

VOL. 2

NO. 31

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1983.

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I would like to report on the successful conclusion of negotiations relating to the Canada-Newfoundland Native Peoples of Conne River agreement. Towards this end I have attached a copy of the understanding reached on Friday, April 29th, 1983, along with a telex from the hon. John Munro, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, indicating his concurrence.

The conditions outlined in my letter of agreement to the Conne River Indian Band Council Association provide for the budgeted allocation of funds and the reporting of the expenditure of those funds in a manner consistent with the requirements of our Department and of the Auditor General. In the area of sawmill operations in the community of Conne River, the Band Council, the Federal Government and the Province have agreed that funds allocated for these purposes under existing provincial legislation shall be expended without prejudice to the litigation which the Conne River Band Council have filed against the Government of Canada.

The important lesson from this experience is that when all parties sat down together to begin earnest negotiations we were able to

MR. GOUDIE: reach a compromise, an honourable middle ground, on which all parties could meet and work out a mutually acceptable conclusion. On the vast majority of items that had been outstanding, 12 out of the 14 original issues, we were able to reach a unanimous consensus. On the question of the allocation of housing funds, we have agreed to await the development of new proposals at the level of the Co-ordinating Committee established under the original Agreement.

I am pleased to be able to report, Mr. Speaker, that the financial and legislative authority of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador remains unassailed by any of the provisions reached in the negotiations. The people of Conne River feel that that they have a case to make with the Federal Government regarding their access to inclusion under the Indian Act and they have filed suit in the Federal Court of Canada towards that end. I could not and would not allow the authority of this Government, of this hon. House of Assembly, to have been eroded because of this litigation. I am pleased that a mutually agreeable compromise was able to be executed where the interests of all parties were protected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that an agreement has been reached between the Micmac Indians of Conne River and this Government. However, I hasten to add that if that is what it takes for a bunch of human beings in this Province to go on a hunger strike for nine days to get this Government to wake up, more power to those human

May 2, 1983

Tape No. 1498

JV - 3

MR. WARREN: beings. I think this is what has happened, Mr. Speaker, the Micmac Indians of Conne River were forced to go on a hunger strike to make this Government and its Ministers wake up and see reality. If that is what you call successful negotiations, then, Mr. Speaker, this government has to address the concerns of this Province better than they have in the past and with that I would just like to say thanks.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Before we get into the Oral Question Period, on Friday the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) rose on a point of privilege and there were some discussion and debate pertaining to that point of privilege, and I said I would take it under advisement and rule on it later. And certainly when a point of privilege is raised it is a very serious charge and not to be taken lightly by the Chair or any hon. member in this House.

I have reviewed the transcripts of Friday's proceedings and have to say while I cannot find grounds enough to say that the hon. President of the Council established a prima facie case, I have to say that some of the remarks made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) were bordering on a little bit of disrespect for the Chair. It seems to all have arisen because the Chair on perhaps three occasions now has recognized the right of a government backbencher to ask a question of the ministry.

I refer to the first occasion, I think it was, when the Chair recognized the hon. member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) and there was some question raised as to the propriety or right of the hon. member to do that. The Chair made a ruling at that time that it was quite proper for any backbencher, government member or Opposition, to ask a question of the ministry, although it is generally recognized that the Question Period is designed for the Opposition to ask questions of the ministry. That was one ruling.

Approximately a week or so ago the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) raised a question and a supplementary, and there was no point of order raised

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): by the Opposition or anyone else about his right to do that. And thirdly, on Friday the Chair recognized the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), and again the question arose.

I would again like to repeat that it is quite in order, it is done in the House of Commons quite frequently for government backbenchers to ask a question of the ministry, and the Chair will continue to recognize hon. members of the Opposition and the government backbenchers who rise to ask questions of the ministry, although the Chair would not like to see government backbenchers monopolize the Question Period.

All I would ask of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is that in part of his remarks on Friday he said that 'as long as we do things in this House within the realm of good taste, within the realm of the rules, then, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we have a democracy left in this Province.'

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): What the Chair is asking is that when questions are raised or comments made that they be done in the realm of good taste.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions I would like to direct towards the Premier in connection with the current application of Newfoundland Hydro before the Public Utilities Board. As hon. members know, the Public Utilities Board asked to have an independent study done by a firm of chartered accountants to look into four projects that were undertaken by Newfoundland Hydro in the last few years. Now in view of the report that was submitted to Newfoundland Hydro on these projects, which indicated gross mismanagement and incompetence on the part of Newfoundland Hydro, would the Premier not agree that it is imperative, it is essential, it is urgent, that before the application from Newfoundland Hydro for an increase in electrical rates in this Province proceeds, would it not be wise for the administration to appoint a Commission of Inquiry to look into these projects, especially the Upper Salmon and the Cat Arm projects?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think so.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Premier clear up then a matter - item Number 4 in the report - that deals with the permanent access road where the cost jumped from \$11,977,000 up to \$27,443,000, or an increase of \$16.5 million? Could the hon. gentleman tell the House

MR. NEARY: how he can sit there and justify that kind of a jump in expenditure from the original contract of building the road to the Cat Arm site? The road, as we understand it, was just done from aerial photographs and topographical maps and no on the ground investigation was carried out. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House how they can justify that?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are many ways to justify that and I am sure that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and the minister responsible for Hydro will be able to indicate what happened in that particular circumstance. It is not unusual at all, when you get into a situation like we were in at Cat Arm on that road, where expenditures will rise. I can remember first when the Upper Salmon development occurred there were a number of companies as a matter of fact I think went bankrupt as a result of what happened there. The weather conditions as well as the rock conditions could not be accurately determined until the equipment had moved into the area and actually started the excavation. So there are many



PREMIER PECKFORD: explanations for it and I am sure over the next few days, weeks, or whatever, it will be quite easy to substantiate what happened at the Cat Arm development as it relates to the road.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman also tell the House -there was a cost overrun on poles as a result of design faults, survey inaccuracies, inferior quality of poles, and inadequate construction practice -could the hon. gentleman tell us how they can justify that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, the kind of questions that the Leader of the Opposition is asking, obviously I cannot give him the data right off the top of my head. If he wants to put the question on the Order Paper in written form so that I can give the hon. member a detailed written answer, I will be only too happy to do so. Or if he wants to write a letter to the minister responsible for Hydro and get the information that way, that will also be done. But to try to give a detailed answer to that kind of a question in Question Period is, I think, inappropriate. It would take up all the time answering the question which we have agreed, over the last week or so, would not be opportune for either side, for me to get up and give a long answer to a question. Therefore I would urge the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to either put the question on the Order Paper for a written answer or otherwise to write the appropriate minister so that an answer can be given.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I already saw the explanation given by the President of Newfoundland Hydro, which, in my opinion, is really not an answer, just an excuse. I think the elected representatives, because after all Hydro is a creature of this House, a creature of the administration, I believe that the Premier should answer the questions. Now another question in connectin with all the examples of mismanagement and incompetence, there was a cost overrun on conductors as a result of the budget being prepared based on outdated quotations, would the hon. gentleman care to comment on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is going to make extensive preliminaries before he gives a question, well then I will take it that I have the liberty to have just as much time to answer. But I am trying to keep my answers brief in line with experiences that we have had here in the House over the last couple of weeks whereby I think Your Honour has indicated that both sides of the House on occasion have gone away from the rules in asking questions and in giving answers. And I will try to be as brief as I can.

As I have indicated already to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, if in fact he has already

PREMIER PECKFORD:

dismissed some of the explanations given by the President of Hydro, that is his opinion, but it might not be the opinion of the majority of people looking at the explanations given. If he wants me to answer a question as it relates to conductors that were purchased for this development or that development, once again that is a question which is better for the Order Paper about which a detailed written answer can be given.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it was reported by this firm of independent chartered accountants that these extra capital costs were incurred as a result of improper planning and improper budgeting. Now this is a very, very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, which points up gross incompetence and mismanagement in Newfoundland Hydro. Does the Premier not think that as result of these examples that have been brought forward that it would be a wise idea to have a Commission of Inquiry into these and other projects undertaken in recent years by Newfoundland Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we will give full explanations on all the points that are brought up by that independent firm. The minister responsible for Hydro is prepared to answer any questions on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the Premier aware of a study that was done by Acres Engineering in connection with the Upper Salmon and the Cat

MR. NEARY: Arm projects? One of the items in this study indicated that if a power house had been located in a different position it would have saved the taxpayers of this Province and the consumers of electricity \$26 million. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition, if he would like answers to those questions on Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, the minister next to me, who is responsible for Newfoundland Hydro, who has been following up on this, can give the hon. member the answer.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is not aware of the report, or if indeed he is aware of the report, would the hon. the Premier undertake to table the Acres Engineering study on these two projects in the House in the very near future?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question under advisement.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.  
The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is obviously stonewalling on whether or not we should have a Commission of Inquiry. Now would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if he agrees that the Auditor General, who is not allowed, as hon. members know, to audit the accounts of Newfoundland Hydro and various

May 2,1983

Tape No. 1602

ah-3

MR.NEARY: other Crown corporations,  
does the hon. gentleman not think that now is the time to  
invite or to allow the Auditor General to audit the records  
of Newfoundland Hydro?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman has been directing a series of questions to the Premier. Contrary to what the hon. gentleman has been indicating from time to time, this government works as a team and people have their allotted tasks, and the task of Hydro is mine. First of all I want to point out, with respect to his innuendoes and his statements, I suggest he might look at the report itself, and it is not exactly as the hon. gentleman pictured it. Why does he not read all of the report? I refer him to the last paragraph on page 21 of the report, which reads - and this is from the auditors - 'We have reviewed the replies given to the Internal Audit Department by management and have held discussions with management but have not been able' - now, note this, Mr. Speaker - 'have not been able to form an opinion on whether these preplanning deficiencies and cost overruns from budgets have actually resulted in Hydro incurring capital costs which would not have been incurred if proper planning and budgeting had taken place.'

So, Mr. Speaker, in other words, the report to which he is referring, the people who gave the report, the chartered accountants, indicated they were not sure of their grounds. Subsequently, there was a detailed report given by Hydro, which I have here, which answers in explicit terms all of the queries that have been raised.

Now, in answer to the immediate question of the hon. gentleman where he asked, 'Does he not think that there ought to be an inquiry?' the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we are very proud to draw to the hon. gentleman's attention there is such an inquiry.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

The inquiry is going on through the Public Utilities Board, Mr. Speaker, which takes the application for the rate hearing. It was a procedure which this party instituted. Prior, when the hon. gentleman was sitting on this side of the House, they used to do these things in secret Cabinet conclave and the smoke would go up every now and then when billions of dollars had been wasted.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is an inquiry. The Public Utilities Board holds the inquiry. During that period of time in the application for a rate increase, there are special accountants and auditors who come in, there are lawyers who come in and present their case. We, the government, invite all interested parties, such as the Federation of Municipalities, to come in and examine completely all of the factors involved so there is a full, complete and sufficient hearing, Mr. Speaker. We also have a hearing in the House

MR. MARSHALL: through myself as minister responsible. I can respond to any particular questions, the government is completely open and aboveboard with respect to it, Mr. Speaker. There is an enquiry, as I say, a full and complete and exhaustive enquiry, the hearing of which consumed some two weeks and there was ample opportunity. Now the unfortunate part is responses are given, and responses very often depend upon one's interpretation. If one wishes to twist these interpretations one could come up with one conclusion. If one wants to take the responses and look at the responses and assess them in a reasonable fashion, one will see that out of \$800 millions preformed by Hydro in capital works that Hydro has preformed very effectively and very well with respect to it and there are full and sufficient answers in that report for all who wish to see them.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the paragraph that the hon. gentleman quoted from on page 21, the hon. gentleman's explanation is even more damning when you look at the comment of this independent firm of chartered accountants who have not been able to form an opinion, Mr. Speaker. That is precisely the point that I am making, that if they cannot form an opinion then who can? And that is why I am asking the hon. the Premier if he would agree to have an enquiry made into these four projects and other projects undertaken by Hydro in recent years, because we do not know how much more information is being covered up and we would like to see that Acres Engineering Report. And now that the hon. gentleman has been allowed to enter into giving the answers, perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us what is in that report. Will they undertake to table the report in



MR. NEARY:

the House, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, by trying to brush it off on the Public Utilities Board by saying that they do an indepth study, that is not so, Mr. Speaker. Most of the time all the Public Utilities Board does is rubber stamp the applications. This is a very serious matter, it involves millions piled up on millions of dollars. There is a \$16 million mistake in the main road of the Cat Arm Project. I mean, this is unjustifiable. It is just examples of gross mismanagement and incompetence. Now would the hon. gentleman tell us if we are going to get that Acres Engineering Report?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it just simply does not happen to be as the hon. gentleman would want to paint it. The fact of the matter is that these findings were findings that were brought about at the instigation of Hydro itself at an internal enquiry by its internal auditors, and it does this from time to time with the larger amount of money that has been expended so that it can satisfy itself that the money is being spent as wisely as possibly and procedures are being implemented. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about when he talks about people not knowing things. I mean, the auditors plainly and purely and simply - he did not bring this out when he has been talking to the press and saying these things - said they are unable to form an opinion. They did not know when they made that report whether they were right or wrong and they suggested that there should be a response

MR. MARSHALL:

made by Hydro to the Public Utilities Board. Hydro seized on that very, very willingly and very openly seized upon that suggestion and gave such a report.

Now with respect to the Cat Arm road that he is talking about, this is not a matter that has been tried to be swept under the table; this was reported to this House in a statement prior to the adjournment of the House last Fall in complete and absolute detail. And what happened with that, you know, does the hon. gentleman think there should be an inquiry? Well, perhaps there should be an inquiry into the amount of rock in Mealy Mountain or the amount of rock in Torngat Mountains up in Labrador. The fact of the matter, the pure, simple fact of the matter, as set forth in this response and as set forth in the statement that was given is that there was much more material that had to be removed than had originally been anticipated. The fact that there was more meant more had to be paid and was paid on a certain unit cost. That is there. And the fact that it was done does not make the project uneconomic. But this is one of the facts of life you deal with, Mr. Speaker, when you enter into enormous projects of this nature, that you do get cost overrun. Certainly you do not take the cost overruns lightly. If this had been done in the hon. gentleman's day nobody would know about it until about ten years later when they came to the House for borrowing. But this government is completely and absolutely upfront through the House of Assembly and through the Public Utilities Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Opposition.

The hon. Leader of the

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that it looks like the Cat Arm project was

MR. NEARY: started in a hurry, there was no planning put into it, no on-site investigation done, and that is why there was an overrun - it is not an overrun, it was just an engineering blunder. It was a blunder because the original plans were made from airplane photographs and topographical maps and no on-the-ground investigation carried out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that the kind of policy, is that the kind of procedure they use at Newfoundland Hydro in carrying out their project? Is that the kind of engineering procedures that are used at Newfoundland Hydro -

MR. MARSHALL:

Do you want an answer?

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman was not listening and I am going to have to repeat myself, Mr. Speaker. Let me give the hon. gentleman another example about the construction camp services contract, which was budgeted for

MR. NEARY: which was  
because of insufficient and inaccurate information when  
tendering commenced. The whole thing looks like it was put  
together in a hurry, without any planning, any thought,  
put into it. Now how can the hon. gentleman explain that?  
And how can the hon. gentleman just brush it off by saying,  
It was an overrun of \$16 million, which is much  
more than the original contract, when in actual fact no on-  
site investigation was carried out? That is inexcusable.  
Does the hon. gentleman not think there should  
be a further investigation into this?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I will never  
convince the hon. gentleman, I have no desire to convince  
the hon. gentleman anyway. But you will never convince  
him of the situation. Look, the response is given fully  
and sufficiently in the document the hon. gentleman has on  
pages 23, 24 and 25. It is in  
substance what I have already indicated.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Read it. Read it.

MR. MARSHALL: I could read it all but  
I suppose the hon. gentleman there opposite will start  
squealing and squalling over the fact that we are taking  
up too much of the time of Question Period. But perhaps  
I will read it for the hon. gentleman if he wishes me to.  
The response is as follows: 'The contract for the construction  
of the Cat Arm Access Road was tendered on May, 1981, and  
was awarded to the lowest bidder for \$11,977,710, in June.  
The contract award on the road was based on 'unit prices'  
which were then applied to the actual quantity of material  
removed as is normal for all such work in the construction  
industry. The schedule provided for completion of the  
road to the powerhouse and Cat Arm dam sites by December, 1981,

MR. MARSHALL: and June, 1982, respectively.

In preparing quantities for tender documents, Hydro engineering consultants relied on the interpretation of aerial photographs and topographic mapping. The rock quantities actually encountered during construction were substantially higher than those indicated in the tender documents.' Mr. Speaker, that is not the fault of the Tory government, we did not place the rock there, somebody a little bit bigger and larger than ourselves did many, many centuries ago.

'The tender document estimated rock quantities for the entire road to be 840,000 cubic meters. However, by December, 1981' - now this was not towards the end of the contract but early in the contract - 'the contractor had already excavated 700,000 cubic meters of rock, some 83 per cent of the amount originally estimated for the entire contract. Subsequence experience has shown that the total

MR. MARSHALL:

' quantity of rock required to be excavated was 1.4 million cubic meters . One of the reasons that the rock quantities proved to be underestimated was that a complete ground survey was not conducted on the road prior to issuing the tender document. This was a decision made in the Fall of 1980 due to the high cost of the survey and due to the significant uncertainties respecting whether or not construction would actually begin on the Cat Arm in 1981. In fact, during the Fall of 1980, Hydro's efforts were being concentrated on proceedings with a Labrador interconnection to avoid a further generation source on the Island. At that time there was renewed optimism respecting the Lower Churchill, since project recommendations had been received by both the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland in June of 1980. In addition, the environment acceptability of the Cat Arm project was still not proven. The decision not to proceed with a survey must be put in the perspective of spending \$350,000 to finalize a survey of a road associated with the project which was not environmentally improved and which was a suboptimal alternative to the Lower Churchill.' Of course, we were trying to develop the Lower Churchill, as we have year after year after year, but have been unable to because we have been unable to gain appropriate and realistic transmission rights through our neighbouring province. 'The substantial increases in quantities in the difficult terrain sharply reduced the contractor's rate of progress and it became apparent that the work could not be completed within the original schedule which contemplated a shutdown during the Winter months. The completion of the road was on the critical path in the overall project schedule. It was essential to provide access for the major civil contractors to the remainder of the work sites. Therefore every action had

MR. MARSHALL: to be taken to ensure its earliest completion. It was evident that work would have to be continued during the Winter at a much higher cost and this was arranged under the force account provisions of the contract. During the Winter period, the contractor excavated a further 340,000 cubic meters of rock, Hydro determined that the road contractor may not have' -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour gave a ruling earlier, and I believe that the minister -

PREMIER PECKFORD: You do not want the answer.

MR. NEARY: We have the report here. Mr. Speaker, the report is available to the media. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. gentleman is abusing the rules of the House under a ruling Your Honour gave about fifteen minutes ago, that the answer should be brief.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: To that, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants answers to questions he will get answers to questions -

MR. NEARY: I do not want the answers in the book.

MR. MARSHALL: - but I will guarantee the hon. gentleman he will get full answers to questions and not the partial ones that the hon. gentleman can take and twist to his own aims.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would again like to remind hon. members that both the questions and the answers should be as brief as possible.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman could answer this question for me? I have here in front of me a list of the various costs that have been stated publicly for the Cat Arm project. The Daily Commercial News back in 1980 said the cost would be \$250 million. Mr. Vic Young said, when giving evidence before the Public Utilities Board in 1981, the cost would be \$287 million. The minister said in June, 1982 that the cost would be \$449 million, and then the minister said again in April, 1983 the cost would be \$375 million. Mr. Young said in his testimony last week -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition just reminded the Chair that answers to questions should be very brief - now he proceeds to read what appears to be a list of things that somebody said, certainly his question should be brief as well.

MR. HODDER: You did not interrupt him. You did not interrupt the other side.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the hon. gentleman, is he aware that Mr. Young, when giving testimony last week before the Public Utilities Board, disagreed with the figure given in this House by the hon. gentleman? Mr. Young said the cost would be \$390 million. And The Atlantic Resources Review, March, 1983, estimated \$405 million. Now, we have six different cost estimates. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House which one is right? Which one of these six is correct? Which is right and which is wrong? Or should we not call the Auditor General in and have him look at the accounts and tell us once and for all how much it is going to cost to finish that project?

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



MR. MARSHALL: The right one, I dare say, Mr. Speaker, would be the one which is the final one, of course, that comes in at the end of the time. Now, the hon. gentleman, who has a great penchant for twisting everything, has tried for many months and years to try to twist me, but he is not going to be able to twist my answers. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there was a report to this House at the end -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen want answers they will get them, but I do not have to, I do not think, respond in that form.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we have the answer, because the cost per megawatt of electricity at Cat Arm hinges on this. If we take the minister's figure given there last week or the week before last, then we would have \$2.95 million for each megawatt of

MR. NEARY:

power developed. If we take Mr. Young's figure, then the figure will be \$3.07 million for each megawatt of electricity developed at the Cat Arm. Now, which figure is correct?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before the hon. gentleman's colleagues interrupted me, there was an original cost that had accelerated. I gave the figure in my statement last Fall. Recently I gave another statement that shows that the estimated cost has reduced, and it has reduced because of falling interest rates, because of the very favourable construction conditions that appertained this Winter, and because as well, Mr. Speaker, of the monitoring that has been done through Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and their very competent staff who are coping with a development under extremely conditions. That monitoring will continue in the futher and I can assure the House that the final cost will be the cost that is the lowest possible obtainable in the circumstances. So, Mr. Speaker, that is it. The hon. gentleman can talk about this cost and that cost and try to turn over and show inconsistencies, but there is no great mystery in it. What has happened was there was an original estimate; the interest rates accelerated, problems with the road were encountered and the cost went up and Hydro went and tackled these problems. Accompanying its efforts over the past while since I gave that statement last Fall, we have seen a deceleration of interest rates, we have seen a favourable construction schedule, so I was very happy to report to the House, in the last statement I made, that the cost had reduced and we indicated that we would hope to get the estimated cost reduced farther and we will do everything we possibly can, Mr. Speaker, to see that we get the optimum of value for our money.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: In view of the fact that the credibility of Newfoundland Hydro has now been questioned because of the gross mismanagement and incompetence that has been illustrated in this report that was done by an independent chartered accountant firm, would the hon. gentleman not agree now that until these matters are cleared up that the current application for increases in electricity rates - because obviously, Mr. Speaker, this mismanagement and incompetence has a bearing on the applications for increases in electricity rates - would he now not agree that the current application should be placed on hold by the Cabinet until a thorough investigation is carried out into these and other matters relating to projects undertaken by Hydro in recent years?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, mismanagement is the subjective determination of the Leader of the Opposition. I suppose if we wanted to take the Leader of the Opposition's assessment in everything, nothing would happen in this Province because there would be nobody around employed except Liberal party hacks because everybody else would be fired for alleged mismanagement.

Now with respect to the application, Mr. Speaker, I say once again very proudly that there will be no increase granted to Hydro until there has been a hearing before the Public Utilities Board, made up of very competent commissioners, who will examine the application in detail having heard Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and having heard every other interested party, having examined every report, including the reports that the hon. gentleman referred to. It will then make its decision and its recommendations in accordance with the legislation. And I emphasize once again, Mr. Speaker, that this procedure is occurring because of the policies of this government in determining that concerns like Hydro should have to report to a technical board, such as the Public Utilities Board, and place its entire affairs under public spectation. And the very reason why the hon. gentleman is able to ask these questions today is by reason of the procedures that we have implemented. And I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Public Utilities Board hearing process is very healthy, as witnessed by what has occurred, but so is Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, which is responding very effectively to enquiries of the Public Utilities Board and responding very effectively

MR. MARSHALL: also to the construction demands brought about in the Cat Arm project particularly which had proven to be a rather difficult project both because of natural occurrences, the condition of the terrain and because of unforeseen financial accelerations in fiscal costs.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health but he is not in his place so I will ask the question to the Premier.

MR. HOUSE: Here I am.

MR. WARREN:

The Minister of Health (Mr. House) is here now. In view of the fact that the Labrador Branch of the Newfoundland Medical Association has requested the Minister of Health that there would be a separate Grenfell Health Board set up for Labrador, has the minister considered a separate Grenfell Health Board for Labrador other than the Grenfell Health Board that is presently in place?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we put the Grenfell Health Board in place about two and a half years ago to three years ago. We very carefully selected an equal balance of members from both the Island part of the Province and the Labrador part of the Province.

MR. HOUSE:

The Chairman was selected by design to be from the Labrador area, because we wanted to be preceived as giving an equal balance on the Board. That has been done. It is working well. There is some problems that erupt from time to time because of a sort of we/they situation. I think the Board is working well. I have received, yes, as you mentioned, word from the Labrador Branch of the Medical Association to consider this and certainly we will be looking at everything possible to give the best health care delivery to the Labrador people.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon.member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the fact that the minister did say the Board was working satisfactorily is the minister aware that members of the Board agree that it is not working satisfactorily? Members on the Board feel that there should definitely be two Boards, number one, because of the geography. We are talking about covering roughly about 800 miles of coastline and it is just too broad for such a Board to cover. So taking geography into consideration, would the minister seriously consider the request of the Labrador Branch of the Newfoundland Medical Association? And even if the minister could take the present Board now and divide it up and make two Boards out of it, does not the minister think that it probably could work more effectively for Labrador and also for the Northern part of the Island?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, the first part of the question, 'Did I know that some of the Board members think that there should be two Boards in the area?' I do not

MR. HOUSE: know that. The spokesman for the Board is usually the Chairman and the Chairman has never communicated anything of that nature to me. It is not so simple to assume that because of the geography, there is a coastline 800 miles long, that has one Board for Labrador and it is going to make it easy, make it simple. If you follow that line of reasoning I would suggest that you would need about eight boards in Labrador if you are going to take care of the geography.

As I said, I have not had a communication from the Board but I have had it from some other people. I will tell you and the House this, that we are looking at the best possible way and there are other alternatives I think that we can take without dividing our Board. You have to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that you have to have a large enough unit to give medical services to. And I do not think, if you are looking at the 12,000 or 13,000 people in the Labrador area covered by the Board, that you could offer all the services that we now offer with St. Anthony and that part of Labrador included too. So you have to look at that

It is not as simple as saying split the Board up and let us do our thing and they do theirs. It may be good politically for some of the problems that they are having now, but I do not think it is going to be in the best interest of health care in the Province.

MR. HOUSE: These things are being looked at and, as I say, I think there are other alternatives. We meet with the board fairly regularly. As a matter of fact I will say, Mr. Speaker, that board is one of the boards that has a very big job to do. It took over a very difficult situation, and I will go on record as saying that I am very pleased with what they are doing.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Time for Question Period has expired.

#### NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act To Amend The Attachment Of Wages Act", and, "An Act To Amend The Judicature Act".

#### ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), Question No. 32 asked on March 17th regarding the prevention of smuggling into the Province from mainland Canada, he asked what measures have been taken and they are listed here. Perhaps I could mention them briefly, Mr. Speaker.

Firstly, legislation has been changed regarding search and seizure by inspectors and fines and penalties have been increased. Secondly, the RCMP have been very active. They have made at least two major seizures. Thirdly, the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary have been appointed inspectors under the Act. Fourthly, gasoline tax inspectors and taxation auditors are being trained and familiarized with the smuggling problem. And,



DR. COLLINS: fifthly, further legislation changes are in progress.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 1.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Motion 1. I think the debate last day was adjourned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is correct. I think I adjourned the debate on Friday and I would just like to carry on for a few more minutes, Mr. Speaker, and then I hope to be able to conclude my few remarks. No doubt the President of the Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), will spring to his feet and lash out in his usual nasty way -

AN HON. MEMBER: The rapier.

MR. NEARY: That is right, the rapier, about some of the things that have been said.

Now, I want to come back for a moment to the matters I raised during the Oral Question Period today. Now, Mr. Speaker, I tried to be as responsible and as sensible and as commonsensical as I could about asking these questions. I did not want to upset either the Premier or the hon. gentleman because this matter is very urgent

MR. NEARY:

and pressing and very serious by nature. I did not want to rub the hon. gentleman the wrong way so I tried to phrase my questions, Mr. Speaker, in such a way that they would not intimidate or be provocative, that they would not get the hon. gentlemen riled up; I was hoping that I would get some straight, honest answers from hon. gentlemen there opposite. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, just take the answers that were given by the Premier and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) today - I hope that somebody will take Hansard and just go over the answers, Mr. Speaker, and see if we did indeed get straight, honest, frank, no holes-barred answers from hon. gentlemen there opposite.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a worthwhile exercise indeed for the media in this Province to take Hansard which will be available either later this afternoon or tomorrow, and go over, look at the questions, look at the points that were raised by this firm of Chartered Accountants, completely independent of government, and then look at the explanations and the answers and the excuses given by the Premier and by the minister responsible for Newfoundland Hydro. You will discover, Mr. Speaker, much to your dismay - the media, anybody who scrutinizes the answers, will discover, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentlemen did not give straight answers. Even the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) when he was Minister of Energy, gave us more honest answers than that. Unfortunately, to quote Mr. Churchill, 'the hon. gentleman seems to be crying ineffectively in the wilderness and this is bad politics and is self-defeating, as I said to the hon. gentleman the other day.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, if these matters had been raised by the Liberal Party, by somebody in Opposition, if these matters had been raised by some insignificant person in the Province, then the Minister and the Premier may be justified in dismissing the whole matter forthright as they did this afternoon. They just more or less washed their hands clear of this matter and shrugged it off on the Public Utilities Board. Now, we all know what the Public Utilities Board is capable of doing, Mr. Speaker, The price of electricity in this Province has been going up continuously, up, up, up, Every application has been rubber stamped by the Public Utilities Board and rubber stamped by the Cabinet, because, as members know and as the members of the media know, when it comes to Newfoundland Hydro making an application before the Public Utilities Board, the application has to be approved by the Cabinet. When the Public Utilities Board hand down their decision, then the decision has to be approved by the Cabinet. And I have not seen them

MR. NEARY: turn down one yet, they merely rubber stamp decisions of the Public Utilities Board. Now, this is the first attempt, by the way - I have to say this - this is the first attempt that I have seen by the Public Utilities Board to find out what is going on inside of Newfoundland Hydro, when they asked this firm of Chartered Accountants, Noseworthy, Keating, Howard and Kung, to report on four projects, Mr. Speaker. In their terms of reference they said, "We submit this report to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador as requested in a letter dated March 3, 1983, requesting us to determine if reasonable and prudent costs of supplying power to retailers are included in the determination of rates." "More specifically," Mr. Speaker, it said, "we were requested to determine if there had been any changes in the accounting principles and procedures since the last hearing, examine the method of estimating revenue expenditures and earnings for the years estimated in their proposal, compare the estimates made and assumptions used in the evidence at the previous hearing to the actual results for 1981 and 1982, and any estimates that were made for future years at that time, comment on the reasonableness and prudence of administrative and operating expenses in relation to sales of power and energy, check the allocation of any expenses incurred for purposes other than supplying power and energy to Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited and the power distribution districts, to comment on allocation of costs for services as recommended by this board in the past, and any other item that falls within the general terms of reference."

Now, these were very narrow terms of reference indeed, Mr. Speaker. And the firm that commented

MR. NEARY: upon these four projects as they were asked to do in their terms of reference, made certain statements. These are not my statements, and the hon. gentleman can stand over there and he can get personal all he wants, he can be as nasty as he wants, he can try to cast aspersions on the Opposition, on me as Leader of the Opposition, because that is what he did today during the Oral Question Period. But, Mr. Speaker, was it I who said that? Really, the hon. gentleman should have been commenting on what the independent firm of chartered accountants said, never mind me, I was quoting directly from the report, Mr. Speaker. No, the hon. gentleman did not do that.

Well, let us see what they said

MR. NEARY: in responding to the terms of reference, 'There was a cost overrun on poles as a result of design faults, survey inaccuracies, inferior quality of poles, and inadequate construction practices'.

Now, that is pretty straightforward. Even a kindergarten student would understand that. 'There was a cost overrun on conductors as a result of the budget being prepared based on outdated quotations'. Pretty heavy stuff, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty serious stuff. These are not my words. I am not making these charges. The consumers of electricity are not making the charges.

'The permanent access road to Cat Arm was budgeted based upon aerial photographs, and topographical maps. The actual cost to July 1982 was \$27,443,000 compared to the tender price of \$11,977,000, for a difference of over \$16 million'. Not bad, Mr. Speaker, for an outfit that is provided with the best expertise, the highest wages in the whole public service - \$80,000, \$90,000 and \$100,000 for the President of Hydro.

MR. CALLAN: Even hired under a premier's personal advice.

MR. NEARY: That is right. I would say they are the highest in Newfoundland. The hierarchy of Newfoundland Hydro earn the highest wages in this Province and get more fringe benefits than anybody else in this Province. And they did not even bother to carry out the simple engineering procedure of doing on-the-site investigation into that road, they just estimated the cost of the road and called tenders, based on aerial photographs and topographical maps.

Mr. Speaker, is that the way to do things? And the hon. gentleman says my words of gross incompetence and gross mismanagement are an exaggeration or are too strong. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is defending

MR. NEARY:

the indefensible.

And then the report goes on,

'The construction camp services contract and the 69 KV transmission lines at Cat Arm cost significantly more than budgeted because of insufficient and inadequate information when tendering commenced'. Now, is that the fault of the weather? Is that the fault of too much rock on the site, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, they can stonewall all they want. There is nothing we can do about it over here. There are only eight of us. We are trying to do the best job we can.

MR. NEARY: They are forty-four against eight, they can say, 'No, we are going to refuse an investigation into these and other projects undertaken by Hydro in recent years that have contributed greatly to the increased cost of electricity to consumers in this Province.' They can continue to stonewall, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to continue to bring it up because I consider this to be a very, very serious matter indeed. Mr. Young can say all he wants in his reports and his statements to the Public Utilities Board that they have taken steps to correct these matters. Mr. Speaker, how do we know when the Auditor General is not allowed to audit the accounts of Newfoundland Hydro? Mr. Speaker, we have another example today of the type of information we are getting from the administration. I have here in front of me six cost estimates of the Cat Arm Project ranging from \$250 million up to \$449 million, six different estimates given at six different times. And then the hon. gentleman has the gall to stand there and tell us there is no need to take a look at this, that they are all competent down there, they are all a great crowd down at Newfoundland Hydro. Back on September 10, 1980 The Daily Commercial News and Construction Record estimated the cost at \$250 million, I believe that was a figure that was mentioned in this House originally by the Minister responsible for Hydro. Then in 1981 when the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) was Minister of Energy, The Humber Log, on May 27, 1981, quoted Mr. Young in giving evidence before the Public Utilities Board on information given to him by the then Energy Minister, that the cost would be \$287 million. That is \$250 million and \$287 million. And then, Mr. Speaker, in this House of Assembly in June 1982 we were told by the present Minister responsible for Hydro that the cost would be \$449 million. That is \$250 million, \$287 million and \$449 million. And then on



May 2, 1983

Tape No. 1616

MJ - 2

MR. NEARY: April 19, 1983, which was only a couple  
of weeks ago, the same minister told us again that the cost  
now

MR. NEARY:

would be \$375 million, and then Mr. Young in his testimony before the Public Utilities Board last week said that the cost would be \$390 million. Can they not get their act together, Mr. Speaker? That is a difference of \$15 million and that is not peanuts. Or, as the Americans say, that is not hay, a difference of \$15 million. You have the hired help saying \$390 million and you have the minister saying in this House \$375 million, a difference of \$15 million. You would not know but you found it around your pocket in loose change. That \$15 million will cost the consumers of electricity in this Province a few cents on their monthly rate, Mr. Speaker. And then in March 1983 the Atlantic Resource Review estimated the cost at \$405 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, the project, we are told, has 127 megawatts generating capability to displace 1.1 million barrels of oil, therefore, if we use the minister's own figures of \$375 million, Mr. Speaker, we get \$375 million divided by 127 and we have \$2.95 million for each megawatt of electricity generated at Cat Arm. But if we use Mr. Young's figures, the hired help, \$390 million, then we get \$3.07 million for each megawatt of electricity generated at Cat Arm. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a big difference and it will have a large bearing on whether or not electricity rates in this Province will increase dramatically in the future. So they can dismiss it, Mr. Speaker, all they want, the report is there for anybody to see, it is public, it is there for anybody to see. I sent for a copy of it. I also asked the Premier and the minister this afternoon, during the Oral Question Period, to table the Acres Engineering Report which we do not have here. The Acres Engineering Report, I am told, is

MR. NEARY:                               devastating. It should be tabled in this House. In that report, one of the items - I am told from the reports that I have that on one item alone where Acres Engineering were commenting on the site of a powerhouse, they said that if the powerhouse had been put in a different location, a short distance from where it was, it would have saved the taxpayers of this Province and the consumers of electricity \$26 million. How does that strike you, Mr. Speaker? How does that strike you? Twenty-six million dollars could have been saved. The powerhouse was put in the wrong place. Had it been put a little further downstream or upstream, I am not sure which, because I have not read the report, it would have saved the taxpayers \$26 million. That is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker, and no doubt it will have a drastic bearing on the cost of electricity in this Province.

So we are not asking anything unreasonable. All we are asking is for the government to allow the Auditor General to go in and audit the accounts of Newfoundland Hydro or alternatively, have a commission of inquiry into these projects, especially the Upper Salmon and the Cat Arm projects and other projects that are mentioned in the Acres Engineering report.

Mr. Speaker, are we being unreasonable? Are we casting aspersions on anybody? Are we making allegations or insinuations, as the hon. gentleman said during the Oral Question Period? Are we accusing anybody through innuendo? We are asking what it is everybody's right in this Province to have and that is an inquiry into these and other projects undertaken by Newfoundland Hydro in recent years, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I dwelt on this item at some length on Friday. I am not going to belabour

MR. NEARY:

the matter again this afternoon.

We took practically the whole Question Period to air the matter hoping that some of the information would filter out to the consumers of electricity in this Province so that they can see how their money is being spent, so that they can see how they are being asked to pay for people's mismanagement and incompetence, Mr. Speaker. We hope that some of that information will filter through to the taxpayers and to the consumers of electricity in this Province. And I was hoping that at least the administration would agree today to put the current application before the Public Utilities Board on hold

MR. NEARY: until these matters were cleared up. Is that being unreasonable? Are we charging anybody with anything? Are we making insinuations or innuendoes against anybody? No, Mr. Speaker. All we are asking is to have an inquiry into these projects and into the other projects undertaken by Newfoundland Hydro in recent years. The people, the consumers of electricity and the taxpayers of this Province are entitled to have that.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to see the Public Utilities Board or alternatively the Cabinet undertake another study, and that has to do with the distribution of electricity in this Province. Mr. Speaker, we still do not know whether or not it would be justifiable, more feasible for Newfoundland Hydro or a Crown corporation to distribute electricity or leave it in the hands of Newfoundland Light and Power Company.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago, a number of years ago the former Liberal Administration decided to nationalize the production of power in this Province. Every kilowatt, every megawatt of power generated in this Province belongs to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. But, Mr. Speaker, for some reason or other at that time the government in its wisdom did not see fit to provincialize Newfoundland Light and Power Company. What we did, in my opinion, was foolish and crazy, we provincialized or nationalized, for the lack of a better word, I think the right term would be we provincialized the production of power and then we allowed a middleman to distribute that power and make the profit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that has to be looked at. We nationalized the Churchill Falls Corporation and kicked out BRINCO, we nationalized the production of electricity, would it not be proper, Mr. Speaker, for us now to take a look at, in 1983, whether or not we should provincialize

MR. NEARY: the distribution of electricity in this Province if it would be in the best interest of the consumers of electricity, to take away the distribution from Newfoundland Light and Power Company and put it in the hands of Hydro or, as they do in some of the provinces on the Mainland, allow the municipalities to distribute the hydro power, something, Mr. Speaker, that we just cannot forget about, it is sticking out there. Every time an application goes before the Public Utilities Board for an increase in electricity rates the debate starts all over again. People keep asking the question, How long

MR. NEARY:

more will this go on? How long can we stand increases in electricity? How long more can we lie back and watch this mismanagement and incompetence on the part of the officials of Hydro and the Provincial Government? How long more can we allow it to go on and just lie back and take it? Is it not about time that somebody took a look at whether or not we should provincialize the distribution of power in this Province. I do not recall a study ever being done on it. I think it would be a good idea and I think the sooner it is done the better, Mr. Speaker. We cannot go on debating it forever, we have to face up to the situation. It might be a good plank in the platform of some political party in the future to come out and say to the people of this Province - 'Give us your vote, give us a mandate and we will take steps to provincialize Newfoundland Light and Power, and take over the distribution of electricity in this Province.'

Mr. Speaker, another item, by the way, that the hon. minister should address himself to when he stands to respond to my few remarks this afternoon in connection with Hydro has to do with whether or not we have a surplus of power in this Province at the present time. Granted we should always have a small surplus of power, Mr. Speaker, but in view of the number of industries that have closed down and cut back in this Province in recent years, I would think, Mr. Speaker, if we were to get a straight answer from the administration,

MR. NEARY: that we now have a surplus of electricity in this Province as a result of industries closing, shutting down or cutting back, Mr. Speaker. That is something that the minister should address himself to. Because, after all, we are basing our future needs on what is happening in this Province. We have had so many industries close and cut back, Mr. Speaker. This administration can point its finger to one thing that is has done in this Province in the last eleven years and that is that it has closed down industries. It has not opened one mine, for instance, not one mine. They have not opened a single mine in eleven years

MR. CALLAN: Not even their own minds.

MR. NEARY: I am talking about M-I-N-E-S not M-I-N-D-S. I know they have not opened their own minds in eleven years.



MR. NEARY:

But, Mr. Speaker, they have not opened one mine in eleven years. They might have seen one or two fish plants open. But I would say 99 per cent of the fish plants in this Province, that are operating, were built by a Liberal Administration, Mr. Speaker. They have not had any original ideas. They have not started any new industries. They have created a hostile political atmosphere and a hostile economic climate which would be more inclined to drive away business and industry from this Province than it would be to attract business and industry.

The Minister of Development

(Mr. Windsor) travels throughout the world with his briefcase under his arm. Nova Scotia - for instance, I was told this by people who sat in on some of these promotional meetings that were going on in various parts of the world - Nova Scotia will come in and say, "Well, we are rolling out the red carpet to business and industry. We want to create jobs in our Province because of the high unemployment we have. We want to create business and industry for suppliers and sub-contractors in our Province. We want to do all these things. We will roll out the red carpet. We will give you tax concessions. We will provide you with industrial land. We have a good political climate. We are not hostile towards you. We are not going to attack you. You can come in and you can be guaranteed that you are going to be welcome." But what does the minister from Newfoundland say when he is at these conferences? What does he say? He opens up his briefcase and he says, "Look, I do not care who you fellows are, I am the big shot here. Here are the terms and conditions under which you can come into our Province," and he starts laying down some pretty rigid and stiff terms and conditions. And these people then have to make a comparison. They have to make a choice between Nova Scotia,

May 2, 1983

Tape No. 1621

NM - 2

MR. NEARY: New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario,  
and Newfoundland, Newfoundland which has a hostile, economic  
climate, a hostile political climate, and you cannot take  
their word for anything.

MR. HODDER: They are hostile toward foreigners.

MR. NEARY: Hostile to foreigners.

MR. NEARY: hostile to outsiders, Mr. Speaker, cannot get along with anybody. Now when the industrialists and the business people and the money people look at the attitudes, what conclusion do they come to, Mr. Speaker? They say, 'Well, we would not touch that crowd down there with a barge pole, the crowd in Newfoundland. You cannot rely on them, you cannot depend on them, you cannot trust them, they cannot negotiate, they have created a very bad political climate, they are hostile towards outsiders and outside interests. Mr. Speaker, that is the situation we have in this Province at the present time and as a consequence of that we are paying the price. We have the worst unemployment since the Great Depression. We have the highest taxes in Canada and there is no hope in sight for the ordinary Newfoundlander and Labradorian, no hope in sight.

MR. BAIRD: We have the weakest Opposition we ever had.

MR. NEARY: Just because the hon. gentleman said that now that makes it true, I suppose. We have the most arrogant government in our whole history. Mr. Speaker, it is sad, when you come to think of it, it is sad, indeed, very sad, and it is not going to get any better. The situation is not improving. As a matter of fact, if anything it is getting worse.

Now, we were told on the weekend - this is what amuses me about the Premier of this Province. He took to the airways with a little news release over the weekend. He has been under severe criticism and pressure for the last two or three weeks in this House and here is the statement he made on the weekend. Now, just listen - and the poor old media fall for it hook, line and sinker - he says that the fishery of Newfoundland is going to start to recover in the last half of this year. Nothing

MR. NEARY: to back it up, no facts or figures, he does not tell us if markets are going to improve, he does not tell us what dramatic steps his administration are going to take to help restructure the fishery industry in this Province, no, he just makes the statement, pumps out a press release and says that the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador will start to recover in the last half of this year. Now, we have been hearing that for several years past but on what facts does he base his opinion? Did anybody come back and say to him, 'Well, now,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Premier, that is fine, you are making that statement, that is great but now would you mind showing us how this is going to happen? What is going to bring it about? Is it going to be the fact that the Americans may start eating more fish, that McDonalds down in the United States will be buying more cod blocks? Will it be because the administration is going to expand the terms of reference for the Canadian Saltfish Corporation to market all the produce of the Sea? Will it be because Canadians feel that if they want to slim down and lose weight, they want to get back their school boy figures, that they are going to start eating fish because of the low calories?' No, none of that, the hon. gentleman just makes the blanket statement, 'the fishery in Newfoundland will recover in the last half of this year.' I only wish it were true, Mr. Speaker. I just came from the People's Conference.

MR. CALLAN:

Did you hear him on with Rick Seaward the other night?

MR. NEARY:

What did he say?

MR. CALLAN:

The Premier does not know what he is going to do.

MR. NEARY:

Oh, yes. I saw it. Here he was— if we ever saw a true picture of the Premier it was the other night when he was being interviewed. And then I heard him on radio, also being interviewed. 'Well, boy, I do not know.' When he was asked a question, it had to do with the teachers and with education, 'I do not know, boy, I am only the Premier, boy. I really do not know what to say, boy. I do not know what to do or say, boy. What am I going to do.' This is what he was saying, 'Rick, what will I do, Rick?' Mr. Speaker, in this House every day we are telling the hon. gentleman what he should do. If he does not know what to do let him go down to the Lieutenant-Governor and turn in his badge. That is what he should do.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I was over today to the People's Conference. That is the second People's Conference that I have had the honour and the privilege to attend. I must say I came away extremely disappointed at that conference. Not with the sincerity of the people that were there from various parts of Newfoundland and Labrador, not because of that, Mr. Speaker, I came away feeling that the battle was lost, that the war was over. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, the people who live in fishing communities, who depend on the offshore fishery, have been fooled and duped by their representatives in this House.

MR. NEARY: They have had the wool pulled over their eyes by the members who serve them in this House. Everybody who went to the microphone at the People's Conference today expressed frustration, did not know which way to turn. Where do we go from here? What do we do? How did we get into this situation? Why is it that nobody seems to be able to help us? I was one of the people who sat there in utter and complete frustration listening to Mr. Cashin and listening to the various clergy and representatives of communities that depend on the deep-sea fishery for their livelihood. It was sad indeed. And, Mr. Speaker, as I sat there I made a couple of notes. I was tempted to go to the microphone myself and add my few words to what was being said, but after I listened to the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) I decided, Mr. Speaker, that a still tongue sometimes is the wisest choice. So I decided that I would not go to the microphone, Mr. Speaker. I left then and came back to my office, after listening for about a half hour or thirty-five minutes to the Minister of Fisheries up politicking, attacking Ottawa, attacking Kirby. Mr. Speaker, here was another opportunity -

MR. MORGAN: I got a standing ovation for it.

MR. NEARY: I was sitting in the back of the hall and I saw the standing ovation the hon. gentleman got.

MR. MORGAN: Why did you not speak to them?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am coming to that if the hon. gentleman will just give me time.

MR. CALLAN: That is why you did not get up.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the reason I did not get up was because I did not want to be painted as

MR. NEARY: the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was , the provincial Minister of Fisheries who raised his voice, who wanted to portray the impression of emotion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: It was a very emotional issue.

MR. NEARY: But the hon. gentleman was just bluffing. He was bluffing the delegates of that conference, a gigantic bluff, Mr. Speaker. Did the Minister of Fisheries outline for the people at that conference plans that the provincial government have to deal with the restructuring or to deal with anything about the fishery? Did he? I challenge anybody who was at that conference - and I believe the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) was there.

MR. MATTHEWS: You believe. You are not sure, are you?

MR. NEARY: I am not sure. I saw an old red rooster going in and I was not sure if it was the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the hon. gentleman from Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS: You are not too sure about too many things.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Fisheries lay out before that conference plans, provincial plans for the development of the fishery? Did he? Mr. Speaker, no, he did not. Did the Minister of Fisheries tell that conference that went on, and it is probably still going on,



MR. NEARY: what input the provincial government will have in the way of putting some financial support behind the restructuring? Can anybody on the government benches, can any member there opposite tell this House what input the provincial government will have in the way of financial support for the restructuring of the fishing industry in this Province? So far there has been a big zilch, zero, zero.

MR. DINN: It was \$61 million.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about the past. We are not talking about the past. We have a very serious situation in front of us. The hon. gentlemen, I know they have some kind of a hang up about the past, a fixation about the past, and, Mr. Speaker, their \$61 million they are talking about is not washing with the people. They are not paying any attention to it. What they want to know - there is a restructuring programme in the works, underway, could hon. gentlemen tell us where in the budget, and that is what we are having now, the budget debate, where in the budget can I find one cent of provincial money that will go towards restructuring of the fishing industry.

MR. MATTHEWS: You found it last year.

MR. NEARY: Where? Now, Mr. Speaker, over at the conference today there was discussion about a day of protest. You know, I believe, Mr. Speaker, I believe that should happen. I think the union should take the lead.

MR. WARREN: Take the bull by the horns.

MR. NEARY: Yes. I think the union should take the bull by the horns and I think that as a demonstration of the seriousness of this situation we should have a one day general strike in this Province, a one day general strike, Mr. Speaker, just to show this administration across the way, and to show Ottawa, that we are determined, that we are

MR. NEARY: serious about this matter.

DR. COLLINS: That would be civil disobedience.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, not civil disobedience, a one day general strike, peaceful marching and peaceful demonstrating and peaceful picketing.

MR. MATTHEWS: You gathered they are going to do that today, did you?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, all I heard was some discussion of a day of protest. I do not think it should be confined to fish plant workers and fishermen, I think it should be, if it is going to be effective and dramatic, it should be a one day general strike of all workers in this Province to show their protest over the way that the fishery is being handled by this administration and by the administration up in Ottawa.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon.  
member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that  
openly advocating civil disobedience in this House of Assembly  
is entirely out of order and should be punished by more than  
being ruled out of order, but by actual exclusion.

MR. HODDER: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the  
hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member  
for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was referring to some feeling that  
was shown at the People's Conference this morning. Mr.  
Speaker, certainly advocating that Newfoundland show its  
united support would be much more sensible than the stupid  
Day of Mourning which the government participated in, costing  
the Province \$18 million, earlier this year.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I  
feel there is no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that is where we  
stand on the fishery situation. We told the People's  
Conference on March 28th, I think it was, that we stood  
behind them, that it was the policy of our Party - although  
we may be few in numbers, Mr. Speaker, in this House, we  
are an old Party, we are strong at heart. Our Party is  
better organized throughout the Province than it has ever  
been in our whole history. And we will find out this  
weekend, Mr. Speaker, when 400 or 500 people gravitate  
towards Gander to the biggest political youth convention  
ever held in the history of this Province. It will be  
the largest political youth convention ever held in the  
history of this Province. But I am not going to say any

MR. NEARY: more about that. I am not going to let out any of our secrets, Mr. Speaker. But I can guarantee you this, that we have had a team going around this Province in the last year, Mr. Speaker, that has restored the sense of direction of this Party if, indeed, we did lose it. If we had lost it since the 1970s, the early 1970s, we certainly have it back today. And that will be clearly demonstrated in the weeks and the months ahead, Mr. Speaker, that this Party has a great sense of direction. The one sense of direction that we have is this, that the Liberal Party has always stood by the fishery in this Province.

MR. DINN: Burn your boats! Let the companies go! Do not give them a cent.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping to wind up my few remarks but they

MR. NEARY: keep interrupting me, of course.

All they are doing is prolonging the agony.

To confirm what I am saying Mr. Speaker, let me go back to year one of Confederation, and let me start at year one and work up to the end of the Liberal Administration, twenty-three years later, and let me show hon. gentlemen how silly that statement is that they can keep making about 'burn your boats' Well, now, here is the party where the leader said, 'burn your boats', Back in 1949, the first year of Confederation, 1949-1950, Mr. Speaker, development of the fisheries. The Fishery Loan Board was created, the Fishermen's Loan Board was created, financial assistance to the fish plant at Bay Roberts, financial assistance to the Crosbie firm to introduce the use of marine pump to pump herring on board herring boats. Government sent Colin Storey on a tour of Iceland, Scotland, England, Norway, Sweden, Germany, and Denmark to observe and report on the latest fishery techniques in those countries. That was only year one, Mr. Speaker. We were only in our infancy, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about year two?

MR. NEARY: Well, what happened in year two as far as the fishery is concerned?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Labrador fishery went out.

MR. NEARY: Year two. One of the half dozen of the greatest developments in the fishery in all our history was introduced. What was that, Mr. Speaker? Who introduced it? And what was it? It was a Liberal government. What did they introduce? One of the greatest developments in the long history of our fisheries in this Province, Mr. Speaker, what was it? I bet you hon. gentlemen could not even hazard a guess. All they do is make guttersnipe remarks

MR. NEARY: across the House about somebody saying burn your boats. Well, this is the same gentleman who headed up the administration that introduced the longliners into Newfoundland. The longliners for the first time introduced into Newfoundland. Two Iceland herring vessels were retained to do experimental fishing for herring, financial assistance given to fish plants at Lawn, \$1 million granted as working capital to the newly formed Fishermen's Development Loan Board. And that is only year three. That was year two, excuse me, Mr. Speaker. What about year three?

Let us see what happened in the development of the fisheries in this Province in year three compared to what we are seeing at the present time. A new fish plant was started at Seldom, a new fish plant started at Gaultois. The one now that this crowd are closing down was started by a Liberal administration, built in Gaultois. The new Crosbie fish plant started at William's Port in White Bay. That was only year three, Mr. Speaker. We are getting there, she is warming up.

What about year four? What did we see in the way of development of the fisheries in year four for an administration that did not do very much to help the fishery? Government appointed a royal commission on the fisheries, with Sir Albert Walsh as its Chairman, to recommend fishery development. Two Labrador schooners put into experimental use as longliners, fish plant

MR. NEARY: at Joe Batt's Arm given financial help, Northeast Fisheries of Harbour Grace given \$1 million financial help to acquire two draggers for their Fermeuse plant. The so-called Fisherman's Fund in the Treasury was granted on an annual basis to the Federation of Fishermen to finance its efforts in aid of the fishermen. Year four, Mr. Speaker. Not bad for an administration that was not interested in the fishery. Compare now - that is only four years - compare these four years to what this administration has done in the last eleven years. Well, let us see what happened in year five, Mr. Speaker. The Fishery Development Authority was instituted. Government launched a new programme of fishery development. And listen to this one, Mr. Speaker! Perhaps the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) should listen to this one, because I hear the hon. gentleman getting up here in his simplicity occasionally, parroting what the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) says about the Opposition, that we are not interested in the fishery, we could not care less; the Liberal administration in the past did not care less about the fishery. Well, what did they do for Trepassey? Does the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) know? What did that Liberal administration do for Trepassey, which now has serving as the member for that district his seat mate, who now is an expert on everything, toeing the party line? Well, I will tell this House what that much-maligned Liberal Government did - large new fish processing plant built at Trepassey. How is that, Mr. Speaker? How is that for a government that did not do very much for the fishery? - said, 'Burn your boats.' That is all they wanted you to do, burn your boats.

MR. BAIRD:

Did he say that or did he not?

MR. NEARY:

Hon. gentlemen should listen because maybe their very lives are affected by these great decisions that were made back in 1951 through 1955. Mr. Speaker, the whole future of the fishery was decided in those days.

Now, let us come to year number six, and I still have seventeen years to go. Year six, 1954 - 1955, well, what happened that year, Mr. Speaker, in the way of development of the fisheries? New fish processing plant built in Witless Bay, new fish processing plant built in Fortune.



MR. NEARY: Where is the old red rooster gone?  
New processing plant for Margaree.

MR. YOUNG: Where is that one?

MR. NEARY: That is in my own district.  
New fish processing plant for Forteau in Labrador,  
community stage for Change Islands, community stage  
for Forteau in Labrador, and Bruce Feather was sent by the  
government on a visit to South Africa. Mr. Speaker, not bad  
for a government that did not want to do anything about the  
fishery. Now that is only six years and this administration  
has been over there eleven years. I could stop right now.  
I think I have shown the House that a Liberal administration  
did more in the first six years of Confederation than this  
administration has done in the last eleven years for the  
fishery in this Province, but does my colleague want me to  
stop?

MR. WARREN: No, Sir, do not stop now.

MR. DINN: What year was that?

MR. NEARY: That was year six. We will go on  
to year seven. The member was not in his seat, I do not  
think, no. He is gone again. Now what happened in year  
seven, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DINN: I would say nothing.

MR. NEARY: Nothing happened in year seven.  
The old Liberals just sat back and did not do anything.  
Just sat back, did not do anything, twiddled their thumbs,  
threw paper airplanes around their offices, into the  
empty waste paper baskets, did nothing. Well, now, Mr.  
Speaker, in year seven a fish processing plant started  
in South Dildo, and a community stage was built at Great  
Merasheen. When we hear the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson)  
there ranting and raving and frothing at the mouth and wild-  
eyed criticizing the administration about resettlement and  
so forth, well who built that community stage at Great Merasheen?

MR. PATTERSON: Why did they build it

MR. PATTERSON: and move the people  
out the next year, tell me that?

MR. NEARY: That is a question that the hon.  
gentleman should ask his own administration. When this administration are  
forcing the people to go out to Alberta to look for jobs,  
perhaps the hon. gentleman should ask that question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is only year  
seven. What happened in year eight? She is only starting  
to get good now. Mr. Speaker, what happened in year eight?

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible) an event in itself.

MR. NEARY: Yes.

All right now, development of the  
fisheries in year eight: Well, did the Liberals, Mr. Smallwood  
and all the crowd that were with him, did they just lie back?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON: That was the year he ran against Bill  
Patterson in Placentia.

MR. WARREN: He beat Bill Patterson too, did he  
not?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, he beat Bill Patterson but  
there was more corruption down there. He spent \$10 million to beat  
me and just barely succeeded.

MR. WARREN: What happened in the last election  
down there?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will  
find his place in the Guinness Book of World Records, he ran  
twelve times before he got elected.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not run in a different district.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, I ran in the same district twelve times, I  
did not run away.

MR. NEARY: I congratulate the hon. gentleman  
for his persistence. He kept running until

MR. NEARY: the people down there finally decided, well, the only way we can get rid of this fellow is to elect him and send him into St. John's, get rid of him. Twelve times he ran.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a good member and he will never be defeated.

MR. NEARY: I hope the hon. gentleman will appreciate the record. These are facts. These are not just made up, these are facts. They are a matter of public record, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman may not like to hear these facts, but they are facts, they cannot be denied. And I want the administration to stand up in this House, after I am finished - I am talking now about year eight - and tell us, give us their record like I am giving them the Liberal record, for twenty-three years. Let us hear their record for the last eleven years. Mr. Speaker, you talk about a government and administration of development, my God, who believed in development and progress. Listen to this, year eight, 1956 to 1957, fish processing plant for Catalina. Catalina, whose district is that in? I hope the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is listening.

MR. MORGAN: Not mine - it is not in my district.

MR. NEARY: It is right in the adjoining district. Fish processing plant for Catalina -

MR. MORGAN: Who built that?

MR. NEARY: The Liberal administration.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, yes, DREE funds.

MR. NEARY: In the eighth year of Confederation -

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, who built the fish plant in Badger's Quay? Was it the Tories? Was it the NDP? Was it the Social Credit? Was it the Non-Conformist Party, the United Newfoundland Party? Who built the fish plant in Badger's Quay?

MR. CROSS: Who ever expanded Greenspond?

MR. NEARY: Who built it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Who built it and who closed it, the first one that was there?

MR. NEARY: Well, back in year eight of Confederation, when we had a Liberal administration in this Province, there was a processing plant built in Badger's Quay. Well, what about Heart's Desire? Who built the fish plant in Heart's Desire?

MR. WARREN: In Trinity Bay.

MR. DOYLE: Who built the chocolate factory?

MR. NEARY: In Trinity Bay, Mr. Speaker -

who looked after the rural parts of this Province? Who developed the fishery in this Province. The fish processing plant for Heart's Desire was built, Mr. Speaker, by a Liberal administration. And what about the fish processing plant in Port au Basques, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DINN: Who built the mushroom factory?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should ask the question - Who built and opened the Oil Refinery, Mr. Speaker?

MR. PATTERSON: Who closed the chocolate plant?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) should ask the question, who opened the oil refinery? Who built the oil refinery at Holyrood and who closed it down? The hon. gentleman should ask himself that question. But I am dealing with fisheries now. I will go through all the other developments if hon. members want me to, for twenty-three years. But I am only dealing with the fisheries now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOYLE: Who built the chocolate factory?

MR. NEARY: Year eight, a community stage built at L'Anse-au-Clair.

MR. HOUSE: Who did? I thought that was (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: There was a government that looked after rural Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us turn back the clock to year nine and let us see what happened. Not too much happened. Actually, not too much happened in year nine. All the government did -

MR. WARREN: Frank Ryan is a contributor to the PC Party.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, anybody who is a bagman for the Tory Party, anybody who is involved in skulduggery for the Tory Party, anybody who milks the public treasury when the Tory Party is there, they are gentlemen. They are gentlemen, Mr. Speaker. They are gentlemen.

But, Mr. Speaker, listen to this, in the year nine not too much done in the way -

MR. DINN: Why do you not name them and say what the skulduggery is? I mean, I do not have to say it inside the House, I can say it inside and outside.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could you get the hon. gentleman to restrain himself?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, not too much activity in year nine. The only thing we had was the government appointed a royal commission to study and recommend solutions of the fishery problems of the Southwest Coast. The hon. John T. Cheeseman was the Chairman of that Commission, the Chesseman Report. And a fish processing plant for Catalina, there was more assistance for that plant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, year ten, we are getting there. We are getting there. Have hon. members heard enough yet? Have they heard enough yet? Are they embarrassed enough yet? Are they embarrassed enough yet, Mr. Speaker? When they point to their own record and I can stand here and reel off all the things that the Liberal Government did for the fishery in this Province, are they not ashamed of themselves?

Not too much happened in year ten after Confederation. Ten years after Confederation,

MR. NEARY: not too much at all. All the government did was decide to station a fishery representative in Jamaica and other West Indian Islands. Mr. Donald Andrews was sent there to cultivate the salt fish market. That was not too important. We only had large markets in the West Indies then; we have lost them since, we lost them mainly through the attitude of this administration. And, Mr. Speaker, financial assistants to the Crosbie company to acquire the means of electro fishing for herring, and a community stage for St. Lawrence, and a community stage for Ming's Bight. That was year ten.

Now year eleven, what happened then? Year eleven, Mr. Speaker, getting scarce. The Liberals did not do too much in year eleven. All they did was provide government subsidies to a Newfoundland ship for conveying Newfoundland fish to the Caribbean countries. That was all they did. And in year eleven they only built a fish plant over in Carbonear. Where is the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach)? I do not see him there now perking his ears up.

MR. CALLAN: He is out marching with the  
(inaudible)

MR. NEARY: He is out - who is he marching with? And they only built a community stage for Crow Head, nothing worthwhile, and a community stage for Pacquet, hardly worth mentioning, Mr. Speaker, in the great march forward. What about year number twelve? What did we do in year number twelve? The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) should hear this one.

MR. CALLAN: That was an election year, there was nothing done.

MR. NEARY: No, nothing done this year only four or five plants built, that is all. Mr. Speaker. listen, year number twelve, the fiscal year 1960/1961

AN HON. MEMBER:

That was not an election year.

MR. NEARY:

No election that year, the election was not until 1962. That was when I had the honour and the privilege of being elected for the first time to this House. But the year before I came into this House, did the Liberals ignore the fishery like the Tories are now doing? Well, here is what they did. They built a fish



MR. NEARY: plant at Twillingate. Not bad for a government that was not interested in the fishery. They built a fish processing plant at Bay Bulls,

MR. WARREN: On the Southern Shore.

MR. NEARY: On the Southern Shore. They built a community stage for Beaumont, a community stage for Fleur de Lys, and a community stage for Leading Tickles. Not a very good year, I suppose, for the fishery. Just keep her going, develop, build more plants.

Now, year thirteen what did we do? Did we do anything for the fishery at all in year thirteen?

MR. WARREN: That is an unlucky number.

MR. NEARY: Thirteen. Well, my hon. friend says it is an unlucky number.

MR. DINN: Are you going to get to 1970-1971?

MR. NEARY: So we just lay back, Mr. Speaker, the government lay back and did not do anything, did not do anything worthwhile except this, Mr. Speaker, they opened -

MR. WOODROW: They had full employment in Greenspond, but they closed down the fish plant and tried to -

MR. NEARY: They opened a fish plant at St. Anthony. The tired old Liberal Government who was not interested in the fishery in year thirteen of Confederation, 1961-1962, not interested in the fishery, lay back, tired, worn out, no interest at all in developing the fishery in this Province, what did they do that year? They built a fish plant at St. Anthony, opened a fish processing plant in St. John's, opened a fish plant in Port de Grave, opened a plant at Rose Blanche and a community stage for Conche.

MR. NEARY: That is not bad. I believe my hon. friend for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) if he is fair-minded, would have to give a few marks for that.

MR. WOODROW: What did they do in the Bay of Islands?

MR. NEARY: What did they do in the Bay of Islands? Well, if the hon. gentleman will just listen long enough he will hear Bay of Islands in there somewhere. There is not a part of Newfoundland and Labrador that the Liberal Administration neglected.

Now let us see what they did in year fourteen of Confederation, the year I came in the government. Mr. Speaker, I want you to listen to this. Now, hon. gentlemen will remember that we had a Newfoundland Government Savings Bank in this Province. Well, what did the administration of the day do with that bank? It was there before Confederation. Hon. gentlemen do not even remember. Well, I remember it. After Confederation, when it became redundant, there was no longer any need for it, what did the Newfoundland Government of the day, a Liberal Government do with it? Did they close it up? Did they burn it down? Did they force it into bankruptcy? Or, Mr. Speaker, did they put it to good use?

MR. WARREN: I would say they closed it down.

MR. NEARY: They closed it down.

Well, here is what they did. The Newfoundland Government Savings Bank was sold to the Bank of Montreal. Most of the several millions of dollars received for it was spent to help fishermen to buy new fishing gear etc.

MR. NEARY: Just imagine! Sold it and used the many millions of dollars to help the fishermen!

MR. WARREN: What did they do with Mount Scio House?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yes, that is a good question: What did this administration do when they closed Mount Scio House, that palace up there in the Garden of Eden where the Premier used to live? - but we shamed him into moving out and now he is living in an apartment and only charging the taxpayers \$10,800 a year.

Mr. Speaker, what else did the Liberals do in year fourteen? Well, they built a fish processing plant at Harbour Breton. And what did this crowd do with the fish plant at Harbour Breton? The Liberals built it in 1962. In the fiscal year 1962 - 1963, the Liberals built and opened the fish plant at Harbour Breton. And who closed it down? Under whose administration is it closed down?

AN HON. MEMBER: Joey's?

MR. NEARY: Can you blame that on Joey, Mr. Speaker? Joey and his administration opened it. Who closed it? Community state for Lumsden South, community stage for Old Perlican, community stage for Point Lance, community stage for Sandy Cove, and government introduced a new five year programme to pay a bonus on top quality codfish. That was back in 1962 - 1963. We started quality control. And who got it off the rails? We have had eleven years of Toryism in this Province. And I remember the old people used to say to me that a Tory Government was never any good. Tory times were hard times and a Tory Government, the old people used to say, was never any good -

MR. WARREN: And it never will be.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker. And it never will be, as my hon. colleague says. All these beautiful facilities started by the Liberals and closed down, shut down by the Tories. There was a community stage for Old Perlican, a community stage for Point Lance, a community stage for Sandy Cove. And, Mr. Speaker, listen to this, by this time, by the fiscal year 1962 - 1963, by this time 1,500 fishing boats fifteen feet to one hundred and fifty long, were built with government help since Confederation came. Not bad for a Premier and an administration who said, 'Burn your boats.' Since Confederation 1,500 boats built, 1,300 new engines provided, 3,000 new or repaired cod traps, 20,000 new nylon nets and lines etc., 4,000 new additional fishermen's stages, 80 new bait depots, 12 refrigerated trucks, 1 refrigerated ship to carry bait, all of these since 1949. Not bad for an administration that was not interested in the fisheries, and I am only up to year fourteen, I still have nine years to go.

Mr. Speaker, let me see what happened in the next year, year fifteen. No wonder hon. gentlemen are sitting over there so silent today. No wonder they are hanging their heads in shame and reading their newspapers and kicking their feet up on the desks. They have not got the face to look across the House. They cannot look you straight in the eye. They have not had a quorum for the last hour and it is up to the government to keep fourteen members in this House. They have forty-four and they cannot even keep fourteen in the House.

Mr. Speaker, what happened in year fifteen as far as the fisheries are concerned?

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: It is going to be very difficult. If we can put it on hold for a moment, I would be glad to do it. Mr. Speaker, in the way of the development of fisheries,

May 2, 1983

Tape No. 1636

MJ - 2

MR. NEARY:                      year fifteen, a very large, probably  
the largest conference in Newfoundland's history, was

MR. NEARY: called by the Premier to consider the fisheries. Delegates attended from all the coast of the Island of Newfoundland and Labrador and from mainland Canada, from the federal and provincial governments, the West Indies and from marketing people in Europe. That is not bad for a government that did not have very much interest in the fisheries.

And, Mr. Speaker, listen to this. The most far-reaching, thorough-going fishery programme ever seen in Newfoundland was developed in and in conjunction with the Fisheries Conference, the most far-reaching programme of development in the fisheries ever undertaken in this Province. A community stage was built in Salvage and a community stage in Coachman's Cove.

MR. MARSHALL: What year?

MR. NEARY: We are gradually getting there, Mr. Speaker, year sixteen. Let us see what happened in year sixteen in the way of fishery development.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nothing happened.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend says nothing happened. I hope I never hear a peep out of any member on the benches there opposite in future about the development of the fisheries in this Province and who is responsible for it, and who is responsible for closing it down.

MR. CALLAN: Tell us about the fire you had.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they should tell us about the fire they had up in the fishery building.

MR. WARREN: Who was the Minister of Fisheries then?

MR. NEARY: Bully boy Crosbie was Minister of Fisheries then. Bully boy ran away. He is going to run now for the leadership of the national Tory Party. He ran here for the leadership of the Liberal Party, went back and

MR. NEARY:                               forth across the House three or four times. And, incidentally, he fell flat in his speech, fell flat, I would put him down fifth or sixth.

  I was listening to Bully boy the other day. He was telling the people of Canada that he believed in the private enterprise system, he did not believe in nationalizing industries. He did not believe in that. He nearly wrecked this Province while he was here as Minister of Finance. He nationalized the Linerboard mill out in Stephenville at a cost of \$500 million to the taxpayers of this Province. And who nationalized Churchill Falls Corporation and BRINCO and kicked out one of the best corporate citizens we ever had in this Province? Who was it did that? Was it Mr. Clean who is now running for the party?

DR. COLLINS:                               Was BRINCO involved in any way with the Upper Churchill?

MR. NEARY:                               Mr. Speaker, that is beneath contempt. I would not even dare to respond to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has just come through a very trying time in which he got severely

MR. NEARY:

battered and bruised, in which he was severely battered and bruised, Mr. Speaker, and stood up in this House on Friday and tried to get pity from members of the House, tried to get a little pity for himself. Well, there is no pity for the hon. gentleman, for the old red rooster, Mr. Speaker. But I do not want to be distracted here now. I am up to year sixteen and the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) is down there listening intently to what I am saying. Year sixteen, government secured - listen to this, Mr. Speaker. Just in case hon. gentlemen need their memories refreshed, just listen - the government secured enactment by the House of Assembly of Fish Marketing Board Act. This together with federal collaboration, brought the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. Not bad for a government that was just laying back on their oars, slinging and slouching in their seats and doing nothing in this House. What else did they do that year? Well, the government sent Donald Andrews, Captain Matt Whelan and Don Burry as a delegation to Japan to observe that country's fisheries.

MR. WARREN:

That is why the Japanese

are here today.

MR. NEARY:

That is right. That is why

we have the Japanese in here today. The government sent Harold Dawe and Alec Stacey and Ron Annison as a delegation to Iceland, Scotland, England, Norway, Germany, France and Ireland to observe their fisheries. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we were just laying back hoping she would fold up, hoping the problems would disappear. And what else did we do? We built a fish plant at L'Anse au Loup in Labrador, a community stage for Black Duck Cove and a community stage for Mortons Harbour.

MR. CALLAN:

You have not mentioned

Trinity yet.



May 2, 1983

Tape No. 1638

ah-2

MR. NEARY:

Oh, yes, I did mention  
Trinity. Now, Mr. Speaker, in year seventeen what did we  
do? This is a matter of public record.

MR. NEARY: Anybody who has a memory or who can do a bit of research can get this information. It is a matter of public record. I am not making it up. Hon. gentlemen will get up over there and, you know, they make off-the-cuff remarks and statements, nothing to back it up, like the Premier over the weekend. 'The fishery' he says, 'is going to start to recover the last part of this year.' Nothing to back it up. At least when we make a statement, Mr. Speaker, we can back it up, and I am backing up my statement here now with facts and figures to show what a Liberal administration did in the way of development in this Province.

DR. COLLINS: I think maybe a little earlier you said the fishery and not the economy, did you not? I am just correcting you for the record.

MR. WARREN: What is the fishery if it is not the economy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the economy in due course. I am talking about development of the fishery now, year seventeen of Confederation, Bird's Eye, Unilever, fish enterprises announced for Harbour Grace. Bird's Eye announced for Harbour Grace.

Mr. Speaker, just listen to this, and this is the crowd that wanted to burn your boats. Over forty new fishing vessels built under the Fishing Ships (Bounties) Act that year. Over forty fishing vessels built under a Bounty brought in by a Liberal government that wanted people to burn their boats. Not bad! A fish processing plant opened at Bay de Verde by Quinlan Brothers, a community stage for Capstan Island and a community stage for Mount Arlington Heights. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: year eighteen.-

MR. CALLAN: They are getting scarce now over there.

MR. NEARY: They are getting scarce now,  
I tell you, getting scarce. Year eighteen - what happened  
in year eighteen in Newfoundland? Listen, listen to this  
now. Where is the member for Burin-Placentia West  
(Mr. Tobin)? What happened in year eighteen of Confederation  
under a Liberal administration?

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is the man to know about it?

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland government's big  
fish plant opened at Marystown. Marystown, where is that?  
Where is Marystown? A new Ross-Steers

MR. NEARY: salt fish plant opened in St. John's. New Ross-Steers fresh fish plant opened in St. John's. Dildo gets a community stage. Ochre Pit Cove gets a community stage. Savage Cove gets a community stage, and Shoe Cove Brook gets a community stage.

Mr. Speaker, not bad for a government that did not want to do anything for the fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, you could take any one of the nineteen years that I have so far laid out for hon. gentlemen, you could take any one of these years and any one of these years will be better than the track record of this administration since they took over eleven years ago. They have a record of shutting down fish plants, shutting them down. We hear once in a while people say in this Province, "Oh, you can compare the present Premier to the former Premier." Like heck you can. Mr. Speaker, can you? The former Premier was a builder. Mr. Smallwood was a builder and a developer, a man who developed the Province. Is this administration developing and building? I ask hon. members to tell this House honestly, fairly and squarely, be honest with yourselves and your constituents, and do not turn your backs on your constituents, is this Premier a builder and a developer? Well, what happened in year nineteen, Mr. Speaker? \$1 million financial assistance to Northeast Fisheries of Harbour Grace, a fish processing plant at St. John's, a fish processing plant at Cox's Cove. My hon. friend was wondering when he was going to get in on the act. A fish processing plant at Cox's Cove, Bay of Islands. That is the stuff.

MR. WOODROW: We are hoping to get another one there now.

MR. NEARY:

You will have to get a Liberal Government back if you want to get it there.

A community stage was built at Ladle Cove, a community stage for Little St. Lawrence, a community stage for Tors Cove, and a community stage for Lower Island Cove. In the past three years, now remember, three years prior to year nineteen, in the past three years the government has spent \$1 million as bounties on 115 fishing vessels over 35 feet. Now remember, Mr. Speaker, remember that the President of the Council will start the chorus when he gets on his feet, he will start the chorus of 'Burn your boats.

MR. NEARY: Burn your boats.' Well, in three years the Liberal administration spent \$1 million on bounties to 115 fishing vessels over thirty-five feet, \$500,000 on smaller fishing vessels, and over \$1 million as bounties on nets and trawl lines, and these bounties helped fishermen to obtain over 2,000 skiffs, 36,000 gill nets and 8,500 trawl lines. Mr. Speaker, 'Burn your boats?' Will anybody on that side of the House ever have the cheek and the nerve to get up again. Mr. Speaker, I am coming now down to year number twenty, I have three more years to go. And hon. gentleman of the right vintage, if they are of the right age will remember what happened in year twenty. It was a year of complete revolution in the fishing industry; large financial assistance towards the cost of two new Ross-Steers Fish Processing Plants, one salt fish and one fresh fish, fish processing plant at Aquaforte, fish processing plant at Isle aux Morts, fish processing plant at New Harbour, fish processing plant at St. Bride's, community stage at Brigus South and a community stage at Cape Broyle. 1970 - 1971, Mr. Speaker, we are getting near the end here now. It case hon. gentlemen need any more convincing than I have already given them, let us see, Mr. Speaker, what happened in the year 1970 - 1971 in the way of development of the fisheries. One of the most distinguished and successful reforms ever brought to Newfoundland's fisheries came when the Canadian Saltfish Corporation was formed mainly on the initiative and by the efforts of the Newfoundland government. Is that not amazing, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WARREN: And a true fact.

MR. NEARY: And a fact. It is history, it is a fact of history that nobody can deny.

May 2, 1983

Tape No. 1641

MJ - 2

MR. NEARY:

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker. I  
want members to pay attention to this.

I know they are ashamed, I know they  
do not want to hear it, I know, Mr. Speaker, when I am listing  
these great accomplishments of the Liberal government that

MR. NEARY: they only wish they could crawl into a hole and take the hole in with them, they are so ashamed of themselves. What happened in year twenty-two, Mr. Speaker? Well, a notable new institute was brought in for the fisheries this year namely - could anybody name what they were, what the new renovation was, what the new reform was that was brought in in year twenty-two, year 1970/71? What was the great reform? What was it? Could anybody there opposite hazard a guess?

MR. HODDER: What year?

MR. NEARY: Between 1970 and 1971.

Year twenty-two of Confederation, of great fishery development, what happened in that year? Are they too ashamed to speak up over there?

MR. WARREN: The Fisheries College.

MR. NEARY: No, not the Fisheries College.

MR. HODDER: That was open before that, was it not?

MR. NEARY: Yes. It says, 'A notable new institution was brought in for the fisheries this year namely'. Does the hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) care to hazard to guess? Perhaps the Minister of Health (Mr. House) would like to have a go at it? Perhaps the member for Bay of Island (Mr. Woodrow) who has been listening to every word I said down there, who knows that every word I said is true. The hon. gentleman used to be a great supporter of the Liberal Party in those days.

Well, here is what happened. Here was the great reform, the great step forward. It was the building for the first time in this Province of Marine Service Stations to give mechanical and such service to longliners and other fishing boats in the same way that garages provide service to cars and trucks. Not bad for a government that was just lying down, not paying any



May 2, 1983

Tape No. 1642

SD - 2

MR. NEARY: attention to the fishery, not bad, Mr. Speaker. And also a fish processing plant built at Fogo and a fish processing plant at Nain in Labrador. My hon. friend will remember.

MR. WARREN: I was living there at that time.

MR. NEARY: He was living there and I played, I believe, some part in that.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: And a community stage for Ramea.

MR. NEARY: Year twenty-three, this is the last year that we had a Liberal administration.

On January 18, 1972 the government changed and then the great march forward in the fishery stopped.

But what happened in the last year that we were there? There was a fish processing plant at Anchor Point, a fish processing plant at Port Saunders, a fish processing plant at Herring Neck, a fish processing plant at Little Bay Islands -

MR. WARREN: Where?

MR. NEARY: Little Bay Islands - a community stage at Lumsden North, a community stage at Petites and a community stage at Port Albert. Mr. Speaker, that was not too bad, I suppose, for an administration that had grown tired and weary, that did not want people to carry on, wanted them to burn their boats.

MR. WARREN: Why do you not tell them about the last eleven years now?

MR. NEARY: The last eleven years, yes. Let us look at what has happened in the last eleven years, only from what I can think of off the top of my head.

MR. WARREN: About that big Harbour Grace concept, remember that one?

MR. NEARY: Every plant in Newfoundland is in financial trouble. Every big plant, every plant certainly associated with the deep-sea fishery except National Sea, has tremendous financial problems. We are told that it will take \$175 million to \$200 million to restructure the industry. Fermeuse is closed. Harbour Breton is closed. Burin is closed. Gaultois is closed. Ramea is closed. Grand Bank is in the process of closing. And the other plants are just barely

MR. NEARY: struggling along, just barely making it. They do not know what the future holds in store for them.

MR. WARREN: What about the big plans for Harbour Grace?

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes what about Harbour Grace. Yes, that is right. Mr. Speaker, this is the close her down government we have here. The Liberals developed the fishery, built the fishery, and along with all the other things that they have shut down, Mr. Speaker, this is the close her down government as far as the fishery is concerned. They are presiding over the demise of the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery.

Mr. Speaker, now we have reached a new plateau in this Province. Now we have come to the situation in this Province where the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) pretends he has no authority.

MR. NEARY: He may as well lock his door, put a padlock on his door. He may as well put the padlock on his door and say 'Out to Lunch'.

MR. WARREN: He has not acted yet.

MR. NEARY: Because the hon. gentleman has not lifted a finger to help the fishing industry in this Province.

MR. WARREN: Right.

MR. NEARY: He may as well, Mr. Speaker, send his staff home, nail a big sign across his door, Out of Business. Because, Mr. Speaker, when I attended - and I have to come back to that - the People's Conference today, I have to come back to the Fishermen's Conference today and talk about the frustration of the people who attended that Conference, why they are frustrated. Do you know why they are frustrated, Mr. Speaker? I will tell the House why they are frustrated. Because they now see a new concept developing in this Province and they do not know how to cope with it. They see a Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who has abdicated his responsibilities, who has no plans for the development of the fisheries, who is either unable or unwilling to do anything, who keeps blaming things on other people, Mr. Speaker, who has laid out no plans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand we have a Minister of Fisheries who will make emotional speeches full of political rhetoric and political garbage and say nothing, lay out no plans, no plans that people can get their teeth into for the development of the fishery.

Now on the other hand, what do we have in Ottawa? We have that happening in this Province, no input by the provincial government. Well, what do we have happening in Ottawa? We have a situation where the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) has been stripped of his authority and his responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: The federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) may be a well-meaning man - I think he is; I like him as a man, I think he is a thorough gentleman - but, Mr. Speaker, it is unknown and unheard of under the British Parliamentary system of government to appoint a minister and then give some super-bureaucrat, the authority and the responsibility that that minister should have. If I had gotten on my feet down there today at that conference, I would have proposed that they ask the federal Minister of Fisheries to assess his position within the federal Cabinet. That is what I would have done.

MR. TOBIN: He would have been embarrassed.

MR. NEARY: He would have been embarrassed? Well, maybe so, but you cannot have a Minister of Fisheries in name only. If you appoint a Minister of Fisheries, give him the authority, do not have a super-bureaucrat running the department. That must be awfully demoralizing, Mr. Speaker, for the staff of the federal Fisheries Department, not to know who they are dealing with, who to answer to. I feel sorry for the federal Minister of Fisheries, I really do, I think he is a very able man, but, Mr. Speaker, I believe that he as of this moment, especially today after the Peoples' Conference, should assess his position within the federal Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, would hon. gentlemen on that side of the House or on this side of the House, or on any side of the House of Commons in Ottawa, or in any other province of Canada, would any man worth his salt, when invited to serve his country as a Cabinet Minister say, 'Yes, I would like to join the Cabinet, I would like to be a Cabinet Minister, I would like to have the opportunity to serve my country and my province,' and then have a

MR. NEARY: super-bureaucrat put in over your head and take your authority and your responsibility away from you? How long would any hon. gentleman tolerate that, put up with that kind of a situation? Mr. Speaker, under the system of government that we operate under it is unheard of, it is unknown, it is terrible. I do not know what adjectives to use to describe it. It just is not done. You have a Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) in name only. You have a provincial minister who does nothing only blame things on other people and as a result of this little move in Ottawa it gives the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) here an opportunity to snipe at the federal government, to get little political brownie points for himself.

MR. BUTT: Our minister would not do that.

MR. NEARY: No, he would not do that. Of course not. It gives our Provincial Minister of Fisheries and our Provincial Government ammunition to fire in the direction of Ottawa, that is what it does, but it is certainly not going to help the situation any.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very, very, bad situation in Ottawa at the present time involving the Fisheries Department, the fisheries portfolio, and it should be remedied as quickly as possible. If the People's Conference want to put an end to their frustration and their bewilderment, what they have to do is to persuade the head of their administration in Ottawa to give full authority and responsibility to Mr. De Bane if he is going to run that department.

MR. NEARY: You cannot have two people running a department, Mr. Speaker, you cannot have two cooks in the kitchen. You cannot have it.

MR. TOBIN: You had two leaders for a while. You and Mr. Stirling, and neither one of you a real leader.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I only wish the hon. gentleman from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) would follow my advice. I only wish he would. Self-improvement is a noble ambition, a noble ambition, self-improvement. If the hon. gentleman wants to get rid of his rudeness, get the rough edges taken off him, if the hon. gentleman wants to learn a few manners and a little bit of etiquette, Mr. Speaker, I made the hon. gentleman a suggestion. Mr. Speaker, I had a number of discussions down there today with individuals and I would like to tell the hon. gentleman what they think about him. It would be interesting.

MR. NEARY: I wish I had had a tape recorder in my pocket. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be distracted.

MR. TOBIN: What about the Mayor of Burin?

MR. NEARY: Ask my Tory brother.

Mr. Speaker, this is pretty serious business. I believe the message that has to be gotten through to Ottawa is that Mr. De Bane has to be restored as Federal Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe in this House you are entitled to your opinion. Well, I am expressing my opinion on this matter: I do not like it. I think the Fishermen's Union, I think the Concerned Citizens groups, I think the people who work in the plants and the fishermen themselves, individually and collectively, should get that message through to Ottawa, that we in this Province are not going to tolerate a part-time Minister of Fisheries. You appoint him and then you take his authority, the responsibility for running the department, away from him. It must be awfully embarrassing, Mr. Speaker. I would not put up with it for one second. I guarantee you that there would be fur flying. As a matter of fact, I would be so jealous of my department that I would not even allow another minister to intrude, and I am sure ministers sitting on the government benches know whereof I speak. You would jealously guard your -

AN HON. MEMBER: No team work.

MR. NEARY: Oh, no, Mr. Speaker. No minister will allow another minister to intrude into his department, let alone a super-bureaucrat.

MR. TOBIN: Have you wired Mr. Trudeau?



MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my views have been made known in the right place, the proper place, on a number of occasions. I think he would do a good job if he were given an opportunity to carry out the restructuring, to build the fishery, to develop the fishery in Atlantic Canada. I believe the man would do a good job and that is the message that should go to Ottawa from the People's Conference and from this House and from the people of this Province today.

Mr. speaker, as I said earlier, I do hope that the provincial

MR. NEARY:

government will put the money where their words are and tell the people of this Province, especially in communities that are economically marooned as a result of plant closures, what imput the provincial government is going to have in the way of financial help to restructure the fishing industry. And, Mr. Speaker, if it is going to be a day of protest, let it be a day of protest. I said here in this House, and I will repeat it again, that the revitalization of the fishing industry in this Province requires drastic and dramatic measures. People have to face up to their responsibility and to the problems, which we have not done yet, Mr. Speaker, both levels of government have not faced up to their responsibility. And hon. gentlemen can play all the politics they want, but I say, Mr. Speaker, that both levels of government are equally to blame for the mess we are in in the fishery in this Province, both levels of government, not one.

Mr. Speaker, the fishery is our most basic industry. Every man, woman and child in Newfoundland depends on the fishery. A hundred or a couple of hundred million dollars is only peanuts, a drop in the bucket, to save the Newfoundland fishery and to save our way of life and our culture. Our way of life is built around the fishery. It is only small potatoes, a couple of hundred million dollars. Hon. gentlemen can probably come to the conclusion that I have some very strong views on this matter. I do not pull any punches, Mr. Speaker, I tell it as it is, and I say that \$100 million or \$150 million or \$200 million, if that is the price, then that is the least we could do to restructure and revitalize the Newfoundland fishery. That is the least we can do. It is only money. It is only a few dollars.

May 2, 1983

Tape No. 1648

ah-2

MR. NEARY:

If this administration  
would only follow my advice and get an offshore agreement signed!  
They have had oil on their brain since they took over in this

MR. NEARY:

Province eleven years ago. How often in this House, Mr. Speaker, how often have you heard members on this side of the House stand in their place in this House and say, 'Look, you are paying too much attention to oil and you are letting the rest of our natural resources deteriorate'? How often did we say that? And our words-unfortunately, I have to say, 'We told you so' - our words have come true. They had oil on the brain. They used to go to bed and dream about oil while the fishery was foundering. We stood in our places in this House and we did our job and our duty and we said, 'Hold it now', we said to the administration, 'Hold it', Oil is fine, that is fine, but oil is not the only thing we have in this Province, and it is not the end all and be all. Hold it. Just a second now', we said, 'What about the fishery?' Year in and year out for the last eleven years - and I have been hear the whole time - all we heard was oil, oil, oil.

MR. WARREN:

Oilmyelitis.

MR. NEARY:

That is right, they had oil on the brain. Once in a while we would ask about the fisheries, we would ask about this industry, we would ask about that industry, Mr. Speaker, and they had the attitude, 'Let her go . The oil is going to save all our resources. Get the oil and we got her made. We will all be oil sheiks overnight. We will all have two cars and a boat in front of our houses. Forget the fishery'. They did not say that but they did ignore it. Mr. Speaker, that is why we are in the position we are in today. But it is an industry that affects every man, woman and child in this Province.

MR. NEARY: If we are going to have a protest let it be a protest.

You know, you can say what you like about the teachers and the Conne River Indians, the Micmacs. You can say, 'Well, the teachers lost or lacked professionalism in what they did'.

MR. CARTER: Who said that?

MR. NEARY: Well, I have heard it said that the teachers lost a lot. As a matter of fact, I heard it said today by a clergyman that the teachers lost a lot because of their dispute. Well, I just do not happen to agree with that.

MR. CARTER: Why do you say that?

MR. NEARY: Because both the Conne River Indians and the teachers won. If they had to take drastic measures and drastic action to win, you cannot beat success, Mr. Speaker, can you? If we are going to have a day of protest in this Province, let it be a day of protest that everybody will remember. If we can have a day of mourning declared by the Premier on the spur of the moment that cost the Province \$18 million, there is no reason why we could not have a general one-day strike not only in the fishing industry but by all people, all employees and shut it down for one day. Have a one-day general strike and let the message go out loud and clear to the politicians. They are playing a slick game now, Mr. Speaker. They can go over now before the People's Conference and they can stand up and play with words and be slick, but the day is not too far away, and I do not advocate civil disobedience -

MR. BUTT: Your buddy Simmons is on the ropes, you know that, do you not?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Simmons is a gentleman I am sure that can take care of himself.

MR. BUTT: He is on the ropes, brother.

MR. NEARY: I am speaking for myself and my party. Well, we could say the same thing about the provincial government, the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is on the ropes. It is a government on the run. We have the Premier on the run.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible) picking up PC cards, right?

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) delegates of the meetings.

MR. NEARY: Well, we are not sure, by the way, in St. John's East. Crosbie's official slate lost out. Does that mean that McGrath's won?

MR. DINN: No, Crosbie's official slate did not lose.

MR. NEARY: Crosbie's official slate lost out.

MR. DINN: Every one of them was for Crosbie.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I saw a list published in The Evening Telegram on Saturday and three of the names I remember - Mr. Gaulton, Mrs. Good and Mr. Dobbin - said, 'We are Crosbie all the way,' and not one of them got elected, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that means that the official Crosbie slate now is gone,

MR. NEARY: and then Mr. McGrath has won out, that is unclear at the moment. I do not know if there was another slate for Crosbie or another slate for Clark, Mr. Speaker, but it certainly goes to show one thing, that those who thought they had a handle on things within that party, the bagmen, they must have been embarrassed, they must have gotten an awful letdown. Not one of them got elected, not one of the three.

MR. WARREN: They paid \$50 a head.

MR. NEARY: That is right. They were giving out \$5,000 to this one, \$50 a head, we are told, to bring people in to vote for them for delegates to the Convention. \$50 a head, the price has gone up considerably since 1977. We used to be accused of paying \$3 a head, but we were never sure if that was with the head on and the gut out. I imagine \$50 would be with the gut out, Mr. Speaker, the head on and the gut out. That is what they were paying the \$50 for. \$50 a head they paid. In some cases they paid \$5,000 lump sum to people I know who were supposed to bring supporters in to vote for them.

MR. DINN: And the guys that just paid the money out, did they win?

MR. NEARY: No, they got defeated.

It was ever thus! It was ever thus!

MR. DINN: Talk about the grass roots!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before I get away from the fisheries again, I only have a few more minutes left, I have to say this. I have to say this. I do not want to, I regret to say it, Mr. Speaker, but we have to get rid of Kirby. We have to get rid of him. Now, mind you, if they want to give him a job to do, keep him in his own backyard, but what we have to do is get rid of Kirby as far as making decisions on the fishery is concerned. The responsibility and the authority has to be restored to the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane). The decisions concerning the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery



MR. NEARY: are political decisions. The solutions, Mr. Speaker, are political solutions, and they cannot be decided upon by a bureaucrat. These are political decisions, Mr. Speaker, political solutions that the elected representatives have to answer for. I do not understand it. I am like Cashin and other people today, I am completely bewildered,

May 2, 1983

Tape No. 1652

ah-1

MR. NEARY:

In my twenty-one years directly involved in politics, actively involved in politics, I have never heard of it before when you appoint a minister, Mr. Speaker, I have never heard of it before where you appoint a minister and then you give a bureaucrat ministerial responsibility, you knock the props out from under him.

MR. TOBIN:

Why does he have that kind of power?

MR. NEARY:

I do not know

why it was done. I have no idea. I have never been able to get an answer to it. I am rather disappointed with it, Mr. Speaker. Now again I have to come back and ask the administration what plans they have? They did not tell the People's Conference today what plans they have. They have not told this House. They have not told the House what happens if Fishery Products now goes into receivership in the next day or two. We were told today at the People's Conference that the Bank of Nova Scotia would not honour cheques issued by Fishery Products for Workers' Compensation, for their employees last week.

MR. DINN:

What cheques?

MR. NEARY:

The cheques that were issued by Fishery Products to cover Workers' Compensation contributions on behalf of their employees. The Bank of Nova Scotia would not honour the cheques. That is right.

MR. DINN:

That is not right.

MR. NEARY:

What is not right? They make a payment to the Workers' Compensation Board on behalf of their employees, they cover their employees under Workers' Compensation. They sent a cheque to the Workers'

MR. NEARY: Compensation Board and the Bank of Nova Scotia would not honour the cheque.

MR. DINN: That is not right.

MR. NEARY: It is not right?

MR. HODDER: Are you sure?

MR. NEARY: That is what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said today, Mr. Speaker. When you get into that kind of a very dicey situation, then she is likely to go under, the whole thing is likely to founder any day at all. There is nobody in this Province appointed to negotiate with Kirby on restructuring.

MR. TOBIN: Do not be talking so foolish. You just condemned Kirby and now you want somebody to negotiate with him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is nobody, there is nobody talking to Mr. De Bane or the federal government about it.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. De Bane and Mr. Morgan have been meeting all morning and they will be meeting again tomorrow morning.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, she is likely to founder.

MR. NEARY: The situation is so desperate that she is like to founder. And if it does, Mr. Speaker, if it does, you know, some of the drastic, dramatic measures that I suggested in this House, and I make no apologies for this, that in some cases we may have to take over some of these plants.

MR. TOBIN: Do you agree with Mr. Cashin?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid of nationalization or provincialization. I am not concerned about it at all. If it means the only way that we can preserve a way of life in this Province, Mr. Speaker, sobeit, we have to do it. We have to take drastic and dramatic measures if we are going to revitalize the fishery in this Province. Forget the oil and gas for a while, that is forgotten, that has been shoved off the table now anyway. The Newfoundland Appeal Court put that off the table.

MR. TOBIN: Do you agree with that, do you agree with Mr. De Bane?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think I have outlined our position on this.

MR. TOBIN: I heard someone asking your fisheries critic what was your policy on the fishery.

MR. NEARY: We have outlined our position, Mr. Speaker. Our position has not changed since day one. We have argued that in the restructuring of the deep-sea fishery that all the plants must be re-opened. We have been saying that since day one, we have not altered our position. Mr. speaker, we still stand by that, we will still stand by the people. We are rather

MR. NEARY: amazed that hon. gentlemen there opposite who represent communities where plants are closed have been able to pull the wool over the eyes of their constituents.

MR. TOBIN: Ah-h-h, sure.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, I was there. I was in Burin, I was in St. Lawrence, I was in Grand Bank, I was in Ramea, I was in Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker, and I saw, read and heard what they were being told by their representatives in this House.

MR. MATTHEWS: What?

MR. NEARY: 'Wait until the Kirby Task Force comes out', that is what they said. 'Wait on Kirby.'

MR. MATTHEWS: That is not what I said.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know about the member for Grand Bank but I know about the other ones. I am not sure about the member for Grand Bank because that plant down there has not closed yet.

MR. MATTHEWS: Be sure of what you are saying.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is why I am eliminating the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews). But all the other places I went, Mr. Speaker, I heard it repeated time and time again by constituents, by fish plant workers and by trawlermen, 'We have been told by the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin),' they said, 'We have been told by our member of the House of Assembly that the Kirby Task Force is going to straighten all this out'. I was told in Ramea that the Kirby Task Force is going to straighten it all out. I was told it in St. Lawrence and I was told in Grand Bank, but I cannot say the hon. gentleman was involved in it, but I was told it in Grand Bank, the impression was left there somehow or other, and I was told it in Burin, moreso in Burin than in any other place.

MR. TOBIN: Well, I will tell you why. Because

MR. TOBIN: myself, and a delegation from Burin led by the mayor, went to Ottawa and we were told that in confidence by your colleague, Mr. Simmons.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, every one of them, except the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) whom I am not sure of, all the rest of them told their constituents to just wait, be patient, wait, do not rock the boat until the Kirby Task Force makes its report.

MR. TOBIN: That is what Mr. De Bane told us.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, is that not bluffing your constituents? Is that not pulling the wool over the eyes of your constituents? Is that not, Mr. Speaker, like running for cover to try to protect your own rear? Is that what they were doing, Mr. Speaker? Because they knew. I went there, I went to these communities. And today I heard Reverend Spencer of Ramea say, 'Gentlemen, about the last People's Conference, I hate to have to say this, but I told you so.' Reverend Spencer will remember me sitting in his dining room in Ramea and telling him so, and telling the concerned citizens in Burin at the town hall in

MR. NEARY: St. Lawrence, and at Mayor Stoodley's home in Grand Bank, Where else do we go?

MR. TOBIN: Mayor Stoodley in Grand Bank?  
How far back are you going?

MR. NEARY: Max Snook rather, Mayor Snook.

MR. TOBIN: Mayor Stoodley,

MR. HODDER: Oh, button up.

MR. NEARY: Yes, go out and learn a few manners.

MR. TOBIN: That is your leader speaking to you.  
Button up, why do you not?

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Speaker, what the people were concerned about most down there today, they were concerned - as a matter of fact, I would say that every member on the Burin Peninsula, bar none, every one of them will be wiped out as a result of this dispute. But, Mr. Speaker, they were told by their members, except Grand Bank, they were told to wait for Kirby, Kirby had the answers. And these people put faith in their members and they sat back and they waited, they patiently waited -

MR. TOBIN: That is what Mr. Simmons told them.

MR. NEARY: Blame it on Mr. Simmons now. The hon. gentleman was one of the big culprits, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman can try to weasle and squirm and twist his way out of it now like a skunk, Mr. Speaker, but there is no out for the hon. gentleman. He is cornered now, Mr. Speaker. He can try now to leave the sinking ship. He is cornered now like a rat.

MR. TOBIN: There is no one calling for my resignation.

MR. NEARY: He is cornered like a rat.  
Mr. Speaker, and -

MR. TOBIN: If there is a rat in this Province I can point at him and he has a white head.

MR. NEARY: - there is no way his constituents are going to let him forget. They will continue to remind him, Mr. Speaker.

What was that movie that was on TV last night? Did you see it?

MR. HODDER: No, I did not see that one.

MR. NEARY: The people who came from outer space, it was an interesting movie. Well, that is like this crowd over there, you know, that is what they are like now. They are trying to get a strangle hold on Newfoundland,

MR. TOBIN: Do you agree with Mr. Cashin that all the Liberal MPs should resign? Do you agree with that or do you not?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. Cashin that the hon. gentleman there opposite should resign.

Mr. Speaker, I was hoping to finish up my few remarks before six but hon. gentlemen keep interrupting me. Hon. gentlemen keep interrupting me and of course as long as they keep interrupting I cannot finish. I cannot even finish my trend of thought.

MR. TOBIN: You are worn out. You have to put a tongue in your shoe, look.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with my shoe. Maybe I should use it for knocking on the desk over there when I want to get the attention of the hon. gentlemen over there.

Khrushchev did that one time at the United Nations.



MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I got a few minutes left before six o'clock and I want to change the subject a little bit and talk about unemployment in this Province. But before I get into it, Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) would be in his seat because there is something happening in Labrador West in connection with the Quebec, North Shore and Labrador Railway. I have had a number of calls in recent days from people in Labrador City and Wabush who are very concerned about the crews that bring the trains from Seven Islands to Labrador City. There was a time, Mr. Speaker, up until four years ago, when the trains used to change crews at a place called Ross Bay Junction. Then the company changed its policy and they allowed the freight trains to be brought directly from Seven Islands to Labrador City, but the crews of the passenger trains still changed at Ross Bay Junction. Now, Mr. Speaker, apparently they are going to change that and as a result nine more Newfoundlanders, I believe will be laid off in Labrador West as a result. I was talking to the international representative of the union in Labrador West, and I was talking to a number of the people who are going to be laid off, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, they strike me as having a very valid case indeed. These trains now will be brought right on from Seven Islands into Newfoundland and Labrador, into Labrador City by outsiders, by people outside of this Province. I do not think it is right, I do not think it should be allowed to happen, and I was hoping, if the Minister of Labour and Manpower was in his seat, he could tell me if he has any knowledge of this and what steps the administration have taken to object to Newfoundlanders being laid off these trains. Once the layoffs take place, these trains will be manned by trainmen from outside of this Province.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the company should be forced to go back, retreat to the original position that they had a few years ago and that they have had as far as the express trains are concerned right up to the present moment, and that is that they should change crews at Ross Bay Junction which apparently is

MR. NEARY: on the border between the Province of Quebec and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, if you were going the other way you would have to have a work permit to go on these trains into LaBelle Province. It may not sound like a very big item but it is a big issue in Labrador. It does not involve that many people who are going to be laid off, there will be nine and that is not earthshattering, but it is the principle here that counts. It is the principle. I contend and these people down there contend that Newfoundlanders should bring the trains from Ross Bay Junction into Labrador City, whether they be express trains or whether they be freight trains. Now as I explained a few moments ago, express trains are the only trains that Newfoundlanders have been bringing in in recent years. About four years ago the freight trains were taken away from the Newfoundlanders and crews from outside of Newfoundland and Labrador were bringing the trains right into Labrador City.

MR. MATTHEWS: Your voice is wearing down, boy. You are getting tired.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not getting tired, Mr. Speaker. but this is the kind of a matter where you can take your time, you do not have to raise your voice, you do not have to be emotional. You just lay out the facts as they are. I still have three or four minutes before I conclude my remarks. So, Mr. Speaker, members there opposite may not think it is a very important matter but I promised the people in Labrador West, in Labrador City and Wabush, that I would raise this matter here in the House of Assembly. And I have raised it and all I get is catcalls and interruptions from hon. gentlemen. Is the hon. Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) aware of what is happening concerning the crews on the Quebec, North Shore and Labrador railroad there?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The crews?

MR. NEARY:

The crews. The hon. gentleman

is aware of it?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

MR. NEARY:

Has the hon. gentleman objected

to it?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, we have not got all the

information yet. That question would be better asked the

Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn).

MR. DINN:

If the hon. gentleman will sit

down, I will get up.

MR. NEARY:

Could I meet eye to eye with

the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, the hon. gentleman was out

of the House. Could I meet eye to eye with the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall)?

MR. NEARY:

Yes. I move, Mr. Speaker,

the adjournment of the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, put us out of our misery.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

It is noted that the hon.

Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has adjourned the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House

at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its

rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

May 2, 1983



GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE  
P.O. Box 4750  
St. John's, Newfoundland  
A1C5T7

1983-04-06

ORDERS OF THE DAY - 8/83, Thursday, March 17, 1983

Question 38: - Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

A progress report on the measures his Department has taken since November 18, 1982 to prevent the smuggling of cigarettes into Newfoundland from the Canadian mainland.

- Answer:
- (1) Legislation has been changed regarding search and seizure by inspectors. Fines and penalties have been increased.
  - (2) The R.C.M.P. have been very active and have made at least two major seizures.
  - (3) The Royal Nfld. Constabulary have been appointed inspectors under the Act.
  - (4) Gasoline Tax inspectors and taxation auditors are being trained and familiarized with the smuggling problem.
  - (5) Further legislative changes are in progress.

The House met at ten of the clock pursuant to adjournment.

The Honourable the Minister of Finance made a statement with respect to the Come By Chance Refinery.

The Honourable the Minister of Labour and Manpower made a statement with respect to the Confederation Building Complex Extension.

The Honourable the Minister of Justice made two statements as follows:

1. With respect to expansion of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary;
2. With respect to certain changes in the organizational structure of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

The Honourable the Premier made a statement with respect to an exchange of correspondence between himself and the Honourable the Minister of State for Economic and Regional Development with respect to the present situation of the offshore east coast fishery.

The Honourable the President of the Council rose on a Point of Privilege with respect to remarks made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker reserved his ruling.

By leave the Honourable the Minister of Justice moved the following Resolution:

WHEREAS complaints concerning the high cost of food and food price differentials throughout Newfoundland and Labrador have been received from homemakers, Town Councils and the general public;

AND WHEREAS monthly Food Price Surveys conducted by the Consumer Affairs Division have indicated that food price differentials do exist throughout Newfoundland and Labrador;

AND WHEREAS it appears desirable and expedient that an enquiry be held into the matter of the prices charged for food throughout the Province;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Select Committee of the House of Assembly be appointed to examine food prices throughout the Province, and in particular:

- (a) to enquire into the various factors affecting the prices of food throughout Newfoundland and Labrador;

and

- (b) to make recommendations with respect to the reduction of food price differentials throughout Newfoundland and Labrador as well as the reduction of the cost of food in general.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Members of the Select Committee be:

The Hon. Member for Trinity North (Chairman)  
The Hon. Member for Carbonear  
The Hon. Member for Bay of Islands  
The Hon. Member for Port au Port  
The Hon. Member for Eagle River

Mr. Speaker put the question.

The motion was carried.

The Honourable the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development presented a Petition on behalf of certain residents of the District of Naskaupi requesting a delay in the decision to close the hospital at North West River.

The Honourable the Minister of Labour and Manpower presented a Petition on behalf of certain concerned parents with respect to the return of students to the classrooms.



It was moved by the Honourable the President of the Council and seconded by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that a message of congratulations be forwarded to Mrs. Pamela House, grandmother of the Honourable the Minister of Health on the attainment of her 100th birthday, on May 1st.

Pursuant to order and on motion debate was continued on the Budget and on motion debate was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, May 2nd at three of the clock.

On motion the House then adjourned accordingly.

  
Elizabeth M. Duff  
Clerk of the House of Assembly

