

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago

I informed the House I would keep the hon. House up to date on the activities of the Fisheries Loan Board and today I wish to inform the House of the recent activities of the board and bring the House up to date on the activities and also as a result of questions the last few days by members from the Opposition.

The complete review of the Loan Board is now in the completion stage. It has been ongoing for the past number of months and, as a result of the discussions with the Fishermen's Union in particular, we had a delegate from the union working with the officials of the Department of Fisheries in drafting up the regulations and the eligibility criteria to be used by the board in the future. We have now finalized the negotiations with the chartered banks whereby the chartered banks will be taking over all the loans to fishermen in the Province over \$50,000 and up to \$1 million in individual loans. These loans will be guaranteed by the Newfoundland Government, by the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), and the interest rate charged to fishermen will be the same as the Fisheries Loan Board, which will be, of course, 8 per cent, which means that the government will be subsidizing the interest rate between the difference charged by the chartered banks and the amount now being charged by the Loan Board. These interest payments will be mailed by the Loan Board to the fishermen on the condition, of course, that the interest be paid on their accounts at the various chartered banks.

The Cabinet has approved the condition of the agreement with the chartered banks and the final signing of the agreements will be within the next two or three week period.

MR. J. MORGAN:

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the Fisheries Loan Board has been quite active in the past number of weeks processing as many applications as possible. I mentioned on numerous occasions that there were a number of hardship cases where there were fishermen who had boats and could not get engines and who had boats and needed additional fishing gear or equipment on their boats, and we wanted to get as many as possible of these hardship cases dealt with.

So, Mr. Speaker, to go back to  
December 10th

MR. J. MORGAN: when the Interim Loans Policy programme was announced by the Premier, the board had then on hand 817 applications totalling approximately \$37 million and the applications were for equipment for engines and for boats. Of course, the conditions of the Interim Loans Programme was that the Board would finance, as announced by the Premier last Fall, a twenty boat programme, twenty new boats ranging from forty-five to sixty-five feet, and of course, these boats, as I mentioned earlier, these contracts awarded and the boats under construction. So between December 10th, Mr. Speaker, and April 11th - just a few days ago - the Board met on eleven occasions. They had eleven different Board meetings. That is more than the total that was held in the past two years.

SOME HCN. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: At these eleven meetings they approved 226 loans at a total cost of \$10.3 million. In actual fact, the Fisheries Loan Board was committed to only \$3 million because the total of \$10.3 million included, of course, the funds for the down payments by the fishermen, the provincial bounties and the federal government's subsidies. So in addition to this, Mr. Speaker, the Board also approved, over and above the 226 new loans, roll-over loans, fishermen whose loans change the name of the fishermen will be called roll-over loans. A number of these were approved as well.

When the Interim Board approved 226 loans, we thought we were putting a substantial dent in the need by the fishermen throughout the Province for loans to carry out this year's fishery. However, between December 10th and April 11th the Board received 422 additional applications for loans. And presently, Mr. Speaker, there is a total of a little more than 1,000 applications on file with the Fisheries Loan Board for an approximate value of \$45 million. During the next number of weeks these applications will be undergoing a screening process because many of these applications, a little more than 1,000, we know are

MR. J. MORGAN: not going to be qualified to obtain a loan. So the screening process will be carried out over the next number of weeks in the most efficient way possible. Of course, taking into consideration our new funds for the estimates this year of approximately \$8 million, plus an additional \$4 million carry over makes a total of \$12 million of provincial money, plus the fact the banks will be taking over the

MR. J. MORGAN:

loans over \$50,000. We cannot see any problem with regards to financing the Loan Board for 1980. There is no problem in that regard.

Many of our loans, Mr. Speaker, require the services of Fisheries Loan Board inspection staff and the Opposition spokesman on fisheries, a few days ago, was totally correct when he pointed out there was a problem in that regard. And the problem is difficult to overcome. We are now advertising in all the local papers in the Province, through the Public Service Commission, for four new inspectors, these four new inspectors to carry out inspections on boats, appraisals of engines and equipments and inspections under the small boat bounty program.

To date we have a total of six inspectors. We would like to see it up to a total of twelve and that is the objective and we are advertising now, as I mentioned, for four and we are hoping that we will be successful in recruiting these inspectors because it means, without these personnel on staff, it means that there will be delays in getting the loans approved for new boats and for used boats where appraisals and inspections are required.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is an update for the House of Assembly on the Loan Boards' activities. I will say, before closing the statement, that the new regulations and the new criteria to be established for the eligibility to obtain loans from the Loan Board, will be approved by the Cabinet, ratified by the Fishermen's Union, will be announced by the first week in May, is the objective now and will be then mailed out to every individual fisherman in the Province and a brochure form pointing out clearly to the fishermen who are eligible to obtain loans and thereby the fishermen will be governed accordingly in making the application and getting assistance to prosecute the fishery in our province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Member for Trinity -

Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, that is not an update.

That is a downdate as far as the Fishermen's Loan Board is concerned. The fact of the matter is, Sir, that we have had a very serious and sad and shameful situation exist in this Province with respect of the Fisheries Loan Board for over one year now. And we have the minister today standing in his place in this House of Assembly and telling the people and the fishermen of this province that the operations of the Fisheries Loan Board, the review is nearing completion. And the arrangements with the chartered banks are being finalized at the very time when the people, the fishermen of this province are trying to get in their boats and go out and do some fishing and still do not know whether or not their loans are going to be approved by the Fisheries Loan Board.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE:

Sir, the fact of the matter is

that this administration

MR. F. ROWE: knowingly or unknowingly have encouraged hundreds of new entrants into the fisheries in this Province over the last couple of years. And hundreds and thousands, in fact, of people have made applications to the Fisheries Loan Board in the hope that they would get some assistance for the purpose of going fishing. And the very figures themselves show, Sir, what the problem is. Approximately 1,000 applications costing approximately \$45.9 million when everybody in this House knows full well that there is only a vote in the Estimates of \$8 million in the Fisheries Loan fund.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) carry over.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not care what kind of a carry over there is, Sir. The fact of the matter is that we have this ridiculous situation, Sir, where we have hundreds of fishermen in this Province, with the fishing season already started, not knowing what the status of their loans is.

Now the only recommendation I can make to the minister and the administration, Mr. Speaker, is that in the future - and I pass this along as a bit of advice - that any activities relating to the Fisheries Loan Board should be concentrated in the Fall and Winter months so that we do not have a situation where the fishermen are waiting in early Spring, Spring and early Summer, for some answer, a simple yes or no with respect to the fisheries' loans. And I hope that the minister will see to it that the bulk of the Fisheries Loan Board activities takes place during the Fall and Winter months.

Now, Sir, with respect to the situation where fishermen have already gone ahead and made an arrangement on a private basis with a chartered bank and gone ahead and gotten a private loan from a bank



April 17th., 1980

Tape No. 840

DW - 2

MR. F. ROWE: at a high interest rate, I would like to ask the minister if he would accept the recommendation that these fishermen who have arranged for private loans through the chartered banks can now have their loans rearranged in such a way that it will come under the Fisheries Loan Board so that they will be paying the 8 per cent instead of the 12,13,14,15 or 16 per cent, whatever they paying if they made a private arrangement with the bank.

Sir, I cannot over emphasize the need

MR. F. ROWE: for getting additional inspectors immediately.

That is a very serious problem that the minister has now recognized. We brought it up the other day. The quicker we can get more inspectors to travel around this Province, to inspect boats and appraise the boats and get back to the Fisheries Loan Board, the less number of frustrated fishermen we will have in this Province. But, Sir, I can only end by saying that the activities, and I am not attacking the individuals in the Fisheries Loan Board, but the activity of the Fisheries Loan Board or the administration of it, for which the minister has to answer, over the past year or so, Sir, has been one of the most shameful and serious and sad situations that I have ever witnessed in my life. I continually get hundreds of telephone calls, as do my colleagues and I am sure people on the other side, from fishermen totally frustrated because they cannot get a simple yes or no. It is a situation which is left hanging in the wind. And it is a sad situation, as I say, and one that cannot be tolerated any longer and I sincerely hope that we will not see a recurrence of this situation this coming year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Well said.

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Province is presently negotiating a Canadian dollar bond issue in the Canadian market. It is anticipated that the issue will be for \$75 million and present indications from the investment community are that the issue is being well received. The issue is priced at ninety-nine and three-quarters with an interest rate of thirteen and three eighths per cent, to yield thirteen point four three per cent and will mature in 1986.

The Province will receive the funds at closing on Thursday, May 15, 1980. The issue has been arranged through our Canadian syndicate which is headed by the Province's lead managers

DR. J. COLLINS: in the Canadian market, McLeod Young Weir Ltd., and Dominion Securities Ltd.

Mr. Speaker, just to perhaps put that in some sort of comparison or context, hon. members may know that a few days ago there was an Ontario issue for \$300 million when the yield was thirteen point three two per cent so that there is a difference here of twelve basis points and that is the narrowest spread that we have had in our history with Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further statements?

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement with respect to the report of the Public Accounts Committee pertaining to the operation of government Air Services. I apologize for my voice. I have a bad case of the flu.

I have reviewed the seven recommendations contained in the report of the Public Accounts Committee in this House which pertained to the operation of government Air Services and, without going into minute detail on each of them, can assure the House that appropriate action has been taken to tighten up in some case administrative procedures and controls, for some laxity existed, and in other cases controls suggested by the Committee have been implemented to enhance managerial and operational efficiency. As an example, all special helicopter charters under current procedures are arranged through the Air Services Division. Information related to types of helicopter, required number of persons travelling, route to be flown, estimated air time involved and purpose of trip are recorded. All requests for chartered flights are supported by the appropriate documentation signed by an authorized official of the requesting department. Similar documentation is required when government aircraft are utilized for each and every government project or programme. As one can see, with information of this nature on file it is now possible without any difficulty to match up invoices submitted by suppliers with correct supporting documents and forward the complete package to the Department of Finance for payment. Incidentally, I would like to inform the House that the department has received a cheque in the amount of \$29,334 which was recorded as an overpayment to a supplier.

I would like further to insure the House that departmental expenditures for all air services are closely monitored with a view to alerting any department in advance of possible exhaustion of funds. No action to make additional funds available if required is taken without the advice of Treasury Board. I would like to inform the House that because of the nature of government aircraft operations there are many factors which can result in an over expenditure of funds in some departments while an under expenditure may be realized in others.

April 17, 1980

Tape No. 842

AH-2

MR. BRETT:

All funds initially requested are based on long range departmental estimates for a variety of aircraft types. Medical evacuations are unpredictable as are the cost, particularly when long range flights with special aircraft are required for certain emergencies. The magnitude of forest fires during any season is also unpredictable, but aircraft must be used immediately regardless of the cost or level of funds available at the time if the forest fire is to be contained.

Conversely, certain departmental programmes may be reduced or terminated during the course of the year leaving surplus funds. Transfer of funds from one

MR. C. BRETT:

department to another within the same subhead is utilized for efficiency purposes only.

As a last item, I would like to address the recommendation dealing with the variance between the terms of a tender call for helicopter services and the contract eventually entered into.

It is acknowledged that the tender call for helicopter services called for a term of three years at fixed hourly rates and with an option for an additional two years at hourly rates to be negotiated at the end of the three year term and the agreement entered into by the department called for a renegotiation of the price in the second and third years.

All I can say in this regard is that the particulars furnished to those companies desirous of bidding on the contract stipulated that escalation in operating costs will be subject to meeting and resolution by both parties prior to February 1st of each year of the contract. Costs to be considered will include wages, salaries, benefits, parts, materials, components, services, insurance, utilities, ground facilities, etc. on the basis of proven expenditures.

In this instance

MR. C. BRETT: it is regrettable that the two documents were not compatible, but the error, if there truly was an error, was in the tender call and not in the particulars. In the inflationary environment we are experiencing it is unrealistic to seek a firm price over a three year period and no supplier would quote under such conditions. What was done was done in good faith and without favour to any party.

In conclusion, I am pleased to advise the House that the Auditor General has acknowledged publicly that many of his earlier criticisms of the operation of the Air Services have been remedied and the patient is improving most satisfactorily.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest it seems to me that this piece of paper here, while a verdict of guilty, the minister's statement is suggesting that there should have been a verdict of innocence. The most it is suggesting is that there has been an aspirin tablet applied where there should have been major surgery. To me it is an amusing. It is an amazing piece of paper, this, and this here, Mr. Speaker, is more amazing - not in the least amusing - when you realize the dire straits of this Province. And when we look back over the last number of years, we do not need to go very far to realize what a gravy train this Province has been.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. BENNETT: What a gravy train!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) pay by the month.

MR. T. BENNETT: Yes. Well, when I have to go out to my district and explain that there is going to be no ramp at Woody Point, when I have to tell the people, 'No school, no road, no pavement, no this, no that, all you are going to have is an increase in taxation to support dollars that have gone down the drain in the last few years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. BENNETT: - to me it is a disgrace. And I am expected

MR. T. BENNETT:

to go back to my district - I am expected to come in here and talk to this hon. House of Assembly and look for dollars to support a Province and a district that needs it so badly. It reminds me of a fellow who might be in business and the truck drivers are bringing the goods to the store and he goes in and takes the cash up himself and follows along. He does not wait to get an invoice



MR. T. BENNETT:

a receipt or whatever. He just goes and grabs the cash out of the till and takes off, and then we expect the business to be successful.

Mr. Speaker, government is supposed to be business. When I was aspiring to contest a district and come into this hon. House of Assembly, my friends around me said, 'Look, I am surprised at you. Going into the House of Assembly is like going into a pig's pen. You bill in clean but you do not know if you will come out clean.' Of course that, Mr. Speaker, depends on the individual too, I might add. And this to me is the most disgracing, it is a disgrace, to see what has turned up in the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor General's report, but I just wish that all of the people in the Province could be supplied with copies of this correspondence.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are you talking about?

MR. T. BENNETT:

If you cannot understand I will

read it to you or send you a copy, or you probably already have a copy, Sir. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, we still have, I understand by the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) statement, a ministerial statement, we still have to go out and look for the borrowing of funds. Why can we not go and collect more of the funds that is owed to the treasury by people of ten millions? Why can we not go after it? Why have we got to go and burden our people down with more taxation? Why have we got to make them do without the services that we already collected taxes to pay for while we have so much of it within the covers of these pages. Two hundred-odd per cent overpaid for chartered helicopter services. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Further statements.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a little brochure that has been produced by the government outlining the major stands that we have taken on a number of important issues dealing with the Province; the fishery, offshore oil and gas and hydro, pursuant to the Throne Speech and to the Budget, it was felt because of the large demand that was coming in both to the Premier's office and to many other ministers' offices and even to the Information Services, that rather than to go out to consultants or go through the Department of Tourism or the Department of Industrial Development, that we would try to do something internally which would cost very little and have it as just a piece of paper, not on any glossy paper, to outline some of the positions that people are asking us to provide for them. So 15,000 of these little brochures have been developed internally, 'Developing Our Natural Resources; the Challenge of the Eighties' and it just goes into the fishery, offshore and hydro. The total

PREMIER PECKFORD: cost of producing this was \$650  
for 15,000 copies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Another effort to try to do ourselves  
what we would give other people to do and it would cost a fortune, so I  
think all hon. members will get copies of this and if they want additional  
copies they can easily pick it up. They are available, done  
on normal paper and it tries to clearly put in just a few words what  
we have been saying over the last time which there has been a high  
demand for over the last number of weeks so I want to table a copy  
of it for all hon. members and I am sure they will take and read  
carefully and scrutinize and I think it will help the information  
flow around the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Are there any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for  
the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins). Given the outline which he  
included in the budget with regard to the Petrocan/Come By Chance  
arrangement, would the minister table the actual letters to which he  
made reference in the Budget Speech so that we can know the details  
of exactly what the situation is vis-a-vis the Petrocan/Come By Chance  
proposals?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Leader  
of the Opposition is referring to the letter of intent between  
Petrocan and the receiver and also the letter of agreement between  
Petrocan and the Province. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will  
remember I did table those the other day actually. Those were the  
letters, or copies, I should say; I should say copies because we only  
received a copy of the letter of intent. The letter of intent was

DR. J. COLLINS: sent by Petrocan to the receiver and we received a signed copy but only a copy. And, of course, the letter of agreement between Petrocan and the Province, we do have that actual letter, that original letter on file and what I tabled was a copy, an absolutely identical copy of that letter of agreement.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: If such is the case, I apologize to the minister. Perhaps there is so much paper coming across here, but quite honestly none of my colleagues, because I checked not more than one half hour or so ago and none of us had seen it so that

MR. JAMIESON: I do not know whether it was distributed in the normal way or perhaps it was laid on the Table, but in any event we will now take a look for it and I will find out where it is. But is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) telling me that it was done in the normal fashion where, as the pages are doing now, it was passed around?

MR. ROBERTS: We are told it was distributed yesterday but I certainly did not see it.

MR. JAMIESON: I have not seen it and nobody here has.

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I tabled it.

Whether it was passed around is outside my prerogative. That would be a matter for the Table.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You did it with the intention of it being distributed.

DR. J. COLLINS: And I would presume that if hon. members wish to have copies, the officers of the Table can make these copies available and if I recall correctly the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) actually commented when I had made the tabling, when I tabled it as a brief statement. The hon. Leader of the Opposition actually commented at the time that I did make the tablings.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Obviously we are tabling even things -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier, Sir. He has not attacked anybody today

MR. S. NEARY: yet so I thought I would give him an opportunity.

In view of the fact that the cost of living index in Newfoundland has increased higher than any other province in Canada according to these statistics released this morning by Statistics Canada, and the main reason for the cost of living being the increase in housing, cost of food and clothing, which are the basic essentials, would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what action, if any, his government is going to take or have taken to put a freeze on the cost of one, real estate in this Province, rentals in this Province and the cost of building lots in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I could spend all the rest of the Question Period on answering that question and I am sure it would not be in the best interests of all. Let me just review briefly what the government have been doing on that score. I thank the hon. the member for LaPoile for asking the question because obviously, he wanted me to go into great detail on the many positive initiatives the government have been taking.

MR. S. NEARY: No.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Obviously, the member for LaPoile wanted all that information.

First of all, we had discussed this at length a week or two ago and had communication with all the other Premiers in the Atlantic Provinces to talk to the federal government and to wire the federal government indicating the high interest costs. And contrary to what the member for LaPoile might think, there are Newfoundlanders who want to borrow money to go into business. There are Newfoundlanders who want to borrow money to build houses.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There are Newfoundlanders who want to borrow money for many many reasons, to buy building lots and all the rest of it, and therefore it is very, very important we solicit the support of the federal government in initiatives that will help keep the cost of living at somewhere near a reasonable level and hence why we have jointly done it, and all the other provinces have agreed with that kind of an approach. So we are trying to do that. We are trying to indicate to the federal government that a Throne Speech is just not enough; they must get into a budget situation.

In our own budgetary allocations this year, as the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor) has indicated on a number of occasions, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), we are looking at trying to bring the cost of land down for existing serviced land in the Province to help, and we are going to do that on a selective basis around the Province. So we are attempting right now, through the budget, to ease the financial burden on individuals and families who want to purchase serviced land to build houses, on real estate in this Province. That is an action that we have already taken.

Thirdly, as it relates to mortgages, we have a programme in place to assist people who want to be home owners with mortgages, depending upon their incomes, especially the low and middle income people, up to \$20,000 a year annual income. So we have done all of these things in trying to lessen the burden on the people of the Province.

There are other areas as it relates to prices that we have very little control of as a provincial government. We do not have the constitutional and legislative authority needed, so that therefore there is very little we can do except monitor the situation as we are doing now, as the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook)

PREMIER PECKFORD: continues to do from time to time.  
So a lot of measures have been taken.  
We are looking at others to take. So we are doing all that is in our constitutional and legal power to ensure that the burden of higher costs are kept to a minimum to the people of this Province.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I only wish I could debate that answer with the hon. gentleman, Sir, because -

PREMIER PECKFORD: You would lose.

MR. NEARY: - because hon. members know the main reason for the increase in real estate, rents, and building lots and the cost of building homes, especially on the Avalon Peninsula today, the main reason for it, and we have been saying this for some time over here on this side of the House, is the oil boom syndrome that is created by this government, with no boom. People are still forced to live on the same income they had a year or two years ago, very little difference, their incomes have gone up very slightly, it has not kept pace with the cost of living. What I am asking the hon. gentleman is not to deal with matters that fall under federal jurisdiction, but what is the hon. gentleman doing about matters that fall under provincial jurisdiction, namely, putting a freeze on to stop these speculators and these land grabbers from coming in here? Most of them are from outside of Newfoundland, a lot of them are our own people, the St. John's vested interests: What is the hon. gentleman doing to stop that sort of thing? Put a freeze on to stop that sort of thing because that is the thing that is driving up the cost of housing in this Province, especially on the Avalon Peninsula, and the hon. gentleman has it all in his own hands, because that falls under provincial jurisdiction. What extraordinary measures is he, or the administration, taking to deal with that sort of situation, an inflationary spiral caused by



MR. NEARY:

an oil boom syndrome that does not exist, a boom that does not exist.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member

for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will look beyond his nose and look beyond two or three weeks or beyond a year or two years, one of the fundamental and basic reasons why this administration has indicated that it should have jurisdiction and control over offshore resources is because it can control then, if it has that kind of authority, the spinoff and the impact that it will have on a given region of this Province, let alone the whole Province. And until the member for LaPoile and his party supports this government wholeheartedly and unequivocally on that very basic issue it will always be a question as to whether we really have the legislative or other authority so to control that kind of impact. Let me say that from the start.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So let the member for LaPoile and

let the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) and let the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador come clean on the issues so that we then know we have control and we have the support of all members of this House and all Newfoundlanders. Because if we do not have jurisdiction over the offshore oil and gas you can forget about control; we do not have any power then to control it and it would be controlled from somewhere else which would make, therefore, the member for LaPoile's question totally irrelevant to this hon. House and he would have to ask his partners in Ottawa or somewhere to do so.

As I have already indicated to the hon. member for LaPoile, we have taken specific measures already that are in our jurisdiction. There is a very, very efficient rent control system in place in St. John's and all over this Province right now.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Rent control?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am talking about rent control right

now. Rent control is one of the things that the member for LaPoile mentioned in his original question. We have a rent control system in place and a very efficient one which by the way is under severe attack right now by

PREMIER PECKFORD:

the Home Builders Association, by many of the people in real estate who are saying that it is stymying further construction activity in the rental accommodation field in the St. John's region and thereby causing the prices of rents to go up. So let the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) think that one over, that there is a strong lobby right now and a lot of very credible evidence to suggest that the whole question of rent control is at this point in time hindering and inhibiting a more free marketplace which would level off rents in the St. John's-Metropolitan area.

Secondly, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor) just a few weeks ago announced that we have available in the St. John's area right now over 400 serviced lots this year developed by government to help stabilize the serviced lot industry so that it would not go out of whack because of the so called boom which, by the way, we have not created. We have been accused, Mr. Speaker, over and over again, outside this House especially, not necessarily by members opposition but by people in general that we have been down playing the results that have been coming in from the offshore, that we are not telling the whole story, that we are not giving the people of Newfoundland the whole facts on this situation. And we have deliberately given the factual information so as not to try to heat up and inflat an already dangerous situation as it relates to prices and all the rest of it that could ensue because of an oil boom. We are doing everything in our legislative power and we ask again for the wholehearted and unequivocal support of the member for LaPoile and all members opposite in our desire to see our jurisdictional rights confirmed so that then we can control even more than we are now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. That was a complete cop-out, Mr. Speaker, if I ever heard one. I started out by saying that the hon. gentleman would end up attacking somebody and sure enough I was not wrong, he lived up to his expectation. He is on the attack now. He is paranoid. The hon. gentleman is getting paranoid. But let me ask -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

Yes. He started out nice and pleasant this afternoon and now has become paranoid and gone on the attack again. Now let me ask the hon. gentleman, the hon. gentleman just let out a mouthful there, he dragged in the offshore and so forth and said that if he could get the support of the Opposition and mumbo-jumbo, but let me ask the hon. gentleman under whose jurisdiction do the onshore things fall, the government of Canada or the provincial government. Housing, land, real estate, rents, whose jurisdiction does that fall under? Does it fall under the Government of Canada or under the provincial government? I believe, Mr. Speaker, and I am not a lawyer or an expert, I believe it falls under the hon. gentleman's administration. So how can the hon. gentleman pawn it off by saying, "If we get jurisdiction over the offshore we can deal with these matters"? The hon. gentleman has it in his power now to deal with matters onshore. And why is not the hon. gentleman and his administration dealing with the matters that I raised about real estate, rents, the cost of building lots and the cost of housing in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, obviously

PREMIER PECKFORD: I should not say any more really and just sit down because anybody who is in earshot of what has happened in the last four or five minutes can now see that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) really does not understand what goes on in this hon. House.

Under our jurisdiction comes serviced lots, number one, and we have said that we have made available and put into the market place over 400 in the St. John's region in an attempt to keep prices down and in an attempt to keep the private sector in line with the lowest possible cost of serviced lots. There are over 400 available this year. Number two, we have in place a very efficient rent control system against the inflationary pressures that can be brought to bear because of a so-called oil situation which might come up in the next while. Three, we have said, this is the third one -

MR. NEARY: You have said it. What have you done?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thirdly, we are going to put on sale lots around the Province at a reduced rate from their economic cost and subsidize them. We are going to subsidize serviced lots so that they are cheaper for the person in this Province, for the citizen in this Province who wants to buy a serviced lot.

Fourthly, we have in place mortgage programmes announced by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this Budget to help get medium and low income individuals into their own homes. These are four measures we have taken that are now in our jurisdiction and we will continue to take more from time to time as we see that they are necessary. These are four specific, concrete, physical initiatives taken by this administration to try to do the very thing that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) just mentioned.

MR. NEARY: What are you doing about the land grabbers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence and that of the House I simply wanted to - I will put it by way of a supplementary to the Minister of Finance (Dr.Collins),but I want first of all to apologize to him: He was of course correct. He did table it on Monday, the documents to which I referred. I have not seen them. I understand they were not distributed and he is right,as well, that I made some comments on them but my comments related to the meeting that was held in Clarenville but not on the documents themselves. Could I ask him now by way of a supplementary, and having assured him that it completely slipped my mind, has he any indication as yet as to when the Petrocan people will be doing the actual, or have they actually started to do the inspection of the facility?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, just on the first little point there, I think the officers at the table, they normally do not distribute if the documents are rather bulky like on this last one. I guess that is where the confusion arose. In regard to what Petrocan are doing, my understanding, I have not in the last week had any direct communication but when I did last have communication with Petrocan my understanding was that they were getting together their experts, and these were being recruited from various parts of Canada and also in the United States, and they would hope to have their group of experts together by about the 18th or 20th of April, around this time, and shortly after that they would hope to put those on site.

Now I did also enquire at the time what would be the possibilities for local added employment and of course the answer I was given was that much of this first phase would be the very expert, very technical nature and that most of the thrust would necessarily have to be in that area although the expectation was that there would perhaps be a small increase in local employment.

Thank you.

April 17, 1980

Tape No. 850

AH-3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). I wonder if the minister could indicate to the House if it is so that a large number of fishermen, particularly inshore, fishermen engaged in the inshore fishery, are not covered under the Workmen's Compensation Act? Is that so, that in 1980, that in this industry that means so much to this Province that a large number of people are engaged in it without any protection against injury or accident? Is that so and, if it is, why?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member brings up a very good point. The fact of the matter is that Workers' Compensation is available to all people in the province, The dragger fishermen are covered and are paid for by the companies for which they work, The people on longliners, fishermen on longliners are covered by legislation, if they have three or more people engaged or employed on that boat. And the problem has been that we have not been able to collect the assessment because we cannot, for one reason or another, cannot identify the employer -

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe there is no employer.

MR. J. DINN: Maybe there is, absolutely. The hon. member is quite correct, absolutely, that there may be no employer; there might be a joint venture of four people on a boat. The individual fisherman, for example, can be covered if he makes application to the Workers' Compensation Board and pays the assessment. Now, the fact of the matter is that we have been having meetings over the past several months, I have personally with the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan), with the Newfoundland Fish Trades, with the Newfoundland Fishermen's Food and Allied Workers' Union and we hope to have resolution of the problem within the next two to three weeks.

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

MR. SPEAKER, (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister can fudge all he likes. This is a terribly important matter and a terrible situation that people in 1980, fishermen working and not brought under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Now I say to the minister that in British Columbia they have ironed out this situation successfully. They do it in the same way as we work it in this province with respect to UIC. It is the buyers

MR. T. LUSH: that are considered the employers in this particular situation and the UIC is taken care of, I say why cannot we do the same as that they have done in B.C. and that is to consider the buyers to be the employers and they take care of Workmen's Compensation in the same way as we take care of UIC?

MR. DINN: That is not true.

MR. LUSH: Sure it is. It is so. It is universal.

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, as always the hon. the member, the Opposition's shadow for Labour and Manpower, puts forth concisely, basically, one of the points that we have been discussing as if he is reading my mail. The fact of the matter is is that that is one of five solutions. There are five solutions that we could have to the problem and it is not as simple as the hon. member wishes to make out. The fact of the matter is is that there is a cost no matter who pays for the assessment, and we would like to get this cost agreed upon by the different parties involved. So we are negotiating first.

Now, there comes a time when government may have to make a decision and I think that time is fast approaching. As I said to the hon. member, it is within two to three weeks that government will have to make a decision as to who pays the assessment, who is covered and so on. There may even



MR. J. DINN: have to be, Mr. Speaker, a change to the existing legislation. So the fact of the matter is that we are currently looking at the situation. There are four or five different alternatives or positions that can be taken. We are hoping to iron it out by consultation and by negotiation with the trades and the unions and if we can do it that way, that is fine. If we cannot do it that way, then within three weeks, I would think, the government will make a definite decision on it and our fishermen in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will be covered by Workers' Compensation.

MR. E. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: A brief supplementary to the minister growing out of my hon. friend's questions. I want first of all the minister to tell us, if he could, please, whether the changes necessary to bring all of the fishermen in this Province within the Workers' Compensation system are administrative or legislative? He touched upon that in his answer, Your Honour, but I would like to know whether it could be done by administrative order, whether it is order of the board, Order in Council, or whether it would require legislative changes in the Workers' Compensation Act. And secondly, could the minister confirm - I think it is what he said, but obviously the issue of timing is of importance because we are on the verge of the opening of the inshore season in those parts of this Province where it is seasonal and that is the largest part of our inshore fishery - could he confirm that within three weeks the government will have come to a decision and taken whatever action is to be taken? Obviously, the urgency is to ensure that we do not lose another fishing season without our fishermen - fisher persons - being covered by the Workers' Compensation Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. DINN: The hon. the Opposition House Leader, as always, sees the problems that are involved in most of the negotiations that would involve this kind of thing. Our objective is to make sure that all of our fishermen are covered. That is the objective.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Fisher persons.

MR. J. DINN: Fisher persons, absolutely.

And the fact of the matter is that since I became Minister of Labour and Manpower and found out that the fishermen in this Province were not covered, became very concerned and attempted to start negotiations and to include an agreement by the fishermen and the trades - I have not been able to do that as yet - what I have come down to is, as I have said before, five options. One of those options would call for legislation.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The other four?

MR. J. DINN: The other four - or if we can get an agreement, obviously we do not have a problem. If we can get an agreement that the companies, for example, pay the assessment, it is a matter of the companies paying and I do not think it necessarily means that we have to rush into the House with legislation.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Is the minister saying that we need legislation unless we get an agreement from the companies to pay?

MR. J. DINN: We may need legislation. I do not think we will need legislation. I am hoping that we will not need legislation.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. J. DINN: But the fact of the matter is that we may need a change to the Workers' Compensation Act to force what we want done. And the object, as I said, is to have the fishermen covered.

MR. E. ROBERTS: There are very few voluntary taxes in this world.

MR. J. DINN: I would hope that we can get an agreement. I am still optimistic that we can get an agreement and therefore will not need legislation.

MR. E. ROBERTS: We will know within three weeks anyway.

MR. J. DINN:

Certainly, we will have a decision within three weeks, I would hope.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) and it relates to the Workers' Compensation or people covered by the Workers' Compensation Board. Would the minister confirm to the House that we have in this Province indeed people who having received injuries on their jobs and being covered by Workers Compensation, have had to wait and are waiting now for as long as a year and a half in order to get a bed in a hospital in St. John's to have a simple monogram done, that we are paying compensation to workers in this Province who, having had an accident a year ago, are still waiting to have a monogram done because either the doctors that the Workers' Compensation Board retain are too overloaded or else the beds are not available in this city?

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to confirm or deny what the hon. member's question centred around. But the fact of the matter is that we do have a substantial waiting list for people, claimants for Workers' Compensation, mainly centred around the neurological problems. And the reason for the problem is the fact that we do not have enough neurological or neurosurgery type beds available in the Health Sciences Complex, which is the only hospital in Newfoundland that can handle the types of things that we want done; monograms and certain other things.

At the present time we have fifty to fifty-five people on a waiting list. They have been waiting, some of them, for eight months to a year, maybe even more. And the fact of the matter is that it is costing the Workers' Compensation Board about \$11,000 per week or over a half million dollars a year because of that very problem.

And the fact of the matter is now and for the past month or more we have been negotiating with the General Hospital Corporation, with the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and we also to have a solution to that very serious problem in the near future. It may cost the Workers' Compensation Board by way of grant or some other way to open up a wing of the Health Sciences Complex, maybe twenty beds or so so that we can cover this situation. The fact of the matter is it is costing about a half million dollars now, I think if we possibly gave a grant of a half million -

MR. ROBERTS: Twenty beds to look after fifty-five people? How long are they going to stay there?

MR. J. DINN: No, no. The fact of the matter is we have right now fifty to fifty-five people on a waiting list. Last year we got a guarantee of eight beds. The waiting list at that time was somewhere around seventy, the eight beds cut down the waiting list to fifty or fifty-five -

MR. ROBERTS: You might two or three more beds.

MR. J. DINN: The assessment that we have, the very extensive assessment that we have done indicates that we need about eight to ten beds.

MR. ROBERTS: Two or three more than you have.

MR. J. DINN: No, eight to ten more beds.

MR. ROBERTS: Why not get twenty-nine more?

MR. J. DINN: If the hon. member would only wait for the answer. I can answer his questions back and forth. The fact of the matter is you cannot open an eight bed ward, you know, what is available in the Health Sciences Complex is one area that is a twenty-two bed area that we would like to open for Workers Compensation.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman believes that?

MR. J. DINN: I believe all the information that I have I have assessed the information quite extensively and happen to know what is required. Now in order to get the eight guaranteed beds for Workers' Compensation that is what we need to do is open up that area for Workers' Compensation. (inaudible) information that I have.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order please! The time for Oral Question Period has expired.

It is a pleasure for me to welcome to the gallery on behalf of all hon. members the mayor,

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Mr. Charles Edwards, and Town Manager Mr. Wilf Maloney from the great and historic town and great historic district of the same name, which this year is celebrating its 75th anniversary, I refer to the town of Grand Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: And, of course, I do know that their visit will be productive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Before we get to Orders of the Day, Sir, I want to raise a matter of personal privilege. And I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, to have to raise this matter. I debated it very seriously in my mind as to whether or not I should raise this matter and I came to the conclusion that I should because I was the subject this morning of a vicious attack on CBC radio by Mr. John Furlong who accused me of - well, he was using the line that, well, maybe because I have been critical of the way this House is reported, not of the way I am reported, the way the House is being reported. And he used the line that, well, maybe Neary does not deserve to be reported because, for example, yesterday he left an impression that he was discriminating against the Japanese, that I was involved in racial discrimination. Now if there is one thing I am not, Mr. Speaker, I am not a religious bigot, neither do I discriminate against - I am not a racist, I do not discriminate against anybody, but apparently this gentleman thought because I referred to the Japanese as 'Japs' that that was a slur, that it was racial discrimination. Well, Mr. Speaker, what about 'Newfs'? I mean, if you use the word 'Newf', is that racial discrimination? If you refer to an American as a 'Yank', is that racial discrimination? If you refer to a Scotchman, is that racial discrimination?

MR. JAMIESON: If you call him a 'Scotch'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: That is why, Mr. Speaker, I hesitated to raise the matter but this goes right out across the Province and I think it is a very serious matter. We, in this House are not allowed to impugn motives, we are not allowed to accuse members of having motives behind what they say. And yesterday, just to shorten it up, rather than call them Japanese I said Japs. I make no apology for it. If I was talking to a group of Japanese, I might refer to them as a group of Japs. It is no slur. They have been known as that all down through history. But this goes out across the whole Province, Mr. Speaker, and people may misinterrupt it. I mean, what does the CBC do? Do they have hired guns? Do they have people up there who go out of their way to do a hatched job on members of this House? Is that what they are hired for? Or are they hired to look at things subjectively and objectively in this House?

AN HON. MEMBER: Your honeymoon is over.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, maybe it is, I could not care less myself as long as I do my job in this House. That is all I care.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: And whether they care to report it, or not or whether the press cares to do their job is entirely up to themselves. But I think this sort of thing has to stop.

Mr. Speaker, the CBC as far as I can see have hired guns. If they do not like you, the CBC will put them on the payroll as freelance reporters, freelance writers and God help you, look out, because they will get you one way or another. And I think that message should go out loud and clear across this Province, Sir. It is not good enough, I am not a racist in any way, shape or form. I like the Japs as much as I like the coloured people, I like the coloured people as much as I like the white people. I love the human race.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You love everybody

MR. S. NEARY: I just love the human race, I love

April 17, 1980

Tape No. 854

SD - 3

MR. S. NEARY:                                   them, I love everybody. And how  
about the hon. gentleman in his buttoned down, narrow-minded - I even  
love the member for Humber East, the Minister of Education (Ms. L.Verge).

AN HON. MEMBER:                                   In a platonic sense.

MR. S. NEARY:                                   In a platonic sense, of course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:                               Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY:                                   How, Mr. Speaker, how could anybody  
unless they are narrow-minded and have a buttoned down mind and are  
out to get somebody, how could they come to the conclusion in the  
remarks that I made yesterday when I was referring to the price of  
squid and the market for squid in Japan this year



MR. NEARY:

when I said the Japs will not buy squid at the same price they did last year, how could anybody interpret that as meaning that I was a racist, that I believed in racial discrimination? And I would ask Your Honour to look at this case very seriously because I think I have established a prima facie case that my privileges in this House have been breached and Your Honour may wish to take it for a day or two under advisement. But I believe it is time that we put an end to this sort of reporting from this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of privilege, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: That is not a point of privilege, Your Honour. First of all is not bound to be editing remarks that are made outside this House, but it is matters that pertain in this House that rise matters of privilege in most instances. And certainly reports made by newspapers, or reports made by the media are not within Your Honour's purview in instances such as this. I would suggest to the hon. member, if he wishes to be taken seriously outside of this Chamber he might act in a serious vein inside it and then maybe that would be the remedy for his grievances.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may say a word, prompted by the, I thought unnecessary and quite unpleasant concluding remarks of the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), perhaps that is his wont, so I will not get into what his wont is right now, but I think that perhaps, Your Honour, there may very well be a matter of privilege involved here. My learned friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), unlike my unlearned friend from the district of Stepenville (Mr. Stagg) -

MR. STAGG: Now we are getting into it.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, if the gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order!

MR. ROBERTS: If the gentleman from Stephenville would remember the advice once given to me by a constituent of mine, since gone to that great holding place in the sky, then living in the community of Northeast Crouse, he would be further ahead, because I was told<sup>7</sup> and I have tried to heed it; the hon. gentleman would be well advised to heed it -

MR. STAGG: Do not get nasty.

MR. ROBERTS: - that a politician is like a fish in that he only gets in trouble when his mouth is open. And I would say to the gentleman from Stephenville that he ought to sit and listen and try to observe and then if he wants to speak let him.

MR. STAGG: That philosophy cannot deal with you.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the point is this, that I think it is worth looking at and Your Honour may very well wish to consider it and rule upon it.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, I am quite prepared to engage in a duel of wits with the gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), even though he comes half armed to that duel. But it is a distraction, it is an interruption and I would suggest, Sir, he is doing it either deliberately -

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: - or doing it so negligently as to be deliberate in his negligence, and I would simply ask that either I be allowed to engage in it and demolish him as only he ought to be demolished, or whether I, as I would prefer, be allowed to finish addressing what is a serious comment on what I regard as a serious point.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

The hon. member has the right to be heard  
in silence and he has made that request.

Order, please!

The hon. member for the Strait of  
Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

The point is this, and it is a brief point and, if I am allowed by those in the House to proceed as Your Honour has directed, I shall make it, it is whether we in this House have a right to be reported accurately, and I suggest that may very well be a possible question of privilege, That is not to talk about comment. If somebody wants to comment upon what we do in this House, that of course is a different subject altogether. Whether or not we have a right to be reported accurately is a matter which is a question of privilege, I would suggest, and Your Honour could probably go back as far as the original Hansard, where Mr. Luke Hansard, after whom Hansard is named, was originally given the right to report the proceedings of the House by a resolution of the House of Commons in England some two or three hundred years ago.

Now I am not proposing to take further time to address the point, but I would suggest quite simply there is a point that Your Honour might very well wish to consider. And as I understood the point raised by my friend from LaPoile district (Mr. Neary), he is not objecting to comment made upon what he did, I mean, we are all subject to fair comment and if we do not think the comment is fair there are remedies and we can follow them. That is not his objection, his objection is whether we have a right as members to be reported accurately. I suggest we do. We have a right to be reported

MR. E. ROBERTS: accurately and that is a question of privilege of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Stephenville to the point of privilege.

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, I would like to clarify my intervention into this exchange with my colleague across the way. In addressing himself to the remarks made by the hon. Government House Leader, he refers to the House Leader as 'a learned gentleman.' I was sitting back here waiting to hear the debate and he said, "Unlike my friend from Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) who is an unlearned gentleman. " Well, I am sitting back there and minding my own business. Now in the business of the practice of the legal profession, Mr. Speaker, we refer to one another as 'my learned friend'. So he indicates that the member for St. John's East (W. Marshall) is a learned gentleman whereas I am an un-learned gentleman. I take that as a crack at my professional competence. As my learned friend across the way is so willing to do, there are no other learned gentleman around my hon. friend, in his estimation. So, I took a few flicks at him, and I will continue to intervene in that manner, and I would suggest that my learned friend across the way, who only recently has begun to practice law, might be a little more- oh, he might be -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I think we are beginning to drift away a little bit from the original point of privilege.

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, well he might be a little more judicious in his statements, otherwise he is going to get flicked every day.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I meant no disrespect to the learned gentleman from Stephenville (F. Stagg). I meant no disrespect to him and

MR. E. ROBERTS: if he feels I should apologize, I have no hesitation apologizing to him. He is officially a learned gentleman and I have no hesitation at all so acknowledging him here or in any other place. But I would simply say, and this is the old tit for tat theory, and he tends to be the tit and I tend to be the tat in this, But he first interjected, Sir, and drew my attention to him. Otherwise, Sir, I do not notice the hon. gentleman from Stephenville when I am addressing a serious point and so I do not respond to him. But, Sir, he flicks at me, he gets flicked back. He is usually the one who gets flucked as a result of it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please. With respect to the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for LaPoile -I believe the comments of the last two members have been resolved -with respect to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for LaPoile, of course it is clear in Beauchesne that the speaker's responsibility is not to determine whether or not there has been a breach of privilege but whether or not there is a prima facie case. In this particular matter, I think it is fair to say the hon. Member for LaPoile has taken the opportunity to perhaps clarify the comments that were attributed to him outside of this House and therefore I would have to rule there is no prima facie case in this particular matter.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I just wondered from the point of information, Mr. Chairman, it might be of benefit to the Committee if we were informed sometime during the afternoon, if not right now as to the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The time, yes. At the present time we have eleven hours and ten minutes left.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Including the nine hours for concurrence debates?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Yes.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No they have eleven hours left exclusive of the nine hours concurrence debates.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Eleven hours and ten minutes exclusive.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I thank the Chairman who once again has set us straight.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Head 111 - the Executive Council.  
Sub-head 302-01

MR. S. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I think we could probably spend eleven hours on the Premier's Office. Now, Mr. Chairman, the first thing I want to deal with was the response and the reaction to questions that I put to the hon.

MR. NEARY:

the Premier the other day in connection with a fund called Confederation Trust Fund. The hon. gentleman, I believe, acknowledged that he knows of such a fund but he pointed a finger across at the former Leader of the Opposition, who is now the Opposition House Leader, and said well, he indicated, that it is no different than the Liberal fund; that is what the hon. gentleman said. Well, if the hon. gentleman will recall the first question, the first day that I raised this matter I asked the Premier to indicate whether this was a PC campaign fund, if Confederation Trust was a fund to take care of PC party matters, and the Premier would not tell me if it was a PC campaign fund or not but yet he pointed a finger at the Opposition House Leader and said, 'It is the same as the Liberals have.' Well, I contend that it is not the same. If he is using the example of the former Leader of the Opposition who is now Opposition House Leader, then I would say that when that gentleman, my colleague, became Leader of the Opposition that he acknowledged any debts or any surplus that may have existed in the Liberal party up to that time, even thought those debts were incurred by another leader. He acknowledged them. And his successor, who happens to be my colleague here to my right, also acknowledged them and the present Leader of the Opposition acknowledged them. They may not agree with it, they may not approve of the way that the money was collected or the way it was paid out, but they acknowledged it. But in this case the Premier does not acknowledge the fund; in other words, does not acknowledge that the PC party owes the money to the Bank of Nova Scotia, so therefore I can only assume that it was a personal matter between the bank and the former Premier. And if it was, then it raises more questions. Was it legal for the Premier of this Province to have a slush fund while he was occupying the highest position in this land? Was it, Mr. Chairman? And if it was legal for him to have a slush fund, then who did he pay the money out to and who were the donors of this fund? I believe it is a pretty serious matter, Mr. Chairman, a pretty serious matter, and the Premier should deal with it head-on rather than treat it as flippant as he has treated it so far and

MR. NEARY: more or less just brushed it aside. It does involve the Premier's office, the highest position in this land, and cannot be just brushed aside. And it is not the same. If the hon. gentleman would just get up and tell me, tell the House and the people of this Province that it was a party campaign fund, that it was to look after expenses of the PC party, I would drop it and forget it. But the hon. gentleman is not prepared to do that and the hon. gentleman says my problem is with the former Premier. My problem is not with the former Premier. My problem here is with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the present Premier who refuses to deal with this matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has no courage.

MR. NEARY: No courage. No. No courage. He tells us he is going to be open and honest and operate a government of integrity, but then he picks the issues and picks the matters that he wants to be honest on.

MR. FLIGHT: His way.

MR. NEARY: He wants to do it his own way. Well, that matter, as I said the other day, is not going to go away, it is a matter that has to be dealt with. And the other matter that has to be dealt with, Mr. Chairman, by the hon. the Premier is the report of the Public Accounts Committee. The word has not yet filtered out, Mr. Chairman, to the people of this Province that on the Public Accounts Committee are seven members of the this House, seven - four from the government side, three from the Opposition side--and they unanimously came to the conclusion, this whole seven of them, voted that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) when he was Minister of Transportation broke the laws of this land,



MR. S. NEARY: violated the Public Tendering Act.  
Seven members of this House, four of whom are his own colleagues, said that he knowingly broke the law, and that passed by this House. And the Premier had the gall and the face to get up in this House and say it was an honest -

AN HON. MEMBER: An honest opinion.

MR. S. NEARY: - an honest difference of opinion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that not terrible?

MR. S. NEARY: That is what the Premier said. And yet, seven members said, 'Guilty'. The Premier gets up and says, 'I am not going to do anything about the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) when he was minister of Transportation because it is an honest difference of opinion.' Yet seven of his colleagues, three on this side, four on that side, said he was guilty, that he knowingly broke the law of this land. Now, Mr. Chairman, that cannot be allowed to stand on the public record of this Province. The Premier showed his lack of courage. He had the opportunity to prove to the people of this Province that he was a man of courage, that he was indeed going to run an administration that was honest and open and an administration of integrity, but he has blown it. And, Mr. Chairman, the next thing he will do is he will come in with a motion that the Public Accounts Committee be disbanded. That will be next. Who does he think he is, Sir, to actually say to four of his own members, 'Sorry, boys, you were wrong. I am judge and jury. I, the Premier of this Province, I am the judge and jury. You are all wrong. He was not guilty of that, he did not break the law. It was just an honest difference of opinion.' That statement was made following the statement made by the minister who said that the Public Accounts Committee had launched a vicious personal attack on him. Seven members of this House, four on that side and three on this side had launched a vicious personal attack on the minister, and the Premier upheld that and condones it. I did not hear him reprimand the minister and say, 'Do not say that again because that Committee was set up by this House, by the Speaker. The Speaker of this House made the appointments.'

AN HON. MEMBER: I bet it is going to be cancelled.

MR. S. NEARY:

in my life.

Mr. Chairman, I never heard the like

The hon. gentleman is looking over now.

He thinks because there are only a few members in the House, there are only a few on both sides, that nobody is listening, nobody is paying attention. Well, as I said a few moments ago, I could not care less who is paying attention. As long as I am doing my job I have a clear conscience. If the press do not want to report it they do not have to, I could not care less, but I am still going to do my job in this House. And my job is to point out the weakness in the Premier's Ministerial Statement. There has finally been a chink in his armour and public opinion is against him on this. What a letdown for the people of this Province who thought the hon. gentleman was sincere when he said he was going to be honest and open! What a letdown for the people of this Province! What a letdown for members of this House, especially his own members who were on that Public Accounts Committee, who condemned the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) for breaking the law! And he refused to deal with it, Mr. Chairman.

He ignored the attack on the Public Accounts Committee made by one of his ministers - chose to ignore it. Well, maybe the press will ignore it, maybe the people will not rise up in arms, will not rebel. Maybe the hon. gentleman thinks he is riding high, wide and handsome and that he is so popular in the Province that he can ride this out. Maybe that is so.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is why he is making all the statements.

MR. S. NEARY:

That is why he came in yesterday, in my opinion, with that camouflage, with that infamous statement that he made yesterday on the eve of a referendum practically, in Quebec.

The government have stalled and delayed and wasted seven years. They could have waited

April 17th., 1980

Tape No. 859

DW - 1

MR. S. NEARY: another thirty-five days. But the hon. gentleman yesterday did one of the most infamous things I think that I have ever seen in my life, You would not know but he deliberately went out to wreck Confederation.

MR. L. THOMS: He is an anti-Confederate.

MR. S. NEARY: I do not know if the hon. gentleman is an anti-Confederate or a Separatist but certainly he is surrounded by a group of advisors who can be considered nothing but separatists. That was the most infamous thing I have ever seen in my life. Here you have a very delicate and sensitive situation going on in the Province of Quebec, only the day before Rene Levesque had announced in the Legislature of Quebec a referendum. You vote yes or no, if you want sovereignty association, in other words, if you want to set up your own little nation within Confederation. And the Government of Canada trying to deal with that - and Mr. Trudeau the day before made one of the most magnificent speeches; I caught the tail end of it when I went home - that I have ever heard in my life.

MR. W. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN A point of order, the hon. Government House Leader.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I will draw to attention that each member in committee gets ten consecutive minutes and I am quite sure from looking at the clock that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has already exceeded that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile started at 4:13 p.m. and it is now 4:23 p.m.

AN HON. MEMBER: Time is up.

MR. S. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. I have to presume I bring my remarks at a close at this point in time.

MR. S. NEARY: I was saying that I had caught the tail end of Prime Minister Trudeau's speech which was in my opinion, what I heard of it, was one of the most magnificent speeches I have ever heard in my life. And then the next day the Premier of this Province comes in and does the most infamous thing I have ever heard. He is going to go to Ottawa and ask them to force the Government of Quebec to allow us to put a transmission line across the Province of Quebec. I am not objecting to the principle of it; I am objecting to the timing of it. It was the most dastardly and infamous thing that I have ever seen happen. He could have waited until the referendum was over or there could have been quiet negotiations going on behind the scenes. It is right the opposite, the hon. gentleman went out of his way to deliberately destroy Canada, to throw an obstruction in the way of getting a no vote on that referendum. My time up, Your Honour?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Your time is up.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I will take my seat and I hope I will have an opportunity to get back at it again. I will be curious to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Premier a question on 302-02 pertaining to travelling. I notice last year \$35,000, this year it is up to \$60,000. Could the Premier enlighten us why the increase of \$25,000 and taking into consideration that he has cut out one or two of his Premier's offices within the Province? Could he enlighten us why the increase of \$25,000?

MR. F. ROWE: I do not know if the Premier is going to reply.

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

April 17th., 1980

Tape No. 859

DW - 3

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that the Premier of this Province leveled with this committee and through this committee informed the people of this Province as to where exactly his administration stands with respect to fisheries policies in this Province.

Now, Sir, approximately a year ago hon. members will remember that a great strategy for the eighties for the fisheries was announced. The cost of the

MR. F. ROWE: studies to make that proposal amounted to \$661,000 - \$661,000 of the people's money, to present a programme called Strategies for the Fisheries to 1985, I believe. And the approximate cost of that strategy was to be \$500 million. So if you wanted to average it out it would cost approximately \$100 million per year. Fifty per cent of the money to come from government, namely the provincial government and presumably the federal government, and fifty per cent of the money, the other \$250 million, to come from the private sector, so said the then Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Walter Carter.

Now, Sir, part of the election campaign was fought on that particular fisheries strategy, or fisheries policy. Last year there was an appropriation or an estimate of \$100,000, for example, for the Fisheries Development Corporation of Newfoundland, \$100,000. We were informed over a year ago, at the time the proposal was presented to the public of this Province, that site preparation was ongoing and land acquisition was taking place in Harbour Grace for the purpose of establishing the primary landing and distribution port, so called "superport" in Harbour Grace. And the total cost of that primary landing and distribution port was to be in the order of \$61 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have great difficulty in understanding what is going on with respect to the fisheries policy in this Province as do five hundred-and-some-odd other Newfoundlanders, because we were told that land acquisition was ongoing, site preparation was ongoing, yet we see that in the revised estimates not one cent was spent for the primary landing and distribution port in Harbour Grace.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: That is in the Fisheries estimates.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): A point of order, the hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Nobody wishes to take away from the latitude of debate within the assigned topics and the assigned way the business of the House is laid down, but we are now discussing Head III, under the Executive Council estimates. Questions could be posed with respect to these matters and the hon. gentleman by his own admission is now over into the Fisheries estimates themselves. Now the Fisheries estimates have been referred to a committee and the hon. gentleman has ample opportunity to go and make his point there, and I know his points would be very welcomed. But I think, Mr. Chairman, he is totally out of order, totally irrelevant, and he is taking up the time of the Committee of the Whole on a matter which the House has assigned for another slot and another time.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order. We are doing the Premier's salary, the Premier's Office; the Premier is the gentleman who appoints all these ministers, in this particular case the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is a gentleman we have no confidence in at the moment. He has been ruled as a law breaker by the Public Accounts Committee. The only one that we can direct our questions to as far as the fisheries are concerned, and a man, by the way, who does not hesitate to outline fishery policy, is the hon. the Premier. He speaks for all the departments of government. My hon. colleague is completely in order. What is worrying the hon. gentleman is that we are taking a little too much time and giving the Premier a little too much of a roasting. And that is what the hon. gentleman is worried about. But I would submit my hon. friend is completely in order.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if I could just reply to the point of order. The Premier today, Sir, made a Ministerial Statement

MR. F. ROWE: in which he talks about developing our natural resources. The Premier of this Province makes a Ministerial Statement. The first topic in that brochure is the fisheries. I would assume that most of the major policy decisions are made in consultation with the Premier, and we are on the Premier's office, the most important office in the Province. So you can talk about anything, about any department, any division of the department as long as it relates to governmental policy as determined by the Premier.

MR. MARSHALL: Just further on in the comments, Mr. Chairman, made by the hon. gentleman opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird): The hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: On the point of order. I do not want to belabour the fact but would just like to point out that certainly we are on the Premier's office and the purpose of examining estimates is so that the expenditures that the government proposes to make can be scrutinized by this Committee. Now, the hon. gentleman is quite wrong when he says that this is a freewheeling debate and you can debate about anything. The hon. gentleman was debating at the time and was bringing in the fisheries and was actually referring to the fisheries estimates. Now there is a time and place to debate the fisheries estimates. In other words, he should stand in line until those particular estimates are being considered. Right now I think it is in the public interest to consider the Premier's office and the expenditures contemplated for the Premier's office. If the hon. gentleman had freewheeling debate in the Budget debate, certainly he would have freewheeling to make his comments on the salary of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) when that comes up in Committee, but to go off in another area just really throws chaos to the order of this House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is too foolish to talk about. The hon. Premier is the pacemaker, the policy maker of this administration, the gentleman who appoints Cabinet ministers. And my hon. colleague is completely within his right to talk about anything under the sun when it comes to the Premier's office and the Premier's salary.



MR. NEARY:

The Premier a few moments ago refused to answer some questions that I put to him, some very, very serious questions about policy and about things that have happened in the past in the Premier's office. I would say my hon. friend is completely in order and I would ask for Your Honour to ask the hon. Government House Leader to restrain himself and not be interrupting my hon. friend and wasting the time of the Committee with foolish and specious points of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Baird):

To the point of order. As the subject is far-ranging I would rule there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay De Verde.

MR.F.ROWE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier in his brochure and in the Throne Speech and in practically every speech he makes, the leading statement is that fisheries has been the mainstay of the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador for centuries and then he goes

MR. F. ROWE: on from there. Now, I am simply asking the Premier, as the head statesman in this Province, to indicate to the people of this Province through this Committee, Mr. Chairman, what is the policy of the government as it relates to the announced policy documented in the strategies for the fisheries until 1985. And I was using as an example that site preparation and land acquisition were supposed to have taken place, yet no money was spent in the revised estimates - that is the example I was using - which indicates that nothing is going on with respect to the primary landing and distribution port in Harbour Grace, which is 61/500ths of the total expenditure that was going to be used for the fishery strategies to 1985.

Now, I would like to ask the Premier just to answer this basic, fundamental question: Has the administration changed its policy entirely? Has the administration rejected outright the policy and strategies for the fisheries that were announced over a year ago - for the want of a better expression, the Walter Carter fisheries policy - has that been rejected? Has the proposal that was announced over in the Holiday Inn with T.V. cameras present, with 100 fishermen brought in - is that strategy that was announced with great fanfare still a part of the present administration's policy for the fishery, or has it been modified, or had it been rejected? Because it was stated in the Throne Speech that a White Paper is to be presented later on with regard to fisheries strategy in this Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can just finish by saying, if the fisheries are as important as the Premier and his other ministers indicate, I think he owes it to the people of this Province to indicate through this Committee what exactly the policy of the government is with respect to the fisheries, particularly as it relates to the original fisheries strategies until 1985.

The hon. the Premier, I assume, must be listening with one ear and talking with his mouth, but I would hope that he is listening because it is a very significant question. It was a \$500 million proposal put to the people of Newfoundland. Now, is it rejected or is it not rejected?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):

Does the hon. the Premier wish to speak?

MR. S. NEARY:

Hold on, now, Your Honour, I am on my feet.

I did not want the hon. gentleman to speak.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, to respond to a number of questions that have been put to me by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. E. Hiscock), the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe).

First of all, I think I should deal -

MR. S. NEARY:

I am prepared to allow the gentleman to go ahead and speak, but I would like to have a ruling from Your Honour. In this House, according to the Standing Rules of this House, you can only be recognized when you are standing in your place.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was not standing, I was standing, and the hon. gentleman invited the Premier to speak. Now, are we having new rules in the House? I would like for Your Honour to give us a ruling on that. Who get recognized a man on his feet or a man sitting down?

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) To the point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would just like to say that I thought that the Opposition had their act in order over there so that they were doing things in concert and it was a direct question asked me and I was in another hon. member's seat and as the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) points out, I can not speak from somebody else's seat, so I scurried back to my own seat and I had to sit down because two members can not stand at the same time, because they have not got their act together over there to know that. I just assumed that the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) wanted me to answer now because two other people had come before him and it seemed to indicate that. He said, "I hope he is listening and I want him to answer." And you sat down and I just assumed that the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde in concert with his members had organized it so that I would then respond at that point in time. So I am sorry if there is some confusion on the other side of the House, I do not think there is any confusion here. Everybody had themselves organized for me to get up now and respond to those three members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order. I understand that there was a question asked by the member. The hon. the Premier was attempting to answer it and was going back to his seat at the same time the member for LaPoile rose. It was the initiative of the Chair to recognize who else was up, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much. I appreciate your ruling. I wanted to answer the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock),. I wanted to answer the question, the only really totally relevant question out of the past three speakers has been the hon. the member for Eagle River. I want to commend the hon. member for Eagle River for keeping relevant and I think it goes to show just where relevance is on the opposite side of the House.

MR. NEARY: You mean Torngat Mountains.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Torngat Mountains. Yes, the Hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren.

MR. NEARY: Point of Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) Point of Order. The hon. member for La Poile (Mr. Neary).

MR. S. NEARY: Well, the hon. member just corrected himself. I wanted to just point out to the hon. gentleman that the member for Eagle River, although he may speak in this debate, has not spoken yet. The member from Torngat Mountains spoke.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Point of Order, a point of clarification.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, yes, to that point of order . I was referring to the hon. member for Torngat Mountains. If it comes down to a question of the geography of Labrador, someday I would only be too happy to participate in any kind of debate on that with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, I was talking there, before I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. gentleman, about the timing of the statement made by the Premier in the House yesterday. Now I am told a few moments ago word just came in on the wire from the Province of Quebec, La Belle Province, that Mr. René Levesque called a news conference a few moments ago and told the people of Canada that whatever chance Newfoundland had of getting a corridor through the Province of Quebec, it was killed yesterday by the premature announcement by the Premier of this Province. Just came in on the wire a few moments ago and the hon. gentleman no doubt will be invited in a few moments, if he has not already been invited, by the great CBC to comment on Mr. Levesque's news conference in

MR. S. NEARY: Quebec Province. He said whatever chance the Premier and Newfoundland had of getting a corridor across Quebec it was killed yesterday in the disclosure of a letter in this House by the Premier of this Province.

MR. PECKFORD: (inaudible) answer to the letter (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the idea put forward yesterday, and I hope nobody in this House thinks that we are that stupid; that is not the first idea the matter of a corridor across Quebec came up. One of the former premiers of this Province was on his way to Ottawa with a letter, a Cabinet decision, back in 1966 to ask that the Upper Churchill hydro potential be declared in the National interest and was intercepted in Montreal by the BRINCO officials and a week later Quebec made a decision to allow the power to be exported -

MR. BARRY: (inaudible) along the way.

MR. NEARY: No. He was intercepted and begged. BRINCO and the Churchill Falls Corporation begged him not to put the letter to Ottawa. But anyway it did not get there. But, Mr. Chairman, if it had gotten there, if it had gotten there, I ask members this - at the time all the bombings were taking place in the Province of Quebec and what is the point, what would have been the point at that time of the government of Canada declaring a national interest and allowing a transmission line across? If you put it in downtown Montreal it would have been destroyed and blown up. And the same thing will happen now, I submit to this House.

The

MR. S. NEARY:

Premier has killed whatever chance we have had, of getting that transmission line across the province of Quebec because even now if Ottawa said yes, and they will not give the hon. gentleman an answer until the referendum is over, but even if they said yes, would not the government of Quebec say, 'No way now'? Will you have a transmission line out in the wilderness? What would happen to it?

AN. HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, listen to the old blue-blood, the old buttoned down mind, the old narrow-minded St. John's Tory bigot. Listen to that

MR. L. BARRY: I thought you liked me.

MR. S. NEARY: It is not a matter of like or dislike. I am talking about the hon. gentleman's politics. Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely astounding, as I said when I was on my feet a few moments ago, the infamous thing that the Premier did, not only to this province but to Canada. I cannot understand it. It was so shallow when I listened to it yesterday. A camouflage for delaying the development of the Lower Churchill by seven years and squandering the taxpayers money back in 1975. Start of a new era - construction starts on tunnel to bring hydro power to the Island and then Crosbie's statement, that I have in front of me, cancelling the project. And I said yesterday to the hon. gentleman, and the President of the Council and the member for St. John's East (W. Marshall) immediately leaped in and said, "No, we did not say it." It was said in this House time and time again and outside of this House that not one kilowatt of power would leave this province. Now, they have changed their policy, altered their policy and yesterday the Premier used the technique of a Ministerial Statement to do it and to camouflage their mistake; their gross blunder, their big blunder of taking over Churchill Falls back in 1972. And the blunder

MR. S. NEARY: they have made in the last seven years while the cost of developing the Lower Churchill has escalated from 1.8 billion in 1976 to 3 billion dollars today.

MR. FLIGHT: Three hundred million wasted.

MR. S. NEARY: Three hundred million wasted on these two explosions. Listen to this. Listen to it, Just listen to it. And then you wonder why I get so mad that the press does not pick these things up. Listen to this. ' The roar of an explosive charge near Flowers Cove on the Great Northern Peninsula this morning, signaled the start of construction of a tunnel underneath the Strait of Belle Isle which will bring Labrador power to the Island of Newfoundland.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister was there.

MR. S. NEARY: You would not know but it was the second coming. Yes, he was there.

MR. BARRY: Well, I was relieved of my responsibility.

MR. S. NEARY: He was not relieved of his responsibility. His name is in here somewhere, if I can find it.

MR. FLIGHT: Do you remember the Lloyd's Lake contract you were committed (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Premier Moores was accompanied by Mines and Energy Minister Leo Barry, and Manpower and Industrial Relations Minister Ed Maynard at the Flowers Cove ceremony this morning, and Mr. Barry will also be with him this afternoon for the ceremony on the Labrador side of the Strait. Also participating are Denis Groom president and other officials. The statement that was made yesterday came after seven years of procrastination of waste and extravagance and delay. And the hon. gentleman came in yesterday with his statement. I can only assume, to try to get the heat off the Minister of Fisheries, that is why he made that statement yesterday, that is why it was necessary to do it - to cover up the breaking of the law by one of his ministers. And look what he has cost Newfoundland now, now he will go out and he will attack Rene Levesque and he will say, ' Well, now it is up to the Government of Canada.' Well, if the hon. gentleman was in the Prime Minister of Canada's shoes right now, what would he do with one



MR. S. NEARY: of the biggest Provinces of Canada threatening to separate from confederation, would he say, yes, Mr. Premier down there in Newfoundland, Mr. Premier that likes to have your picture taken and to hit the headlines from coast to coast, yes, we are going to put that transmission line, we are going to issue instructions now to Quebec next week to allow a corridor to go across that Province. Is that what he is going to do?

MR. FLIGHT: (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: What will he do?

MR. S. NEARY: I will tell you what he will do if he has any sense; He would do what any ordinary human being would do. He would write the Premier and say, 'Thank you, very much. This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of so and so date. We realize this is a serious matter. We will think it over and you will get your answer in due course.'

PREMIER PECKFORD: If you fellows had not sold it out you would have no problem.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman should go out and get one of Mr. Smallwood's books The Time Has Come To Tell and see who sold out what! Because if we did not have to protect the Upper Churchill the hon. gentleman would have no argument at all. That power belongs to Newfoundland and, as I said in this House yesterday - and the press did not think it was important enough to pick up - that instead of Newfoundland taking Churchill Falls Corporation or Quebec Hydro to court, they should be taking us to court for withholding the power. How can we be so stupid in this Province? The power is ours, it belongs to Newfoundland and if we want 800 megawatts we just tell Churchill Falls Corporation to withhold it and let Quebec Hydro sue them. Let Quebec Hydro sue them if they want to.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we can withhold 800 megawatts of power if we want to because of the law of this land; an Act of this Legislature supercedes any other contract or any agreement or any letter. The law of this land - does the hon. gentleman know that? - I am not a lawyer.

MR. L. BARRY: You speak against the captain. (Inaudible) support it because you leader supports it. Be objective (inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I did not have an opportunity to answer it yesterday but I am answering it today. But the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) agreed with me yesterday that the reverse situation should apply in Newfoundland, that we should not be taking Churchill Falls to court or Quebec Hydro to court. We should withhold our 800 megawatts of power because the law of this land says we own it and we can have it.

MR. L. BARRY: And we will be getting a report in a matter of a few weeks then we will set out the best way (inaudible) the least harassment and the greatest degree of security for this Province.

MR. S. NEARY: That is seven years after the fact, four years after they started the court case, four years wasting the taxpayers' money, squandering the taxpayers money! Four years later they finally came to the conclusion that there was an Act of this Legislature.

MR. E. ROBERTS: What you are saying is that Crosbie and Peckford were wrong.

MR. S. NEARY: Crosbie was wrong, the present Premier who was then Minister of Mines and Energy was wrong and now my hon. friend is right. Well, if that is going to be the strategy and the future, the future strategy of this government, Sir, well then I would say they are starting to get on the right track. But it is seven years too late! Three billion dollars now it is going to cost and not only that but they have Mr. Levesque's (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: That is bad.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, it is bad believe it or not. If the hon. gentleman Digging 'em Dillion who does not know the difference may think that it is not bad, but I happen to think it is bad. Not only is it bad timing for Canada, but it is bad for Newfoundland.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has expired. The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, this present tirade by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has very little to do with the subheads that are under discussion here.

MR. S. NEARY: We are doing the Premier's office.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, subhead 302-01 which has to do with the salaries in the Premier's office and 302-02-01 to do with travelling, office, grants, the former Premiers general services and so on. That is what it has to do with.

The response to the question by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) had to do with travelling which was under 302-02-01 and had to do with why the increase. I think if the hon. member looks at the original Estimate for last year, before the revised Estimates, it was at \$67,000 but only \$35,000 was spent. So what we are doing this year is just putting it at \$60,000 not at \$67,000, just to cover in case there are some unusual expenditures. The actual expenditure last year was about \$35,000 so there is nothing unusual about it. It was just put in there to cover any unusual travelling that might have to occur. Last year we did the same thing and we only spent \$35 000 out of \$67,000 and now we are putting it at \$60,000. But there is no special reason for it, to answer the gentleman.

So that is the only reason for that vote but

PREMIER PECKFORD: it is in line with what it was last year in the original estimates. The revised estimates showed that we saved \$32,000 there on that subhead. Hopefully we can do the same thing again this year.

The other matters that were mentioned by the hon. the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) had to do with fisheries policy in the Province. As indicated on a number of occasions since the House opened, we will be dealing with fisheries policy, and we have already indicated, in a pretty clear way, how we stand on the Northern cod issue and we are pursuing that. An overall fisheries policy is being developed and will be put out in the form of a White Paper. The hon. the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde refers to a number of documents that were produced over the last two or three years relative to the fisheries in this Province by the former administration. I am well aware of them, as most hon. members of the House, as most honourable citizens of the Province are aware. Things have happened, since those documents have come out, of significant import to the future of the fishing industry and, hence, we intend to amend and change in whatever way we see fit now to articulate a fisheries policy, which will come out in the form of a White Paper for debate by hon. members opposite and by people in Newfoundland generally. That will be done in due course and, hopefully, through the estimates in the fisheries, in the estimates committees - the hon. members on that committee will have an opportunity to debate that fully. Then, when the estimates come back to the whole Committee, further debate, no doubt, will ensue on that. Also, of course, in the Budget Debate, which will be called next week, hon. members will get another opportunity to debate that as well. The whole question of hydro development which is not technically relevant to the subheads under discussion, this is an old debate that has been since I have been in the House, Mr. Chairman, since 1972 - it has been over and over again usually the same ground, very few new ideas. There were no new ideas at all in what the member for Lapoile just had to say. He seems to be agitated and excited and somewhat disturbed over events on hydro policy and power policy in the Province and so on. He seems to

PREMIER PECKFORD: be overly disturbed about the fact that the Province of Newfoundland is asking for the same kind of rights that other Canadians have in other provinces for the transmission of their natural resources. Pipelines from Alberta through to Quebec to bring oil and gas is okay, but now we are asking for that same kind of treatment. We are doing it in a rational, reasonable manner. It is unfortunate if Mr. Levesque wants to say what he has said. Apparently the Northern Report of the day reported to have said, "That is fine, that is his position, we disagree with it and we will continue to disagree with it". That is why we have called upon the senior government in this Confederation about it. It has been a longstanding thing. As it relates to the whole Upper Churchill situation, which is another, if you will, quintal of fish, another component of overall Labrador power policy - you have the Upper Churchill, you have the Lower Churchill and you have other things in the Province. The whole question of the Upper Churchill is under study right now by a task force of lawyers. It is in court and so on and there are

PREMIER PECKFORD: different views on it. Suffice it to say that whatever the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) says, the people of Newfoundland have spoken on a number of occasions since 1972 as it relates to this very important question as they have on many other important questions. The argument by the hon. member for Lapoile has been found to be wanting on a number of occasions along those lines. We will pursue the initiatives that we have outlined yesterday and so on. We are not afraid of René Levesque. I am sorry to say that one could easily draw the conclusion that there were people in the Government of Newfoundland years ago who were and who, once again, are showing it again now that they were scared to take a stand, scared to stand up for Newfoundland, scared to stand up for that when it was our birthright, that we had to buy back our own water and all the rest of it. So the member for Lapoile might have a very uneasy conscience. He might be trying now to rationalize his stands years ago. He is trying to defend himself now and, you know, if he has a problem with that that is his problem and we can all witness it and see it again for what it is worth. Our arguments are clear, we made them and we will continue to make them, and Mr. Levesque notwithstanding, we have no other alternative but to insist and request the senior level of government in this Confederation to allow us to have the same kind of treatment as now is being given to other provinces in the transmission of natural resources across the whole Confederation, and that we will continue to do. If members opposite are against that policy, if they are against the Northern cod, if they are against the ownership of our oil and gas, if they are against these kinds of things, the people of Newfoundland, again, will speak loud and clear as to how they think this Province should be run over the next ten years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) Order, please! So I do not interrupt the next speaker coming up, the time being almost five o'clock, I now leave the Chair for the hon. the Speaker to come in and announce the Late Show.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! Although it is not quite five o'clock, I can now inform the House that I have received notice for debate at 5:30 of one matter, when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House. Notice given by the hon. the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Premier, and the subject matter concerns the fishery.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) Order, please! The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on this subhead and I want to divide them into two parts. Both the Premier and his Parliamentary Assistant are out of the Chamber which may be inevitable but is at least discourteous. I wonder - and I have some specific questions on the Premier - if Your Honour flaps Your Honour's arms, you know, I have some specific questions for the Premier. I move the Committee adjourn, Sir, until either the Minister responsible or his assistant is here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the Committee adjourn until the Premier returns to the House, to the chamber. All those in favour aye, contrary nay. In my opinion the nays have it.

MR. ROBERTS: Divide the Committee, then, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Division? Call in the members.

MR. ROBERTS: Since the Premier is here we will now vote nay.



MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): All those in favour 'aye',  
contrary 'nay', carried unanimously.

The hon. member for the  
Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Your Honour may defeat it  
unanimously; if it were carried unanimously the committee  
would have adjourned. But anyway, I had some specific  
questions, as I said, on the Premier's Estimates and per-  
haps I could - they are not all related to 302-but in  
the interest of not having to have me on my feet repeatedly  
maybe I could deal with a number of them.

I would like to know, this  
Office and Allowance it is 302-02-02, I understand what  
office means but I do not know what allowance means and  
perhaps the Premier could indicate to the committee  
exactly what that means. Now I ask because in my under-  
standing the Premier does not draw a car allowance, nor  
should he because in return he does get a car. Your  
Honour is looking at me quizzically. What have I done?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

May I interject and say that  
we have not passed 302-01. Shall I call that subhead now?

MR. E. ROBERTS: I thought I had leave to sort  
of - let us go at them globally and in due course Your Honour  
will put them all through. Let us do it that way.

But I just want to know what  
allowance means. I am certainly not objecting, I am asking  
a question. The Premier quite properly is provided with a  
car by the Government of the Province, there is nothing new  
in that, there is nothing wrong. In due course no  
doubt he will be getting a new car and hopefully it will  
be a little one. -

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. E. ROBERTS: Is there a new one out there?

April 17th., 1980

Tape No. 868

DW - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, yes.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

And it is not one of these energy gobbling ones?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

26.8 miles per gallon.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

That is rather good. Okay, I want to know what the allowance covers and perhaps the Premier could indicate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

By leave of my colleagues behind me and on the other side, if I may carry on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

I would like to know while we are it, a general question, what is the car allowance now being paid to ministers who do not receive a car as such? Secondly, - I will skip down, Your Honour, you know I am skipping but I am still within Head III, which is not bad given the rules of relevancy. Why are we proposing a drop of the Grant to Institute for Research on Public Policy which is specifically 303-05. Now last year we gave \$20,000, as budgeted this year apparently we to give nothing. There is no vote requested. I am curious about that and I must say I am somewhat surprise because I have always considered the Institute for Research on Public Policy to be rather a good operation. It is amazing what they have published and I have here their annual report which came just the other day. They have quite a good series of publications and of course, we are represented on them Mr. David Vardy who I believe is Clerk to the Cabinet and Clerk to the Executive Council and a very senior and a very responsible public servant. He is the government's representative on it. You know, why are we dropping it? And I cannot move that we put it in but I would hope that the government if they had felt it should be dropped would perhaps reconsider

MR. E. ROBERTS: that particular decision. I mean, it is not a lot of money, given the scale on which the government are operating, but I think it is \$20,000 that is well spent in that it contributes to the budget. It is not a big part of the budget of the institute. According to their annual statement, the institute's revenue last year was \$2.274 millions of which the largest part came from investment income, operating and endowment funds. Obviously, the institute is not going to go out of business simply because of our decision, but nonetheless, it would mean we would not be participating in what seems to be an institution with wide national support and one which I think performs well for the money which is put into it.

The institute, as Your Honour is probably aware, produces some very highly technical studies on areas of public policy and I think most people feel the studies are a good contribution to public discussion in Canada.

I am intrigued by the fact there were six special assistants, apparently, provided for in the Premier's vote, a total salary request for them, \$120,000. I wonder if the Premier could list for us, please, the names of whoever -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the other day but I could not get them.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Okay, I do not so much care what their salaries are; I am sorry, that is of no particular import - that is an average of less than \$20,000 a body and that is not too bad in the current world.

I wonder as well - the Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier is, of course, the distinguished member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. N.Doyle). Has the Premier any other member of this House employed as an assistant? Now, I ask because in days gone by, if I am not

MR. E. ROBERTS: mistaken, the former Premier, Mr. Moores, had an assistant employed at the Corner Brook office and I do not know whether that arrangement is in effect now, and if so, whom and how much is he paid? I think that is legitimate given that that particular gentleman who helped these gentlemen would be a member of the House. I just want to know. I do not think it is unlawful, I think the legislation in the Disabilities Act does provide for that.

I would like the Premier to tell us as well if he would, please, who the three personal assistants are. Again, I do not care about their individual salaries. I have no concern at all. You know, does that include the lady who sort of does the work that Mrs. Templeman used to do? I do not know, I have not been on the 8th Floor for so many years I am not sure what even the layout is - but, you know, sort of the chief private secretary. Although as the Clerk at the table will recall, there was a lady who held the title of Private Secretary as well as a lady who held the title of Personal Assistant to the Premier in Mr. Smallwood's time. And I think the same was true in Mr. Moores' time, but of course, I was not quite as familiar as I would have been before.

I would like to know who the social policy adviser is at \$20,000. That is an intriguing one to be found in the Premier's -

MR. S. NEARY: It ain't Cabot, that is for sure.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Martin, I believe, is the senior policy adviser contractual at \$50,000 per year.

MR. S. NEARY: It is a good thing I defeated him.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, he was done a great favour in that, but I would like to know who the social policy adviser is at - it says \$20,000 - again, I am not so much concerned, I do not think that is an outrageous salary, but I would like to know who it is and is that a Public Service position?

MR. E. ROBERTS: And I wonder, as well, if the Premier could tell us whether the very large number of people employed in the Executive Council - and I do not know if there is a total in the detailed salary breakdowns, Your Honour - 165 in all under the general heading of Head 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. member's time is running out.

MR. E. ROBERTS: So quickly? The time just whizzes by, Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Indeed.

MR. E. ROBERTS: You know, are the - I am sorry, Your Honour has not deliberately, but inadvertently broken whatever train of thought I had and I certainly had one. You know, are we underrecruited? Are we having difficulty recruiting and holding these very senior people? Because while I do feel that at times we perhaps have an over bloated bureaucracy, I do want to go on and say that the people that are poor of that bureaucracy, whether it is bloated or not are really the people who make it work and these

MR. E. ROBERTS:

are the key people the very limited handfull of people who hold the jobs that are dealt with in this head or probably of more importance in shaping policy and in setting the directions that this government attempts to follow than all of the rest of the Public Service who by and large are entrusted with the job of carrying it out as important as that may be. And finally I simply want to say to the Premier that I was a little disappointed in the tone of his remarks to my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) . If the Premier wants to get into this kind of debate I for one would welcome it but I am not so sure it makes the committee go any better or the House go any better or the work of the people of this Province go any better. There were several particular remarks which the Premier made which I could quarrel with but, you know, I am getting short of time and I am not so sure that -

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, I do not want to, because then I would be launching into a debate and while I think that would be good sport I am not so sure that would serve the purposes of the committee at this stage. But, you know the Premier ought to be I think very sensitive and sensible now, I am not implying he has been insensible but he has been insensitive in my view to the fact that he is now in the same position as both of his predecessors were, my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition - maybe I could be allowed a minute or two more your honour -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No. If not, I will sit down and, you know, I will come back at it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. E. ROBERTS: My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition who has had a vast amount of experience in public affairs in a wide variety of forms and I think that we in this House should be very much aware of that whether we agree with the view he expresses

MR. E. ROBERTS: or not is another storey, but the hon. Leader of the Opposition has played in the big leagues and has played with outstanding success and in fact he is probably the only Newfoundlander who has ever done that. Mr. Crosbie might have had not Mr. Crosbie destroyed the government of which he was a part; you know, Mr. Crosbie was not there long enough, Mr. Jim McGrath in my view is a very confident, capable man, but again he was not in office long enough to do very much one way or another. But the point I am getting at is as my friend the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday our Premier now finds himself in exactly the same position as did Premier Smallwood and as did Premier Moores when it comes to vis-a-vis Quebec and it is not really much help to anyone to get rhetorical and to claim in great proclamatory statements that you did not stand up for anybody or that. I would love to debate the Churchill the original Churchill deal I thought a comment in a bit of news recently by the hon. Jack Pickersgill a man of a considerable wisdom and assure your honour a considerable degree of experience. Mr. Pickersgill knows a great deal of what went on in the Government of Canada during the period when he was involved from about 1935 to about 1965 or 1970. You know, that was a very well taken comment and it is one thing to say the deal was a bad deal, it turned out to be a very bad deal, it is another thing to say that the people who were involved in it and I was not by the way I witnessed some of it but I was not involved in any real way I was an executive assistant and so had some knowledge perhaps of what was going on but no substantive knowledge, no substantive involvement. But it is not helping things, it is not helping anybody it certainly does not hurt us politically I mean if anybody really believed the kind of nonsense the Premier is getting of with they believed it years ago and they will go on believing to their grave just as some people - there are people who believe Confederation was a bad thing. You know, right or wrong they believe it and let them believe if they want but I am much more concerned

April 17, 1980

Tape No. 870

RA - 3

MR. E. ROBERTS: with trying to get some rational debate on what I believe the Premier would agree is one of the key issues facing this Province and that is the development of the Lower Churchill the Labrador Power and the recapture of an economic rental from the Upper Churchill and they are different problems or different concerns and there may be different approaches or there may not be that is another storey. But simply getting up and my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) you know, we do not agree on a great deal often but often we do agree on a great deal we certainly I think have different styles in our approach and that does not make either of us right or either of us wrong. But he made what I thought were some very good comments he made them in his own inimitable style and I do not think we should fault that any more than I do not fault the Premier's own inimitable style although at times I may occasionally in good humor poke a bit of fun at him, that is part of the game.



MR. E. ROBERTS: Sure, life is too serious to be taken seriously all the time. But the fact remains -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: I do indeed, I say to my friend from Stephenville. I say some very good things and sometimes he even appreciates them, and I thank him. But the point is, your Honour, that the Labrador power thing is a very crucial problem and it is not going to be any answer to say you gave in to LeVesque or you did not give in to LeVesque. I have no problem in debating what went on years ago. The final answer will be to say to the Premier to date he has achieved zero, as Premier of Newfoundland, good or bad. And those who went before their records stand there good or bad but the measurement is not in on this Premier yet. First of all we do not know how long he is going to be there. At some day he will be an ex-premier. You may think it is one hundred years away, you may think it is five years away. Who knows? But at some time he will be an ex-premier and then we will measure his record one way or the other. I may not be around, your Honour may not be around but there will be members here in the House. There will be members on both sides.

AN HON. MEMBER: The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will still be there.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The member for LaPoile will doubtless be here as long as he chooses to seek election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. ROBERTS: As long as he chooses to seek election. And there may be others of us in that position too but that remains to be seen too. Who knows who in this House will be here?

Only the member for LaPoile has been here as long as I have, I guess, and the gentleman from St. John's -

MR. S. NEARY: No. I have been here going on eighteen years.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No, but you are the only one who has been here any longer than I have in this House, and the gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) and I were freshmen together, You would not believe

MR. E. ROBERTS: that, would you. We were both young innocents once, your Honour, and look at us both now. But the fact remains -

MR. S. NEARY: The trouble is I have been here too long and my memory is too good.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, the hon. gentleman's memory is too good but I am not so sure I would agree he has been here too long. Some on the other side may feel that way, but that again is another story. But I would say to the Premier that I can understand him wanting to rhetorical and declamatory and I have been known to do that too, but I think this issue is much too serious to be the subject of the kind of partisan folderol that he unloosed from himself this afternoon. I think he is doing himself a disservice because if he says this kind of thing he is going to get responded to in kind. He is going to set the tone and if he sets that kind of tone it is, I would suggest to him, the wrong tone. -

MR. S. NEARY: He set the tone yesterday when he declared war on LeVesques.

MR. E. ROBERTS: - he will do himself a disservice. He will do the administration he heads a disservice, More importantly, he will do this Province a disservice. I do not think he wants to do that and I would suggest to him quite simply that if he falls into this kind of easy trap we can have a lot of fun. But I do not think we will do any good. I do not think we will do half the good we could by examining seriously, what is a very serious problem. We have to cope with geography We have to cope with economics, We have to cope with technology. And we somehow have to cope with all three of those and make it come together to develop the Lower Churchill, the other Labrador power, and to get that economic rental from the Upper Churchill. And there is nobody feels any stronger than I do, and there is nobody in this House feels any stronger than the Premier does. We all, I think, are united to a person, to a man and a woman

DR. J. COLLINS: It comes down to the will to do something about it.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, I say to my friend the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), of course it comes down to the will but more importantly, and that was the point I was going to make, and he has not been reading my mail but he has obviously be anticipating my -

MR. S. NEARY: (inaudible) on the last

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, it is a cheap analogy.

But he has been anticipating my thoughts because the point I was going to say is that we may sometimes disagree on the method by which we try to achieve a goal. There is no lack of will power I would suggest on either side. And it would be a mistake if the hon. minister thought there was any lack of will power or resolution. He is very new to public life, very new to public office.

DR. J. COLLINS: Very old (inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: Very old. He may be very old. He knows a lot about human nature which does not fit him to deal with this House because he spent his time with children.

DR. J. COLLINS: (Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, that is true. And you cannot teach an old dog new tricks I would say to the minister. But the fact remains he is doing himself and everybody else a very grave injury if he thinks for one moment there is any lack of will power or resolution. That is not the problem. The problem may be the method of how to go at it. But now if the Minister again- He either was not listening or was not heeding what I was saying, If he wants to get into this kind of debate I will welcome it. I can blagard, I assure the hon. minister, with the best in this House. I have seen far better than the minister, infinitely better. He is not fit politically to carry the boots of some of those who have gotten into this kind of row with me.

MR. ROBERTS:

He does not know what rows are, he really does not.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

A point of order. The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order. I think the people on this side of the House when they accorded the gesture to the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) additional time beyond the time of ten minutes to clue up his remarks had to do with - he was about to breach on a subject of great public importance and I do not think the banter of this sort is the kind of issue of public importance to which we had lent our support in the first instance for the extension of time.

MR. ROBERTS:

Your Honour, I think the point is well taken.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To the point of order. The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

I was just going to say I think the point is well taken. I did not intend to go on in this way and I apologize to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins); I should not have let him lead me astray. I think the Premier's point is well taken. I will sit down, but I will simply say that what I have said leaving aside the banter, I have said, you know, because I believe it and because I think it is a point worthy of being examined and I would commend it to him whether he agrees with it or not. I think we are facing great challenges in this Province, Sir.

MR. YOUNG:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

I have excellent hearing, I would say to my friend for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), I have excellent hearing and if somebody wants to interrupt me I shall attempt to deal with them even if it is the member for Harbour Grace. But I do not want to get into it. I was trying to finish a sentence. I think, Your Honour, and to say that what I said I believe to be of some importance whether it is agreeable or

MR. ROBERTS:

not to the other side. That is their choice. I think we are facing great challenges in this Province. I think we in this House have a role to play in trying to resolve those challenges. But I think the way in which we do it will determine in large measure how we do it, and more than any other individual in this House, the Premier will set the tone. And the kind of thing he said today, I would suggest, is not the kind of tone I had hoped to see. If he wants to do it he certainly has the right to do it. But I am afraid it will draw a response in kind and nobody will win. I thank gentlemen on the other side for giving me the leave and I apologize if I have exceeded their intent. I do tend to get led astray by gentlemen like the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and for that I apologize.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle talks about setting the right tone by myself or somebody else. I thought I tried yesterday to do just that in the statement that I gave to the House in as reasonable a way as I could give it. And I thought I did it again today. As the member for the Strait of Belle Isle must, when he lectures other people in this House like myself and other hon. members, he should also take some example from himself because he always makes the excuse that the reason why he got diverted is because somebody interjected or asked him a question. And if my tone was anything less than wholesome in the eyes of the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, it was simply because, using his argument, that I was asked a rather provocative question and had been lectured by one of his colleagues on the whole question of Labrador power in a rather provocative manner by him and I was only responding. I thought as a matter of fact that I responded in a way and in a tenure which was somewhat higher than the questions asked of me in the beginning. So I make those preliminary remarks for the benefit of the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

Obviously there is in this Province today, as the hon. the member has said, challenging times.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No question, and we have taken the positions we have both yesterday and weeks ago and last year not lightly and not done in a day or a week or two weeks or three or four weeks but done over months of deliberations on the various points, and we have attempted on many, many occasions on all these issues, and the caucus, all the members of this side of the House, have been totally and absolutely involved in it and it has taken a long, long time to develop them and take the positions that we have taken.

I do not think it is any point at all - I have been in this House now since 1972 - in really rehashing the past either. I do not agree with it. You know, I do not think there is anything to be served. We all know what happened in the last fifteen or twenty years, all of us here are all old enough to know that, whether it was right or wrong, what the motivations were, whether it can be justified or cannot be justified. I am not really, perhaps, totally qualified to say, nor is anybody. You have to be in the circumstance at the time, you know, and all the rest of it. All I do know is what has happened and where we are today and what we are looking at for the next ten or fifteen years, and it is in that light, given that foundation, given that past, given that present, today and yesterday, that we look forward to trying to do something more in the future. So, I do not think it is going to serve any purposes in the Budget debate next week or on other legislation or through other ways in this House to debate the pros and cons of the BRINCO - CFLCo - Hydro Quebec situation. Negotiations went on at the time. There are a lot of things that can be said about it. There is a lot of information that has not come out into the public totally that I am familiar with, for example, that someday will come out in due course in the appropriate time and in the appropriate manner. What is important, I think, for us to do, as members of the House, is to try to clearly outline now where we should go from here on. We have taken a very firm stand on a number of very important matters, and we think it is important for us to do it, and the timing that we do it can be questioned and all the rest of it. It is there in the public, and

PREMIER PECKFORD: we will be judged by the people of the Province in due course on those various stands and on those various policies. I think that is what we have to address our minds to. That is why I have repeatedly, Mr. Chairman, both inside this House and outside this House, tried to stick almost exclusively, almost to the point of insanity, of just sticking with the issues and trying not to bring, especially, names and, very often, not even personalities, not even parties involved, but just saying Newfoundlanders generally, and have deliberately used that phraseology so to do. So there is no intent on my part to do it any other way, but we are faced with a lot of very, very critical decisions and we are making them as we come along and after reasonable, sober debate and after reasonable, sober attempts to do it in the easiest way possible, the least provocative way possible, wherever we can, and we will continue to do that. I think we can, as an administration, as a government and as parliamentarians on this side of the House, hold our heads high for the way that we have acted in this House since last March in the fulfillment of our role and our mandate and in trying to put forward the policies that we have done in the last while and tried to elevate and keep the debate and the tone and the tenor at a high level. I think all members in this hon. House have helped in that, especially the newer members of the House, if I may say so. I think it is a real credit to this House when you look on both sides. The new members of this House, almost to a person, in my view - and I can be criticized on this one - almost to a person, have - and I would like the hon. members to ponder this - the new members of this House since last March have done more to elevate this Chamber and us as politicians in the conduct of our business than, perhaps, all of us older ones who were here long before they came.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And if you just examine the personages - I am talking about on both sides of the House - to a person, they have performed themselves very, very well, lacking the rules of the House and all the rest of it. They have really done a good service and nobody has ever, perhaps, recognized. You just look around this

PREMIER PECKFORD: House and go through the districts. I can think right across from me the hon. the member for Burin (Mr. Hollett), for example, who is a good example of what a member of the House should be. No question in my mind, and I know he does it deliberately. He is a good, good member. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) and so on have conducted themselves with grace, integrity. Forget the foolishness, forget the silliness! Let us get on with the job of trying to serve our constituents and serve this House and all the rest of it. They have done a fantastic job on it. We can take,



PREMIER PECKFORD:

the older members of this House can take a good lesson from the newer members of this House is all I am saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Let me go on from that now to clue up because we have the Late Show coming up. The other day when the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) was either in the confines of the Chamber or somewhere else.

MR. ROBERTS:

I was not in my seat?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You were not in your seat. The hon. member was not in his seat. I had mentioned about the staff. I will just go through it again. Two offices, one in Corner Brook and Grand Falls and then here in my own office: Cabot Martin is the senior policy advisor; Luanne Leamon, a lady who is the social policy advisor; Mr. Alvin Hewlett, who was my executive assistant years ago when I was a minister who is one of the personal assistants; and Mr. Desmond Sullivan; and then Mrs. Helen Miller who is my personal assistant, answering the phone, mail and all of that; and Mrs. Margaret Rossiter who is my secretary who does the typing. That is it essentially, with Mr. Eric Rowe -

MR. ROBERTS:

(Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

If the hon. member will permit I think there were six.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, I think that is the six of them.

MR. ROBERTS:

Six, but there were six shown as special assistants. Most of these individuals I believe are paid out of other salaries and it may well be there are vacant positions there.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There are two vacant positions now, yes that is right. I have not filled them deliberately. I am trying as I indicated yesterday to try to cut back on expenses there because there are two or three ways of showing leadership, getting up and making a long speech and there is another way of doing it is to go about and do your work.

MR. ROBERTS:

(Inaudible) three personal assistants.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You can say then to the ministers in the other departments, "If I can cut in my little bally wag on the eighth floor they can also cut in their bally wag on the second floor or the first floor".

MR. ROBERTS: Rock for rock I say.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So I have not filled all the positions that are available to be filled and that have been approved by Treasury Board for the Premier's office.

MR. ROBERTS: Who are the special assistants to the Premier?

PREMIER PECKFORD: The special assistants were, well that is Mrs. Shea - I think that is what she is called now - in Grand Falls and Mrs. Allen in Corner Brook and I think Mr. Sullivan might be called a special assistant. The first time that word special assistant came up was when I was special assistant way back.

MR. ROBERTS: Remember we amended the legislation (inaudible) to allow the Premier -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes they amended the legislation at that time and they were all called executive assistants before that.

MR. ROBERTS: There was only one, well -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes they did. They were all called executives. Then the words had gotten all fooled up and you see at the same time the ministers change the names of their assistants from executive assistants to special assistants. The words got all tangled up.

MR. ROBERTS: A rose is a rose is a rose.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Exactly.

MR. ROBERTS: Are there any other members before we go to five-thirty?

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is Mr. Doyle who is the parliamentary assistant.

MR. ROBERTS: So he is the only member on the Premier's staff?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, right. Mrs. Allen is the executive or special assistant in Corner Brook.

MR. ROBERTS: But she is not a member.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No. In Corner Brook but she is the chief -

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): It now being five-thirty a motion would be in order to rise the Committee.

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

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

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred and has made further progress on Head 3, the Executive Council and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It being five-thirty a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. The matter for debate raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is fishery.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, although I am not the spokesman on this side of the House on the fishery I do represent a district that has an economy that is 60 per cent fishery, probably more, 65 per cent fishery and therefore I am speaking as a concerned member who is worried about the plans of the government as far as my own district-and I suppose by talking about my own district you might say that I am talking about a problem that exists in just about every rural district of this Province. Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see the government in the past several years have completely neglected the fishery. They have concentrated all their efforts on oil and gas offshore. They have been so preoccupied with the offshore situation that they have neglected the fishery, not only the fishery, they have neglected a lot of other things in Newfoundland.

MR. S. NEARY: So this year, Mr. Speaker, as a result of their neglect we find the fishermen of this Province, the plant workers and so forth with a very uncertain and very uneasy situation. Market conditions, we are told, for Newfoundland fish are bad. There is a slump in the market in the United States. The Japanese - yesterday I referred to them as Japs and got raked over the coals for it - the Japanese market for squid is bad I am told, is very poor indeed even though practically every fishermen in my own district and, I suppose, in other parts of Newfoundland, have geared themselves up for the squid fishery. The markets this year are going to be very bad indeed, very poor, we are told and the price is going to be down. And the government have given us no indication whatsoever of how they intend to cope with this situation if, indeed, it is true. They have not told us what plans they have to find new markets for squid and yet our fishermen have become dependent on the squid, especially in the last year or two. So we have a bad situation as far as markets are concerned, which in all probability will result in the fishermen of this Province being asked to accept less for their fish this year than they received last year or the year before. And the government do not seem to be lifting a finger to deal with this situation.

Now, as far as the lobster prices are concerned, it would appear that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) has now altered his position, shifted his ground as far as the lobster prices are concerned and the season is going to open on Monday. We were told by the Minister of Fisheries in this House that the government were going to set the price and anybody who was not prepared to accept that price would not get a licence. Now we were told today in a public statement by the minister that the union will enforce the prices and if they are not satisfied or if any buyer is not prepared to pay union prices then all they

MR. S. NEARY: have to do is notify the minister or the government and they will withhold the licence - a complete reversal, a complete change in policy.

So what I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, to get as a result of this five minute debate that we have here during the Late Show is I am hoping to get the Premier - because we cannot depend on the Minister of Fisheries, he no longer exists as far as we are concerned. He is dead in this House as far as we are concerned. He is dead politically because the Public Accounts Committee have found him guilty of breaking the law. I have no intention of dealing with him, I am going to deal with the Premier on fishery matters. And I am hoping the Premier now in his five minutes - and he can have twenty-five minutes if he wants - will tell us what is happening as far as the markets are concerned, what the fishermen can expect this year in the way of prices for their squid - is the market good? and prices for their lobsters. And will the fishermen, as we are told or led to believe indeed, have to accept less this year for their fish than they accepted last year? These matters have to be straightened out right now because the fishermen are getting ready to put their nets in the water to go back fishing - that is those who are not already fishing. And in my district, as Your Honour knows, we have a year 'round inshore fishery, they are already fishing, but there are thousands of fishermen and plant workers right on the eve of getting back to the fishery and getting back to work and they want to know where they stand as far as prices for their product and markets for their product are concerned. I hope the Premier will straighten that out now in the next twenty or twenty-five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we had a go at this subject the other day. It is obvious to all onshore that there is no way to know at this present moment. There will

PREMIER PECKFORD:                    be herring caught in September and mackerel caught in October and November and all the rest of it, turbot caught then, the price of which we do not know now. So it is a job to say whether in fact the amount of income that a fisherman living in Joe Batt's Arm this year, the amount of income that he earns in 1980 as an inshore fisherman on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland will be as great as what he caught or the amount of income that same fisherman had last year. That is difficult to say because the prices

PREMIER PECKFORD: will fluctuate and come September or October or whatever and he gets into other species of fish besides just perhaps the codfish then that has a big bearing on it, the timing.

We are, as I indicated the other day, Mr. Speaker, involved with the union and the fish companies in the whole question of the establishment of reasonable and sensible prices for various species of fish. And to help us do that so that we do not take just the word of the companies, so we just do not take the word of the unions, we have our own independent assessment done by the Fisheries Advisory Board. That is one of the main reasons the Fisheries Advisory Board is established; it is an independent group of people who work for the government, whose main mandate is to research and get as much information as they can on the marketplace both in Europe and in the United States so that we can bring to bear upon the negotiations if and when necessary, objective information which can help settle the whole question of prices of fish. I think the lobster situation now might be settled in the next couple of days. And it seems, for example, contrary to - here again you are depending on how many lobster fishermen you have, that the price of lobster is going to be a fairly handsome price. There is going to be a good price for lobster this year. So on the one hand, you might get - especially in my district, I know, in Card's Harbour, Triton, Brighton, Beaumont, Lush's Bight and Little Bay Islands, especially in the other ones I mentioned, and into Pilley's Island where you have a lot of lobster fishermen, they are going to do much better - if the price is what I am sort of hinted at now it is going to be - do a lot better on lobster this year than they did last year and they might do marginally less on codfish in the price. So that overall, they still might have a gross income this year in the fishery much better than last year.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There are a lot of factors and a lot of components. We are in the marketplace; we are involved with the Canadian Government in negotiations in GATT; we have been to Spain and Portugal ourselves and across Europe, the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Slade, especially over the last several months. And we have markets in the Carribean and in South America as well. The United States does remain the big market for most of the large companies. We have to try to diversify that and we have to try to persuade the federal government to get involved in treating fish a little bit different than they have in the past so that we can get it into the European economic community and not have to compete with grain from Western Canada. And if we do - and this is always the problem that Newfoundland finds itself in on so many fronts, not only in the fishery but everywhere else, that you are competing against a larger economic unit, one, given the Prairies or whatever or a larger political unit within Canada which has more power then economically and politically so that their products get preferential treatment when it comes to GATT negotiations by Canada with these other countries. And fish is still - the codfish to a lot of people in Ontario is still not a very wholesome thing. I noticed in my last trips around upalong that it is changed a lot in a lot of places. One time the codfish was the great Newfie joke and now it is the latest piece of gold or the diamonds that come out of South Africa. It is almost equated in that way. So it is changing.

But we are involved in fish prices. We have our own objective, independent group who help us on that, as I said, and we will try to ensure that the fisherman gets a really good wage. But it will vary from product to product. Herring, again is one that you can - and squid, we do not know what is going to happen in squid. There was some indication earlier in Japan that the inventory is pretty, pretty - a lot of inventory, and it is going to



PREMIER PECKFORD: be very difficult to really move the squid if it comes in in the kinds of quantities it came in last year.

Seals, for example - when I was home last week in my own district I was told that most of the landmen who are into the seal business right now are doing a fantastic business, that seal prices were never better. People in Little Bay Islands and Harry's Harbour are getting a higher price and people on the Baie Verte Peninsula are getting a higher price for seals than they have got for years. So here you have it on that end.

So there are a lot of fishermen on the Northeast Coast now who are going to have a lot more income from seals than they did last year, which might offset the reduction that they might see on their codfish. And then again, like I said, it varies from place to place - some places, turbot is big, mackerel and herring. That is the great thing about the Newfoundland fishery now that it has not been in the past. One time you had all your eggs in one basket and that was just codfish. Now you have your crab and your shrimp and your herring, your mackerel and your turbot and your squid and your seals and everybody is into all of those species and can afford to be, have gradually gotten into it. The plants are taking everything now. It is a different fishery, and between it all they come out with a fair wage.

We are there with our own independent people and we will do all we can, as we did last year, to ensure that the fisherman gets a good return for his labours.

MR. S. NEARY:

Hear, hear!

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 18, 1980 at 10:00 A.M.