school boards.

MR. SPEAKER: Time is up.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 1.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt Two Indentures Of Mortgage Relating To A Mill At Hawke's Bay, And To Make Provision Respecting Matters Connected Therewith," carried. (Bill No. 12).

On motion, Bill No. 12 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 2.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act to Amend The Evidence (Mechanical Recording) Act," carried. (Bill No.15).

On motion, Bill No. 15 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 3.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Chairman Of The Board Of Commissioners Of Public Utilities (Pension) Act, 1974." carried. (Bill No.17)

On motion, Bill. No. 17 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 4.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Education Act," carried.

(Bill No.13)

On motion, Bill No. 13 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 5.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Establishment And Operation Of The Polytechnical Institute Of Newfoundland", carried.

(Bill No.14)

On motion, Bill No. 14 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 6.

Motion, the hon. the Minister Of Consumer Affairs And Environment Introduces a bill, "An Act To Amend The Landlord And Tenant (Residential Tenancies) Act", carried.

(Bill No.16)

On motion, Bill No. 16 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order one, the adjourned debate on the amendment on the Address in Reply.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, to the amendment to the Address in Reply, moved by the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the member for Fogo.

My sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:

and the House regrets that which hath been done hath been done poorly and that which hath not been done hath brought sorrow to every corner of this land.

MR. HICKMAN: On that motion, two things; may I draw to the attention of the Chair firstly which is a technical one, I did not see an indication from the hon. member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) that he was seconding the amendment. And secondly in my opinion this is not a sub-amendment that is acceptable to the Chair or goes to the root of the motion that is presently before the Chair, and I would ask for Your Honour to rule upon it before we embark upon a debate thereof.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. member for Fogo was probably going to clarify the first point made in the hon. gentleman's point of order.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, it was just because we did not catch eye to eye.

MR. SPEAKER: Correct.

CAPT. WINSOR: That is the reason. I was heading in that direction.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. gentleman has seconded it, so that matter in the point of order is disposed of. Is there any further argumentation with respect to the other matter referred to by the hon. Government House Leader?

MR. ROBERTS: Which is?

MR. SPEAKER: The sub-amendment.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I only half heard the hon. gentleman because

MR. ROBERTS: It was on the microphones. But I think I have the gist of his point. My submission is that the sub-amendment is in order. There is no reason why it would be out of order. It proposes to add—I have it here in front of me somewhere, unless somebody has taken it—to add some words to the amendment which is before the House now. The language may not be every day language but it is perfectly acceptable language I submit in every sense of the word. And in fact, Sir, I could find a precedent, there was an amendment to the Throne Speech moved two or three years ago by my colleague at that time, still very much my friend, the then member for Labrador North, Mr. Mel Woodward, which had similar language. I believe the wording was, "this House regrets the Government has not done those things which they ought to have done and has done those things which they ought not to have done." And Your Honour's predecessor in the Chair accepted that, the amendment was debated and in due course put to the vote.

I think the sub-amendment is perfectly in order, Sir, and I would suggest that the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) be allowed to proceed with his remarks in respect of it. I assume he is in favour of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Do I understand then there is no further argument? There is. The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion that sub-amendment is more properly another amendment. It neither modifies nor expands the existing amendment and therefore while I do not deny the hon. member's right to move any amendment that he wishes to, I suggest that this is not a proper sub-amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard all hon. members who wish to make a submission on the sub-amendment, one matter is clarified and that is that the sub-amendment was in fact duly seconded. Obviously a sub-amendment is an amendment to an amendment. And, in general, the rules covering amendments cover this specific kind of an amendment as well. There is very little in the authorities on sub-amendments as such. There is very little. One reference is in Beauchesne, page 169, Section 202, subsection (3), "Since the purpose of a sub-amendment is to alter the amendment, it should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment. -

MR. ROBERTS: It would be hard to enlarge upon the scope of the amendment I put down.

MR. SPEAKER: - and it should deal with matters which are not covered by the amendment.

Now certainly this sub-amendment, in my opinion, fulfills those criteria. It does not enlarge upon the scope, it deals with something which is not covered in the amendment, because the hon. gentleman is putting forward the opinion of regret etc., there is no need to read it out again.

And in the argument which I have heard, I have only heard, well I have heard two submissions arguing against it, Now the point made by the hon. member gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), that in his opinion it will be appropriately an amendment, I think, it could be moved as an amendment, but that does not mean it could not be moved in this manner. I am not aware of any authorities quoted to me by the hon. Government House Leader in arguing against it. In my opinion, it meets the rules of relevancy. It does not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment, but it does deal with a matter not covered by the amendment. In my opinion, therefore it is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved, and seconded by the hon. member from Fogo (Capt. Wins. . . to add the following words to the amendment before the Chair. And the House regrets that which hath been done hath been done poorly and that which hath not been done hath brought sorrow to every corner of this . . .



MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. And first of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague, the member for Fogo, for agreeing to second my sub-amendment. And I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his co-operation in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, you may not find this quote in Scripture but it should be there.

AN HON. MEMBER: It probably will be after -

MR. NEARY: The Scripture according to St. Stephen, "And the House regrets that which hath been done hath been done poorly and that which hath not been done hath brought sorrow to every corner of this land."

AN HON. MEMBER: The last St. Stephen was stoned, was he not.?

MR. NEARY: St. Stephen was the first marytr. That is right. He was stoned to death.

Mr. Speaker, when the House rose yesterday, Sir, I was lashing into the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation for his negligence, for his ignoring, for his turning a blind eye to the fact that there are no smoke detector system at the Hoyles Home, there is no sprinkler system at Hoyles Home, there are not adequate ramps at the Hoyles Home. And I am not saying this to try to alarm people, Sir, these are facts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is the minister responsible.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they do not have adequate ramps to move 250 people at short notice, in case of an emergency. There are presently 250 patients at Hoyles Home, most of whom are bedridden, and if they are not bedridden they are the equivalent of bedridden patients. And the minister, in spite of the fact, Sir, that we had a tragedy in Province on Boxing Day down in the Coultis.

Mr. Neary.

the minister has refused so far to recognize the plight of the people who live, not only in government homes, Sir, but in apartments and homes that are operated in the private sectors. You know, Mr. Speaker, when this tragedy occurred at the Goulds, Sir, it affected every man, woman and child in this Province, especially the senior citizens, the older people. I know my mother was deeply shocked and moved over this tragedy at the Goulds. And I talked to a lot of other people around her age, they all felt it, Sir. And they all became suddenly very conscious of the fact that the same thing could happen to them, "But for the Grace of God there go I." And even though, Mr. Speaker, the government have decided to appoint a Commission of Enquiry to look into the private boarding homes, the terms of reference do not include homes such as the Hoyles Home.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, it does.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it does not.

The terms of reference do not include apartment buildings like Kenny's Court apartments, like George's Court apartments, where you have large numbers of senior citizens congregated in one area, and these people are very concerned. They do not, Mr. Speaker, have the security going around twenty-four hours punching the clock. They may have it at Hoyles Home. They may. I am not quite sure. They do not have it in the other apartment buildings that are operated by private industry, in the private sector. And these people, Mr. Speaker, are very, very concerned. And I was going to suggest to the minister yesterday afternoon, before I wound up my remarks, that the minister should take a good, hard look at homes and apartments in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, if the City Council sees fit to put the boots to the Canadian National Hotel, the Hotel Newfoundland, in a year when hotels and motels are going to be blocked to the doors, when there is going to be tremendous pressure on the hospitality industry because of the

Mr. Neary.

Canada Summer Games which they themselves sponsored, if they see fit, Sir, to put the boots to the Hotel Newfoundland - and I could only assume, Mr. Speaker, that there is no ulterior motive behind it, that they are genuine and sincere, although they themselves have ignored the fact that Hoyles Home does not have a smoke detection system or smoke sensors as they are claiming should be in Hotel Newfoundland. Why are they ignoring the Hoyles Home and why are they socking it to Hotel Newfoundland? I hope it is not a vendetta of some kind. I hope it is not, Mr. Speaker, because they have down on the City Council supporters and employees of the gentleman who did not get the CN Hotel down on Water Street. I hope that this not the reason behind it. I hope that they are quite sincere and not just trying to get revenge against CN, which I am told, by the way, Mr. Speaker, I am told by the highest authority in this land, as far as fire prevention is concerned that Hotel Newfoundland is the safest building in this Province.

MR. HICKMAN: Who is that?

SA.N Ah, the Minister of Justice is over there. I can see the wheels turning. The gentleman made the statement publicly, and I called him and said, "Is this true? Is it true what you are saying?" I heard the gentleman being quoted on radio. Yes, the gentleman said, it was the safest building, in his opinion, in this Province. And yet the City Council, whether they are trying to get a bit of publicity for themselves, I do not know, - maybe they are genuine and sincere. Let us give them the benefit of the doubt. But let us also draw to their attention that what they are trying to do with Hotel Newfoundland, force them

MR. NEARY:

to put in a smoke detection system, and while they are waiting for that to get it planned and get the engineering work done and so forth, they are trying to force them into putting two security officers punching a clock twenty-four hours, when at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that same crowd down at City Hall are ignoring Georges Court Apartments, Kennys Court Apartments and Hoyles Home where you have senior citizens. Most of them have to depend on somebody else to move them. They are ignoring that problem. Why? That is what I would like to know. Perhaps the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation could make a few comments on this matter when he speaks in this debate.

It is a pretty serious matter, Sir. And I have had, and other members of this House have had, representation from residents of these apartment buildings and from institutions that are operated by the government and from private boarding homes. The boarding homes are all right, they are going to be taken care of under the enquiry. Well, Sir, I submit to the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation that it would be criminal, Sir, on our part, as elected representatives of the people we should hang our heads in shame if ever another tragedy occurs in this Province. My God we must learn our lesson from what happened on Boxing Day down at the Goulds. It is a pretty harsh lesson to learn. If we do not learn a lesson from that, we will never learn it.

So, Sir, I call upon the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation to act without further delay on my suggestion that all these homes and apartments - it does not make any difference whether they are operated by the government or in the private sector - take a good hard look and talk to some of the people and see how concerned they are. In some of these apartments, Mr. Speaker, that are operated in the private sector there are people there now, two senior citizens living together one sick in bed, one down and one up. And in some cases it is the wife who is down and the man has to do the cooking and look after everything, and they are very, very concerned about the fact that they do not have

MR. NEARY:

twenty-four hour supervision in these apartments. It should not be allowed.

If the minister has to bring in new regulations and amend the act, then I think he should do it at once. Mr. Speaker, yesterday too I made reference to the parliamentary ecumenical movement that was taking place in this Province. I did not mean to hurt anybody's feelings, Sir. I think there are some wierd and wonderful things going on. I am as much concerned about the financial condition of this Province as anybody else. I for one do not want to see the Province declare bankruptcy or the Minister of Finance go to the bond market and discover rather suddenly, to be brought up standing by his friends Moody's down in New York.

MR. LUSH: Moody and Doody.

MR. NEARY: Moody and Doody, sounds like - what is that team they used to have in -

MR. NOLAN: Howdy Doody.

MR. NEARY: No, not Howdy Doody. I forget now what it was. They used to have it in the Calety Theatre. What was it?

MR. DOODY: Callagher and Sheehan.

MR. NEARY: Callagher and Sheehan, that is it. Now we have Moody and Doody. I do not want to see the poor old Minister of Finance sometime when he is down in New York being wined and dined by the big financiers in the United States, down South of the border, to discover that we cannot borrow any money. But I am the first, Sir, to suggest to this hon. House that before we start socking it to the ordinary people of this Province, the poor old taxpayers who are overburdened already, before we start socking it to the taxpayers, savage cutbacks and savage restraints, sacrifices, increase in taxes, that the government itself start making a few sacrifices, show the example, lead the way.

Here is what I do not understand, why that was left out. I am all for

Mr. Neary.

doing anything to keep this Province afloat, to save the Province from bankruptcy. But, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the Auditor General's report, and you see all the examples of extravagance and waste, and you see the entertainment here in the Premier's office, \$10,000; ministerial entertainment, \$7,400, reception after reception, dinners and banquets. I do not begrudge poor old Aubrey Mac, you know, a reception to say good-bye to him - I sent him a wire when he retired - \$1,800. And you can go all the way down the line. Dinners for this one, receptions for that one, cocktail reception for So-and-So, dinner in honour of So-and-So, dinners, receptions, state banquets. The total, Mr. Speaker, is \$162,000. I would suggest that it be wiped out. No more dinners, no more receptions, no more banquets. You know, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have restraint and cutbacks and savage taxes, then the government itself has to bite the lead bullet, and not just come on and sock it to the overburdened taxpayer. Cut it all out!

MR. DOODY: A reception in honour of the Irish Christian Brothers.

MR. NEARY: I am sure the Irish Christian Brothers would not mind one bit if they did not have a big state banquet with cigars being passed out, wined and dined. I am sure, Sir, that is not their calling at all. I am sure they would be just as glad if you did not have bread - give them cake.

MR. DOODY: If I remember, they had a bit of cake too.

MR. NEARY: Did they?

But, Mr. Speaker, this is all unnecessary spending, extravagance and waste. Mr. Speaker, if the government are sincere and if the hon. gentlemen on my side of the House are genuine and sincere, then I say to them, let us show the people by precept and example that we are, that the government are prepared to make sacrifices. The government are prepared to show the people of this Province that they are satisfied to give up traipsing around the world on wild goose chases, living in the best of hotels and eating in the fine restaurants in the world.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for Exploits (Mr. Twomey) is looking at me over there as much as to say, well now this cannot be

Mr. Neary.

happening. This is all nonsense. Well I can give the hon. gentleman an example, I think, if I can find it here in my files, Sir. The hon. gentleman might be interested in knowing that New Year's Eve, 1976, Newfoundlanders were treated to a report of a press conference held by the hon. Premier. "Premier painted in warm colours the trips taken by his ministers to various parts of the world in a valiant effort - so he said - to try and attract business and industry into this Province. The hon. Joe Rousseau travelled to Iceland. The hon. John Lundrigan traipsed about Finland. Fisheries Minister Carter socialized in Norway." And, Mr. Speaker, as any good leader would do, the hon. Premier joined in the fun, joined his footloose and fancy-free ministers by linking up with them, rendezvousing with the ministers in the ever popular Denmark. Somehow or other, Sir, they all managed to somehow or other get to Denmark, although they were off in different directions. The hon. Joe Rousseau, so the Premier told us,

Mr. Neary:

apart from going to Iceland 's Hot Springs, Mr. Speaker, was scheduled to go to Scotland, Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Denmark.

MR. DOODY: They have all returned, I think.

MR. NEARY: So we are told he was supposed to be concentrating his attention on sheep. Well the only sheep, Sir, were the members of this House, and the people of this Province for putting up with that kind of nonsense. And Mr. Lundrigan so the Premier told us, he was supposed to go to Finland, Norway, Sweden, and listen to this, Denmark again, and the United Kingdom. Somehow or other -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is that sheep you are referring to?

MR. NEARY: The Minister of -

MR. LUSH: Manpower.

MR. NEARY: No, no, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development was purportedly off looking at -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The tugboats.

MR. NEARY: No, no, not the tugboats, the bakeapples. Bakeapples, cloudberries, I think they are called.

MR. ROBERTS: Cloudberry wine.

MR. NEARY: Cloudberry and blueberries. And we are wondering what happened to the big blueberry industry that the minister told us about in the last session of the House? And, of course, my old buddy, the Minister of Fisheries he was out socializing in Norway, the ever popular Denmark, Germany, Spain, Portugal and the United Kingdom.

MR. W. CARTER: The results are coming back though are they not?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir.

MR. LUSH: What is in Denmark?

MR. NEARY: I do not know what is in Denmark - well I know what is in Denmark I was there once myself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that during this session of the House that the people of Newfoundland are entitled to a full report of the costs of these trips, and what was accomplished during this invasion of Europe by so many ministers and the Premier of this Province. I am sure, Sir, Eisenhower would have been proud if he



Mr. Neary:

had been over there. He probably would have thought that it was another landing in Normandy to see so many Newfoundland Cabinet ministers and the Premier landing on European soil. And if they cannot come up, Mr. Speaker, if they cannot come up with a satisfactory explanation for their trip that in future in order to show the people of this Province that this hon. crowd are genuine when they talk about retrenchment and cutback that the hon. the Premier would put a leash on his Cabinet ministers in the future and not allow them to go traipsing around the world, and force them, Mr. Speaker, force them to stay in their offices, here in St. John's, and do by letter with a twenty cent stamp, what you could do by going off on these expensive jaunts. There was nothing, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen, no evidence of any results at all except that it provided a vacation, it provided a vacation for these hon. gentlemen at a time of the year when the weather was very poor in this Province, in February, just about, I would say it was about this time of the year I believe they went.

MR. W. CARTER: We were not swimming nights then either.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of the invasion of Europe, the 1976 version, on the anniversary, I think, that the ministers and the the Premier owe an explanation to the people of this Province. And they should give an accounting of these trips because, Sir, the box score so far shows very little success, in fact, it shows no success at all, except that the Minister of Fisheries just reminded me, "Oh" he says, "what about the?—joint ventures. I presume the minister is talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No. Well what was the minister reminding me of, "What about West Germany," I think, I heard the minister say. What about West Germany? What about it? We were led to believe, Sir, that when the administration, when one-quarter of the Cabinet were over in Europe that they were going to do an inventory of all the surplus dragnets and trawlers in Europe,

MR. NEARY: and a deal was going to be made, this was the impression that was left abroad. By now they had apparently scrapped the idea of building twenty draggers in Newfoundland, by having twenty draggers built down in Marystown or in Canada or in the shipyards in Newfoundland. They had apparently scrapped that idea and they were looking now to Great Britain and to Europe, to pick up the surplus, draggers, draggers that would become surplus because of the various countries implementing the 200 mile limit and the drop in fish stocks in the various oceans of the world.

In Great Britain I am told 90 per cent, is it 90 per cent or more even higher than that of the trawlers and draggers are tied up and there is a good many over in Europe and so we were led to believe that somehow or other we were going to see John Cabot come back across the Atlantic again, led this time-it would be, John Cabot Moorss out front and a whole flotilla of draggers and trawlers behind them sailing into Newfoundland, so we could have the capability of catching the fish when the two hundred mile limit was declared on January, 1st. Well, Sir, that did not happen either. But what did happen, Mr. Speaker, was that the government, when they were being wined and dined by the West Germans, entered into an agreement where by a pilot project would be carried on in Newfoundland with the West Germans landing 6000 tons of fish that was supposed to be caught on the Hamilton Banks in our fish plants here in Newfoundland, Ocean Harvesters, I think -who are the other two -and Fishery Products in Marystown.

That was the net result. Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of made the people of this province a little bit skeptical and a little bit suspicious, Sir, about the benefits that would come to Newfoundland as a result of the 200 mile Canadian Management Zone that became official on January 1st. of this year. And no wonder, Sir, they became suspicious because as some writers have pointed out in this province and as the union has pointed out and rightly so and as I have pointed out myself, I believe, I am not putting myself on the back, but I think I was the first member of the House of Assembly to come out against the joint venture system on the grounds,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that as far as I was concerned it was the beginning of the sell-out again, Sir, of the fishermen of this province. It was the beginning, Mr. Speaker, of a betrayal of the people and the fishermen of this province. It was a doublecross, Sir, if I ever saw one, the people were going to be doublecrossed.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Fisheries can shake his head and the hon. the Premier can say we are going to have a fullfledged debate on this matter of joint ventures, and the hon. gentleman can talk all he likes about us not understanding the joint ventures. I am not an expert, Sir, on the fishery of this province by a long shot, but I understand the principal of joint ventures and if the government had been allowed to get away with it, the fishermen would have been sold down the river again by the fish merchants in this province aided, and abetted by the provincial government. Now I realize, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Government of Canada who ultimately have to approve any joint venture project within our 200 mile limit. I realize that. Sir.

But the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, will succumb to the big lobbies that go on by the big fish merchants, especially National Sea -

MR. NEARY: and some of the - and Mickerson and some of the big boys over in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Quebec and the lobby starts up in Ottawa. It can be fierce. The Minister of Finance is there looking very serious. The Minister of Finance knows what I am talking about. Maybe the denturists in this Province cannot get a meeting with the Minister of Health and they tried this afternoon to talk about legalizing denturists in this Province, and the Minister of Health refused to see them this afternoon, even though very strong appeals were made on behalf of the denturists by the various ministers in whose districts these gentlemen resided. The Minister of Health refused to see these gentlemen although I have in front of me a letter from the Premier, it only came to my desk today, and the point I am making here, Sir, before I get off the track is that the denturists may have difficulty getting to see the Minister of Health in this Province but the big fish merchants have no problem to get in to see Romeo LeBlanc up in Ottawa.

MR. DOODY: Who employs the most people?

MR. NEARY: Who employs the most people?

MR. DOODY: The fish merchants or the denturists?

MR. NEARY: The fish merchants over in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec do not employ very many people in Newfoundland.

MR. DOODY: National Sea is quite a sizeable organization.

MR. NEARY: It may interest the hon. gentleman, who just interjected, Sir, to know that National Sea that have this plant over here on the Southside, that was practically given to them as a gift by this Province, and a fleet of druggers, are not having all their druggers, as they agreed to, coming into St. John's, they are going over to Nova Scotia.

MR. DOODY: Who gave them the plant?

MR. NEARY: This Province.

MR. DOODY: This Province. It was not the previous administration?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. The main point here is that -

MR. DOODY: Okay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: - is that these people have an agreement. They have an agreement, and the Minister of Fisheries should make a note of this -

MR. DOODY: Get back to the denturists.

MR. NEARY: - whereby they are supposed to be bringing one hundred per cent of their draggers into St. John's -

MR. DOODY: Not true.

MR. NEARY: - to look after that plant on the Southside of St. John's.

MR. DOODY: Not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true. And my understanding is, Sir, that they are bringing some of these draggers over to Nova Scotia.

MR. DOODY: And some of the Nova Scotia draggers come in here.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. There are none of the Nova Scotia draggers coming in here. And the minister should know the difference of that.

MR. DOODY: I know.

MR. NEARY: The minister does not know.

MR. DOODY: I know.

MR. NEARY: The minister got a job now to try to look after the Carm Rockwell Park over on Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: I will come to that shortly too. But, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the minister, it is very, very funny, very funny. They put in for a LIP project over there and the name of the park they wanted - so they could get the blessing of the minister, the member and they honed the Federal Member of Parliament. For lack of another name they called it the Carm Rockwell Park, called after the minister's executive assistant.

MR. DOODY: Is that true?

MR. NEARY: That is true. That is an absolute fact, Sir.

MR. DOODY: Sounds as though he is asking a question of the minister.

MR. NEARY: No wonder poor old Moriah is after scuttling McGrath -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: - and is now back -

MR. DOODY: There is nothing sacred.

MR. NEARY: No. There is nothing sacred, that is right, when it comes to politics.

But, Sir, the denturists may have a problem to get in -

MR. DOODY: Did you notice they do not have a Doody Park?

MR. NEARY: Well they should have called it a Doody Park. But up in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, there is no trouble for the big boys, the big fish merchants when they start to lobby, Romeo LeBlanc and the Government of Canada will cave in if we do not start a crusade in this Province to put a stop to it. And the minister in the provincial government, after handling the situation very sloppily in the beginning, finally began to realize that this could be a red hot political issue. It is the biggest matter, Sir, to come before the people of this Province, I would say, in the whole history of Newfoundland, even Confederation. Because, Mr. Speaker, those of us who do not realize it by now, would want to be deaf, dumb and blind or all three, that the future of this Province depends on the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the banter and the arguments back and forth from my vantage point here as an independent Liberal. And I have to analyze the statements that are made from this side and the statements that are made from the other side and then I have to try to

MR. NEARY:

be objective and constructive and I have to try to pick out what I think is right and what I think is wrong. One thing, Sir, I have to agree with as I travel around this Province today - and I have done a fair amount of travelling across Newfoundland in the last year or two and I have made a couple of trips with my hon. friend, the Minister of Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, do hon. members realize that the only prosperity in this Province today apart now from Bowaters and Price Newfoundland Limited in Grand Falls and IOC and Puchans and a couple of other places where you have mining and paper, apart from that -

MR. DOODY: Rockwell Park.

MR. NEARY: And the Rockwell Park. Apart from that, Sir, the only prosperity in Newfoundland today is in the areas where the fishery is big, where you have fish plants. My hon. friend, the Minister of Fisheries and I have talked about it a couple of times. Anybody - I do not care who he is - go down on the Burin Peninsula and see the prosperity of the Burin Peninsula. Is that not right, my hon. friend?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is right.

MR. NEARY: Go down in the Southwest corner of this Province in the district that I represent where you have about sixty per cent of the economy of the district based on the fishery, just take a look and see the prosperity. Or go down in Port au Choix down on the Great Northern Peninsula and in that immediate area what do you find? You find prosperity. Wherever you have fish plants and wherever you have large groups of fishermen today, you have prosperity. I mean that should indicate something or other to us. Are we all stunned?

Let us not waste our time in the next year or two or three twiddling our time away on foolish ventures and wild goose chases. As far as I am concerned, Sir, I would put all my eggs in one basket. Granted, Mr. Speaker, if the opportunity presents itself for the development of a deep water port or the opportunity presents itself to get the oil refinery started up again or to keep the Linerboard Mill going or to start up another industry, a cement mill here, if the opportunities come along, well and good. Embrace the opportunities.

MR. NEARY:

But, Sir, I would strongly contend myself that you can have all of this over the next couple or three years but I will take the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, if this administration want to make their mark and they want to stay in power for another few years, if we can take the Premier at his word that he only wants ten years and then he will go away and retire, that ten years is long enough, so he says, he is on his fifth year now. Give him another three years of this turn and that will be eight years. If he wants to make the magic ten, then my suggestion, Sir, is that this administration come up quickly, soon, enough information available, with a comprehensive fishery programme. And do not sell our fishermen out to the West Germans or the Europeans or anybody else in these foolish joint venture systems and by using the excuse that we do not understand them, we need more information.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be so short-sighted, that we will grab a few jobs in fish plants over in Harbour Grace, and God only knows they need it, let us not be so short-sighted just to grab a few jobs on shore and force our fishermen off the high seas within the 200-mile limit that we fought so hard for. Mr. Speaker, the trouble is, the danger is with the joint ventures system that it will become a way, a permanent way of economic life. And the fish merchants, Sir, who have never been noted for their generosity to, say the least, in this Province would use the excuse, Mr. Speaker, not to build a fleet of dragnets, not to put any money back into the fishery.



Mr. Neary.

They take the easy way out. The Europeans are easier to deal with. No unions. You do not have to sit down across the bargaining table. They can spend more time down in Florida. And, Mr. Speaker, human nature being what it is, these fellows, the fish merchants, will take the easy way out. And they would have all European druggers in here catching fish if they had their way. We must not let it happen, Sir. We have an example now where we have this pilot project before us, and we are told, "Oh, we got to learn. We got to find out about it. We got to have a debate. We get the newsmen and the union and the members of the House together, and we will all sit down, and we will all get in bed together, because we do not understand it!" We do not understand it! All of a sudden somebody on that side becomes a walking encyclopedia on joint ventures, but we do not understand it. And the press do not understand it, and the union does not understand it. Nobody understands it.

MR. W. CARTER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the hon. member is deliberately trying to mislead the House, but I think what he is saying is, in that this government is on record as stating that we are not committed to any long-term programme of joint ventures. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the story appeared in the newspaper this morning, a Canadian Press story, to the effect that a certain gentleman in Nova Scotia, a gentleman connected with, I believe, the deep-sea fishery in that Province, complained that their proposal with a company in Germany, known as NORDSTERN, was scuttled - to use his words - because the Newfoundland Government intervened. Mr. Speaker, we have registered strong objections to the Government of Canada and to others against any further joint ventures, any more joint ventures either by Nova Scotians, Quebec, New Brunswick, P.E.I. or indeed by any other company in Newfoundland. We make that statement, Mr. Speaker, because, like I said, we are committed to the proposition that there is only room at the present for one experimental joint venture.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: I do not see that there is any valid point of order before the Chair. There would appear to be a difference of opinion.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I can assure the hon. gentleman that this is too serious a matter to play games. I did not deliberately or otherwise accuse the administration of misleading the House or the people of the Province. I am saying, Sir, that they handled the whole situation very sloppy in the beginning, and there was a danger that the fishermen were going to be sold down the river again.

MR. W. CARTER: None whatever.

MR. NEARY: Well, I take the minister's word for it. And I appreciate what the minister did the other day, yesterday, I think it was.

MR. W. CARTER: Do you think I would be a party to that?

MR. NEARY: No, I do not, Sir. No. I have more faith and confidence in the minister than that, who is going to be one day, I hope, Premier of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I told the minister during his trip to Port aux Basques - I told that minister - he and I were sitting down out in the Mamateek having a little bit of codfish together and a cup of coffee, and I said, "Mr. Minister, I have to tell you something that if I had my choice of portfolios today, if I was in government and I had a choice to pick out a portfolio, a department of government, I would take Fisheries, because I think the potential and the future is in the fishing industry in this Province." And I said, "Mr. Minister if you do the right things - I know it is going to be a hard grind, you are going to have to work hard night and day - but if you do the right things, one day you could very easily be Premier of this Province." I told the hon. minister that.

MR. DOODY: He is a man of his word.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. The hon. gentleman may have some opposition from Forest Road and from Hogan's Pond , but I am sure the hon. minister can withstand that sort of opposition. But nevertheless, Sir, it is a very, very serious matter indeed, this matter of joint ventures.

Mr. Neary:

And I do not think we should wait to debate it. Here we have now, Sir, here we have it, I would like to ask the minister to explain this to me, poor old stunned Newf who does not know the difference. We were told that the West Germany would take 6,000 tons, metric tons of fish from the Hamilton Bank. And the reason we were given, Mr. Speaker, was that they had the equipment, they had the fishing boats, the vessels, that could penetrate the ice and the gear that could fish under the conditions this time of the year on the Hamilton Bank. That is why, Mr. Speaker, they were given this agreement to take 6,000 metric tons from the Hamilton Bank. But what we were not told, Mr. Speaker, is this, that that 6,000 tons now, so we are told, is not from the Hamilton Bank, which is incidentally the spawning ground for the fish that goes up off Labrador. I do not know whoever thought it up, whoever dreamt it up, whoever let them go in there in the first place, I do not care if the ice is there or not, they are in the spawning ground. The spawning ground should be protected. But now we are told the 6,000 metric tons can go anywhere from the Hamilton Bank to Cape Freels. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister shakes his head, and says, no. But the Premier the other day in answer to a question -

MR. W. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. W. CARTER: The Premier in defining the areas 2J and 3K, which are ICNAF designations for certain areas in the North Atlantic, stated that that area was contained between the Northern part of Labrador up, I believe, he said, to off Cape St. Mary's. But at no time did he suggest to this House or anywhere else that the 6,000 metric tons of codfish will be caught by West Germans under the joint venture proposal would be taken anywhere but in the Northern areas. And I am thinking of areas by the way that are even further North than the Hamilton Bank. There is a surplus, I believe, of 3,000 metric tons in that area, areas that are totally inaccessible to other ships. And that is exactly where the West Germans will be carrying out the joint venture proposal. And I am reminded in that regard the

MR. W. CARTER:

Canadian quota. And I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the stocks surplus to the Canadian effort in that area must under the bilaterals that have been signed by Canada with five other countries must be harvested or at least given to other countries to be harvested.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the situation is the same as it was previously, there is in fact no point of order, but a difference of opinion.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the West Germans had been given permission, Sir, to catch fish, this 6,000 metric tons in areas 2J and 3K. Is that correct? 2J and 3K.

MR. W. CARTER: That is correct.

MR. NEARY: You would not know but it was some kind of a code. But anyway that is where they are given permission to catch the fish. The first indication the people of this Province had that there was to be a joint venture, we were told they were catching it on the Hamilton Banks, on the spawning ground because they had the vessels and so forth. Now they can move into 2J and 3K and that goes as far as Cape Freels.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is saying it?

MR. NEARY: I am saying it. And they can catch that 6,000 tons anywhere in these areas. And what they are doing now, Mr. Speaker, whether the minister cares to admit it or not, they can leave now the spawning grounds if they do not get their 6,000 metric tons and they can follow the fish as it moves up towards Newfoundland or towards Labrador. They can chase the fish now. And that was not our understanding in the beginning. So we will learn about the pilot project all right. The pilot project was unnecessary. It looks to me, Mr. Speaker, as if we are stuck with it this year. The minister took an assist there a few moments ago for thwarting the -

MR. J. CARTER: A point of order.

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

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the hon. gentleman from LaPelle (Mr. Neary) has a motion on the Order Paper, a Private Member's

Mr. J. Carter:

Motion, specifically on the 200 mile limit. Now either he should not be allowed to discuss that then, or else he should not be allowed to discuss it now, and should be forced to sit down. I wonder would you rule on that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the submission of the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), he is alluding to the anticipation rule and that is that an hon. member may not in debate anticipate with respect to a subject which the House has determined for consideration at a later date. With respect to that, there are two motions on the Order Paper related to joint ventures. The operative effect of one is that this legislature condemns a certain action and the operative effect of the other would be the appointment of a select committee.

I would say that speaking on either of these two specific matters would be anticipation.

MP. NEAPY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again - no I better not, I am trying to get away from this matter, Sir. I do not mind interjections, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind them at all. It is a pretty serious matter, a little more serious than growing a few miserable pounds of savoury a year. You are talking about a potential of 30,000 jobs in this Province over the next say five to ten years. That is what you are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, the West Germans will now chase the fish. They will get their 6,000 metric tons and they will put it ashore in Marystown and over in Harbour Grace and no doubt, Sir, they will be back again next year. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to say this, that wherever I go in this Province today I have talked to fishermen who cannot understand the difference between the 200-mile limit and the situation that existed before January 1 of this year. They tell me they see no difference. You still have the big Russian trawlers out there sucking the fish off the bottom. You have the big factory ships. You have 600 or 700 European vessels still off our coast catching our fish. And, Mr. Speaker, does Your Honour realize that they do not - they have to get a license, sure, that is the only difference. That is the only difference the fishermen can see. They did not even have to come in to port to pick up their license. Canada is so generous and so hospitable and so soft and so girlishly-sensitive that instead of forcing them to come in to get their licenses we

MR. NEARY:

delivered it to them, delivered their license. Got a whole bunch of them and brought them out and gave them to them.

MR. DOODY: Shame, shame on Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Shame on Ottawa - well whoever's responsibility it was I say shame on them. I would like to see us get treated that way in Pussia or in some other country, or France. Bring them out a whole raft, a whole bunch of licenses, delivered to them, not even COD because they did not have to pay a red cent for them. A vast contrast, Mr. Speaker, to what is happening in the United States. This is not a condemnation of the provincial administration. I am now referring to something, Sir, that falls under federal jurisdiction. I do not know if anybody saw the reference in the Daily News this morning as a contrast to what is happening down in the United States, when the United States declares their 200-mile limit, what is going to happen.

Do you think they are going to give free passes to their foreign fleets, the vessels to go inside their 200-mile limit like my hon. friend used to get for sweeping the ice in the Stadium one time, get a free pass? Do you think that is going to happen, Sir, to the foreigners when the United States declare their 200-mile limit? No, Sir. And I have here in front of me a clipping from the Fisheries Management magazine published South of the border, dated January 15, 1977. I want all hon. members to pay attention to this because I have a little more information than appeared in that news story in The Daily News this morning. This should open up hon. members eyes for them, just to show the difference between Canada and the United States, to show how soft Canadians are. I do not know, maybe we are soft peddling the issue because we want Pussia to buy our wheat. Maybe we are, I do not know.



MR. NEARY:

Maybe Pomeo LeBlanc and the people up in Ottawa are catering to the Western Provinces.

AN HON. MEMBER: External Affairs.

MR. NEARY: Well I do not know about External Affairs. I have not been at the game long enough yet. But maybe, Sir, maybe there is a trade off. Maybe I am so naive and so stunned that I cannot see it, the international implications.

But why should the United States put the boots to the foreign fishing fleets and Canada let them get away scot-free? Just listen. Hon. members should listen. I wish there were more hon. members in their seats to hear what I am about to read so they can make a comparison between what they are going to do in the United States and what they have done in Canada in connection with the 200-mile limit.

It says, "200-mile limit foreign fishing fees proposed."

AN HON. MEMBER: Table it.

MR. NEARY: I will table it when I read it. Are these reading glasses you have there? They are not, ah. If the hon. minister sends me over - this is very small print and I -

AN HON. MEMBER: Good reason.

MR. NEARY: Yes. Bring me over the reading glasses. "A schedule of fees to be paid by foreign vessels and foreign nations fishing within 200 nautical miles of the United States coasts has been proposed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)," - Would somebody get me these glasses, please? - "a Commerce Department Agency. Such fees are provided by the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 which extended United States fisheries jurisdiction to the 200-mile limit." No, I am afraid they are a little bit too strong. I think I can probably make it all right. You know, I can see a fly on the wall on the other side, but close up is my problem. I have got what you call the long arm, you know, I am right down to the end -

MR. NOODY: I have had the experience.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I know. "Now the proposed schedule provides that each foreign vessel will be charged a fixed annual access fee of one dollar per gross registered ton, not to exceed \$5,000 a vessel. In addition, every foreign nation with fishing vessels in the zone will be charged a fee of 3.5 per cent of the total dockside value of pounds of fish allocated to that nation. The value will be determined by the price received by United States fishermen for the species in the United States. If there is no United States market an average foreign dockside price will be used.

"Written comment on the schedule may be sent to the Director of National Marine Fisheries Service, (NOAA), Washington, D.C. The Department of Commerce Agency estimates that 1,400 foreign fishing vessels with an average size of 1,400 gross tons are expected to apply for fishing privileges off the United States."

Just listen to that again, Mr. Speaker. "The Department of Commerce Agency estimates that about 1,400 foreign fishing vessels with an average size of 1,000 gross tons are expected to apply for fishing privileges off the United States. They are expected to be permitted to catch about 2 million metric tons of fish with a dockside value of about \$553 million in 1977 in this calendar year. And revenue, Mr. Speaker, "from the fees would thus amount to about - listen to this - revenue to the United States would amount to \$32 million from the access fees and about another \$19 million from the dockside value fees assessed against the foreign nations. In addition, up to \$750,000 may be collected from the foreign vessels for the cost of United States observers. " Mr. Speaker just listen to this. In addition, so we are told,

MR. NEARY: to \$32 million plus \$19 million that the United States Government, the authorities in the United States, are going to collect \$750,000 to put United States observers on board foreign boats. And what do we charge to put our Canadian observers aboard foreign boats? What do we charge? Not one nickle, Sir, not a red cent. We charge it to the taxpayers of this country. That is how soft and foolish we are in Canada. The United States is going to make the foreign nations pay for the observers on the foreign boats and we poor, old soft Canadian are going to have to pay it through our income tax.

Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear anything so ridiculous in your life? Did you ever in your life? Here we went up and we were almost prepared to take up arms and fight for the 200 mile limit and when we get it the lowly fishermen off the Bill of Cape St. George that was referred to so often in this hon. House does not know the difference. You would never know we had a 200 mile limit. They go up, they come back, they tell me, they are out there in droves, 500, 600 foreign vessels inside of our 200 mile limit and not a cent, not a red cent, they do not even pay us for the observers that Canada has to put on board. How foolish can we get. The United States are not going to be that soft. And the United States, I suppose, have to export to these countries as well as Canada does. I do not know how much wheat Canada expects to sell in return for this little favour, this little gift.

I have to start thinking of the East Coast of Canada as well as Western Canada. The total annual cost of research administration enforcement and other aspects of management of the 200 mile zone is estimated to be about \$92 million. The value of fish taken by foreign fishermen is about sixty per cent, \$553 millions of the total value of the combined US and foreign catch of \$720 million, I think it is. This is according to 1973. About sixty per cent

MR. NEARY: of the total cost of the programme, \$55 million, can be attributed to foreign fishing.

Now there it is, Mr. Speaker. There it is. We are getting new boats built for surveillance off our Coast, we are putting observers on board the foreign fleets, we are delivering their licences to them free of charge and not one iota, no revenue for this Province. It is a sad, sad, sad situation indeed. It is sad.

I do not know if the Minister of Fisheries agrees with me on that or not? The minister does. I am certainly glad, Sir, because I am glad to be able to say it in this hon. House. It has not been said yet and I hope when other members participate in this debate, I know we got two motions on the Order Paper, Sir, one I put there and the other one was put there by the Leader of the Opposition, I am well aware of that but we cannot wait, Mr. Speaker, we have to develop our own strategy or we will be forced, as we have been over the past number of years, to accept unilateral decisions from the federal government or a continuation of the aimlessness in which our fishery policy has been directed over the past several years.

Mr. Speaker, one other point that I want to make before I get off the subject of joint ventures, although I could stay on it all day. I cannot help, I cannot help it. I am so carried away with the potential and the prospects of the fishery and what it can do for Newfoundland. And we would, as elected members of this House, if we allow our fishermen to be sold the river to be betrayed, to be stabbed in the back,

Mr. Neary.

to be kicked in the mid section, as they have so often in the past. If we allow that to happen again we should hang our heads in shame.

The other point I want to make before I get off, Sir - I meant to make this point when I was talking about the fishing on the Hamilton Banks and the West Germans now being allowed to chase the fish, and before they get up probably to Labrador, they will be caught - and that is, Sir, the buffer zone. I think the minister wrote - if I am not mistaken did I hear the minister yesterday or see something where the minister has written Ottawa about the buffer zone. They want a twelve mile -

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, the Government of Canada is talking about a twelve mile -

MR. W. CARTER: More than talking.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they are talking about twelve miles, a buffer zone.

MR. DOODY: Newfoundland only is it?

MR. NEARY: No, I know. I am not talking about this government. I am talking about the other one up there in Ottawa, the national government, the one that is kowtowing to the Mafia of Quebec. You got them over in Quebec. They are trying to set up another Liechtenstein only this time it will be in Canada. And that government up there in Ottawa are talking about, and other people, people I presume who are familiar with the fishing industry, are talking about a twelve mile buffer zone - twelve miles. We had the twelve mile limit here for years, and you heard what the inshore fishermen thought of the twelve mile limit. It was absolutely useless. Our fish stocks dwindled, got caught before they got in to shore by the big draggers, and the big ships off shore. And now they are talking about this - this is in relation I might say to the joint venture - they are talking about

Mr. Neary.

allowing - and not only the joint ventures but all the ships - they are allowing them to come within twelve miles of our shores again to catch the fish. That will do nothing for the inshore fishery. And I think the Province and the minister has recommended a fifty mile buffer zone. I say, "Hear, hear" to that. I am all for it. They should not be allowed to come within fifty feet of our shores. It is our management zone. Mr. Speaker, when will we get that into our thick skulls. When will Uncle Ottawa, the Government of Canada and Mr. Romeo LeBlanc, who seems to be taking such an arrogant attitude towards Newfoundland these days - "I am King Kong, I am the Minister of Fisheries. I will run the fisheries in Canada," and the crap all over the Premier of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, we should fight for and settle for nothing less than a fifty mile buffer zone so that the poor old longliner fishermen and the inshore fishermen will have a break for a change. Right now I am told, Sir, and I do not know if the minister has any figures to back it up, but I am told, the people that I have talked to, that the fish are now coming in to shore. Down in my own district, on the Southwest corner of this Province, and probably right along the Southwest Coast, that this year there are good signs of fish. There is plenty of fish, and it is big fish. Fish landings, Sir, so far, I would say, this year are up substantially. The fishermen are elated. The inshore fishermen now I am talking about. Because when we are talking about the fishery in this Province, we are talking about two kinds of fishermen, the inshore, the mid water - probably three kinds - and the offshore. So I think it would be a shame, Sir, to allow these foreign fleets, these vessels to come within twelve miles of our shore again, the buffer zone, around the coast of Newfoundland, the East coast of Canada and Labrador, twelve miles. I say, "No, drive them out of it. Keep them out fifty miles off our coast." As far

Mr. Neary.

as I am concerned, they should not be there at all unless they pay through the nose. And then we should think twice about giving out licences. Was not the whole idea, Sir, conservation, conservation, conservation! We had it drilled into us for the last ten years. Conserve our stocks. I heard an argument put up recently, and for a little while I was kind of stunned - it was indefensible I thought - that the Government of Canada would be embarrassed, they would be embarrassed to tears if we enforced a 200 mile limit, and we did not go out and catch the fish. So many

MR. NEARY: hungry people in the world, so many nations starving, if we did not go out and catch the fish it would be embarrassing in the countries of the world that do not have anything to eat. I doubt very much if any of the fish from off the Coast of Newfoundland gets into the poorer countries anyway, gets into probably the rich countries, gets into Japan, Portugal - well I do not know if Portugal is a rich country or not, but they are not too bad - Spain, France, Germany, Russia and -

AN HON. MEMBER: Cuba.

MR. NEARY: - and Cuba. Yes, Sir. But, Mr. Speaker, is not the answer to that, is not the counter argument that the whole idea, one of the main reasons for bringing in the 200 mile Canadian management zone, was it not for conservation purposes? Was it not? To allow the fish stocks to build up.

But we think somehow or other, we have been brainwashed into thinking that we have to have the same number of boats off our Coast that we always had and yet the big argument that was used by SOFA and used to - what is the fishery organization they have, the international?

AN HON. MEMBER: ICNAF.

MR. NEARY: ICNAF- every time somebody from this Province went to ICNAF they talked about getting the quotas reduced, they talked about conservation and here we have it now in our own hands and we are still not able to take advantage of it. And of course the other thing. -

MR. DOODY: You should run federal.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I should not run federal because these are things that should be said in Newfoundland. And if - I do not know about my old sparring partner that graduated up to Wellington West last Fall if he will put up as good an argument in the House of Commons, or any MP from Newfoundland, will put up as good an argument to the House of Commons as we will put up in this House in our next House of Assembly in connection with the total catch of



MR. NEARY: and the 200 mile Canadian management zone and the capability of Canadians to catch the fish.

You know, Mr. Speaker, just to get off this topic I want to wind it up by saying, Sir, that in my opinion and in the opinion of a good many more people, we have to adopt a comprehensive plan for the development of the fisheries on this Eastern Seaboard of Canada, especially here in Newfoundland and we have to take advantage of federal money that is available. We have to put the proposals before the Government of Canada, otherwise they will do it unilaterally. And we have to tell the industry, we have to tell this House - I used ultimatum in my resolution in connection with the Government of Canada to stop the joint ventures, I was told that, that was a pretty strong word, probably would not be allowed, and the Speaker did not allow it, so I had to change it to something wishy washy.

But we should give the industry an ultimatum and say, "Look, smarten up. Build your draggers and your trawlers and your ships that you need. Train your people." Mr. Speaker, we have got the beginning of it. My God we got the Fishery College over there wasting its time, herding people in every year trying to train them in all kinds of foolish things just to get them in so they can get the Manpower grants. I bet you if you did a poll to see where they are now a lot of these people who came in, trained at the Fishery College, are probably off working in some other kind of a job.

We are going to have a poly-tech so we are told. We got the Fishery College merging with the College of Trades. We have got the training facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I know, I realize it is going to be a long, painful process. It is going to take three, four, five years to change the attitude of young Newfoundlanders, to get them to go out and start on the trawlers, to get them to think in terms of productivity, to think in terms of what can you do for your Province, that is what we need for the Province though.

MR. NEARY: I grasped what was mentioned in the Throne Speech. I grasped it. Because I have been advocating in this Province for a good many years now that we should have a Provincial Productivity Council. So therefore I am not exactly behind the times, only now the government, three years later, catches up to me.

But, Sir, we have the training facilities. We have the manpower. Maybe we do not have the attitudes. Maybe our children were brainwashed through the educational system that we have

Mr. Neary:

through the educational system that we have into getting out of the fisheries. It was demeaning. I do not want my son to be a fisherman. He will never go in the boat. My son, what do you want? Do you want to be a dentist? Do you want to be a doctor? Do you want to be a lawyer? Or do you want to be an old sock or do you want to be a fisherman?

MR. J. CARTER: They would not want to be like you.

MR. NEARY: No, and I would not want to be like you either. Miserable, pathetic spectacle.

Mr. Speaker, the attitudes of our young people have to be changed, Sir. They have too. We have the facilities, but we have to tell the industry we can do that, this House can do it, the government can do it. The minister himself can lead the biggest crusade that was ever led in this Province, go from one end of her to the other recruiting young men to get into the fishery, to get jobs to earn good pay with all kinds of sophisticated and ultra-modern equipment like they have in West Germany that we hear so much about. Why they even have a television, a closed circuit television on the end of a net that is going out into the water, and tell you how deep it is, where the fish is, From the sound of the fish they can tell you what kind of fish is in your net, Absolutely unbelievable! And cannot our people do that?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: They cannot? They cannot do it now, but can we not train them to do it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure.

MR. NEARY: Sure we can train them to do it. And we got the facilities, and if we procrastinate, if we are weak-kneed, if we are unpatriotic we will let that opportunity slip through our fingers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We were the first country in the world to put a pump down in the net where the herrings were and pump them up out of the net.

MR. NEARY: The hon. former Premier reminds me that we were the first country, I do not know if we were the first Province?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The first country.

MR. NEARY: The first country in the world to put a pump down in the net and pump - suck the fish up or pump it up, the herring up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The herring. Ches Crosbie.

MR. NEARY: Ches Crosbie. Well at least he did one good thing in his lifetime. Apart from the fact that he produced a couple of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I would ask the hon. member to come back from his seat, to speak from his own seat.

MR. NEARY: Do you want to go up to your seat, you will give me a break, I am starting to get hoarse, and I am only getting warmed up yet. Do not go away, Sir, I got a few more gems of wisdom for you yet before you go. I hope you are enjoying it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am.

MR. NEARY: Because it is pretty important stuff.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are not going to finish before 6:00 o'clock, are you?

MR. NEARY: No indeed I am not, Sir, going to finish before 6:00 o'clock because I have to talk about the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation. I have to talk about the Rural Development Authority, the Federal Development Business Bank. And I have a few ideas and a few suggestions to throw out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To the whole House, not for me.

MR. NEARY: No. Well I mean somehow or other, you know, we are all on a bit of an ego trip in this House. But somehow or other when the former Premier says a kind word to me or gives me a little pat on the back or sends me a note, says that was a good speech, somehow or other I really appreciate that, very much I appreciate it. I do not know what it is. I do not know what it is about it, but there is something about it. I still got notes, by the way. The first time I spoke in this hon. House I just got inside the rail over here, representing

Mr. Neary:

Bell Island, and I was there a long time before I made a speech, and I believe the hon. former Premier was kind of worried about me because I was a little bit radical, and a little bit erratic, you know, the big shots, the high mucky-mucks in the Liberal Party at that time said, Look, why do you not shut that nipsqueak up, keep him down, he is only a troublemaker, and an agitator.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Anyway I got my chance, and I got up and I thought I made a pretty good speech, and I got a little note from my hon. colleague here, saying that was a good speech, we are all proud of you, I still got it home in my scrapebook.

AN HON. MEMBER: You read it well.

MR. NEARY: I certainly did. But I must say what I knew about public speaking at that time was just peanuts compared to now. I mean experience, I suppose, makes- well I know I am not perfect, but my hon. friend here, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush) was telling me this afternoon that he will like to speak in the debate soon. And he said, "You know, I am going to follow your example." And I said, "What is that?" He said, "Sometimes you get up and you do not have a note in front of you." I said, "Sometimes. Some of the topics that I talk about I do not have a note in front of me." And

MR. NEAPY:

in connection with the joint ventures this afternoon. I did not have very much information in front of me only what I have heard and observed and thought about. And the hon. member said, "Well, you know, I think I am going to try that." I said, "Yes, what will you go with, just notes, not a prepared speech?" And he said, "Yes, that is right." Well I tell you I really appreciate that from the hon. member, a new member of the House. It just goes to show you how sincere and earnest the hon. gentleman is. I might say you are getting stronger Opposition this time. The government are reacting. The Opposition is more united. The government are reacting by doing a few things. They are making ministerial statements now, bringing in announcements every day, starting to do a few things. Maybe we have shamed them into it over here. But you are getting better Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Irrelevant, Sir.

MR. NEAPY: That is irrelevant, Sir, but anyway the point that I was -

DR. COLLINS: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SPFAKER: The hon. member for St. John's South.

MR. NEAPY: Yes, the hon. member can have his question.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member mentioned the building of sophisticated trawlers, trawlers with sophisticated equipment, and he indicated that the local fishery firms should be encouraged or otherwise to help to acquire these. Would the hon. member give us some idea of how many trawlers he has in mind in that regard and what the capital investment would be?

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation at all to tell the member the ball park figure I am talking about, \$1 billion. I hope the member did not fall off the end of his seat.

DR. COLLINS: Would the hon. member indicate which local firms have \$1 billion available?

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, there you go, there is the hon. friend of the capitalist who does not understand

MR. NEARY:

understand is how you can get an MCP card signed as fast as you can, "Here, my son, here, put your name on the dotted line." Think, think, think, think, think. My God, you know, I wonder sometimes how some of these fellows get through law school and medical school.

Are you expecting we are going to pass out \$1 million in one day or one month or one year? It is going to be done over a period of time. But you are talking ultimately about \$1 billion, 300 or 400 or 500 boats. Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member realize that for every offshore job, every job you create on a dragger you create three onshore? Is the hon. member aware of that? Would that not be worth it?

If the big government of Canada, Sir, and the provincial government instead of piddling its money away and throwing it down the drain, and the industry together combined forces - does the hon. member realize what it is going to cost to develop the Lower Churchill. And how many jobs will it create? This Province is talking about borrowing \$1.5 billion to develop the Lower Churchill which will end up with probably 150 or 200 jobs. Here we are talking about 30,000 jobs offshore or onshore, 30,000. For every job you create on a dragger you are creating three onshore. It is not going to be done overnight.

I know the hon. gentleman thought he was going to make me look silly. I am not one bit ashamed of it if my economics are all loused up. Maybe the hon. gentleman can get his computer and show me where I am crazy. But, Sir, it can be done. We can develop the Upper Churchill and the Lower Churchill and build oil refineries, build Linerboard mills. We have \$300 million in that so far and how long was it operating? Five years? Less than five years? Three hundred million dollars, \$60 million a year. Ten years, \$100 million by the Government of Canada, Newfoundland, the industry, \$1 billion, 300 or 400 or 500 draggers and trawlers fishing and 30,000 jobs onshore. There is what we are going to give up. There is what we are going to lose by default if we bow to that crowd in Europe -

MR. NEARY: And Ottawa.

MR. NEAPY: - and Ottawa, that is right. I am sorry I did not get Ottawa in there.

Mr. Speaker, we can do it. We have the training facilities. We are going to have to get the gear and the equipment and the vessels. If we take the defeatist attitude that we cannot do it, we are going to miss the opportunity of our lifetime. We are going to give up the future of this Province.



MR. NEARY: And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that we should be, and rightly so, reluctant to entertain any kind of foreign landings of fish in Newfoundland. Because our record, Sir, our record of dealing with this resource and with the fishermen and the people of this Province has been a dismal one indeed. It has been a history of sellout and betrayal, and that brings me right back where I started my few remarks, on the -

MR. DOODY: Denturists.

MR. NEARY: - on the joint venture.

No, Sir, the denturists. I do not know if they have gotten yet to see the Minister of Health. They were out in the anteroom earlier waiting to get in and see the minister. I was told by one of my intelligence agents that the denturists could not get to see the Minister of Health. I do not know if the minister has since seen the denturists. No, the minister has not. He is looking away from me. He cannot look me straight in the eye.

Another case, Sir, of an upkept promise and a double cross, and given in writing. Does the hon. minister want to hear what the Premier said to the denturists. February 8th., only three days ago, "Mr. Robert M. Hall, B.A., LL.B., Barrister, Solicitor and Notary, P.O. Box 9553, Postal Station "B", St. John's, Newfoundland. Dear Mr. Hall -"

MR. MURPHY: Where is it from?

MR. NEARY: It says Postal Station "B", I do not know where he is. He may be over in Elizabeth Towers with the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I do not know.

"Dear Mr. Hall, Thank you for your letter dated January 5th. in which you wrote on behalf of the Denturists Society of Newfoundland and Labrador specifically concerning their request for legislation. I have discussed the matter with the Minister of Health, the hon. Harold Collins, and I hope that this reply will serve to confirm my government's stated intentions to introduce legislation to govern the activities of denturist.

MR. NEARY: "I can appreciate the concern of denturists and I would like to dispel any fears that might exist that government has changed its mind regarding the need for legislation. Hopefully the legislation will be introduced during the upcoming session of the legislature."

A very, very nice letter, very courteous indeed, Sir. And the hon. the Premier is to be commended for recognizing the fact that the denturists of this Province should be legalized instead of having the RCMP sent off to harrass them, by our weak kneed Minister of Justice, Instead of having the RCMP running around the Province raiding their offices, it would be better to legalize the denturists so that the consumer of this Province could get a break.

Mr. Speaker, you know I have seen cases of hypocrisy in my life but some of these denturists, most of them I would submit, Sir, have worked in dentists' offices, and they were great, they were God's gift to making uppers and lowers when they were working in the dentist office, and he was making a mint and he was raking it in. Well once they went off on their own they became a bunch of scoundrels and rogues and they were unhygenic and they could not do the work, and all they had was the RCMP - And the poor old consumer -

Mr. Speaker, did you ever realize that in this Province today a denturist will make an upper or a lower for half the price that he is forced to pay to a dentist, half the price. And they are trying to take this away. Even if they bring in the legislation, Sir, will it be only for full dentures? Will they be allowed to make partial dentures? And this is where a large amount of the work is. I do not have a partial denture or an upper or lower myself, if I did maybe I would not be talking so much.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am told that forty per cent of the cost of making partial dentures,

Mr. Neary.

and yet I am told that because the denturist cannot see the legislation, not allowed to have a look at it, when they are bringing in laws, legislation governing optometrists, ophthalmologists, bringing in legislation creating a water authority in the city of St. John's, bringing in legislation concerning the legal profession - the biggest rogues of all - they can all see their legislation in advance of it being brought into the House. The Legislative Disabilities Act, another classic example. I wonder who saw that one before it came into the House? But the denturists are not allowed to see their legislation. The Premier wrote a very nice letter.

MR. COLLINS: It has gone on the public record.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and it is gone on the public record.

Let us see what the minister said when he wrote.

"At a later date when a preliminary draft of the act has been prepared I shall try to arrange a meeting between representatives of the Denturists Association and the Dental Association to discuss some of the outstanding items. Partial dentures could be one item. Immediate dentures, we would like to deal with the subject of immediate dentures in the same manner as that of partial dentures by referring the subject to the governing board for consideration and recommendations."

MR. COLLINS: Where did the hon. member get his file?

MR. NEARY: "I thought I would advise you that I have requested the Department of Justice to commence preparing of draft legislation, and when a draft has been prepared I shall contact you again with regard to obtaining your comments with respect to the draft." The date on that, Sir, is September 27, 1976. It is signed Harold Collins, by the way.

Mr. Neary: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. COLLINS: Sure, why not? I would be glad to see your letter on one of these days.

DR. WINSOR: Is the hon. gentleman aware that in provinces where the denturists have been legalized that there is a very little difference in fee charged by the dentist and the denturist?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that, no, and I am not aware of what goes on as far as the denturist, vis-a-vis, the dentist, in other provinces are concerned. But if there is - and probably the consumers in these provinces are getting a better break than they are in Newfoundland from the dentist - but if there is a lower price for an upper or lower, I would say it is due in large measure to the denturist. And in this Province, Sir, the consumer will not get a break until the denturists are legalized. And so why all of a sudden the change of attitude, the change of heart on the part of the Minister of Health? Why is he now resisting the denturist? Why cannot they get to see him? He is alleged to have told one denturist recently - he described himself, I think, as a canary. He said, "I do not want to be the canary caught between two cats," meaning the dentist and the denturist. Is the minister kowtowing to the dentist? Is the minister going to allow the dentist to dictate the legislation? The minister does not hesitate - I understand he had a meeting recently with the Dentist Association. What of the denturists? Have they got leprosy? Have they got the bubonic plague? Why cannot the Minister of Health sit down man to man, man-fashion and talk to the denturists as he promised them he would? And then bring the legislation into this House, after prior consultation with the denturists, and then let us go over it with a finetooth comb, and not have the dentist dictate. Let not the dentists dictate what kind of legislation we are going to have. That is what is happening now. I have had a lot of dealings myself with dentists outside this Province. I had a lot of dealings.

DR. WINSOR: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman might be surprised.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. COLLINS: Would the hon. member indicate if the letter he just read, attributed to the Premier, has the Premier's signature on it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated a few moments ago, Sir, I do not have my specks with me,

MR. NEARY:

but it says here, "Yours sincerely, Frank D. Moores, Premier", and it is signed, it looks to me like it might be the Premier's signature. I have several letters myself from the Premier. If the hon. gentlemen can see it from over there, does it look like the signature of the Premier or did somebody forge his name?

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, what is the requirement of the House? Is the hon. member required to table -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I cannot hear the gentleman.

MR. H. COLLINS: Is the hon. member required to table any correspondence which he reads from?

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct. If the hon. gentleman refers to correspondence, then he should table it. If the hon. gentleman reads correspondence or a letter then he should table it.

MR. NEARY: I have no hesitation at all, Sir. There is nothing to hide, Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing. Incidentally, I might say before I table -

MR. H. COLLINS: Give it to the Page.

MR. NEARY: Well the Page is out getting me a glass of ice water so I can get my batteries recharged. Right up here on the top it says, "The Premier, St. John's, AIC ST7, The Government of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, February 8" in case the hon. gentleman misses anything in this letter.

MR. H. COLLINS: Table it, table it. We can read it.

MR. NEARY: And incidentally the hon. gentleman has a copy. Down at the bottom it says, "cc, Hon. Harold Collins, Minister of Health." Here it is, Sir. As soon as I get my glass of water, Mr. Speaker, I will gladly accede to Your Honour's request and lay this very, very important and significant document on the table of the House. It should prove beyond any shadow of a doubt, Sir, the difference of attitude of the hon. the Premier and the hon. Minister of Health who says, "No, I am not going to be like a Canary." I will not give a package of birdseed. He does not want to be like a Canary caught

MR. NEAPY:

between two cats, two pussies, I think he said. "I do not want to be like a Canary in between two pussies," namely the denturists and the dentists. But he sees the dentists and he will not see the denturists.

MR. H. COLLINS: Lay that on the table of the House, please.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister wishes and with the approval of my hon. colleague, the member for Bay de Verde (Mr. Powe) I will gladly lay this document upon the table of the House too and anything else the hon. minister wants. Mr. Speaker, I read nothing, I produce nothing in this House that I am not prepared to table. That is one thing. So here you go, take this one too. Now that I have laid it on the table of the House, have I called the minister's bluff? Will the minister now agree to see the denturists? Or are the doors of the minister's office going to be closed to the denturists but open to the dentists? Not that I have anything against the dentists. I do not.

MR. DOODY: I hope you do not need a filling soon.

MR. NEAPY: If I do I will have to go to get the work done the same place I got it done before. I got work done that I could not get done in this Province.

MR. DOODY: Out of the Province you got it done.

MR. NEAPY: That is right. Not only that, Sir, it is very simple work too where you use a brush. I do not know if they have updated their techniques.

MR. DOODY: Maybe they can get some crazy glue.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, this is another example, Sir, of an unkept promise and a double-cross and another example of how the administration, what little regard they have for the consumer of this Province. I imagine we will eventually get the legislation, Sir, we will eventually get it. I have no doubt about that. It will be so tough, the regulations and the standards will be set so high, that it will force them out of business and that is the kind of technique they will use from now on.

MR. NEARY:

In the meantime the poor old consumer will just continue to be shafted. An unkept promise, Sir. And the government should be ashamed. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to swing into - I only have another few minutes before six but I want to swing into another matter that has been concerning me as an elected representative of this House as I am sure that it has concerned other members in this hon. House, Sir, and that is



Mr. Neary:

the lack of control by the government of this Province. Mr. Speaker, do you realize, and does the House realize that it is not the government who is running this Province at the present time, This Province, Sir, is run by the bureuacrats. The government is not in control. The hon. Leader of the Opposition made a great speech the other day when he went on for four or five hours talking about the government showing leadership. And a lot of the things that the hon. Leader of the Opposition said I must say I have to approve of, I have to agree with him on. One thing the hon. gentleman did not say, although the hon. Leader of the Opposition was probably thinking about it, there are a lot of other people thinking about it, is that this government is not governing simply because the bureaucrats have gotten a strangle hold on the administration, and a strangle hold on the Province. And if the officials, Treasury Board, Planning and Priorities, the university crowd they brought over, who are running this Province. No wonder we are not getting any ideas or any originality out of the government. They are not getting anything done. They have given up their responsibility, they have abdicated their responsibility, and they have given it up by default to the bureaucrats and the officials. And they are quite happy as long as they can go off to Europe and travel all over the world, go traipsing around on wild-goose chases, and leave the bureaucrats behind to take the flak and to run the Province, and go off chasing partridge and moose and everything else. That is why they can do it all because they say, "Oh we do not have to stay home and keep the store today, look after the shop, the bureaucrats will do it for us."

Mr. Speaker, the members of the House of Assembly probably know more than anybody else what has happened in the last four or five years in this Province. We have created a monster. We have not, the government has. They started off by what they called restructuring, a sophisticated term for shifting around various responsibilities, and this restructuring was suppose to be the salvation of Newfoundland.

Mr. Neary:

And all it did, Mr. Speaker, was insulate the politician from the ordinary people of this Province. If you want to get in now to see a minister or you want to call him on the phone or to get in to see the Premier of this Province you have got several layers of officials and bureaucrats to go through, and if you can survive it you may get to see your member or you may get to see the minister, but certainly, Sir, you will never survive long enough to get to see the Premier of this Province. He has got a whole battery, the hon. Premier has got a whole battery of buffers on his floor, answering letters that are brought to the attention of the hon. Premier, intercepting phone calls, and heading off people from getting into the office of the Chief Executive Officer of this Province. It is a terrible situation. Terrible, Frustrating. It is frustrating for the members. How much more frustrating it is for the ordinary people? The empire building that has gone on for the last four or five years has been absolutely astounding, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an example of something that I saw the other day that turned my stomach. It was an advertisement, I do not have it here with me, an advertisement that appeared in the newspaper, I believe it was last weekend, where a hairdresser, a beautician for Harbour Lodge - now remember, Mr. Speaker, here is the crowd that are talking about retrenchment and cutback and savage sacrifices on behalf of the ordinary people, and Harbour Lodge in case hon. members do not know about it, is an institution over on Saddle Hill, a former posh motel that was

MR. NEARY: turned into a home for mentally and physically retarded adults.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: That is very funny. That is one of the bureaucrats now, one of the buffers down on the eighth floor. He thinks it is very, very funny. Anybody who would laugh at that clown would laugh at anything.

Mr. Speaker, a hairdresser, now down under the hill probably less than a half a mile away is a vocational school with all the hairdressing equipment in the world in it. The most modern equipment I suppose you could get, two hairdressing courses being run in that school, about I would say thirty or forty students in that school who are being trained to be hairdressers. And one time, Mr. Speaker, one time they used to bring the people down from Harbour Lodge, down to the vocational school to get their hair done but I am told, I am told, I do not know if it is correct or not, I am told that one of the instructors did not like to do these people. She turned up her nose. She said, "No, I am not going to do those people any more." So now they are advertising for a hairdresser for Harbour Lodge instead of bringing the kids in the school who are studying to be hairdressers, bring them up to Harbour Lodge and let them get some experience. Or go in to Harbour Lodge and train some of the people in there. They are not all as stunned as the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). They are not all that retarded. Some of them are pretty alert people. Some of them are fairly bright and could be trained. Why not go in and train them? Bring them down to the vocational school and train them. Or bring the students up and bring the instructors up or the people that can get out and go down would be glad to take a stroll down to the vocational school or they would be glad to get out for an hour or so or they would be glad to see somebody coming in.

MR. NEARY: But no, not this crowd, not the bureaucrats, not the crowd that are talking about retrenchment and cutback and sacrifices. They are going to hire a hairdresser and put her in Harbour Lodge.

Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I will move the adjournment of the debate.

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

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Monday, February 14, 1977 at 3:00 p.m.