

VOL. 2

NO. 66

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.  
28 November 1983

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER. (Russell):

Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR.SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of

the Opposition.

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, they

must have had a hard weekend. No Statements By Ministers today, they have nothing to announce, nothing to say. So I will put a question to the hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr.Goudie). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how we are doing on the Rural Development Agreement? Is there any progress being made or are we still bogged down? Does the hon. gentleman have anything to report on the federal/provincial agreement?

MR.SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of

Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR.GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, the only

thing to report is that this government is still very interested in signing a Rural Development Agreement for the Province. We have had two in place over the last ten years and as the gentleman knows the most recent one has expired. There are still discussions ongoing at the officials' level and to this point in time that is all I can report.

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the

Opposition.

MR.NEARY:

Mr.Speaker, could the



MR. GOUDIE: and, as a matter of fact, they have accepted funding from this government to carry them through until the end of the present fiscal year, funding in the amount that had been extended over the past five years, so I do not see any signs of demoralization or anything else. As a matter of fact, I think they have an even stronger fighting spirit now than they may have had before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: In any event, we are working towards that agreement. I think it is possible to get an agreement; however, one thing, I think, will probably have to change and that is the attitude of the federal government at this point in time, where they want to go ahead and get all the credit - at least that is what it appears to be - and their only interest is in the political aspects of things and not, as is the interest of this government, in implementing and carrying on with credible, established programmes which have been working very well over the last fourteen years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: As hon. members know, the two agreements referred to by the hon. gentleman are 90/10 agreements, 90 per cent of the funding paid by the Government of Canada, by the taxpayers of Canada, and the Government of Canada, of course, only getting 10 per cent of the credit.

Now, let me ask the hon. gentleman this question: Is it possible to get an agreement and have the Government of Canada issue its own





MR. GOUDIE: accountable to either government, federal or provincial, they are completely autonomous through their constitutions, which have been established over the years, and they prefer to carry on that way. In relation to the issuing of two cheques, I do not know but I do not think there will be any great difficulty with government accepting that position if that were the only problem. There are other much more deep-rooted problems involved in the concept that the federal government wishes to sell and that has to do particularly with a management committee and the implementation of the programmes, and that is one of the areas where the bog-down has occurred and is still bogged down at this point in time.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Can the hon. gentleman tell the House what the Development Associations are doing now for funding and if this funding will continue? What kind of, I presume, interim financing or some other arrangements being done by the Province, will these continue until an agreement is in place?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, as I have said the government of the Province has extended administration funding until the end of the present fiscal year and in the process of trying to get an agreement in place we are evaluating our position as a government to decide for ourselves what our involvement will be down the road in the event an agreement is not signed. That decision has not been made final yet but the funding put forth, as I said, is for administration grants only at this point in time,

MR. GOUDIE: There had been project funding in place under the agreement and was still in place at the end of September in the amount of \$420,000, I believe. Since that time that funding has been expended, allocated to various associations who had -

MR. NEARY: Would that be refundable, by the way?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker.

As a matter of fact, one of the things that we wanted to do, that amount of money, \$420,000, would have carried the Development Associations through on their administration grants cost shared until the end of the present fiscal year without even my having to go to Cabinet or Mr. Lumley having to go to Cabinet. But they decided they did not want to do that, they wanted to put it into project funding so projects are going ahead. So, in one sense nearly all of the programmes of the associations are still in place and obviously they can still apply to any other programme of either the federal or provincial governments for funding, depending on what the nature of the project is. But the administration grants are in place and we are addressing ourselves still to the need for an agreement or in lieu of agreement then exactly what action the provincial government will take.

MR. NEARY: I would like to introduce a new topic, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I would like to introduce a new topic, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to address a couple of questions to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Could the minister tell the House if he has met with or did he arrange meetings between Oxfam Canada and a South African support group requesting that Newfoundland follow the lead of other Canadian provinces, liquor corporations in refusing to import and sell South African wine, bandy, and other liquor products at their retail outlets in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the group the hon. member referred to have requested meetings with the Liquor Corporation. I am not sure whether those meetings have taken place yet or not.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, on a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Is it correct the group were refused meetings by the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Corporation and that the hon. gentleman had to intervene and call the Liquor Corporation to ask them to meet with this group?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Speaker, I made no calls to the Liquor Corporation on this subject. I know there was an approach there, but as I have mentioned, whether the approach culminated the meetings or not I am not sure, but I see no reason why they should not have.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House now if it is the policy of the administration that he is a member of to eliminate the sale of these South African

MR. NEARY: products that I mentioned? Because as hon. members know, the combined efforts of Oxfam and the Canadian University Services Overseas had been instrumental in convincing governments in other provinces, in Manitoba and in the Province of Quebec, to either eliminate or drastically curtail the import of South African liquors, wines, and other spirits. Now does the hon. gentleman intend to follow that policy here in this Province?

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

DR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume the reason why the group wanted to meet with the Liquor Corporation was to put their case before them. And I would expect, coming out of that, the Liquor Corporation will make some report or recommendation or comment to me, because I am the minister through whom they report to the House of Assembly. Once I have received that report, comment, recommendation or whatever it is from them, I will take whatever action seems to be appropriate. I cannot at this stage foretell what that action will be because I do not know what the Liquor Corporation is going to say in their report or recommendation or comment.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: This is simply amazing. I am horrified at that answer from the hon. gentleman. He is waiting for the Liquor Corporation to give the administration some direction as to policy when in actual fact it should be the other way around. Because the hon. gentleman, no doubt, is aware that every sale of South African products is another spoke in the wheel for the continued existence of apartheid in South Africa. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House what his administration's policy is regarding the sale of these products, Mr. Speaker, what is the administration's policy not what is the Liquor Board's policy? The Liquor Board is set up at the pleasure of this House, the administration founded it. This is a question of policy, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman must be aware that our Canadian dollars that buy these products provide economic support for this violent and unjust system that I am referring to. So would the hon. gentleman tell the House what the policy of the administration is on this matter?

MR. SIMMS: You are reading from something.

MR. NEARY: I am not reading anything, in case the hon. gentleman is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is getting into the area of international relations, really. This government does not set the tone for the relations of Canada or parts of Canada with a foreign country. This is a matter, strictly speaking, that is in the ambit of federal foreign affairs. Insofar as we are concerned, as I mentioned there was an approach, very recently, I understand, to the Liquor Corporation and once that approach has gone through the usual channels it will end up on my desk and, at that point in time, depending on

DR. COLLINS: it content, what the report is, I will take whatever action I deem appropriate or whatever action my colleagues feel should follow on from that.

This government really does not set its policies on a sort of ad hoc basis, you know, perhaps reading a letter in the paper or getting a single letter in the mail or one person making a phone call and then that would give rise to a new policy thrust on the part of this government. This government reaches policy decisions through a very careful assessment of the issues brought before it. And I would think the most appropriate way for this issue to come before government is exactly what is happening. And I presume the people who are bringing the point out are sensible people, they are certainly taking a much more sensible approach to the thing than the hon. member opposite. They are going to the Liquor Corporation in the first place because they are the people on the front line of this thing. The corporation will hear them, they will consider what they have been told, they will report to me, merely because I am the minister to whom they have contact with the House and with the government generally, and once those normal, rational, systematic approaches have been made we will carry on from there.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon.  
gentleman referred to this matter being in the realm of  
External Affairs. Now let me ask the hon. gentleman who  
purchases the products that I am referring to? Wine and  
brandy and liquor and other products that are on the shelves  
of these liquor stores, who is it that purchases these?  
Is it External Affairs, is it the federal government, or is  
the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Corporation, which is a  
Crown corporation established by this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of  
Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon.  
member is referring to products produced and exported by  
the Union of South Africa, or whatever its present-day name  
is, and insofar as Canada is concerned they are purchased by  
agencies of the various provincial government. It is not  
just one provincial government, the agencies of all provincial  
governments. When all provincial governments are involved  
in some matter, it almost certainly then falls into the orbit of  
the federal government. They take an approach, they reach  
a policy decision because all provinces of Canada are involved  
in it and they will therefore come up with an approach which  
they would recommend to the various jurisdictions where those  
jurisdictions are involved. If they come up with a policy  
decision which is totally in their own jurisdiction, well, they  
will carry it forth.



- MR. NEARY: You would accuse them then of intruding into provincial jurisdiction.
- MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!
- DR. COLLINS: So to my knowledge - but I will be glad to check on this - to my knowledge I have not received, nor has this government received, any recommendation or approach or suggestion from the federal government over the purchase of alcoholic beverages or any other products put out by the Union of South Africa.
- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.
- MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) as well. I want to ask the Minister of Finance is there anything happening at the Come By Chance oil refinery these days, anything that would indicate that, for example, there is a dismantling process beginning?
- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance.
- DR. COLLINS: I do not believe so, Mr. Speaker. I think I reported to this House some little while ago that Petro-Canada wanted to do certain things out there and I believe, I am quite certain, I made a Ministerial Statement on it because what they wanted to do out there might have been misinterpreted as dismantling. But in actual fact it was doing certain necessary things out there. I have not been informed, nor am I aware of anything more recent than that that Petro-Canada are doing, but if the hon. member has any particular concern or worry I will be glad to follow it up.
- MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.
- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) not agree that dismantling and preparing for send-off, say, to the province of Alberta three or four parts from the Come By Chance oil refinery, whether it be on loan or whatever to another province, would the minister not agree that this could be construed as dismantling? Is the minister not aware that this is happening?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. member is referring to the matters that I commented on previously, that is, Petro-Canada did find that they had in inventory a large number of items at the refinery which, you know, just conceivably would not be used, that they were aging, they were becoming obsolete and so on and so forth, so it just seemed sensible for them to use those particular items in other parts of their operation or dispose of them or what have you. I presume that is what the hon. member is referring to. If so this is not a dismantling process, it is just rationalizing their inventory. Now there were other parts of the refinery which are very valuable, a platinum catalyst, that type of thing, and these catalysts were just lying in the equipment out there and not being used, they have not been used for quite a number of years, and it just did not seem financially sensible to leave them there unused, so that was another thing that Petro-Canada was going to do; however, that would not interfere in any way with the later rehabilitation and reactivation of the refinery if that decision was made. What was taken out, these

DR. COLLINS: catalysts that were taken out and perhaps used elsewhere or disposed of, could be very readily replaced.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think we are talking about the same thing.

MR. NEARY: He does not know what is going on.

MR. CALLAN: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the minister should take it under advisement to find out exactly what is happening out there, because I have a feeling that the parts that are being dismantled and sent away now to another province, purportedly to be sent out on loan, may be setting a precedent. And if I may draw an analogy, Mr. Speaker, the same thing happened with the Arctic Fisheries plant in South Dildo: things went to Triton and went to other plants and they were suppose to be on loan, but what it pointed to was the phasing out off that plant and, of course, we saw what happened subsequently. Would the minister take it upon himself then to find out exactly what is happening and report back to this House?

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

DR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to do so. I might say that we have had very cordial relationships with Petro-Canada, certainly over the Come By Chance thing, ever since they became involved there. And they have undertaken that they would not make any radical change in their decision-making with regard to the refinery without informing us. They have kept up that commitment religiously ever since and I would expect that they will continue to do so in the future. We have not had a meeting with them, and usually it is at their initiation. Now, sometimes when we have not met with them for some period of time, we ask them for an update, but in most instances we have found that it was at their initiation that meetings between us were arranged and they have not initiated any new meetings in the recent past. But because of the hon. member's question, I will now initiate an enquiry to them and ask them for an update.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the Question Period go by without involving my old sparring partner directly across the way there. He seems to be relaxed after, no doubt, a hectic weekend. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if it is his intention to go to Gander on Wednesday to attend the meeting in connection with the expansion of the Lakeside Senior Citizens' Home in that community and for that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Up to the time I came into the House, Mr. Speaker, I had not received a request to go to Gander, but I understand that since I have come into the House there has been a formal request and we are in the process of determining what approach we will take to the situation at Gander.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: That is typical of the kind of attitude you would get from the hon. gentleman. The question required a simple yes or no answer: Is the hon. gentleman going to go to Gander on Wednesday to attend the meeting?

Now, let me ask the hon. the Premier a supplementary. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) had his representative on the board and, if he was aware of it, then did he know that this representative that the Minister of Social Services had on the board was in full possession of the facts, step by step, until approval was given for the funding for the expansion of this home? Is the hon. gentleman aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) can answer that question for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). As it relates to his preliminary, I do not know what the Leader of the Opposition expects me to do. I checked before I came into the House, and since I got in the House I was informed by a parliamentary assistant that a telegram had come in, I have not had a chance to consult with the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook), I am in the process of doing that now, and with the Minister of Social Services and other ministers on the request that has come in. I think it is only fair. Therefore, how could I give a yes or a no answer, Mr. Speaker? I do not operate the government over here like the government the Leader of the Opposition was in where one man was going to make an answer yes or no all of the right. I consult with my colleagues and do it through a proper process.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it must lately it becomes the hon. gentleman. We have a one man government and everybody in the Province knows that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. the Premier aware that his Minister of Social Services gave an undertaking in writing to the chairman of that board that they could proceed with the expansion as soon as funding was put in place?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the Minister of Social Services can answer some of those questions. I am fully aware of the situation in Gander and the situation was that a number of letters were written and those letter speak for themselves. The letter perhaps that

PREMIER PECKFORD: the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is referring to is one in which a letter was written to the board saying, 'Pursuant to a previous letter which outlined the priorities based upon need of the Government of Newfoundland,' and that letter then went on to indicate the procedure to be followed, but it was all subject to the previous letter and that previous letter had the priorities: Carbonear was one priority, Placentia was another priority, Bay St. George was third - those three were in some order one, two and three - and then the fourth priority was Gander. The whole situation as it relates to Lakeside Home, Mr. Speaker, is an extremely regrettable and unfortunate one. There is a trick trying to be played upon the people of Gander by their MP and by the federal government through Mr. LeBlanc. We are having no part of tricks when it comes to chronic care for senior citizens in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: If there is any political trickery or political game-playing, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman wrote the book. The hon. gentleman is the one who is playing games and he knows that this policy he is following is a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy. I ask the hon. gentleman now would he instruct his Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) to forget these little political games and political tricks and get on with the job of expanding that home, Mr. Speaker. If there is any trickery it is on the part of the administration not on the part of Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services is quite capable of speaking for himself.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just let me inform the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) from his latest question and comments that we have intention of using Carbonear against Bay St. George, Bay St. George against Placentia, Placentia against Gander, Gander against Bay St. George and all of the rest of the foolishness that is going on. This was tried before as it related to the industrial park in Gander, where Mr. Baker and his people tried to orchestrate one industrial park going ahead while Pasadena and Port aux Basques and all the rest were going to be left hung out to dry. Mr. Baker did



PREMIER PECKFORD: not succeed in that thrust, neither will he success in a similar thrust as it relates to chronic care, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Social Services , on a point of privilege.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman obviously is not going to direct any questions this way -

MR. NEARY: No, because you are not capable of answering them.

MR. HICKEY: - because he knows that he will just get too much information and too much fact. So he attempts to go through the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: - as though the Premier and my colleagues were going to reverse a decision that he preceives me to have made as opposed to the provincial government. But I cannot sit here, Mr. Speaker, and allow the hon. gentleman, as per usual, who do not want the facts, afraid to ask a question because if he gets the facts, of course, he cannot stand up in the House and , you know, create this great situation of what is going on ih Gander. He made the statement, Mr. Speaker, that a representative of mine sits on the Board.

MR. NEARY: That is true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: That is an absolute untruth, that is an unfounded statement, incorrect, not right, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Des Dillon, who is the senior representative in Gander, is a member of the Planning Committee. He does not represent my department with regards to policy. He does not represent my department with regards to any priority list, funding or

MR. HICKEY: anything of that nature. He was invited to sit on the Planning Committee because he represent Social Services in terms of the kind of programme , the delivery of services, and his chief and sole responsibility, Mr. Speaker, in the Gander area is the delivery of services. Stop right there.

MR. NEARY: This is not a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, it is an abuse of the rules.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Now what is the hon. gentleman talking about?

MR. NEARY: A breach of privilege.

MR. HICKEY: A breach of privilege, deceiving the House? No way!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

When an hon. member of this Legislature arises on a point of privilege, I feel that the Chair is obligated to hear any arguments put forward. However, I have to rule, of course, the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) did not raise a valid point of privilege. It appeared to be more of a clarification of certain matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, then in view of the so-called point of privilege raised by the hon. minister, which was an abuse of the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, let me go back now to the Premier again. Now the hon. gentleman just heard confirmation that there was a representative of the Department of Social Services on the Planning Committee. Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously the gentleman was on there to report progress, to report activities to the minister.

MR. HICKEY: No.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only reason that Mr. Dillion was on that Committee was to represent the department

MR. HICKEY: Assumption again!

MR. NEARY: Well, it is not an assumption, Mr. Speaker, that is the only reason he was there, because he was an employee of Social Services. Now would the hon. Premier tell the House if it is his intention to get away from this silly, childish nonsense; his silly childish attitude and approve this expansion, Mr. Speaker? Because here you have a situation where the Government of Canada is providing funding and this crowd cannot even spend money when you give it to them.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: The hon. the Minister of Social Services will answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman again likes to oversimplify things. He says the federal government is providing funding and we do not want to spend it or cannot spend it.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I remind him, as I reminded his colleague the other day when he did not want to listen, when the hon. gentleman was objecting to my answer being too long, obviously he had his ears plugged, I said then, Mr. Speaker, to the House the amount of money provided or committed by Mr. LeBlanc when he parachuted into Gander with Mr. Baker to pull their little trick, was \$175,000 a year diminishing each year to zero. The amount that he was going to cost the provincial treasury as a result of that decision was \$1.5 million escalating every year to infinitum as long as that facility was there. Does the hon. gentleman agree that this government, any provincial government, this or any other, whatever political stripe, should sit here and have a federal minister and a federal MP parachute into God knows where in the Province and cause that kind of provincial dollars to be spent without even any consultation?

PREMIER PECKFORD: No way.

MR. HICKEY: That is his new kind of planning, Mr. Speaker.

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

000

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, can we revert back to Presenting Reports of Standing and Special Committees?

MR. SPEAKER: Can we revert to Presenting Reports of Standing and Special Committees?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table the Report for the Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services Limited, Annual Report 1983.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) the other day asked a question with regard to the McConnell situation and arising out of my answer to the question at that time he asked if there had been interest payments in regard to this account and I indicated there had been, and he asked what was the authority for it. The authority for those interest payments are in the Financial Administration Act and there was in February 1979 an Order-in-Council issued pursuant to the Financial Administration Act which authorized those payments to McConnell.

MR. NEARY: Interest paid to McConnell.

DR. COLLINS: The interest payments on the McConnell account.

MR. NEARY: That was in Mr. Moores' time.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Moores, yes.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have  
received a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-  
Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: The message is dated  
May 17, 1983, to the hon. Minister of Finance.

"I, the Lieutenant-  
Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit supplementary  
estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the  
Province for the year ending 31st. day of March 1983, by way  
of supplementary supply in accordance with the provisions  
of the Constitution Act, 1867, I recommend these estimates  
to the House of Assembly.

(sgd)-----

Lieutenant-Governor."

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the message be given to the Committee and the Committee now be constituted.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the message of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, if I could, just before we begin Committee of Supply, I would like to propose that we follow the usual practice in Committee of Supply of the minister speaking for fifteen minutes there would be a reply, fifteen minutes and then it be ten and ten rather than the rules of the House, in other words, the same rules as apply to the Committees on Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that we follow the same rules as apply to the Committees in general? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, this is the Supplementary Supply Bill for the fiscal year 1982 - 1983. It relates to the special warrants that were tabled in this House following the bringing down of the budget for that year. And this will now ratify those special warrants.

By brief way of explanation, Mr. Chairman, we are debating a resolution, but there is

DR. COLLINS: a bill related to the resolution, Bill No. 44, and when we finish the examination in Committee, it will be taken that the bill itself will also have been considered on a clause by clause basis.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains the sum of \$70.5 million approximately, and that is the total of those Special Warrants that were tabled. The schedule attached to the bill lays out the various departments; for instance, in the Department of Finance there is approximately \$1.5 million, Development, \$700,000, Mines and Energy \$600,000, Social Services \$5.5 million, Health \$4.8 million, Labour and Manpower just over \$600,000, Municipal Affairs just over \$600,000 and Justice \$3,250,000, approximately, for a total of \$70.5 million in Special Warrants.

I do have further details if hon. members wish their memories refreshed but, as I have already mentioned, these Special Warrants with some details had been tabled throughout the period after the 1982 - 1983 budget had been brought down and were therefore available for perusal by the hon. members of the House.

The Supplementary Supply bill is very common practice. I do not know if there has been any year in which a Supplementary Supply bill has not been brought in. The reason for a Supplementary Supply bill is that at the time the budget is brought down, not all expenditures by government can be anticipated and foretold

A very obvious thing, for instance, would be if there were some emergency that was not even present at the time the budget was brought down, that that emergency arose later on, and government might well have the responsibility of doing something about it, and if so,



DR. COLLINS: funding might well be required. The Supplementary Supply Bill is to allow government to do those types of things, otherwise, of course, the process of government would be hamstrung. Now, it is not all just new things, sometimes funding for any number of reasons is just inadequate, it is the particular heading for which there is some funding in the budget that does not cover all the expenditures that are coming before government and then an amount has to be added on. And that is another reason why sometimes Supplementary Supply has to be brought in.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to go into any further details than that. There may well be questions arise and I will do my best to answer them.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it is not our intention to debate this bill at any great length. As hon. members are aware from the remarks of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) the money has already been spent and we had a budget brought down and they had to ask for Supplementary Supply. The trouble is, Mr. Chairman, that we are late, we are very, very late indeed in bringing this bill before the House. As hon. members know - and this is our complaint with this, Mr. Chairman - the Supplementary Supply Bill really should be debated before the estimates are brought down. At least when the estimates are brought down they should be debated at that time because they reflect upon the current estimates before the House. Now, the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), of course, in his calling the order of business of this House left this bill until the Fall session which he should not have done, Mr. Chairman. He should not have done it.

MR. MARSHALL: Should not have done what?

MR. NEARY: Should not have left this Supplementary Supply Bill for this late date in this session of the House, Mr. Chairman. That is our big

MR. NEARY: complaint. The hon. gentleman in a slick kind of a way has managed over the years to erode the authority of Parliament, of this House, has successfully manoeuvred estimates off the floor of the House and then calls money bills whenever he feels like it, Mr. Chairman. This Supplementary Supply Bill should have been debated last February or March when the House met, not now. It is ancient history now, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman is only running about six months behind schedule as far as this bill is concerned and we think that is terrible. Government can almost do what it wants. I have said this before and I repeat it again, that one of the things that the electorate of this Province were concerned about and worried about following the April 6th, 1982, general election was that they might have put too many members on the government side, that they could become dictatorial and arrogant in their deliberations. Well, Mr. Chairman, these words have come true. We do have somewhat of a dictatorship, a one-man rule on that side of the House. There is no question about their arrogance and their contempt for the people of this Province. They have no concern for people, no regard for the people of this Province. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the reason we are in such an incredible financial mess as we are in today is a result of that 1982 provincial election which was unnecessary, as hon. members know. But the government did not bring down a budget if Your Honour will recall, they were too cowardly, they did not have the courage to bring down a budget before that election. And that was the real issue in the election. The Premier made it a one-issue election, Mr. Chairman,

MR. NEARY: a one issue election to negotiate an offshore agreement and now he does not want to see or hear tell of that issue. But in the meantime, what they have done in the process of playing these political games with the electorate they practically bankrupt the Province. And that was the real issue before the 1982 provincial general election, they could not balance the budget. They tried to conceal and hide substantial deficits in current account from the people. Now we are going into our second year, next year will be our third year running with a deficit in current account. That was the real issue, Mr. Chairman, that was facing the people of this Province. The hon. the Premier managed to hypnotize the electorate into believing that he was the great fighter for Newfoundland, he had a great national issue and he succeeded with it when in actual fact we are reaping the results today, Mr. Chairman, in this Province with the incredible financial mess that the administration have gotten us into and the way they have mismanaged our economy. No wonder the hon. gentleman rushed to the polls on April 6, 1982, to avoid having to tell the people of this Province what an incredible financial mess, because of the incompetence of the administration, that he has brought about in this Province. And let nobody be fooled by that, Mr. Chairman, that was the real reason for the election. And so the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) plays along with that little political trickery, little political game playing, the hon. gentleman plays along with that knowing the difference. I would not mind it so bad, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. gentleman knows the difference. The Supplementary Supply Bill should

MR. NEARY: have been tabled in this House, debated in this House last Spring, not now. Anything we can say about it now is ancient history, the money has been spent, a new budget is being brought down, Mr. Chairman. There was \$17.5 million unforeseen spending, some of it should have been foreseen, in Supplementary Supply. For instance, Mr. Chairman, \$195,000 Grants and Subsidies, Legal Aid. What is all that about? Could that not have been foreseen?

DR. COLLINS: What was that one again?

MR. NEARY: \$195,000 Grants and Subsidies, Legal Aid. And how are we doing with the Legal Aid? I remember back, I believe it was in the early 1970s, I remember the administration of the day came into this House and asked for \$100,000, Legal Aid. And if hon. members want to go back over my speeches they will see that in that debate I predicted that Legal Aid would soon be \$1 million; In a very short time the young lawyers downtown would have discovered another milch cow and that the Legal Aid would be \$1 million. Well, I do not know what figure it is running at today, but I believe it is either \$1 million or over \$1 million.

DR. COLLINS: Are you against Legal Aid?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not against it. I am just wondering about accountability and about control of it, because one of the items that is listed under Lieutenant Governor's Warrants is Grants and Subsidies for Legal Aid of \$195,000. Well, we would like to have an explanation of what this is all about.

MR. NEARY: Has legal aid gone out of control? Are we getting the value for our money? It is not a criticism of the lawyers, Mr. Chairman, who are working for Legal Aid, that is not a criticism of them. Are we getting value for our money? Because I understand that there are not very many senior lawyers that you can get who will participate in the Legal Aid programme, they will pawn it off on the young lawyers just coming out of law school and that is how they get their start. It was not meant to be an apprenticeship programme for young lawyers coming out of law school, Mr. Chairman. So I would like to a little bit of a report from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), or the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) who is responsible for the Legal Aid programme, to find out why we needed that extra money, why we needed Supplementary Supply and how we are doing in the area of Legal Aid. We get all kinds of requests in our office from citizens throughout the Province who cannot get Legal Aid. We would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what categories fall under the Legal Aid programme, who can get it and who cannot get it. We can understand why Legal Aid has increased dramatically in this Province, Mr. Chairman, with the rate of unemployment we have. We have record unemployment, record numbers of people on social assistance and on unemployment insurance. For the first time in our history, I would say, since Confederation anyway, we have large numbers of people, workers, who do not have enough stamps to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits this coming Winter. We realize, Mr. Chairman, that there is a big demand on the Legal Aid services because of the horrible state of the economy brought about by the mismanagement and the incompetence of this administration. We understand that, Mr. Chairman, but we think we are entitled in this House to a

MR. NEARY: report from the minister once in a while on these huge amounts of taxpayers dollars that are being spent on Legal Aid; this is only one of the Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants we have in front of us. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear either the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) give us a report on the Legal Aid. Do they get an annual report from the Legal Aid Commission or whatever it is? And if they do, would the hon. gentleman consider tabling such reports in this House? It is a vast amount of money. It is a lot of money, Mr. Chairman, we are spending on Legal Aid. I know some of the young lawyers who have worked in Legal Aid, and they worked hard, they were very dedicated and very devoted to their occupation, but some of the stories that I have heard, Mr. Chairman, indicate to me, at least, that not all the lawyers are dedicated,

MR. NEARY: that they merely use this legal aid programme to serve their apprenticeship. One time, downtown, you had to article under a law firm, now, as soon as you come out of law school or pretty close, well, within a matter of weeks or months, you can be working for legal aid. You do not see too many senior lawyers taking on legal aid cases in this Province. You do not see too many senior lawyers, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to know why? Why cannot people pick the lawyer of their choice? I do not see many lawyers from some of the law firms that are represented by members of this House out -

MR. MARSHALL: You do not look very far either.

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Chairman, there was a time, by the way, in this Province, there was a day, just to show you how things have changed in Newfoundland, there was a day when if a person needed legal aid they would go to the Law Society and one of the lawyers would be seconded to look after that person on a voluntary basis, no remuneration. Not too long ago, fifteen years ago that was the way it was. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no such thing as working for poor people on a voluntary basis. We do not have any Perry Mason's in this Province any more, Mr. Chairman, they all want their pound of flesh. And we have gone from \$100,000 up to well over \$1 million.

So, Mr. Chairman, it might be a good opportunity while we are debating the Supplementary Supply Bill, and one of the items we are talking about is legal aid, to have a report from one of the hon. gentlemen, a comment on some of the points that I raised. I am not condemning the legal aid services, Mr. Chairman, far from it, I am encouraging it. I think that an awful lot of our people are getting the shaft. An awful of these cases involve

MR. NEARY: prosecutions by various government departments. The Minister of Fines over there, of Wildlife, Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that legal aid has to come to the rescue of a lot of these people. But it is not a bottomless pit, Mr. Chairman. It is not a bottomless pit. And where is it all going to end? Where is that spirit of wanting to help your fellowman on a voluntary basis? Have things now become so commercialized that no lawyer will help his fellowman on a humanitarian basis? They all want to get on to the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, they want to get in somewhere, Mr. Chairman, where they can turn on the valve and then it will take a miracle to get it shut off.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, it will take a miracle now to control this legal aid, a miracle. It will take a miracle to get some of the lawyers to remove themselves from what appears to be a conflict of interest situation.



MR. NEARY: supporting the government, or members of the administration representing some bank or some Crown corporation while they are supporting the government on that side of the House. Is it time for that to stop, Mr. Chairman?

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

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words about what the hon. gentleman is talking about.

First of all, with respect to Supplementary Supply and the fact that this has not been debated up until now, I do not know when the hon. gentleman would have expected it to be debated. This Supplementary Supply relates to the period - the hon. gentleman has been in here twenty-one years, so perhaps he can listen and this time he can understand - it relates to extra Supply that is needed up to the end of the fiscal year of March 31, 1983. So, consequently, when this session of the Legislature convened it was not known how much Supplementary Supply was going to be needed for the last of the year. So obviously nobody could bring in a bill until after March 31, 1983. We are debating Supplementary Supply in this particular session; I could point back to other periods of time when Supplementary Supply for years before was not debated in that same year but was debated in the following year.

MR. NEARY: No way.

MR. MARSHALL: So it is a lot of errant nonsense by the hon. gentleman to indicate that somehow the rights and the concerns have been derogated from purely and simply because we are not debating it until now. There was no other real opportunity to do it, and nobody is prejudiced by debating it at the present time.

MR. MARSHALL: I would also like to point out something that the hon. gentleman conveniently overlooked when he was debating the situation: For the 1982/1983 fiscal year the total budget that was budgeted, the total amount of estimated expenditures, \$1.7 billion. This represents the amount by which the administration went over that budgeted amount in the various categories.

DR. COLLINS: For very good reasons.

MR. MARSHALL: And for very good reasons. And it turns out to be a mere, in relation to the thing, \$17 million. And according to my calculations, Mr. Chairman, that represents a mere 1 per cent of the total budget which I say is a very good showing by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) particularly and by the government generally. In a budget of that size to be merely coming in, and particularly when you consider the atmosphere or the time which we are in at the present time, for the Minister of Finance to be merely coming in for 1 per cent of his total budget by Supplementary Supply represents a considerable achievement by government and by the minister.

I would also like to point out as well, Mr. Chairman, that this represents a period of an election year. And I remember during the election period in April, 1982, the hon. gentleman there opposite and his predecessor and his predecessor predecessor were carping throughout the Province that we could not bring a budget in, that it was impossible to bring a budget in and that was why we were calling an election. Well, I think this represents a very good demonstration of the way in which the government was conducting the affairs. And I think it is pretty good indeed when you consider, too, it was during an election year. I could point to some of the Supplementary Supply that was spent by other governments, and particularly the hon. gentleman's government, in times past during election years, and comparatively speaking,

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, it would choke you to look at it. And the wonder of it is that it did not choke the Province, as that government in that particular day were trying to bribe the people with their own money. So this was an election year, it is a mere 1 per cent of the total amount, it represents a tremendous achievement, particularly when you come and consider what had occurred in other sister provinces, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec during the same period of time, when they were incurring huge deficits on current account which resulted in them being downgraded in their credit rating. And at the same period of time, with a much smaller base than most of these other provinces had, this government was able to keep the ship of state on a firm course and on a firm foundation and you cannot see any better evidence of that, Mr. Speaker, than in this resolution for Supplementary Supply, which is a mere 1 per cent of the total amount.

I would also like to draw to the hon. gentleman's attention once again when he gets up and he speaks about little non sequiturs, he picks up an insignificant, relatively speaking, expenditure with respect to Legal Aid and talks on about that with his banal generalities, without any substance to it at all, hoping to get the press with respect to it.

Here is something the hon. gentleman might like to address himself to: About the stewardship of this government with respect to the Province's affairs, the Province has adopted a responsible manner of debt management to such a degree that we have been able to hold our direct debt to 5.4 per cent, one half per cent of our Gross Domestic Product, in the past few years. Now, how does this compare to other provinces?

MR. MARSHALL: I emphasize again, much to the chagrin of the hon. gentleman opposite, the Province's rate of debt, in total direct and guaranteed debt, was only 7 per cent from 1977 to 1982, a mere 7 per cent, compared to an-all provinces average of an increase of 12 per cent and compared to the great federal government whom the hon. gentleman is always emulating, and he came in here during Question Period, as he does day after day, with the questions on Rural Development, the questions on Finance, prasing the federal government, compared to the federal government's increase in borrowing of 11 per cent. In other words, we were better than the average of all the other provinces, we were better in our control of the debt than the federal government was, and the testimony to that is shown today in this Supplementary Supply Bill which is a mere 1 per cent of the total budget. Now, I ask the hon. gentlemen when they address this situation, and if they want to address it honestly and directly, to comment upon the fact that this is a mere 1 per cent of the total amount budgeted, a considerable achievement. And the hon. gentleman is not going to be able to allow this to swept under the table by inane little remarks, inconsequential remarks about a little overrun in the Legal Aid vote of the Department of Justice or, for that matter, a little overrun anywhere else. It is, as I say, a real achievement. And when we say it is a real achievement that does not mean to any degree that we are not concerned with the amount of the public debt in this Province and the financial condition of the Province. Certainly we are very concerned. We would hope it would be better, but the fact of the matter is it would be much worse but for the stewardship of this government and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). And, Mr. Chairman, this bill and this resolution, as I say, bears testimony to that, and let not the hon. gentlemen there opposite forget it or,

MR. MARSHALL: by their little weasel words, try to cast other reflections on the way in which the government is conducting the affairs; the proof is in the pudding and the proof is in this Supplementary Supply Bill.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let me read for the House a quote from Hansard, a statement made in this House by the hon. gentleman who just took his seat. Now, we all heard what the hon. gentleman had to say. On May 14, 1976, Mr. Speaker, only four years after the Tories assumed office in this Province - four years after - the public debt at that time was running less than \$1 billion. Because back in 1972, on January 18, 1972, when the government changed after twenty-three years of a Liberal administration, the public debt in this Province at that time, the total debt, was around \$750 million, between \$750 million and \$800 million. Now, Mr. Chairman, let that figure register in your mind, \$750 million to \$800 million, the public debt after twenty-three years of building and developing - monuments to that administration everywhere you go in the Province from here to Port aux Basques and in Labrador, monuments everywhere. And we were told at that time by Messrs. Crosbie and company in this House, the hon. gentleman who just took his seat - and he repeated it a few moments ago - that we were using people's own money to buy their votes. We were only \$750 million in debt after twenty-three years.

Let me see what the hon. gentleman actually said four years after the Tories formed the administration of this Province, May 14, 1976, quoting from Hansard: "I am alarmed about the financial condition of the Province. I feel that the major problem facing us today is to make the public aware of the financial situation so that if the public is aware they will know what action we have to take to do something about it."

MR. NEARY: Now, the public debt at that time was less than \$1 billion. What is it now, Mr. Chairman? What is the public debt now? It is close to \$4 billion, \$4 thousand million and not a thing to show for it. And the hon. gentleman has the face to stand in his place in this House -

MR. CALLAN: Gall.

MR. NEARY: - and heap scorn on us over here and use the little technique that he uses of slurring the former Liberal administration and members on this side of the House who were associated with that administration.

Mr. Chairman, what did the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) have to say in the same debate? Here is what he said on May 14, 1976: "I take the position, Mr. Speaker, that the financial condition of this Province is extremely grave."

MR. CARTER: It was then.

MR. NEARY: It was then.

MR. NEARY: We were told back in 1971, when that crowd were clawing and scraping and trying to get into power, we were told that we were buying people's votes with their own money and that the Province was bankrupt. That is what we were told by the same hon. gentleman who just spoke, by Mr. Crosbie, who is now moved on to another jurisdiction. That is what we were told, that we were bankrupting the Province. Now we have a debt of \$4,000 million or \$4 billion, or a 500 per cent increase in our public debt and the hon. gentleman gets up and dismisses it out of hand as if it were nothing, a bit of loose change; \$4000 million, \$7,000 per capita debt, the highest in Canada, the highest per capita debt in the nation, every man, woman, and child in this Province owes \$7,000 to the moneybags throughout the world. Children not even born, not even thought of yet will owe \$7,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not something to be dismissed lightly when we were told by the same hon. gentlemen in this House, when they were on this side and since they moved across the House, that they were alarmed, to quote the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), 'they were alarmed about the financial condition of this Province'.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman says, Oh, we did bring down a Budget. Of course they brought down a Budget, Mr. Chairman, but what did that Budget disclose? It disclosed something that they did not want the people to know in that election, that we were headed for a substantial deficit in current account for the first time since Confederation, over \$40 million, \$41 million, a deficit in current account, which means, Mr. Chairman, in any layman's language, that they could not balance the Budget. And that is what we are saying. And the hon. minister in his



MR. NEARY: sly way, in his devious way can sidetrack that issue if he wants to. And then he accuses me - this is a new technique they have over there now. Just to show how we are getting to them, they are saying now that all I am worrying about is the press, Mr. Chairman, that is a new technique they have. I must be getting to them over here. We must be getting to the administration. They are worried about the reporting of the House. That is another way of saying how dare you, Mr. News Media, report any criticism of this administration? And then he proceeds, after he makes

MR. NEARY:

that statement that I am worried about the press, he proceeds then to try to brainwash the press into believing what he says is accurate and true when in actual fact, Mr. Chairman, it is downright - I cannot say 'deceit' that would not be parliamentary - would it? - it is downright misleading to say the least. And I am sure that the media is not going to fall for his political trickery he is trying to use on this.

The fact of the matter is, Sir, that nobody can deny that we have the highest per capita debt in the nation, our public debt increased by 500 per cent, went from \$750 million after 23 years of Liberalism, to \$4 billion under a Tory administration, in the past eleven years - absolutely incredible! - and not a thing to show for it, not a thing.

DR. COLLINS:

There are a few roads and a few schools.

MR. NEARY:

Oh, a few roads and a few - there is nothing to show for it, Mr. Chairman. They cannot point their finger at one new industry in this Province. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that the public debt is unmanageable. If we were not a province of Canada today, Mr. Chairman, we would be bankrupt. We are no better off today in this Province financially than we were when Commission of Government was appointed to take over the governing of this Province, no better off than we were back in the early thirties, Mr. Chairman. We are no better off. If we were not a Province of Canada we would be bankrupt. And the moneylenders and the people who set our credit rating, I have to repeat this again, because I was there and I heard it from their own lips,

MR. NEARY: Canada will not allow a province to go bankrupt because it would be embarrassing, Mr. Chairman, that is the attitude they have. The Government of Canada will bail you out. Well, the Government of Canada is contributing 50 per cent of the revenue to this Province right at this moment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Reluctantly.

MR. NEARY: Not reluctantly. They are doing it -

MR. ANDREWS: Are we not lucky?

MR. NEARY: Yes, we are lucky. We are lucky, Mr. Speaker. 50 per cent of our almost \$2 billion -

MR. ANDREWS: Are you proud of that?

MR. NEARY: 50 per cent of the minister's salary comes from the Government of Canada.

MR. ANDREWS: Are you proud of that fact?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not proud of it, Mr. Chairman, but it would be much less if the government here was doing their job. In order to reduce that you have to broaden your economic base, you have to create new sources of revenue, which they are not doing, Mr. Chairman. 50 per cent of the hon. minister's salary, 50 per cent of the Premier's salary comes from the people of Canada, donated to this Province by the people of Canada. And the thanks the people of Canada get for that, of course, is the anti-Canadian, separatist statements that have been made over the past two or three years, Mr. Chairman, by people like the hon. minister, who is anti-Canadian. It will take years and years to undo the damage that this crowd have done in their false and misleading statements and their attacks on the Government of Canada and on the other provinces of Canada. They have brainwashed practically a new generation of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians into believing that the great Canadian wolf is going to take away -

MR. NEARY: or at least they have gotten away with it up to now, but the thing is changing, fortunately, with this nationalist issue they have had.

MR. MARSHALL: How are your (inaudible) today?

MR. NEARY: Oh great! Beautiful!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, they can get all the digs they want in, they do not know what they are talking about. They are more concerned now - they are reacting to us over here - there are only two of us here today the rest are out on -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

They are reacting like there were twenty of us here.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman, I will speak briefly on Legal Aid. Legal Aid is around \$1.1 million per year. It has been going up the past number of years, a certain amount each year. It is, in my opinion, an excellent programme for people who need legal advice and cannot afford it. That is what it comes down to. It is a federal/provincial programme. Most of the work of legal aid is in the criminal law area, and in the criminal law area it is shared 90/10, ninety by the federal government and ten by the provincial government. In the civil area there is no federal assistance as such, but in many instances people using Legal Aid will come under the Canada Assistance programme. So there can be cost sharing under the Canada Assistance programme. The development of Legal Aid during the past several years in Newfoundland has been quite rapid and I think that it will continue to grow. Things such as, for example, the entrenched Charter of Rights certainly

MR. OTTENHEIMER: give rise to a lot of litigation that may not have developed before. I think more and more, as well, people are becoming conscious of their legal rights which is to the good, because people cannot stand up for their rights if they are not aware of them or do not take them seriously. Legal Aid services are provided now in most areas of the Province, not only St. John's but in Central Newfoundland, Western Newfoundland, in Corner Brook and Stephenville, in Happy Valley and Goose Bay and any member and every member of the law society, every practicing lawyer in Newfoundland may do Legal Aid work and most of them do do it. But obviously it is up to the individual lawyer how much of his time he wishes to be involved in Legal Aid for which he is paid, but the scale of fees would be somewhat lower than if he were acting in another capacity. So because there are public funds being used to pay for the Legal Aid - the Legal Aid agreement with the federal government has run out, has been run out for about two years but is

MR. OTTENHEIMER: just going ahead based on the old agreement, and indeed it has been hoped for quite some time that a new agreement will be entered into.

There is a Legal Aid Commission which runs the programme. It is independent of government but reports to government and has a close liason. The Chairman is an outstanding gentleman, a former member of this House, well-known and admired and affectionately regarded by all of us, and that is Mr. Fintan Aylward. I can well remember a few years ago when he was sitting just behind here and I know that he is remembered by all his former colleagues with affection and perhaps endearment. So Mr. Fintan Aylward, who may go down in history as the father of legal aid in Newfoundland, has certainly done an excellent job in developing legal aid in this Province. And the other members of the Committee are: ex officio the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Ron Penney; the federal government has an appointee, Mr. Alan Caul; two people are nominated by the Law Society and they are Mr. Doug Moores, who is a lawyer in Harbour Grace, and Mr. Wayne Diamond, a lawyer practising in Clarenville; and then we have made it a policy on all of these legal boards or quasi legal boards to be sure to have at least one non-lawyer representing, if you wish, the general interest and that is a lady, Mrs. Mary Connors.

So that is the Legal Aid Commission. It is doing excellent work. Certainly for people in conflict with the law who do not have sufficient financial resources then it is of very, very great assistance.

MR. NEARY: Do they submit an annual report?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: They do not submit an annual report in the statutory sense, but obviously we do get regular reports from them and any information that we wish

MR. OTTENHEIMER: to have we get. Indeed, you know, they report to both the provincial and the federal governments, because they are cost shared by both governments. So, as I say, in the criminal area which is extremely important the cost sharing there is 90/10 - we are not sure what the new agreement is going to result in - and in the civil area there is no federal cost sharing as such, but frequently under the Canada Assistance Plan it is possible to cost share it under that programme.

So I think I can say, Mr. Chairman, that the Legal Aid Commission and those who are involved with it are providing a very useful and very necessary service, and they are performing a service of real value to those thousands of Newfoundlanders who need their services and are not in a financial position otherwise to be able to afford it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.



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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman said was rather interesting, as far as he went. He did not give us very many facts or very many details. I presume the agreement that has run out two years ago, the funding is still in place, that the - what is it, 50/50? -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: 90/10 for federal matters.

MR. NEARY: You mean the Government of Canada pays 90 per cent? Ninety per cent paid by the Government of Canada! Well, now, is that not something!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The criminal load is 100 per cent.

MR. NEARY: Ninety per cent of the cost of criminal matters that require Legal Aid services are paid for by the Government of Canada.

DR. COLLINS: It is their Code, sure.

MR. NEARY: Oh, it is their Code. Well, talking about that the hon. gentleman just reminded me of something. The Premier told us in this House the other day, another example of how he tries to dupe the press - we were talking about the abortions that are going on over at the Health Sciences Complex, 1,400 in the last three years. The Premier got up and gave us a lecture and do you know what he said? It was absolutely incredible! I could not believe it! He said it is a federal law. Well, who enforces the Criminal Code in this Province? Is it the provincial Minister of Justice? Is it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is. Well, you should tell your boss, the Premier that because he did not know that the other day when he started to throw his nasties across the House. And not only that, in addition to the provincial Minister of Justice enforcing the Criminal Code

MR. NEARY: in this Province, the Minister of Health runs the hospital that we were talking about. And yet the Premier got up and tried to cleverly dupe the media and put the blame over on the Government of Canada and started to play politics with that very serious matter.

So I presume the funding of 90/10 is still in place with 90 per cent of the cost still recoverable from the Government of Canada even though the agreement has run out, Mr. Chairman.

Now, as I indicated a few moments ago when I spoke, I was so right back in the early 1970s when at that time we were told by the Newfoundland and Labrador Law Society that Legal Aid - and Mr. Chairman, I remember the debate that took place in this House. I remember the gentleman to whom the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) just referred, getting up and saying, 'Oh, \$100,000 will adequately take care of everything - \$100,000 is all we would need because the lawyers would do some work on a voluntary basis, on humanitarian grounds.' And I nearly laughed in his face, Mr. Chairman, because I knew the statements were silly, and I forecast at that time that within ten years the Legal Aid would be \$1 million or more. How right I was! How right I was! And now we have young lawyers coming out of law school in droves. The next thing, if you do not already have it, is you will have a surplus of lawyers. I do not know but you have it now.

MR. NEARY: Last year I heard of a lawyer going bankrupt, who had to go to work with the Justice Department, the first time, I suppose, in the history of Newfoundland where a lawyer went bankrupt.

AN HON. MEMBER: A lot of them are bankrupt.

MR. NEARY: A lot of them are bankrupt? The hon. gentleman's firm is not bankrupt. The hon. gentleman gets us coming and going. He gets the Petro-Canada cases. You go down and who are you facing across the table? the hon. gentleman's law firm - Petro-Canada a great Liberal corporation, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, it was impossible, I suppose, to foresee at the time that so many young men and women in this Province would want to become lawyers because it looked like a pretty easy living, a pretty comfortable living, you would make a pretty decent living. And, as I said, there a couple of years ago one lawyer, because he was bankrupt, had to close down his law firm. And I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that a number of lawyers are struggling today.

MR. MORGAN: He was not a very good lawyer if that is so.

MR. NEARY: He was a good lawyer. Well, I had some dealings with the gentleman.

MR. MORGAN: That is the reason why.

MR. NEARY: Now he is working for the administration, so he must have been a pretty good lawyer, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenhemier) must have thought so when he hired him. But he just could not make a go of it.

MR. NEARY: So you are getting a surplus of lawyers. And so now what do they do? They cannot get themselves tucked away with some well-established law firm, so they are shunted off to the Legal Aid go down and do a bit of legal aid work, make a few dollars off that. And it was not meant to be a make-work project for young lawyers coming out of law school, Mr. Chairman. It was not meant for that. It was not meant to be an apprenticeship programme. It is not a criticism of the lawyers. A lot of my friends are lawyers, I doubt though, with the criticism I have levelled at them over the years, that I will ever be made an honorary member of the Bar Society, but you never know, Mr. Chairman. And the hon. gentleman tried to leave the impression when he was speaking that a lot of the senior lawyers are doing legal aid work. Mr. Chairman, they would not touch it with a barge pole the senior lawyers, they would not touch legal aid work with a barge pole. I would like to know when the hon. gentleman last did a bit of legal aid work.

AN HON. MEMBER: Last week.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, they go from one extreme to the other, they are either forced on to the welfare roles of legal aid or they hit the jackpot with Petro-Canada, the Bank of Montreal, oil companies -

MR. CARTER: Oh, listen to the dirt. Oh, listen to the dirt.

MR. NEARY: No, dirt. It is not dirt. These are facts. Absolute facts, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to get some information from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer); not as much as I would like to have, I would like to have a full and detailed report in the next Session of the House on Legal Aid. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to try to cut it off. I realize how desperate people are for Legal Aid in this society where we have had the economy of this Province so grossly mismanaged by a Tory administration. The words, 'That a Tory Government was never any good', Mr. Chairman, are truer today than they have ever been in our whole history. How often have I heard it said, how often have the members opposite heard it said that a Tory government was never any good? That is what they are saying now. I have travelled this Province more than anybody in this House, more than the Premier, and wherever I go, Mr. Chairman, what do I hear? "A Tory government was never any good." Once in a while you will hear it said that Tory times are hard times, but generally speaking you hear it said that a Tory government was never any good. Now these words were never truer than they are today, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOUSE: What did your policy committee say in Deer Lake last Saturday when you expected sixty-five and only eleven showed up?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they are awfully worried about our dinners and our conferences and our meetings. If they would only concern themselves as much with their departments and with the running of this Province. They seem to be awfully sensitive about what we are doing, Mr. Chairman. Are we getting to them? It would seem that way. The way they react in this House day in and day out you would not know but there was twenty-five of us over here. They get so vicious and so treacherous. But, Mr. Chairman, why do people say that a Tory government was never any good? They say it was never any good because you have record unemployment, you have high taxes, you have a high cost

MR. NEARY: of living, you have charges for children's school books, you have charges for hospitals, you have to be privileged to get a university education. We are going right back to the old Tory days, Mr. Chairman, and that is why people need Legal Aid, more now today than they ever did. It is an indication of the cancer in the Newfoundland and Labrador economy. That is what it is, Mr. Chairman, it is an indication of the poor times. So I would not advocate a reduction in Legal Aid, but I want to make sure, Mr. Chairman, that we are getting value for dollars that we are spending. There is a move on foot now to get the Auditors General of Canada, the Provincial Auditors General to do comprehensive accounting. Well, that is what we need for the Legal Aid, a comprehensive account for this House.

MR. MARSHALL:

(Inaudible) bureaucrats (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Is that so? We do not need bureaucrats, all we need, Mr. Chairman, is information. Comprehensive reporting, do you know what it does? It makes the government responsible, that they get value for the dollars they spend. And that is all I am asking about Legal Aid, are we getting value for the dollars we are spending, or is part of the programme being used for a self-help make work project for young lawyers coming out of law school, Mr. Chairman -

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

MR. NEARY: - for an apprenticeship programme?

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

MR. CARTER: I heard my name used in vain earlier by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) so I could not sit still and let it pass. He points out that the debt of this Province in 1971, early '72, was \$750 million. I think it was rather higher than that, but I will not argue that point with him because that is not what I wanted to argue about. But in line with that debt, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I am sure will support these contentions, we were left with an awful mess to clean up. Now, every time Russia has been invaded she has adopted a policy of scorched earth, that is to say she has burned the crops, and burned the grain, and burned the villages and the invaders had very little left to live on. Now, I would hardly put us in the position of invaders, although I am sure the Liberals back in 1971 and 1972 looked upon us as invaders because we were taking over what they felt to be their rightful domain, and so they adopted a policy of scorched earth and left us with some awful stuff

MR. CARTER: to clean up.

The Labrador Linerboard mill, I believe that cost us \$400 million to straighten up. Come By Chance was something of the order of \$100 million. The steel mill was a matter of some tens of millions. And there were a number of liquor stores that we learned were owned and rented at terribly high rent to the government by the former Premier, Mr. Smallwood, not a large item but certainly an item.

MR. NEARY: How, low.

MR. CARTER: It was just a symbol of the rot that had taken over.

MR. NEARY: How low and slimey can you get?

MR. CARTER: Oh not as slimely as the hon. gentleman even though the moon is full. I suggest that is probably the reason for his vicious attacks.

MR. NEARY: Get up out of the gutter, boy.

MR. CARTER: So, Mr. Chairman, we still have a Joseph McCarthy with us. It is true that the original Joseph McCarthy may have died, but I am sure his spirit on its way to hell fled into the hon. member and it has infected him.

So I would suggest that although we are now debating a message from the Lieutenant-Governor, if the Clerk would pass this message over to the Leader of the Opposition that this might be more appropriate. Because I have never heard such a tissue of abuse, so many twisted facts, and I think that the only way to reply to him is to raise his salary by thirty pieces of silver.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



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

MR. CALLAN: It is not difficult, Mr. Chairman, to see why this Province is so badly in debt, especially on current account, not to mention, of course, the long-term, the \$4 billion one. Because I think, Mr. Chairman, everybody on that side of the House now, all forty whatever it is, forty-two or forty-three - forty-four is it? -

MR. HOUSE: Forty-four.

MR. CALLAN: - forty-four, I believe all forty-four, Mr. Chairman, are on the government payroll in more ways than one. We know, of course, about all the secretaries. The Premier could not put them all into his Cabinet so he then set up these secretarial jobs for people like the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt), and St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) and so on, \$10,000 and \$12,000 gifts, and, of course, Mr. Chairman, when the Premier ran out of these sorts of positions he started to set up commissions like the Commission on Food Prices, for example -

MR. CALLAN:

over the Province, the only reason being to put some extra bucks into the pockets of the Chairman and some of the other Tories on that Commission. They travelled around the Province, stayed in the best hotels and, of course, met for their meetings only to discover that nobody or hardly anybody turned up. It was an embarrassment, I am sure, especially to the Chairman of that Commission, It must have been embarrassing to go to meetings in various towns and villages around this Province only to discover that nobody showed up, hardly anybody.

Mr. Chairman, it was obvious to anybody that if there was any quick and easy way to straighten out the food prices problem the Premier would have done it. Because the Premier is pretty sneaky, Mr. Chairman. I am sure we all remember, it was only a couple of months after the Premier took over the job, it was before, I think, he even went to the polls in his first election, that we saw on CBC the Premier and his family out in the supermarkets pushing the carts around and the CBC reporter said, 'Well, here is the Premier personally concerned about food prices and no doubt he will get to the bottom of it' and so on. It was not too long after that though, when obviously the Premier decided that there was nothing that he could really do about it, that we heard about the threats on the Premier's life and the wire fence around Mount Scio House and so on and now, of course, it came to birth again in the form of a Commission. And I think, Mr. Chairman, every member on that side of the House is on the government payroll, as I said, in several ways besides the way that we are all on it, of course, as MHAs. Mr. Chairman, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), I would not be surprised if he is not getting a stipend because he, of

MR. CALLAN: course, provides the comic relief for this House of Assembly at various intervals, as he did today.

MR. MORGAN: Who?

MR. CALLAN: The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). And he gets a chuckle out of his colleagues across the way.

MR. NEARY: You have to have clowns in every Santa Claus parade.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, when you consider all of the taxes that there are in this Province, you know, not the 12 per cent sales tax and the income tax and the ones that everybody knows all about because they are up front and aboveboard, but when you consider all of the other taxes that are brought in slyly by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, by the Cabinet - for example, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), Mr. Chairman, very sneakily during the Summer we discovered, and I did not discover it until two or three weeks ago when one of my constituents came to me and told me how he had applied for a wilderness cabin permit and when the report came back, yes, you are successful in having control of this land - you do not grant the land all you get is a permit to occupy, and he was told in his letter from the minister's department, 'You send back both forms - both to be signed by the minister, one to be kept and, of course, one mailed back to you - you mail it back to us with a fee of \$375 and, of course, the wilderness cabin permit is yours.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I happened to have gone through the process, myself and a couple of friends of mine, in the Spring and at that time it was \$50. Suddenly it went up to \$75 a year, sneakily over the Summer, and these are the sorts of examples, Mr. Chairman, of the sneaky kind of taxes that this government is imposing on people.

MR. CALLAN: Only last week, Mr. Chairman, I discovered that when somebody is building a home through Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, and of course it is done through the legal firm of the town closest to where a person lives, that the consent of the minister is required. Of course that was always required, there is nothing new about that, the minister is aware of that. However, when a particular law firm sent in their paperwork to obtain the consent of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) a letter went back to the law firm saying, you omitted to enclose your \$50 fee. So a \$50 fee was sneaked in there in recent times also, Mr. Chairman. So these are the kinds of sneaky little taxes and tactics that this government, or this political party that calls itself a government, is perpetrating on the people of this Province, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure that there are many, many other examples of it.

Mr. Chairman, if I may refer to Legal Aid for just a moment, I am quite certain that some of the lawyers who are supposed to be working for Legal Aid are not doing a very good job of it. Because I am sure, I am convinced - a constituent of mine who was involved in a car accident and had to go seek Legal Aid and so on - that the lawyer, who is a prominent St. John's lawyer, by the way, who is a fairly prominent St. John's lawyer, he is not as prominent as the government House Leader and some of the other prominent lawyers around the city but he is well-known around the city, this gentleman dragged his feet, he did not do the necessary paperwork to insure that this young gentleman could get some insurance as a result of the accident he was involved in.

So, Mr. Chairman, Supplementary Supply is \$17.5 million, the Special Warrants that were issued, how much is it going to cost the taxpayers of

MR. CALLAN: this Province to set up this other commission? I mentioned a Food Prices Commission, what about this latest commission, the Commission on the Electoral Boundaries Redistribution? Looking at the Special Warrants there this commission was allocated a certain amount of money and they came back looking for extra money. What are they doing? What are the members of this committee doing, Mr. Chairman? I was on the way to Corner Brook last weekend, not this one past, and stopped for dinner at Gander and ran into the members of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. They are having meetings, there is no question about that, Mr. Chairman. By the way, I was happy I ran into the members because for the past three weeks I had been talking to different members in the House of Assembly who told me that part of Bellevue is going to be in my district the next time, and another part of Bellevue is going to be in my district the next time around and so on, and I got some calls from constituents who were concerned. But I was very pleased in one sense that

MR. CALLAN:

I ran into the members of the Electoral Boundaries Commission because I was assured in no uncertain terms that there are no changes planned for the district of Bellevue. There are no changes in the district of Bellevue, and neither should there be.

MR. SIMMS:

It has to go through the public hearing process.

MR. CALLAN:

The minister should show me the map. I have been shown the map and there is nothing on that map that indicates anything except that somebody does not know how to look at a map. That is all it indicates.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman, I will get back at it some other time.

RESOLUTION: That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1983, the sum of seventeen million five hundred and sixty-four thousand two hundred dollars (\$17,564,200).

On motion, resolution carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution and a bill consequent thereto, carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, before I move the Committee rise, now that we have dispensed with Supplementary Supply, I call, while Your Honour is still in the Chair, Motion 2, Bill No. 49.

RESOLUTION: That is is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957, to provide for the guarantee of the repayment of loans made to, and the advance of loans to certain Local Authorities.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. MCNICHOLAS): Motion 2, Bill No. 49, the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, this resolution again will give rise to a bill, hopefully, and the bill will be "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957." There is a schedule attached to the bill and the effect of the act will be to amend that schedule and bring it up to date. And the schedule deals with the monies that local authorities have borrowed to carry on various works, water and sewer works, road paving and so on. They, in the first instance, borrow these monies from banks and, subsequently, when the money is borrowed through NMFC, Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation, when that money is borrowed those bank loans are paid down and the communities then have the borrowings directly with NMFC. And the reason for that mechanism is that there is a better rate available to the municipalities from NMFC than from the banking institutions.

So with those words of explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I assume that we are still talking about the year ended 31 March, 1983?

DR. COLLINS: Yes, the loan and the -

MR. MARSHALL: Look at your bill, look at your bill.

MR. NEARY: It does not say in the bill.

DR. COLLINS: This is an amendment of the schedule up to the current date.

MR. NEARY: What I am asking the minister is what year we are talking about? Is it the year ended 31 March 1983, or it is the year ended 31 March 1984?

DR. COLLINS: There will be another amendment of the schedule next year so this is for this year.

MR. NEARY: This is for the current fiscal year.

DR. COLLINS: Right.

MR. NEARY: So we are talking about loans and guarantees issued to councils, local improvement districts and the like for the year ended 31 March 1984? Is that what we are doing?

DR. COLLINS: Since the schedule was last amended.

MR. NEARY: When was the schedule last amended, can the hon. gentleman tell me?



DR. COLLINS: I forget the date now but it was about a year ago, roughly a year ago, a bit over a year ago.

MR. NEARY: Okay. Now, Mr. Chairman, we would like to ask a few questions about some of these heavy items here, the heavy items such as \$1,200,000 for the town of Brigus, twenty years. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what that was for? And there is \$3 million there for the town of Conception Bay South. The hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) seems to be doing very well, \$3 million over a period of twenty years. The city of Corner Brook \$1,800,000, and the town council of Gambo \$1,720,000 - I am only going for the ones that are over \$2 million - \$2 million the town of the Goulds. Mr. Chairman, I am only singling out the heavies here.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, leave the light ones to me.

MR. NEARY: I will leave the light ones to my hon. friend. Now, Mr. Chairman, as hon. members know there is \$450,000 in there for the town of Port aux Basques. I would assume that some of that \$450,000 is for the clean-up operations that they had to carry out earlier this year to try to clean-up the water supply in Port aux Basques. And although they made a tremendous improvement in the water, Mr. Chairman, they still have very serious problems with the water in Port aux Basques. Now, they have approached the administration

MR. NEARY: and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) agreed to put up \$1. - what was it? - \$1.8 million or \$1.9 million, and they are looking to the Government of Canada for the balance. I do not know what programme under the Government of Canada they would expect to get -

MR. HOUSE: Are you trying to help them?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I am trying to help them. -to get that money from. But as hon. members know, Mr. Chairman, water and sewer projects are a provincial matter. Now, we have one minister in this House thumbing his nose at Ottawa when he is offered money to expand a senior citizens' home, and we have another minister who sends a delegation off to Ottawa to look for money for something that comes under the jurisdiction of the Province.

MR. DINN: You would think the member would have gone with them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that, to me, is an indication that the minister is trying to shrug off a responsibility on somebody else.

MRS. NEWHOOK: They went to Ottawa on their own.

MR. NEARY: Oh, they went on their own.

MR. DINN: And they did not ask the member.

MR. NEARY: In other words, Mr. Chairman, the minister did not give them adequate financing to do the job that had to be done. Because what they have to do in Port aux Basques, they have to put in a filtration system. Mr. Chairman, the water in Port aux Basques is discoloured, has been for years, and has a very high ratio of bacteria, Mr. Chairman. I suppose if you sniff anything long enough it is bound to get to you - is it, Mr. Chairman? If you sniff glue or if you sniff savoury long enough it is bound to affect your brain, is it not?

MR. NEARY: You are bound to have brain damage if you sniff anything long enough, I suppose.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I would submit that the hon. gentleman has been in the savoury patch too long.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it is going to take \$4 million or \$5 million to remedy that situation in Port aux Basques. It is a desperate situation. I have not seen water anywhere in the Province like it.

MR. GOUDIE: Water, water everywhere (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, I saw a system - where was it? - not Makkovik, yes - was it Makkovik or Davis Inlet? - where they made this reservoir and in the Winter they forgot that the water did not run into the reservoir, it was all hove up. Where was that? Davis Inlet was it?

MR. GOUDIE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Where?

MR. GOUDIE: Davis Inlet.

MR. NEARY: Davis Inlet.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it will take \$4 million or \$5 million to cure that situation in Port aux Basques. Now I would like to ask the minister, in the event that the funding cannot be found anywhere under a federal programme, what does the minister intend to do about this? \$1.8 million will not go near rectifying that situation, and the town cannot afford to borrow a couple or \$3 million to do it. What does the minister intend to do about this?

MR. SIMMS: Talk to the Mayor about it every day.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the Mayor. His brother Kinsmen might be talking to the hon. gentleman ever day, but that is

MR. NEARY:

about all.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member is mad now.

MR. NEARY:

That is about as far as it gets.

Mr. Chairman, so what is the minister going to do about this? How long more will the people of Port aux Basques be forced to drink contaminated polluted water , one of the oldest Town Councils, I suppose, in the Province, a town that has made more than its contribution to the economy and to the social and economic life of this Province,

MR. NEARY: hard workers that have paid their taxes? They have had layoffs out there recently, thirty-six employees. In addition to the layoffs over the last year or two, thirty-six more employees got their notice there a couple of weeks ago, and not a word out of the administration, not a peep out of them. Not a peep to try to save these jobs. I think it is seventy-odd jobs going altogether, thirty-six freight handlers in Port aux Basques. Not a word out of them. They ignore it as if the place does not exist in this world. They cannot think beyond Stephenville. They cannot get their thoughts beyond Stephenville. They think there is some kind of a road block, a barrier in Stephenville. They cannot get any further than Stephenville.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am taking advantage of this bill now to raise this matter. I hope I will get a response from the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) as to what the Province is going to do about a matter that comes under its jurisdiction. Will they provide adequate financing to the town council in Port aux Basques so they can carry on with the filtration system that is necessary, which is a very expensive system by the way, very expensive. I believe there are only one or two like it in Canada.

MR. MARSHALL: Rose Blanche, I think, has one.

MR. NEARY: No, the one in Rose Blanche is not a filtration system. The one in Rose Blanche was an experiment that was carried out to see if it is possible to put in water and sewerage above ground in the North, and apparently it has been very successful. It cost \$2.3 million. I am very familiar with it, Mr. Chairman. I fought hard to persuade DREE and the Government

MR. NEARY: of Canada to put that system in Rose Blanche. It is over and above ground. It is the only system in Newfoundland like it, over and above ground. Part of it is above ground, part of it is below ground and they have pumping stations. I think every home has a pump of its own.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, only the ones that are on the right hand side of the going out.

MR. NEARY: No, all of them have pumps.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, they do not.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: You are not quite as Tory as the other one, not quite as Tory, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMS: I would not say that.

MR. NEARY: Well, I would. I would say it. Now that we have gotten them cable television down there I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman anytime he wants to, he can come down. Anytime he wants to. Now that we have got cable and we have got the discs and we -

MR. SIMMS: Who got that for them?

MR. NEARY: Well, certainly the administration never lifted a finger to help them.

MR. POWER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, that is between me and the people of the community. No comment! I am not making any comment on that, Mr. Chairman.

I am talking about the filtration now to cure the problems with the water in Port aux Basques. I do not think the minister is assuming her responsibility in this regard. The town certainly cannot.

MR. NEARY: Because of the economic setbacks in recent years and another thirty-six being laid off now the first of the year, the town cannot afford these kinds of dollars. And it is a very, very serious situation. Mr. Chairman, when I look at some of the loans and guarantees in this bill—take a look at Conception Bay South. Now, the people of Conception Bay South deserve everything they are getting.

MR. BUTT: Right on!

MR. NEARY: Well, what about the people of Port aux Basques.

MR. BUTT: They do too.

MR. NEARY: But they are not getting the same treatment from the ministers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, why are you not doing something about that?

MR. NEARY: I am doing something about it now and I have done something about it.

MR. BUTT: Per capita they are getting more in Port aux Basques.

MR. NEARY: Are they really?

MR. BUTT: Port aux Basques is only a little tiny place compared to Conception Bay South.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Chairman, do you hear that now? Only a little tiny place. What about the town of Brigus, \$1,200,000? They are certainly entitled to it. They are only getting what they are entitled to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, what about the town of the Goulds? I know if Your Honour could answer me he would tell me that they need much more and I would have to agree with him that they do need much more, and they are getting everything they are entitled to. They got \$2 million. Grand Falls did not do too badly either, \$315,000 for a company town that has everything, practically, they want.

MR. SIMMS:

They have the member they want anyway.

MR. NEARY:

That is only a temporary thing, Mr. Chairman. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not complaining about these loans and guarantees. The point we are making is the favouritism. Mr. Chairman, we have an emergency situation in Port aux Basques, it is an emergency. And not trying to be an alarmist, Mr. Chairman, but I never cease to be amazed that an epidemic has not broken out a long time ago. I think it is terrible that in this day and age people are forced to go up to the provincial park, the Cheeseman Park, and bring their water in buckets and barrels down to Port aux Basques, in this day and age in 1983 under a Tory administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

has elapsed.

The hon. the member's time

MR. NEARY:

Chairman.

I will get back at it again, Mr.

On motion, resolution carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

On motion, Schedule carried.



Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Resolution and a bill consequent thereto, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order 4, Bill No. 77.

RESOLUTION: That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend The Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957, the Act No. 70 of 1957, to provide for the advance of loans to and the guarantee of the repayment of bonds or debentures issues by or loans advanced to certain corporations.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, once again we are debating a resolution and there will be, undoubtedly, a bill brought in thereto once the resolution is carried, and this refers to the Loan and Guarantee Act. The effect of the bill will be to amend the Schedule which is appended to the 1957 Act, and that amendment to the Schedule is necessitated by new guarantees and/or loans given to certain companies and enterprises that are carrying on business in the Province and for one reason or another got into some difficulties and needed assistance in order to maintain a level of employment. Now as has been stated a number of times, when these requests come in for assistance very many of them are fishing companies, not exclusively but very, very many

DR. COLLINS:

of them, the vast majority are. And there is a committee of officials from three of the departments in government, they are from Fisheries, obviously, from the Department of Development, and from the Department of Finance, and they will assess these requests as they come in and they will then make a recommendation which the three ministers from those particular departments will review. And, having reviewed that, then a recommendation is made to Cabinet as to what to do about the request.

If the request does result in the granting of a guarantee, or the granting of a loan, the same officials are charged with monitoring those companies to make sure that the effect of the loan or guarantee is in actual fact, as far as humanly possible, in line with what was proposed. And we have been very successful in that. These companies have been closely monitored and the total effort has been a very valuable one. Indeed, if this effort had not been entered into, our fishery, and especially the inshore fishery, the smaller producers would be in very dire straits indeed as a result of the unfortunate federal monetary policies which a number of years ago put interest rates at such a level that these small operations had great difficulty in getting working capital and in conducting their affairs. At the same time, the unfortunate federal neglect in taking care of the marketing necessary for our fishery resulted in rather diminished markets for these small operations. In many cases these were absolutely crucial rescue operations. Otherwise, there would be closures of many plants, there would be many communities left without their sole sources of employment, and there would be a great deal of hardship and, of course, expense to various

DR. COLLINS: governments in terms of welfare payments and so on.

So this has been a very good programme, indeed, and I commend it to the House and I move the resolution.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let us accept this for what it is, it is a bail-out. The hon. gentleman, it is a wonder he is not struck down with lightning over there, Mr. Chairman, the twist he puts on everything. What a wonderful programme this is! The programme this is, Mr. Chairman, is that it is a bail-out because the companies have financial problems or are headed for bankruptcy. Now I believe the best way for us to deal with this particular act, the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957, Bill No. 77, is to take them one at a time, one company at a time. Let me take, first of all, Aqua - and I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this bill was only circulated in the House today, to show the contempt that the minister and this administration have for the House. I sent to the Speaker's Office for this

MR. NEARY: the Speaker's Office for this bill before the House met at 3:00 p.m. today and it was not available. It has been circulated since we came into the House. And we are forced here this afternoon to debate this bill even though we only saw it an hour and a half ago for the first time. Mr. Chairman, that is shameful! Shameful! It just goes to show the contempt that this administration have for this House.

MR. SIMMS: It is a simple bill.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is kind of a simple bill, alright!

MR. SIMMS: It is easy to understand.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is easy to understand as long as you do not twist words like the minister just did to try to make believe that it is something else.

MR. SIMMS: That is Steve's version of it.

MR. NEARY: It is a bail-out, and let us find out how well our tax dollars are being protected.

Now, Aqua Fisheries Limited - could the minister tell the House where Aqua Fisheries Limited is located, what it produces -

MR. SIMMS: Would not these bills be the same as the ones written in the 1960s when the hon. member was a member of another administration? Are these not standard bills, to be written the same way? Are they not pretty standard?

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman wishes to contribute to the debate he is allowed ten minutes and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that hon. gentleman will not do what the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) did.

MR. SIMMS: I am asking a reasonable question. You said you got the bill only a half-hour ago.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) was going to answer my queries about

MR. NEARY: Port aux Basques and what happened? She got stared down by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), stood up -

MR. SIMMS: Did the Chair call the question?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I was watching the hon. minister. She very nervously got up out of her seat and then all of a sudden collapsed in the seat and did not give me the answer.

MR. SIMMS: She was going to the bathroom.

MR. NEARY: Going to the bathroom and she has not gone yet, Mr. Chairman. - And she squat back in her seat again. Now, I do not know if the minister was afraid of the Government House Leader, if she was too nervous - if she is smarting under what is happening in Gander regarding the expansion to the senior citizens' home; the controversy surrounding that may have her in a nervous frenzy. But, anyway, for some reason or other she hauled herself up out of the seat, looked very nervous and then got a cold stare from somebody there opposite and then squat in her seat again and did not answer the questions about this very serious matter concerning the drinking water in Port aux Basques. So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will not be like that. The Government House Leader is out of the House at the moment.

Give us a little information about Aqua Fisheries. Where is it located? What do they produce? They have gotten \$40,000 of a loan. When did they get it and are their payments up to date? A few very simple, honest, common-sense questions and I would like to hear the minister's answers.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, I rise to assist my colleague in supplying information to the Assembly on these loan guarantees made to fishing companies. And, as the minister mentioned, of course, without these government guarantees, some of these companies would have found themselves - well, did find themselves really, in some dire financial straits. And because of high interest rates and because of sluggish markets, they found themselves wanting some financial assistance and under a formalized programme - in fact, a few days ago before the House of Commons Committee on Fisheries, the Newfoundland Government programme of financial assistance to independents was applauded, applauded by Opposition members, applauded

MR. MORGAN: by the NDP members and by the Liberal members in the Committee, that this was a good programme. They would like to see the same kind of a programme put in place by the Nova Scotian government, and by the New Brunswick government in particular. They thought it was a good programme. It is not a grant, it is not direct subsidies, it is a programme whereby, when the banks get tough with these companies and they will not advance a lot of credit, they will after we put in place some guarantees. Now some of these companies are only small but at the same time very important to the respective community where they operate from or in. In this case, Aqua Fisheries, for example, is a good little company, small scale, in Aquaforte. They operate up there and the two principals, Mr. Don Graham and Mr. Gary Hearn, as I recall, and I had a number of meetings with them, are involved with the independent association; in fact, they were very instrumental, that same company and its principals, in forming a consortium of independents. Something like sixteen or seventeen companies got together and formed a consortium to market under one label. What a good initiative that really is. We support it financially, in fact, over and above this assistance to Aqua Fisheries, we support it in a grant of \$15,000 to I think it was a total of seventeen companies, which formed a consortium to market their product under the one label Sunsea, S-u-n-s-e-a. And that has been very successful, very well accepted in the US market. Each of these companies do its own surveillance among the companies making sure they are producing top quality products. If I recall correctly, Smith Sea Foods out in the Bellevue district is part of that same consortium and they are doing a good job. We gave

MR. MORGAN: Aqua Fisheries a loan guarantee of \$40,000. They are principally involved in groundfish, they are not involved in any lucrative species, crab, for example, which was good the last few years, and any company with a crab licence can usually be able to make a profit and cross subsidize the groundfish because of the better prices they are getting for the crab products in the US market in particular. But they do not have the lucrative species, mostly they are involved in groundfish and doing a good job, as I say, in working in co-operation with their fellow companies in the fishing business. I can go on, Mr. Chairman, to talk about the other companies, unless we can come back to individual questions on them, but I will be glad to answer any questions regarding Blue Ocean Products, regarding Island Seafoods - there are the same couple of shareholders in these two companies, Island Seafoods and Blue Ocean. Port Enterprises, of course, is Phonse Best out in Long Harbour.

MR. CALLAN: Southern Harbour.

MR. MORGAN: Southern Harbour, I am sorry.

Thanks for the corrections, Southern Harbour in Placentia Bay. White's Fisheries is up on the Great Northern Peninsula. White's fisheries had some problems there as well and I must say since the loan guarantee was put in place about a year ago, a year and a half ago, they have turned things around and are now in a stable position and on a good footing for the future. The same goes for Port Enterprises. To the best of my knowledge there is no indication in this year from them, although the loan guarantee is good, I think, until the end of March, the end of this fiscal year. There is no indication they want an extension and there is no indication to date from Blue Ocean or Island Seafoods that they will want an extension. So these kind of loan guarantees were put in place when the





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

MR. NEARY: Now let me come back to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) where I feel I could get more specific information. I did not ask questions of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to get up and start patting himself on the back. We would like to have a few -

MR. MORGAN: Do you want the information or do you not?

MR. NEARY: No. Mr. Speaker, that is information all right! The hon. gentleman trying to blow his own horn.

MR. MORGAN: I am sure you will not do it, you will not blow my horn.

MR. NEARY: No, that is for sure. Neither will the people down in Bloomfield or Lethbridge or Port Blandford. The hon. gentleman is headed out there on Thursday. They will not blow his horn either. They are just laying for the hon. gentleman in Lethbridge and Eastport.

MR. MARSHALL: Why are they keeping you on?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the reason I did not think I was going to be here today is I was out there for the weekend.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, really! Were you campaigning?

MR. NEARY: I was there on the weekend.

MR. MORGAN: I am really worried!

MR. NEARY: You know, the funny part about it I can get around this Province. Even though I do not have the helicopters or the aircraft, I can get around this Province, I guarantee you, as good as anybody. I spent part of Friday in Terra Nova and then I went to Lewisporte and then I spent all day Saturday in Terra Nova district. Now, Mr. Chairman, how is that for getting around the Province? And not only that, Mr. Chairman, but ran into the worst kind of a snow storm in the process.

MR. MORGAN: You did not even make enough money in Lewisporte to pay for the hall. You went in the hole on your fund raising. Only seventy-five turned up for the meeting.

MR. NEARY: Now, if the hon. gentleman will just restrain himself.

Mr. Chairman, there is only one point the hon. gentleman made that I agree with, and that is that the independents are terribly worried about restructuring. The independents are afraid that they may be wiped out by this establishment of a super company. And do not let anybody cod themselves, especially the hon. minister, that the independents are going to market the product through this super company. The hon. gentleman, by the way, down there from Trepassey (Mr. Power), I have a word of advice for him too, that some of the quota that went into Trepassey last year was National Sea's quota. If I was the hon. gentleman I would watch restructuring very, very carefully because Trepassey may not get that quota this year and they may end up working ten or twelve or fourteen weeks instead of several months as they worked this year. The hon. gentleman nods his head. Do not be too sure. I heard a conversation the other day about Trepassey. Trepassey was using part of National Sea's

MR. NEARY: quota, that is what kept them going so many months of this year, but they may not get that quota next year. I do not hear the hon. member for the district up fighting for that, to see that that does not happen.

But, Mr. Chairman, the independents are concerned and they have every right to be concerned. They could all be annihilated with the establishment of this super company if appropriate steps are not taken to protect the interests of the independents. They could very easily happen.

I want to come back to the first item on the agenda here, Aqua Fisheries Limited. Now, we know where it is located, in Aquaforte. How many people do they employ and how many months out of the year are they operating, or do they just take the fish at the glut season? Do they have a year-round supply of fish? I realize the amount is not all that much, but it is taxpayer money and taxpayers have a right to know how their money is being spent. How many people do they employ? Could the hon. gentleman give us that information?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Again, to assist my colleague, Mr. Chairman, I would not expect my colleague to have at his fingertips all the information on these different plants and companies, and I am pleased to be of assistance in supplying information.

As I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, Aqua Fisheries is one of the many small companies we have assisted, but it is still important to the area it is operating in. The plant employees, if I recall, a figure around 100 or 110 employees on a seasonal basis. It is a seasonal inshore plant, what we call resource-short plant. Like many, many other plants that we have assisted, they do not have trawlers, they do not have access to trawler fish, they depend on the inshore fishery. When the inshore fishery is over in the Fall of the year, their plants are closed, the doors are closed until next Spring. That is the reason why the resource-short plant programme is so important to these independent companies. The hon. gentleman speaks with two voices. He is speaking again with tongue in cheek, forked tongue because -

MR. BUTT: Forked tongue.

MR. MORGAN: - Mr. Chairman, a few days ago he was condemning this government for working in cooperation and to agree with a proposal from Ottawa, and it was Ottawa's policy and proposal to have foreigners land fish. It was not initiated from this government at all, it came from Mr. De Bane's policy, and we agreed with it because he wanted to see a programme of using foreign vessels for a temporary period, an interim means of catching fish like they have always done. There was never a programme, there was never yet fish landed to resource-short

MR. MORGAN: plants caught by Canadian trawlers. There was never a pound of fish yet landed and processed in resource-short plants using Canadian trawlers. They have always used foreign trawlers and foreign vessels, Japanese, Russian, Portuguese mostly. Now we are at a time when we cannot get the Canadian vessels to come into play because of the restructuring in process and not finalized.

The hon. gentleman condemns the government for trying to get fish to the resource-short plants to help the independent. Now, on the other hand, he is coming in and saying we are not doing enough for the independents. Well, the fact is if the hon. gentleman is opposed to the programme of guarantee assistance to these inshore resource-short plants, independent plants and companies, let him say it. Let him stand and say he is opposed to the government dollars being used to assist the small and medium sized companies. It is no good in getting on with this measly mouthing that restructuring is going to hurt the independents or the independents are concerned. We know they are concerned. I have been talking with them over and over. In fact, tomorrow I am meeting with twenty-five independent companies in one meeting, representing the fish trades in Newfoundland, twenty-five companies, and sitting down and discussing with them the whole issue of restructuring and the programme of assistance for the independent and the resource-short plant programme.

So the Opposition has got to indicate where they stand. Do they want us to support the independent companies or not? We know they are opposed to getting fish to the independents' plants and every fish plant along the East coast is aware of that. I made sure of that a few days ago, that the Opposition



MR. MORGAN: inshore fishing boats. Without Aqua Fisheries, they would not have had a market for their product last Summer.

MR. POWER: And they would not need the guarantee to get some of that offshore fish that the Liberals oppose.

MR. MORGAN: That is right. They probably would not need any financial assistance if they could have the resource-short plant fish from the offshore put in their plants, which the Opposition has now opposed, and scratched and bawled about a few days during Question Period, trying to let it be believed that it was our policy, that we were going to get foreigners back in our waters after a 200 mile zone being declared in 1977. Now to turn things around, the fact is the foreigners always landed resource-short plant fish, always. We are trying to get it more Canadianized, sure we are, the two governments working together. But Aqua Fish is a prime example of this government recognizing the importance of the small little company out there in the fish business. We will never allow the restructuring, the big, large company, the new super company, to swallow them up. We will never allow that. We will never let them bring in unfair competition against the small companies. We will always fight that. We will make sure that the large super company helps out, aids, and augments the activities of the small independent companies, even in the marketing of their fish and otherwise. But we are never going to see a situation where the independents are going to be left out there on their own without recognition from this government. So Aqua Fisheries, I will say again, employs 110 people,



MR. MORGAN: a small company, found themselves hurting in difficult times, they bought from 45 to 48 fishermen and they are seasonal. They are closed right now because they have no fish.

I met with Aqua Fisheries no longer than three weeks ago, and Phonse Best, another gentleman we helped there, Port Enterprises. Here are two companies here that if they had resource-short plant fish being landed right now, and landed last Fall by low-cost employment of foreign vessels, we would never have had to have this loan and guarantee put forward for these two companies. Never. But the fact is that common sense is not prevailing in the issue and the hon. gentlemen in the Opposition wants to twist things around, to try to score some political points with the inshore fishermen on the Northeast Coast, leaving the impression, 'Here goes the Peckford Administration bringing back foreigners.' The fact is we want to displace all the foreigners. That is the reason why there is in the restructuring agreement a firm understanding that a study will be carried out on resource utilization. And in that resource utilization study, one of the mandates of it is to look at all means and ways of disposing of foreign fishing within our 200 mile zone to make more fish stocks available to our plants and for our people to be employed in these plants.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say again that the hon. gentleman, he cannot be weasling around, he cannot be speaking with a forked tongue; either he is for the independents and he wants to help the independents, or he is against the independent fish companies. The policy which I heard coming forward from at least one spokesman on fisheries - there are so many spokesmen on fisheries these days in the Opposition I just do not know who to respond.

MR. MORGAN: to; they are supposed to have an official spokesman on fisheries matters - I do not know what the situation is but at least one spokesman is leaving the impression that we are wrong as a government in putting forward assistance to the independents or any other fish company, let the fittest company survive, and why should we use taxpayers' dollars to help any of the companies in trouble in the fishing industry. Let them go out and if they cannot survive let them fall by the wayside, with a loss of jobs in their plants and the loss of markets for fishermen.

Mr. Chairman, that may be their policy but it is not the policy of this government here and this party. We are going to help these small independent companies, whether they be in the fish business or any other resource sector, and help them survive over rough times and carry on to be vibrant and viable in the future.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that the hon. gentleman has no credibility with the fishermen or with the plant workers in this Province after making that kind of statement in this hon. House? You know, we never cease to be amazed why the hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford) has not dealt severely with the hon. gentleman who has been in hot water more often than any other minister, I suppose, in the history of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is -

MR. MORGAN: I would not get personal if I were you.

MR. NEARY: No, that is not personal. The is the Auditor General's report and the report of the Public Accounts Committee is not a personal issue, Mr. Chairman. The Public Tendering Act is not a personal issue, breaking the Public Tendering Act.

MR. MORGAN: Talk on the policy issue. There is no need to get personal.

MR. NEARY: Breaking the Public Tendering Act is not a personal issue, Mr. Chairman. And neither is going out and telling racist jokes a personal matter, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that we were just asking the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) some very simple questions regarding a bill that he has before the House. The hon. gentleman gets up and makes wild, irresponsible statements about

MR. NEARY: we are opposed to this and we are opposed to that. The fact of the matter is that is our duty and our responsibility to ask questions as to how taxpayer money is spent. And that is what we are doing, Mr. Chairman, asking the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) decides that he is going to leap into the fray, to get drawn into the debate, get in over his ears and make statements that he cannot back up, just to show his complete ignorance of the topic under discussion. As I said, is it any wonder the credibility of the hon. gentleman is so bad with the fishermen of this Province. He is the laughing-stock of the fishermen. The laughing stock, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN: Come along to a meeting some time and I will show you.

MR. NEARY: The poor old fishermen have no choice. They are shunted off to the Minister of Fisheries. They have no choice. But, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is time that the hon. gentleman had a reshuffle. The hon. gentleman managed to get back in the House now for another five minutes. It is time that he had a Cabinet reshuffle. We would still like to know why he cannot deal effectively with the gentleman who just made these irresponsible statements across the House.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we are concerned about the independents, that we want to see the resource-short plants get a good supply of fish. Mr. Chairman, what we oppose is slave labour. That is what we oppose.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to take Hansard for this afternoon and I am going to underline what the hon. gentleman said, everybody heard it, that bringing the foreigners inside the 200 mile limit was Mr. De Bane's programme.

MR. NEARY: That is what the hon. gentleman said, 'It is Mr. De Bane's programme'. Well, I am going to take Hansard for this afternoon and, as soon as I can get that part of Hansard, I am going to underline that in red and I am going to send it to Mr. De Bane to see what the hon. gentleman said.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we will find out whose programme it is. The fact of the matter is that I have a feeling the administration, who requested bringing the foreigners inside the 200 mile limit, the Province requesting it is ashamed and afraid to put their request in writing. I have that feeling, Mr. Chairman, that they are too cowardly to put their proposal down on paper. And the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) supports that kind of an administration, that are too cowardly to state their position, to put their proposal in writing to the federal minister and to the federal government. This question of bringing foreigners in the back door, after 1977 trying to kick them out, trying to get them outside the 200 mile limit, now this administration wants to bring them back in. And that is what we are opposing, Mr. Chairman.

I would suggest to the administration that they look at the other options.

MR. NEARY: Once you open up the flood-gates it will take a miracle to get it shut again, once the Portuguese and the Spaniards and the West Germans get in here. And the Portuguese are pretty heavily involved here now on the Southern Shore. As a matter of fact, I would not be a bit surprised, but up to the time they had the misfortune there in Bay Bulls, that the Portuguese had control of that company. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have to ask ourselves a question about the foreigners controlling our fishery. Is that what the hon. gentleman wants over there, who has been advocating owning our own resources for the last couple of years, the great nationalist issue? He has been carrying the ball on that. Mr. Chairman, that is a good question. But, anyway, I think we have squeezed enough information one way or another on Aqua Fisheries. Now, could the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) give us some information on Blue Ocean Fisheries Ltd.? They have gotten a guarantee of \$500,000. Actually, in all of these cases, by the way, I would like to ask the minister if the interest payments are up to date. I wonder if the Minister of Finance is listening to me? In all of these cases that I am asking questions about, are their payments up to date? Mr. Chairman are we going to get any answers or is the hon. gentleman just going to have another meeting?

MR. SIMMS: He will respond to you.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman is not in his seat. I will gladly sit down.

MR. SIMMS: Let him worry about that. You get on with your remarks.

MR. NEARY: Well, first, Aqua Fisheries; I want to know if their payments are up to date. Blue Ocean Products: I would like to know where they are located, what they

MR. NEARY: produce, how many employees they have and if their payments are up to date? These are questions that the taxpayers are entitled to have answered, Mr. Chairman, because it is the taxpayers' money that we are using to help these companies.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries,

MR. MORGAN: I want to respond again to the irresponsible position being taken by the Opposition on a very important matter whereby today in this Province there are no ifs, ands or buts, today, right now, across this Province, the Northeast Coast in particular, we are losing thousands of jobs in our plants because of the position taken by the Liberal Party in Newfoundland. And I found that out yesterday, over the week-end, that the Liberal Party took a firm stand and said 'No, do not approve any foreign vessels landing fish to those plants in the Province of Newfoundland, We are opposed to it because Mr. Cashin is opposed to it', those were the words that were used. Now the fact is the Liberal Party can try to weasel out of this all they want to, but the fact still stands that the Opposition Party, the Liberal Party in this Province, took a position firmly to deny jobs to Newfoundlanders at a time of the year when we need the jobs so desperately, when there is no work in these plants. They need an extra income for the winter and for the Christmas Season coming up in particular. But the Liberal Party has taken a stand to deny them work in these plants by saying, 'No, do not you ever approve that up there, we will condemn you for it if you do it, Mr. De Bane and the federal government.' Do not do it because Mr. Peckford and his government will get credit for it. Because Mr. Peckford and his Administration, it is their proposal about foreign vessels. Well, it was obvious last week in Question Period





MR. MORGAN: the independent companies themselves by the federal government and the federal minister, Mr. De Bane, with copies to us, the Newfoundland Government. They want to harvest 10,000 tons total, half by the foreign vessels and half using Canadian vessels, with the objective being, down the road, to totally Canadianize the resource-short plant programme, which is indeed a very good objective. We both want to see that kind of policy pursued of eventually having the resource-short plant fish from the offshore landed by Canadian bottoms, by Canadian vessels. But because the restructuring was not in place, and because the Canadian trawler company owners could not reach an agreement with the independents, we said, 'Let us put in place right away the portion of your policy which says, 'Let us land half of the fish using foreign vessels.' Now, that is what we said to them in a telex. We are not ashamed of our position. We are quite proud of the position we took on the issue. Then the first of January, when the restructuring is all complete, then we can have the remaining portion, or the remaining half of the total amount, to be then landed by the Canadian vessels. We will have the restructured companies in place, hopefully in both provinces, and we could then assign part of the fleet to catch the fish for the same resource-short plants.

Now, that is the crux of all of this. And to try to twist the whole issue around now, to try to weasle out of the hole they dug themselves in, in this case where there is hardly a plant owner who is not aware of who is opposing getting fish to their plants, not hardly a plant owner. You know, Mr. Cashin took a stand and says, 'No, we are opposed at this time' and gave some reasons. Because their own trawlermen - and

MR. MORGAN: it is a good reason on the part of the union, no question - they have 1,555, to be exact, trawlermen now not working, at this time of the year not working, many of them, for example, tied up in the vessels in St. John's and other ports. And they said, 'Well, why should we agree to having foreigners land their fish when our own trawlermen are out of work? Let us try to pursue this further and try to get the trawler companies like National Sea and Nickerson in particular to use their vessels.' Up until now the receiver is speaking for Fishery Products, the receiver appointed and responsible for the operations, and we have not yet got the company in place, the new company with the shareholders, the two government and the bank, so we could not interfere.

But the fact still remains all of these independent companies -

I am sitting down eleven o'clock tomorrow morning with twenty-five of these companies at their request - want to sit down and discuss the whole restructuring. And one of the main topics on the agenda tomorrow is resource-short plants, the main topic. And they all know who is opposed to getting fish to their plants, who is opposed to helping them become more viable, who is opposed to providing work for Newfoundlanders. It is not this government here and this party here, it is the Liberal Party. And I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that is a very sore point with many plants workers along the Northeast coast right now, to know that they are denied jobs by a policy which was poorly thought out,

MR. MORGAN: that they thought they were going to score some political points on by attacking this government for bringing back foreigners to land fish. At the same time we are saying all we are trying to do by this temporary measure is to supply jobs to Newfoundlanders at a time when Newfoundland needs the jobs in a desperate way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on Blue Ocean, I am going to yield for a moment or two to my good friend from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) because he is quite familiar with Blue Ocean. Blue Ocean operates the plant in Branch in his riding, They operate St. Bride's in his riding, and they operate the plant at Argentia down in my other colleague's district.

In St. Bride's I recall a big controversy about a year ago when the plant was closed down, the doors closed and the fishermen at the time could not find a market to sell their fish and there was no employment at all in the plant, the plant was closed. As a result of Blue Ocean moving into that plant and taking it over last year, I think it was - well the hon. gentleman can speak accordingly on it after-but I think it was around sixty-five to seventy jobs in St. Bride's, or close to ninety. They brought from maybe the same number of fishermen, or close to it, in that general area. And they are also operating in Argentia. So those three locations in that part of the Province are indeed again very, very important to these small communities and these fishermen who are out there looking for markets and to plant workers to get at least enough weeks of work to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits the rest of the year. And I understand on Blue Ocean Products, my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can answer questions regarding the financial aspect of it with regards to the interest rates

MR. MORGAN: being up to date or interest rates paid, etc. or if they are in default of payments to us. I can say to my knowledge - or not to my knowledge - but I know, I know the department is quite aware of it because we dealt with Blue Ocean a little while ago, they have no outstanding bills with the Department of Fisheries. Because in some cases they lease some facilities owned by the Newfoundland Government, some equipment, etc., and they are up to date with regards to the payments to us, the Newfoundland Department of Fisheries. My colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can comment with regards to any other bills they have outstanding to his department or to government.

So again, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman can try to ridicule this Minister of Fisheries all he wants to. The fact is it is only going to go in through one ear and out through the other. Because I know in my travels, especially in his own district and I have travelled there in that district he represents - that the hon. gentleman is not taking seriously even his own district. Because the fact is and I can show proof of it that I get letters from fishermen and from people in his area who just will not deal with him as a member. They come directly to me as Minister of Fisheries. Now, surely the role of a member is quite different from that. The problems can be brought in to the member for the area. That is his job. Why should they come directly to me as minister? They should go to the member and he channels these problems on to me. And the hon. gentleman has yet, to my knowledge - I have been four years now as minister, I will be four years in January coming - I have yet to have one meeting in the office with my deputy minister, when Gordon Slade was there or

MR. MORGAN: with the new deputy who  
is there now, with that same hon. gentleman who always  
expounds to be concerned with the poor man in the  
Province. All he does is play politics. He is not  
genuinely concerned with the problems of the

MR. MORGAN: the poor man out there and the fishermen in particular. There has yet to be a meeting in the Department of Fisheries with him bringing in delegations and sitting down. Now the Local Development Association for that area, they are indeed very active, very, very active. I have had, I would say, three or four meetings in the past two or three months with the Development Association. They come into St. John's. When, for example, Burnt Island Fisheries found themselves in difficulty in that same hon. gentleman's district, did I hear from the hon. gentleman? No, I did not. But I heard from the Development Association. Who came in? A Mr. Cal Mitchell, a very fine gentleman, a very honourable gentleman. In fact, I would say he has got a higher profile in the district than the hon. gentleman who is now sitting in the House for the same area. I would say that the sincerity of the Development Association is a good example of trying to resolve problems. But the hon. gentleman wants to stand in the House or outside the House and make grandiose statements to play politics with people and their lives, in this case the fishermen, and it is wrong. If the hon. gentleman is concerned about the fishing industry, he is not going to be helping anybody by personally attacking me or somebody else in the fishing industry. If he has problems he wants to resolve, do it as I have been doing for the last four years, in co-operation with all concerned and not just merely attacking me for the sake of attacking me for political reasons.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will say again that whether it be in Port aux Basques in Burnt Islands, whether it be in Port aux Basques in T.J. Harding's operations or in the operations in Rose Blanche or anywhere else which is in the hon. gentleman's district, or whether it be in St. Bride's in Branch or out in Argentia,

MR. MORGAN: where there are independent companies that need assistance, if they can prove to us they are genuinely determined to make a go of it and to become viable, we will assist them accordingly and be proud of it in the end.

MR. CALLAN: What about Marpro?

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

MR. NEARY: My colleague says, 'What about Marpro?'.

Mr. Chairman, the trouble in this House is you have to listen to the wind blowing from the East. The fact of the matter is, let me state categorically for this House, that we neither have had input into the offshore versus Canadian vessels catching fish inside of our 200 mile management zone. We were not asked for our opinion, neither have we volunteered our opinion to anybody except what we have said in this House. We have not been asked for it neither have we volunteered our opinions.

MR. MORGAN: What a responsible position to take. He has not enough concern to talk to his colleagues in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, therefore we are not in a decision-making capacity, we are not in a decision-making role. We state our position in this House for everybody to hear. And, Mr. Chairman, we are not losing thousands of jobs because they were not there. These jobs were never there in the first place. The hon. gentleman makes a statement that we are losing thousands of jobs, and then goes on to make a further statement, that the Opposition is opposed to resource-short plants getting fish. Mr. Chairman, we are anything but that. We are all for resource-short plants getting fish, but we are not for slave labour. Let that register with the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman mentioned a telex. Well, let him put the telex on the Table of the House for us all to see.

Now he is watering down his proposal according to what he just told us. Now they are going to ask, 'Well, let us get half the fish caught by foreigners and the other half by Canadian vessels'.



MR. NEARY: That is a different proposal than what we heard in this House

MR. MORGAN: Oh, no, it is not.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, it is.  
I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman,  
it is.

MR. MORGAN: There is a total of 10,000 tons out there, so you take 10,000 tons by foreigners, that is the quick answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that these thousands of jobs that will be lost will be lost catching the fish. The jobs were not there in the first place. These are seasonal operations, the jobs that were not there. Now they could be working more weeks or more months out of a year if they were getting more fish, but it is not right to say that we are losing thousands of jobs. The jobs would be lost catching the fish, and that is why I presume the union is opposed to it, they do not want to lose these jobs. It is a one of these situations, Mr. Chairman, where you will be damned if you do and doubled-damned if you do not, if that is parliamentary and I believe it is. So let the record show this, that we are all for resource-short plants. And they know that. Mr. Chairman, I have had calls, I have talked to people who operate these plants, they understand the situation. They are completely shocked and alarmed, there is only a couple of them who want the Portuguese in here, by the way, and some of them already have them in.

MR. MORGAN: They all want the foreign vessels. Every one of them wants the foreign vessels.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they have already been in on the Southern Shore, down with the hon. gentleman's buddies. So, Mr. Chairman, let us hear no more of that,

MR. NEARY: let us get back to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and see if we can get a few intelligent answers from the hon. gentleman.

Blue Ocean Products Ltd., is that the same plant that the government took over from Newfoundland Quick Freeze?

DR. COLLINS: It is not.

MR. NEARY: It is not. Well, let the hon. minister tell us. The \$500,000 guarantee, did that plant work this year? How many weeks or how many months did it operate? How many people did it employ? Where did it get its supply of fish and are they up to date on their payments? These are fair questions.

DR. COLLINS: Would the hon. member permit a brief interruption?

MR. NEARY: No, go ahead and give me the answers.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: I think you are misreading the bill. These are guarantees. It is not a case of being up to date to us they are guarantees. We have not been called on by the banks to honour them.

MR. NEARY: But they have to pay the interest on them.

DR. COLLINS: To the banks, not to us.

MR. NEARY: That is what I am asking, are the interest payments being made?

DR. COLLINS: We would only come into the act if the bank required us to honour our guarantees. The bank has not required us to honour any of these guarantees.

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

MR. NEARY: What the hon. gentleman is saying then, that as far as he knows the interest is paid on Item No. I

MR. NEARY: Aqua Fisheries Ltd.?

DR. COLLINS: I am sure the banks would be doing something about it if it was not.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what I am asking the hon. gentleman. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman need not be so snarky, I am asking a legitimate question.

Now, what about the next one?  
How many were employed this year at Blue Ocean Products?  
How many were employed for how many weeks and for how many months out of a

MR. NEARY: How many were employed for how many weeks or how many months out of the year, and where is it located and is the interest on this loan paid? Does the hon. gentleman know?

DR. COLLINS: Question!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Shall the resolution -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman. Do I get an answer to the question? Mr. Chairman, is the hon. gentleman going to give me the answers?

DR. COLLINS: I have answered the question, that these are guarantees.

MR. NEARY: That is what I said, these are guarantees. Has the interest been paid to the hon. gentleman's knowledge?

DR. COLLINS: We have not been asked to honour any of these guarantees.

MR. NEARY: Okay. Well, give me the answers to the other questions then. Where is it located? How many employees does Blue Ocean Have on its payroll? How many weeks or how many months out of this year did the plant operate? Could I have that information?

MR. SIMMS: He does not have that at his fingertips now.

MR. NEARY: I am not asking the former Speaker, the Minister of Cultural Affairs (Mr. Simms) the gentleman responsible for the monkey suit. Am I going to get any information from the Minister of Finance? Am I going to get any answers from the hon. gentleman?

DR. COLLINS: You have the floor.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will sit down if the hon. gentleman will give me the answers.

MR. MARSHALL: Are you sitting down now?

MR. NEARY: No!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman said if I sat down he would give me the answers. Are we going to get any answers from the hon. gentleman?

MR. MARSHALL: You have gotten all the answers.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman. Let me repeat the questions again. I do not have the answers. Where is Blue Ocean Products Limited located? How many employees did they have on their payroll in the past year? Where do they get their supply of fish? How many weeks or months out of a year do they operate? Now, could the hon. gentleman give us that information?

DR. COLLINS: Would you yield just a moment.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

DR. COLLINS: I do not want to interrupt you if you are continuing.

MR. NEARY: No, that is it. Give me the information.

DR. COLLINS: Just an interruption.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: The Blue Ocean is at Branch and St. Bride's and also Argentinia. There are 150 boats, a minimum of 300 fishermen, 160 plant workers and 5 million pounds of fish annually is an average harvest of the company.

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

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what I call getting information.

Now, let us go down to the next one, Item 3, W. M. Goudie Limited, \$100,000. Where are they located? How many employees do they have? How many weeks or months did they work out of this year so far, 1983? And is the interest paid on their loan to

MR. NEARY: the knowledge of the hon.  
gentleman?

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Shall the resolution carry?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I am waiting  
for an answer from the hon. minister.

MR. MARSHALL: This is nonsense!

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is kind of nonsense  
all right. Mr. Chairman, we are being asked here -

AN HON. MEMBER: Your time is up.

MR. NEARY: No, the time is not up.  
We are being asked, Mr. Chairman, to approve a bill,  
No. 77, which we only got this afternoon.

DR. COLLINS: You just want an interruption now  
so you can carry on.

MR. NEARY: No. It does not make any  
difference. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the Chair a  
question, because

MR. NEARY: I can see what the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is up to now. Mr. Chairman, we are allowed ten minutes each back and forth. But if there are no speakers on the other side, Mr. Chairman, you have to recognize this side again.

MR. SIMMS: No.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes.

MR. SIMMS: No.

MR. NEARY: Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. We are in the Committee of the Whole -

DR. COLLINS: There has to be an interruption.

MR. NEARY: No, there does not have to be an interruption.

MR. SIMMS: An intervening speaker.

MR. NEARY: There does not have to be an intervening speaker at all when you are in Committee of the Whole.

MR. SIMMS: We could keep going all night like this.

MR. NEARY: Sure, we could keep going all year if we wanted to.

MR. SIMMS: But not the same person.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Chairman, that is something worth looking up because I can see what the hon. gentleman is up to now. In his desire to ram legislation through this House -

MR. WINDSOR: You can see how concerned your members are, where are they?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, do not worry, I know where all my members are. The hon. gentleman does not know where his are.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, the point of order is that I think I heard Your Honour indicate to

MR. MARSHALL: the hon. gentleman that his time had expired. By my watch certainly his time has expired. Now, the procedure is when a person's time has expired he sits down. If anyone rises to speak in the debate one can; if nobody rises then the question will be put.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) had three minutes left when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was recognized, so that permits the hon. Leader of the Opposition another ten minutes.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have a lot of questions to ask about these matters on this paper here. I wonder could I move the adjournment of the debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, have directed me to report that it has adopted certain resolutions and recommends that Bills 44 and 49 be introduced to give effect to the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

On motion, the following bills read a first, second, and third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper:



A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eight-Three And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service". (Bill No. 44).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957". (Bill No. 49).

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe by the clock it is six o'clock. Your Honour has to leave the Chair, I believe, at six.

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

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order, we agreed -

MR. NEARY: Well, it is after six.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, we agreed -

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

MR. MARSHALL: I am speaking on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: It is one minute after six. Your Honour has no choice but to leave the Chair at six o'clock.

It is one minute past six.

MR. MORGAN: We agreed to stop the clock.

MR. NEARY: No, we did not agree to stop the clock.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order. I mean it is always accepted practice with a Speaker, in cases such as this when you have a routine proceeding of this nature, that the clock is agreed to be stopped. And the clock was in fact agreed to be stopped, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that these matters are done not by the government, who think they own the House and they have public servants running in the side doors taking the place on their back. If it is done, if the

MR. NEARY: clock is stopped, Mr. Speaker,  
it is only done by mutual agreement, the unanimous consent  
of both sides of the House. This side of the House did  
not give consent. Your Honour did not -

MR. SIMMS: You did not object.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I  
did not hear the question; and if I did hear it, I would  
have objected. But if Your Honour can check Hansard

MR. NEARY: we will discover that unanimous consent was not given by this House. And I would submit that Your Honour has no choice but to leave the Chair and come back at eight o'clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

The point is that on Mondays the House normally adjourns on a motion by the Government House Leader. I deem that the clock was held and it is now six o'clock.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that 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.