

VOL. 3

NO. 33

THIRD SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, and with the co-operation of the hon. gentlemen there opposite, I rise today to express our extreme regrets and, indeed, our horror at the sad news which occurred earlier this day, concerning an incident in the Quebec National Assembly, the wanton murder of three people, either directly or indirectly associated with the Quebec National Assembly, and the wounding of twelve or more people, certainly a senseless act that should be condemned in the strongest language possible.

I believe it would be in order, Mr. Speaker, if this House through Your Honour sent a message of sympathy to the Speaker of the National Assembly in the Province of Quebec, to be passed on to the families and friends of those who lost their lives and who were injured in this terrible tragedy.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, everybody in this House and the Province, and I am sure throughout Canada is appalled at the senseless act that has transpired today in Quebec City, the act of tyranny that apparently has occurred and which we have been used to seeing, unfortunately, in other countries but not in our own country. We would certainly associate ourselves with the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition(Mr. Neary).

MR. MARSHALL:

It is something that we greet with a great deal of profound regret and would wish to extend sympathy to the National Assembly of Quebec and the employees of the National Assembly of Quebec, and the families of those who unfortunately have been killed, brutally murdered, and also the other members, indeterminate, I understand, as yet, of the staff of the National Assembly who have been injured as a result of this action.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Rural,Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR.GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my statement today is to inform all hon. members of the House of Assembly of the disterious effect the federal governments 1984 Salmon Management Plan has on the fishing industry in Labrador, in general, but more particularly the sports salmon fishery and tourism industry.

To this end, I sent a telegram to the Honourable Pierre De Bane, the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, protesting the federal government's lack of foresight and consultation with those most affected by this management plan.

The text of this telex is as follows:

"I cannot stress strongly enough my objections to the recently announced changes in the 1984 Salmon Management Plan in its present use.

"As pointed out to you in their telex on May 2,1984, the Labrador Outfitters Association have very ably presented the disasterous ramifications to the Labrador region of the Province virtually destroying the growing tourist industry.

"While we all agree that it is essential that all regions co-operate in furture management of the salmon fishery,it is imperative that unconsciously harsh limitations not be inflicted on regions such as Labrador that have a crippling effect on the tourist industry which is still in its infancy."

MR. GOUDIE: That is the end of the text of the telex.

Mr. Speaker, we all appreciate the current crisis facing the salmon industry in the Atlantic Provinces and no one has risen to this challenge more than our fishermen in Newfoundland and Labrador. This is evident by the formation of several salmon enhancement associations including one in Labrador which the Labrador Outfitters Association played a major role in forming.

The 1984 Salmon Management Plan in its present form will have devastating effects on the outfitting business in Labrador and virtually bring an end to the tourist industry in that part of the Province. The sport salmon fishery realizes optimum revenue from a very limited number of salmon. In the 1980 report released by the Quebec government, the commercial fishery realized a value of \$20.00 per fish, while that of the sport salmon fishery was an astounding \$342.00 per fish. This limited catch, high dollar value from the sport salmon fishery is not the problem facing the salmon industry and it behooves the Government of Canada to take a closer look at the commercial fishery both internally and internationally.

MR. GOUDIE: While we do not wish to see the commercial salmon fishermen, who work long and hard for their living, bear the brunt of the salmon crisis, neither can the outfitters of Labrador bear this burden alone. The current proposals, if implemented, will ring the death knell for the sport salmon fishery in Labrador. And, Mr. Speaker, to add insult to injury, as I understand it, the regulations which apply to Labrador do not apply to the Province of Quebec or the Province of New Brunswick.

Mr. Speaker, the present limitations imposed by the federal government in the 1984 Salmon Management Plan must exclude Labrador if the outfitting business and tourist industry is to thrive and prosper.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for providing us with a copy. As has been well documented in this House, the Opposition has stated its position to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) in that we are totally against this Salmon Management Plan for Newfoundland, regardless of whether it is for the sports fishermen or for the commercial fishermen.

I want to remind the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) that his colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was far behind - as a matter of fact, there is some doubt as to whether he did not originally agree with the federal Minister of Fisheries - but he is at least far behind, and as usual, this government is too far behind in its approach to problems that face us in this Province.

The Minister of Fisheries, a few weeks ago we had a big fuss in this House and he was tearing

MR. TULK: around all over the place, and we have not seen him for the last week and we have heard nothing from the government as to what they expect in the way of a reaction from the federal minister.

Now, I have to ask the government, too, if their priorities are more for the sports fisherman or for the commercial salmon fisherman in this Province. We have seen a situation where there is virtually no compensation for fishermen, either commercial or for the outfitters in Labrador, and that, as we say on this side of the House, is not good enough for the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane).

But what have we seen the provincial government do in the past couple of weeks? Nothing! Absolutely nothing has happened. All we have seen is a Ministerial Statement in this House and Telexes, and that is typical of this government, that you get Telexes sent back and forth.

MR. NEARY: Government by Telex.

MR. TULK: Government by Telex. But have we seen the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) demand that the federal Minister of Fisheries meet with him? No!

MR. TULK: No, there was some flimsy excuse about a weekend that the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) could not get here and that is the last thing that we have heard about it since. We saw him send a Telex and that was the end, Mr. Speaker. So I say to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) his minister has not taken the necessary action.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!
The time for the hon. the member has elapsed.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the hon. House earlier, we were all horrified at the tragic occurrence in the National Assembly in our sister province of Quebec. I would like to direct a very serious question to the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), Mr. Speaker. I do not want to be an alarmist, and we should all thank God that we have not had that kind of an incident happen in this Province, but I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what kind of security we have for the members and the staff of our own House of Assembly?

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

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I should answer that question seriously or not, because we did have some security for the Premier one time when there were some threats made, phone calls, and the hon. member was up every day ridiculing the Premier and government for doing these things. Our security, I am sure, will not be

MR. YOUNG: relaxed because it is not really relaxed now, after hours you must show identification cards and so forth, but I feel that everything is quite in hand in this Province and I think it is only a foolish, alarmist question he is asking.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the National Assembly of Quebec I believe two weeks ago did away with armed guards in the National Assembly, and I am sure that he regrets that now very much, but the hon. gentleman did not answer my question. He referred to the security, the fence and so forth around Mount Scio House and that sort of thing when there was an awful lot of silly things done during that whole affair, Mr. Speaker, But what I am talking about is security of members of this House when the House is in Session and the staff of the House. Could the hon. gentleman outline for the benefit of the members of the House what kind of security we have? Because, as I say, we can thank almighty God that we have not had an incident

MR. NEARY:

in this House or to my knowledge a plane has never been hijacked in this Province. What kind of security do we have? We cannot relax. We cannot let our guard down, Mr. Speaker. We must always be ready for this sort of a thing. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House what kind of security we have here on the 9th and 10th floors of Confederation Building when the House is in session?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has been in the House much longer than I have and he should know that the 9th. floor and everything pertaining to the House of Assembly is under the control of the Speaker and, as requested by the Speaker, the Department of Public Works and Services takes care of it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to belabour this point because it is a very serious matter because, as hon. members know, an official of the Department of Justice came up one day, walked in through that door over there and laid a document down on the desk while the House was in session, Your Honour sitting in the Chair. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an indication that anybody could walk into the gallery, with all due respect to the commissioners and the people who are on duty, or walk in on the floor of the House, they could throw something from the gallery.

MR. SIMMS:

What a slur on our commissioners.

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. SIMMS:

What a slur on our commissioners.

MR. NEARY:
on the commissioners at all.

No, there is no slur

MR. MARSHALL:

order.

Mr. Speaker, on a point of

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Council on a point of order.

Order, please!

The hon. President of the

MR. MARSHALL:

the Question Period and the hon. gentleman is into supplementary questions. I would have thought he would have had a little bit better taste than to use the present analogy in Quebec and compare it to somebody inadvertently coming in from the Minister of Justice's (Mr. Ottenheimer) office into the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, this is

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

MR. SPEAKER:

We are of course into the Question Period and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was recognized on a supplementary question, and proceeded to give some reasons, perhaps, as to why things may or may not happen. Perhaps he should pose a direct question.

Hear, hear!

To that point of order:

MR. NEARY:

asking the hon. gentleman - I am posing a direct question - I am asking the hon. gentleman to outline for the members of this House what security we have on the 9th., 10th. and 11th. floors of Confederation Building when the House is in session?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am

MR. SPEAKER:

Public Works and Services.

The hon. Minister of

MR. YOUNG:

before, the House of Assembly is under your control, Sir, and whatever you request we do. The commissioners are looking after the security, they will not let people read papers in the galleries, they will not let them have cameras, and so forth, like that. But, Mr. Speaker, apart from that we -

Mr. Speaker, as I said

May 8, 1984

Tape 1380

PK - 3

MR. SIMMS:

Despite what he says,

you are doing a good job.

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, despite the criticism of the hon. member of the commissioners, I feel they are doing a good job and I am sure I am and you are, Sir, quite pleased with their performance.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can misrepresent what I said all he wants because there was no criticism of the commissionaires, just the hon. gentleman repeating, parroting, what the former Speaker of this House said to him. He should have better sense because the hon. gentleman knows this is a very serious matter. And while the hon. gentleman may not be concerned about security, there are people who are. So there is no criticism of the commissionaires or the ushers or the policemen who look after this House. But, Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to tell the House what kind of security -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is proceeding to make a speech.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the hon. gentleman to tell us the kind of security that we can expect to have in this House when the House is in session.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are scared.

MR. NEARY: No. I am not scared, especially of the hon. gentleman. And God only knows I have had enough threats in my twenty-two years. In my twenty-two years I have had more threats than all the members of this House put together. That does not worry me a bit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TULK: Yes, and from members opposite.

MR. NEARY: And from members on the other side.

The fact of the matter is we have a right to know, Mr. Speaker. And I ask the hon. gentleman again if he will tell the House what kind of security we have on the eighth, ninth and tenth floors of this House when the House is in session?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is the same question. And I

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): think that the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) has indicated, perhaps, that the matters of security pertaining to the precincts connected with the Legislature do come under the jurisdiction of the Office of the Speaker, who, indeed, may have to take the initiative and have some conversation with the Minister of Public Works and Services and have the matter discussed with the Internal Economy Commission.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I thank Your Honour for your assistance. I could not direct the questions to Your Honour, I had to put them to the Minister of Public Works and Services and I am glad Your Honour got the message.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a

MR. BARRY: question to the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall). I would like to know whether, in light of the result of the Upper Churchill case and the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, is the minister now prepared to reveal the contents of the offer made by the Province of Quebec, and is the minister prepared to indicate how much the government of this Province lost by refusing to accept the offer of the Province of Quebec?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I tell the hon. member that that question was posed, I think it was, by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and I think I responded to that question last week.

The position prior to the Reversion Act decision was that the government of this Province did not wish to reveal the contents of those negotiations at that particular time. Since the Reversion Act, Mr. Speaker, we are actively considering the matter and we will be revealing the contents of these negotiations at such time as we consider it to be in the public interest. I can state to the hon. gentleman that it would appear that the details of this will be revealed in the very near future. It depends upon the outcome of certain enquiries that are presently in the process of being made. We realize that ultimately that is a matter of interest to the people of this Province, of real interest to the people of this Province, and we fully intend to let the people know exactly what it is, but it is purely and simply a matter of timing. I have to tell the hon. gentleman

MR. MARSHALL:

that our decision at the present time is made after considering all the ramifications and aspects of everything and what we perceive to be the best interest of the situation as it presently exists.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Could the minister indicate whether these enquiries referred to have to do with enquiries concerning the possibility of further negotiations with the Province of Quebec?

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. gentleman repeat the question.

MR. BARRY: The enquiries that the minister referred to, would these enquiries have to do with enquiries being made either by the Government of Newfoundland or by the Government of Quebec as to the possibility of resuming negotiations on this point?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the situation is, and I think that the Government of Quebec would confirm this - the hon. gentleman talks about resumption of negotiations - in a real sense negotiations did not end. It was not the case that negotiations were called off or anything like that. We indicated at the time, and we still indicate now, that it is our ultimate aim and our desire that all of these matters, the reversion case, the hydro situation, the offshore and all matters pertaining to our role and our rights in the Canadian Confederation be resolved through an amicable agreement.

So it certainly is not a case of resuming negotiations in the sense that I think I understand the hon. gentleman to mean, to take up negotiations again, because they were never called off. I think, rather, in answer to the hon. gentleman's question directly and briefly, I think it fair to say that the determination of revealing the contents of that depend more upon our assessment as to whether or not there is any real possibility at this particular stage of making any progress in the negotiations themselves, or whether the continuation of these negotiations would very likely be futile, and that is what we are really assessing at the present time.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Well, in that context I would like to ask the minister whether the Government of Newfoundland has examined the possibility of any further legal options being opened as a result of this loss before

MR. BARRY: the Supreme Court of Canada, and specifically whether the decision that was brought down last week will mean that the 800 megawatt recall case has been dealt a fatal blow as well by that decision. I would ask the minister to comment not just with respect to the effect upon the recall case, but have there been any further options examined, and is the minister in a position to indicate to the people of this Province, and to the Province of Quebec, whether the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is now helpless, or whether it has further legal options available to it such as certain taxing powers which could be employed and which might mean that the Province still has some negotiating position with the Province of Quebec.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman was out of the House last week when the Premier made a statement in reaction to the results of the Supreme Court case, and I think he made that quite crystal clear. This Province will continue to examine all options that are available to it and is continuing to do so, but, obviously, the speediest and the most secure manner in which this matter can be resolved is through some legislative initiative or otherwise of the federal government, the Government of Canada, the government which now, as a result of application of the reversion case, has the power, the undoubted power, to act in the interests of the people of this Province.

So that statement has been made. A Telex went off yesterday, to the Prime Minister from the Premier, indicating our position with respect to it and asking the federal government to take this legislative initiative and hopefully to do it in the interests of all Canadians, including Newfoundlanders. We would hope that the federal government would be able to take this particular action, notwithstanding the fact that the only interests that it seemed to have been seized with at all in the course of the reversion case was the interests of the people of the Province of Quebec, when it came in and argued on the side of the Province of Quebec the issue of inter-provincial rights and interprovincial undertakings.

With respect to the other options that are available, there are other legal options. All options, including legal options will be explored.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman

is well aware, for instance, let us take the recall case to show the difficulty in getting any kind of a speedy solution to this, that the recall case originally went before the Trial Division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. There were appeals upwards and downwards on preliminary matters, Well, upwards; it depends on one's perspective, I suppose. But, anyway, Mr. Speaker, there were appeals on preliminary matters to the Supreme Court of Canada. It took - What was it? - four or five or six years before the matter actually came for trial. The trial came, the matter was

MR. MARSHALL:

litigated against the Province again. The Province is now in the process of appealing that and the appeal is continuing before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. If we get a decision with respect to that in our favour and that goes to the Supreme Court of Canada, by the nature of the trial judge's decision it would have to come back, as we interpret it, and be litigated all over again. So in substance and in summary that is a patent example of the difficulties involved in trying to seek any kind of legal solution, even if a solution is there, Mr. Speaker. And when you consider the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada recently with respect to these matters, particularly the revision case, one has to reassess your chances of winning before that particular court on the recall case. But it is obviously crystal clear that it is going to take not just weeks or months or years, it is going to take more than years, it is going to take numbers of years before we get a resolution and in the meantime \$2 million a day goes into Quebec and into the pockets of the people of Quebec. So the only speedy resolution and the only secure one, the only reasonable one, the one that is reasonable for us as Canadian citizens is to ask the federal government to take a legislative initiative and we have done just that. The same observations pertain with respect to the taxing powers. The hon. gentleman knows that the taxing rights were given in the agreement. It is one thing to give a right and it is another thing to be able to implement a right. And the taxing powers on the export of power from this Province,

MR. MARSHALL: Section 92(a) of the constitution, but buttressed against that is the provisions in the documentation itself and the contracts itself to the effect that if Newfoundland imposes a tax, then and in that event it would constitute an event of default and then Hydro-Quebec can come in and take over Churchill Falls. So it is one thing, Mr. Speaker, to give a right but it is another thing to give a right that can be implemented. The two rights that the federal government may try to contend that they have given to the Province that the Province can use were with respect to the transmission of power and with respect to the taxing power. Those rights were given, but, if you consider those rights within the context and the circumstances, you find that it is very difficult to implement those rights. So having said that, even if you did bring in provincial legislation on the taxing power, that in itself is also going to be subjected to exactly the same situation as the recall case or any other legal remedy. It will be litigated for weeks, for months and for years, and in the meantime \$2 million a day goes into the pockets of the people of Quebec. So I hope that that gives the hon. gentleman a full and sufficient response to his question. In summary I will say that certainly this Province continues to examine and assess its options. It has not abandoned the possibility of pursuing further legal options along those and other lines, but obviously the injustice and

MR. MARSHALL:

oppression of that contract calls and cries out for action by the federal government to exercise the jurisdiction which it always had and which recently it avidly sought before the Supreme Court of Canada when it intervened on the side of Quebec. One result of the reversion case is that we can now say to the federal government, 'You sought the jurisdiction, now exercise it for the benefit of the people to get a measure of equality for the people of Newfoundland.'

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying that there has been anything new added to federal jurisdiction which did not exist before this case went to the Supreme Court of Canada? The minister talks about the Government of Canada now having the power to intervene with respect to the contract. I refer the minister to the former constitution, even before the amendment of last year, which in Section 92(10) (c) exempted from provincial jurisdiction such works as, 'although wholly situate within the Province are before or after their execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for advantage of two or more of the provinces.' Now is it not a fact, would not the minister agree, that this power has always existed as far as the Government of Canada is concerned and that this recent court case changes nothing with respect to that power, and the minister is pointing to a power of the federal government that has always existed and, if it was felt that the federal government would intervene with respect to that power, why have the court cases commenced in the first place, Mr. Speaker? Why have this legal case prepared and have the court case proceed in the first place?

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

MR. MARSHALL: It seems as though the hon. gentleman himself can answer his own question because it seems that I remember that the reversion case, for instance, commenced when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Energy on this side of the House. Now I realize that the hon. gentleman can get away from time to time with one moment going to run for the Tories in Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador and the next minute take on the cloak of a Liberal on the other side of the House, but I do not think we are hardly going to let the hon. gentleman get away with the fact that he can completely wash himself from responsibility over here,

MR. MARSHALL: and, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that he ran away from when he was over here, which is the reason why he is there.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to enter into a legalistic debate with the hon. gentleman. I would welcome in another forum at any time getting into a legalistic debate, but not here. I mean, the fact of the matter is so the power was there before. What difference has the reversion case made? It has revealed in all its pristine clearness to the people of Canada now that the federal government, which before was loath to act on the part of the people of Newfoundland, has now the power. It has been confirmed, if you like, by the reversion case, if it needed any confirmation. But the difference is between power given and power revealed, and it has been revealed through the reversion case that the federal government has it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: - and we expect the federal government to exercise it. As I say, I have no desire to get into a legalistic debate with the hon. gentleman -

MR. NEARY: You could not win it away.

MR. MARSHALL: I shall not respond to that, Mr. Speaker. I will not let myself be -

MR. SIMMS: Trapped.

MR. MARSHALL: No, not trapped, detracked by the hon. gentleman. You know, I have no desire to get into a legalistic argument. It is a fact that the federal government has been loath from time to time to act on behalf of the people of this Province in matters pertaining to their interests. And now we have focused crystal clear, if there is one positive thing that has come out of that reversion case it is that it can now be focused crystal clear before the general public of this Province and Canada that it is the federal government which has this power under this section, and the section as it existed before. And I think, it being clear in the minds of

MR. MARSHALL: the people of this Province,
they will ask why all principles of justice and equity do not
require that the federal government exercise it, and exercise
it in a speedy and prompt fashion to prevent what is happening,
the \$2 million a day going out of our pockets and flowing
into the pockets of the Province of Quebec.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Would the minister confirm that the reason for the case being put in the court and the reason for not relying upon this already existing power of the federal government is because government, and indeed all the people of Canada, would view it as unrealistic to expect that the Government of Canada would intervene with respect to one particular contract in declaring a plant to be for the general advantage of Canada, that if the Government of Canada were to do this, would the minister not agree, it would have to be done for the nation as a whole with respect to all hydro electric facilities?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, how quickly he takes on the new mantel. Now it is unfair to expect Ottawa to act in the interests of the people of Newfoundland. I see nothing -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member for Mount Scio on a point of order.

MR. BARRY: The minister is deliberately misstating what was said in my question. I would submit that the minister by so doing is, I am sure inadvertently but in any event misleading the House, and that it should be made clear, Mr. Speaker, that what I stated was that it is unrealistic to expect that the Government of Canada would do this with respect to one single situation, plant facility, rather than doing it for the electrical industry of Canada as a whole, as in fact they had to do with respect

MR. BARRY: to the grain industry where it is the grain industry of Canada as a whole that was declared to be a work to the general advantage of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order, the hon. President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. gentleman was really - well, I mean, you have to rule on it I suppose. I am not going to speak to it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Scio certainly did not raise a valid point of order. It was more of a difference of opinion as to what the hon. President of the Council intended to say.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, you know, I do not know. If it is unrealistic to expect it, the unrealism is based on the fact that we have only 7 seats out of 285 in Ottawa. I would suggest to the

MR. MARSHALL: hon. gentleman if this were a problem faced by the Province of Quebec or by the Province of Ontario, it could not be, Mr. Speaker, a case of it being unrealistic, it would be a reality and it would have been a reality ages ago where we would have had the opportunity to transmit our power.

Mr. Speaker, this is a contract the operation of which is so unjust and so oppressive that it is a blight on the Canadian Confederation both in Newfoundland and outside of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: It arose because the federal government was not prepared to give Newfoundland its rights to transmit power. And all we are simply asking now is that this injustice to the people of Newfoundland be redressed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And I see nothing wrong with asking the federal government to act in this manner and I would hope that they would weigh it and they would consider it. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. gentleman wants to address instances which are kindred to this, I ask him to address the uranium industry, and the way in which the matter of uranium is dealt with in the Canadian Confederation, where price is set, where the people who produce get what is deemed to be a fair return. That is what really in essence we are asking now.

I ask him, and I do not want to get into a legalistic exchange with him, to look at the Ocelot case in Saskatchewan where they were in effect in pith and substance, as the Supreme Court of Canada likes to talk about pith and substance all of the time, but in pith and substance really what happened was that the Province of Saskatchewan wanted to export gas to the United States. But they were a net

MR. MARSHALL: importer of gas from Alberta. What did the National Energy Board do, Mr. Speaker? The National Energy Board said, no, you are not going to export that gas because really that gas is from Alberta, so you have to talk to Alberta and there has to be a fair sharing from the resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So those are two instances, Mr. Speaker. Legalistically the hon. gentleman can draw up parellels between them all they want to but that is the net effect of those cases, the pith and substance.

So we are not really asking anything that is untoward, anything that we should not do. I mean, those people who are the successors of those people who talked about Uncle Ottawa all the time, and what a great gift it was and do not speak up too much because you will lose your baby bonuses, and your old age pensions, and all the rest of it, that type of attitude that is, surprisingly, emitted by the hon. gentlemen there opposite all of the time, is going to get us nowhere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: What is going to get us places, Mr. Speaker, is a government that insists on the rights of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We want in this Province the same rights as pertain to the uranium industry, the uranium industry in Ontario, and to the people in Saskatchewan. We are Canadians, too, and surely to heavens we are entitled to a fair return from our resources, a return that is unequal, you must realize, at the present time because it was wrung and exacted from us purely and simply because of our geographical position in Confederation, and that Quebec stood between us and the markets where we could market our commerce.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister whether he would confirm that to sum up the total of his answers today what the minister is saying is that the response of the Premier to the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada adds absolutely nothing new to a situation which has existed since the signing of the Upper Churchill contract, that the power of the federal government has always existed, that there is no new initiative being suggested by the Premier, that there is a total lack of constructive suggestion as to what the next move might be, and that it is merely an attempt to divert attention from the total and colossal failure which occurred in the recent approach of the government on this issue. And I would like to ask the minister, with respect to meeting the future energy needs of the Province, does the minister have a date when it will be necessary to commence construction of new generation facilities in order to obtain the power and the energy that will be needed for our future needs? At what point in time will the construction of new generation equipment have to commence if power is not available from the Upper Churchill contract?

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!
The time for the Question Period has expired except, of course, if the House wants to grant the hon. minister leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

MR. NEARY: As long as he does not get nasty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I will take leave to answer the question but I want it understood that if I have leave I will answer the question in its entirety.

MR. NEARY: And you do not have to be rude and nasty, either.

MR. MARSHALL: All I can say, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to send the hon. gentleman into a state of apoplexy, or to send him on another vacation, but the fact of the matter is we get down to the pith and substance of the hon. gentleman's questioning today when the hon. gentleman asked, Did the response of who? - the Premier to the Supreme Court of Canada - it adds nothing new to the situation. And that bespeaks the whole reason for the questioning of the hon. gentleman, the reason why he is over on the other side, he wants to try to prove the hon. the Premier wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the situation is, and I say right here, and I repeat once again to the hon. gentleman, that

MR. MARSHALL: the power that existed before became focused in all of its pristine clarity by the reversion case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We took an initiative, We thought that we had the right - Heaven knows we thought we had the right! - to repeal legislation. And what is going to happen when the resources flow, Mr. Speaker, and we have all of these taxing acts passed now, does that mean that we cannot repeal the taxing acts and reduce the taxes? Mr. Speaker, we thought we had that in the reversion case, but the Supreme Court, in its great wisdom, decided that we could not repeal our act and decided that it was outside the powers of the provincial government to act in the matter. In doing that, they were saying it is within the power of the federal government. So these powers have become crystalized, Mr. Speaker. And the hon. the Premier has taken this action in response to the decision. I think it was an eminently reasonable one to take and despite the protestations of the hon. gentlemen there opposite, we await with a great deal of interest the outcome and the response of the Prime Minister of Canada to the Telex sent yesterday by the Premier. Because on the answer to that Telex will depend whether we are going to get a speedy resolution to this very oppressive problem and whether we are going to be treated in the same way as other Canadians, as were the people of Saskatchewan, the people of Alberta, the people of Ontario, and most of all, their great friends in the Province of Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The Question Period has expired.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Before we proceed, yesterday afternoon, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) rose on a point of order pertaining to certain remarks allegedly made by the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). At that point in time, I said that I would look at the transcripts and hopefully make a ruling today.

The point of order, perhaps, although a very technical point, should have been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition or somebody else much earlier than perhaps it was. However, I have read the transcripts and it certainly does appear that the hon. the member for Stephenville was casting some comments upon the integrity, perhaps, of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada and I would ask him if he would like to withdraw those remarks at the present time.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STAGG: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was just reviewing these remarks here before Your Honour spoke and, while I marvel at the perspicacity of my comments at the time, it is quite possible that they were unparliamentary and, in that regard, I do withdraw them without equivocation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Motion No. 1, the Budget Speech Debate that was adjourned last day

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

by the hon. the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas), and I was about to say that he does have seven minutes left.

The hon. the member for St.

John's Center.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. MCNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude the remarks I started yesterday. I think there is no doubt in anybody's mind that the most important matter to come before this hon. House, in fact to come before Newfoundland since Confederation, is the disposition of the offshore. Canada now lays claim and has legal claim to the offshore, but let us not forget that if Newfoundland had not joined Canada in 1949, Canada as a whole would have absolutely no claim today to the offshore. Surely Newfoundland, which was instrumental in bringing the offshore into Canada no matter how indirectly, has the right to prosper because of that. I think we lost the legal battle but, make no mistake about it, the moral battle, the moral case has only just begun. If we are ever to have a place in the sun, if our children are to have a place in the sun and our grandchildren are to have a place in the sun, we need to build what some people call an infrastructure here, and we will never have the money to do that, to bring us up to the level of the average Canadian unless we get our fair share of the offshore. We need to build roads, schools, hospitals, we need to reduce the staggering debt we have in this Province; we have to look after regional development so that all of Newfoundland will be looked after and so that we will have money there to develop our renewable resources, our fishery, our forestry, our tourist industry, etc., so that when the oil runs out we will have an infrastructure and a lack of debt that will enable us to prosper like so many other places in Canada.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker, that is our hope and that is our aim. No matter how long it takes, we are determined to have our place in the sun.

Thank you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to wonder there for a few minutes if the hon. gentleman was going to make it to the finish line. He sounded yesterday like he was completely exhausted, that he was scrabbling and groping for a few nice things to say about the administration that he is supporting, but today, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK: He gave the same speech he gave in 1979.

MR. NEARY: Yes, He gave the same speech back, I believe, the first time he came into the House, in 1979. But today I was terribly worried that the hon. gentleman was going to collapse before he got to the end of his speech.

Mr. Speaker, let me pick up where the hon. gentleman left off. The hon. gentleman said towards the end there that we are depending on the offshore to build roads and to build schools and to build hospitals and so forth and so on. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go back a few years. Let me go back to 1972 and work right up to the present time to see

MR. NEARY: how many times the administration there opposite - and one Tory administration is the same as the other, you cannot separate them. A Tory administration is a Tory administration, you cannot call it anything else.

MR. HODDER: A Tory is a Tory.

MR. NEARY: A Tory is a Tory. When they started out with Mr. Moores back in 1972, they told the people of this Province that they would not discuss offshore oil or gas with anyone unless they admitted that Newfoundland owned it. Ownership, that is what they told us, ownership was the question. Ownership was the only issue. I remember the present Premier, when he was a Parliamentary Secretary in Mr. Moores' office and later Minister of Energy, used to froth at the mouth. He was like a race horse in the Kentucky Derby - what is it they call it? - froth.

MR. STAGG: Lather.

MR. NEARY: Lather, that is it. But the lather is on your body, the froth is in the corner of your mouth. So he had the bit in his teeth and the froth was running out of the corners of his mouth, telling the people that we are not -

MR. STAGG: Whose is this you are talking about?

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the present Premier -

MR. STAGG: Oh, I see. I thought you would withdraw.

MR. NEARY: - with the bit in his gob and the froth out of the corner of his mouth saying, 'We are talking to nobody. We are not having anything to do with Ottawa, the other provinces, the oil companies. We own it and that is it.'

MR. TULK: He did that late in 1979.

MR. NEARY: He did it to 1979, right up to 1979, and then he shifted his ground. And then, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden we are told by the hon. gentleman, who is now gallivanting across Canada on one of these speaking tour, a

MR. NEARY: one-man circus, Mr. Speaker, told us after 1979 that the offshore ownership was not the real issue. Ownership was not the issue, let us put ownership aside. And that is what we have been saying here on this side of the House since 1972, put the ownership question aside and get at the bargaining table and try to negotiate an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, then came the SIU case before the Ontario Appeals Court when the administration there opposite, the present Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) teed off the SIU, insulted them, was rude to them, practically ordered them out of his office because he was trying to fraternize with the offshore service people, trying to play up to the offshore companies, the people who service the rigs -

AN HON. MEMBER: Say who it was.

MR. NEARY: - I will not say who it was - trying to butter up to them, anti-union, anti-labour, and, Mr. Speaker, the frustration the SIU were having with the hon. gentleman forced it to put the question

MR. NEARY:

before the Ontario Appeals Court as to who had the jurisdiction for organized workers on service vessels. And when that happened the federal government, in keeping with tradition and custom and the law of this land, had to intervene in that case, because there was a jurisdictional question involved. Just the same as the federal government had to intervene in the water reversion rights case because it was a jurisdictional dispute, they had no choice. The Federal Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) is notified as the moment a case goes before the Supreme Court involving jurisdiction. The federal Minister of Justice is notified and has no choice but to intervene. Now the intervention can take different shapes and forms but they intervened in the case of the SIU. What happened then? The Premier of this Province went off his head, went bonkers, lost his cool, just as he did when proclaiming a Day of Mourning that cost the people of this Province \$30 million or \$40 million. He made all kinds of irresponsible statements and anti-Canadian and separatist statements. Just the same as we heard today from the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), the biggest separatist in Canada, Mr. Speaker, anti-Confederate and anti-Canadian.

But, anyway, the Premier lost his cool and decided to put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court. Now he had won an election in the meantime. He had gone around the Province asking the people for a mandate to negotiate an agreement. He

MR. NEARY: was given an overwhelming mandate, not to put the matter before the courts, to negotiate an agreement. And so he put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, before three Newfoundland judges, and lost - they lost the case.

In the meantime, the Canadian Government had put the matter before the Supreme Court of Canada and Newfoundland lost the case.

Now they came from not talking to anybody unless that anybody admitted that the hon. gentlemen owned the resource, up to putting the ownership question aside, to putting the matter before two courts and, Mr. Speaker, they lost all-around.

But in the meantime we have lost twelve precious years in

MR. NEARY:

this Province. When they could have negotiated an agreement on the offshore twelve years ago, ten years ago, eight years ago, now, Mr. Speaker, these precious years will never be made up. You can never make up for them. In the meantime, what have they done to the people of this Province? Well, the hon. gentleman who just took his seat and the hon. the Premier, when he is in this House, have asked the people to hang tough. And I just heard one of the aristocrats in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who spoke, say we are going to hang tough and we do not care how long it takes. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not care how long it takes. He will not be down to the welfare office. The Premier with his rent-free apartment down in Tiffany Towers at taxpayers' expense will not be hanging tough. The member for St. John's Center (Dr. McNicholas), who just spoke, will not be fining it very tough. Neither will representatives of the Bank of Montreal who actively practice law and at the same time represent the government bankers. Mr. Speaker, they will not be hanging tough.

MR. CARTER: Who are you talking about? Name him.

MR. NEARY: Everybody knows who the representative of the Bank of Montreal is in this House, ~~the~~ only time in British Parliamentary history that a lawyer is down in court actively practicing law while he is a member of the Cabinet, a conflict of interest if there ever was one, ~~he~~ will not be hanging very tough, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: Who are you talking about?

MR. TULK: Go plant your savory, John.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman will not be hanging very tough either.

MR. TULK: No, not the millionaire savory grower.

Mr. NEARY:

Well, if he wanted me to I could go a little bit further than that but I will not, I am not going to be distracted by hon gentlemen there opposite. Now, Mr. Speaker, we just heard it again from the hon. member for St. John's Center (Dr. McNicholas). We do not care how long people have to hang tough, we do not care how much pain and suffering we impose on the people of this Province, hang tough. We do not care how much unemployment we create, we do not care how far we put the poor old Province in debt, we do not care how much we make sick people suffer because we are closing hospital beds and because we are trying to recover some of our deficit on the backs of the welfare recipients of this Province, Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the state that we have reached in this Province, hang tough. They have shifted their ground at least half a dozen times on the offshore. They ignore the fact that they were given a mandate to negotiate an offshore agreement, they do not want to see or hear tell of that anymore. And the only strategy, the only way they can try to fool the people

MR. NEARY: is to say, 'We are asking them to hang tough. To hang tough. We do not care how long it takes, if it takes another ten, or fifteen, or twenty years.' In the meantime, the oil ship is passing us by. I was over in Nova Scotia on the weekend and I saw all the activity going on in Nova Scotia, the construction, the employment, the spinoff benefits from the offshore, compared to this Province. It would sicken you. My stomach rolled over when I heard the Nova Scotians I spoke to on the weekend tell me that Newfoundland has the best Premier that Nova Scotia ever had. They poke fun at us, they laugh at us. Former Newfoundlanders I met in Nova Scotia are embarrassed everytime the Premier or the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) - more especially the Government House Leader. If we could only get him on television every day, the Minister responsible for energy, we would get 1,000 votes every day - if we could only get him interviewed.

Former Newfoundlanders whom I met going across the Gulf, and over in North Sydney, and Sydney, and in Halifax, are embarrassed to tears because of the attitude of the Premier and of this administration.

MR. STEWART: That is not true and you know it.

MR. NEARY: That is true.

MR. STEWART: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is absolutely true, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STEWART: Be a man about it.

MR. DINN: You never said a word of truth in your life.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is very embarrassing indeed to Newfoundlanders and former Newfoundlanders who travel outside of this Province, it is very embarrassing to them.

MR. STEWART: Well, you are not meeting

MR. STEWART: the same people everyone else is.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in the meantime, while they have oil on the brain, while they can think of nothing else but oil, while they dream oil and sleep oil and eat oil for breakfast, dinner and supper, oil on the brain, while they are doing that they are neglecting every other industry and every other resource in this Province. And I think the most shameful part of all is that they neglected our most basic industry, the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago in this hon. House -

MR. STEWART: We have heard all that before.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the member for Fortune, who, I do not believe has made his maiden speech yet, says, 'Well, there you go, we heard all that before, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is repeating himself.' Well, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat myself. I am proud to be able to do that, because six, seven, or eight years ago we told the administration -

MR. CARTER: Who said, 'Burn your boats!'

MR. NEARY: When I was on this side of the House I was not in the position that I am in the moment, but I was a member on this side of the House when I appealed to the government, the administration, when I asked them and suggested to them that what they were doing by ignoring the fishery, they were crucifying the fishing industry. By putting all their eggs in the offshore oil basket, they were crucifying fishery. And that is precisely

MR. NEARY:

what happened, I am sad to say. I regret very much to have to say that that the industry that has kept the economy of this Province moving for five hundred years is completely ignored by hon. gentlemen there opposite - one per cent of the budget allocated for the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery! And I go down to the Committee meeting where the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) is trying to pilot his estimates through the Committee and he tells us he is going to beef up the Petroleum Directorate. Going to beef it up for what reason? It should be disbanded, it should be dismantled. It is only a monkey on the taxpayers' back at the moment, Mr. Speaker. Ever since the Supreme Court handed down its decision on the offshore, the Petroleum Directorate is merely a monkey on the taxpayers' back and yet the hon. gentleman wants to build up the empire at the expenses of the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery.

MR. CALLAN:

It is an albatross!

MR. NEARY:

It is an albatross around the hon. gentleman's neck. They want to beef it up instead of doing away with it and saving, I believe it is \$3.5 million a year. That is more than they pump into the Newfoundland fishery in a year.

In the meantime, Mr.

Speaker, the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery a year or so ago was on the brink, was on the verge of collapse, financial ruin, collapse. And what did the administration there opposite do?

MR. CALLAN:

Built more fish plants.

MR. NEARY:

Well, they had already given the licences to build these plants. There were too many plants, we know that, everybody knows that, a Kindergarten student

MR. NEARY: knows there are too many plants.

MR. TOBIN: There must have been lots of fish out there for the federal government to give away all over the world.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want any talk or any interruptions at all, Mr. Speaker, from the understudy of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). The Government House Leader is the ultimate in nastiness in this House, followed very closely by the hon. gentleman for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), who should take a course in etiquette and good manners, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they had to rely on the federal government to come to the rescue of the Newfoundland deep-sea fishery. They had to depend on the federal government -

MR. CARTER: So they should!

MR. NEARY: 'So they should'. - to look after something that is provincial jurisdiction, processing? The processing sector of the Newfoundland fishery is provincial jurisdiction. And the Premier went to Toronto, entered into an agreement with Mr. De Bane and turned the jurisdiction of the deep-sea fishery over to the federal government. Now this is the same crowd that out of one corner of their mouths are asking for more jurisdiction,

MR. NEARY: and out of the other corner, gave away the jurisdiction that we already had, the processing sector. The hon. gentleman smiles at that! Look at the make-up of the board of directors of the super company and you will see that it is loaded in favour of Ottawa.

MR. TOBIN: It must make you happy!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it certainly does not make me happy!

MR. TOBIN: Yes, Sir, anything that would put Newfoundlanders on their knees for life would make you happy, that is why you are supporting the Liberal regime in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is well used to being on his knees, Mr. Speaker, trying to worm his way into the Cabinet! He will soon have knee pads, cushions on his knees trying to worm his way - I suppose it would not be parliamentary for me to say 'suck his way into the Cabinet', so I will not say it. It would not do anything for the decorum of the House for me to say it anyway.

So, Mr. Speaker, Ottawa had to come to the rescue of the deep-sea fishery and the hon. gentleman, in the process, gave away a part of the jurisdiction that we had in this Province.

Now, their latest attempt - and this is the same crowd that talk about giveaways - now, their latest attempt to give something away, because they lost the water reversion case before the court, their latest attempt is to ask the Parliament of Canada, to ask the Government of Canada to take over the production of electricity in Labrador in the national interest. That is what it means, Mr. Speaker. The Telex that was read

MR. NEARY: in this House yesterday, that the hon. the Premier sent off to the Prime Minister of this country, sent off to the much-maligned Prime Minister - they were telling us in this House all along that they have no respect or no regard for the Government of Canada. They have spent the last four or five years ridiculing and smearing and trying to knock down the Prime Minister of this country, Mr. Speaker, trying to undermine the credibility of one of the most brilliant leaders in the world today. Unfortunately, he was probably more of a statesman than he was a politician. But hon. gentlemen there opposite have spent the last five or six or seven years, Mr. Speaker, doing everything that they could to smear the Prime Minister, to downgrade him, to belittle him, and now, the hon. gentleman got up in the House yesterday and told us that the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada are the only hope we have in getting this matter of the contract and the Upper Churchill straightened out, the only hope we have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might say in the meantime, on this matter between the Province of Quebec and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, that the hon. gentleman went

MR. NEARY:

to the Government of Canada a few years ago and asked for a corridor, asked the Government of Canada if they would bring legislation into the Parliament of Canada that would give Newfoundland a corridor across the Province of Quebec. And despite the fact that the Tories in Parliament voted against that legislation, the Liberals managed to put it through the House of Commons and it became the law of this land. They gave them a corridor. And we used to be told so often by the hon. gentleman, who is now reading a document there but no doubt listening to what I am saying, we were told so often by the hon. gentleman that all we need is a corridor across the Province of Quebec. They were given the corridor, Mr. Speaker, and then -

MR. STAGG: Yes, expropriate it yourself.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see, expropriate it yourself. How else would you do it, Mr. Speaker? So that was made the law of the land. Then they found another excuse. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that they have no intention of negotiating anything. As long as they can squeeze one ounce of political mileage out of these issues, they have no intention of settling them. And that is the cruel part of it. These are the hard cold facts. In the meantime, the only ones who benefit by these cases that are put before the courts - and they seem to be court happy over there, playing a very dangerous game with the courts. They realize when they put a matter before the courts that there is only a fifty/fifty chance

MR. NEARY: that you are going to win that case, the only ones who benefit by it are the lawyers. And I am told, I do not know if it is correct, the hon. gentleman no doubt can give us a few facts, but we are told that a lawyer who represented the Province on the water reversion case was paid \$1,400 a day. He was paid \$1,400 per day while we have children going to school in this Province hungry and very poorly clad, while we have sick people suffering because they cannot get the medical services they require. We have specialists leaving this Province because of government restraint. We have students who soon will not be able to go to the university, or the College of Trades or the Vocational School because of the restraint programme. Students having their student aid cut and yet, Mr. Speaker, we hear of lawyers - well, we know what they are making down at the Royal Commission on the Ocean Ranger. But, Mr. Speaker, has the administration gone mad? Have they gone mad paying lawyers for these silly court cases that they dream up, Mr. Speaker, \$1,400 a day. Have they gone completely off their rockers over there?

They cannot deny it. I do not hear anybody denying it. \$1,400 a day. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of an administration, that is the kind of mentality that has developed on that side of the House.

MR. NEARY: They have psyched the people up in this Province now into thinking that if you got a job you are lucky. To work is a right not a privilege. To own your own home is a right. To be able to move freely around this Province from one job to another is a right. But the psychology today, because of the way that this administration has handled this Province, is that, 'Oh, I am lucky. I have to keep quiet, I am lucky to have a job. I cannot ask for a raise because I am lucky to have a job. I cannot negotiate a collective agreement because we are lucky, boy, to be on the payroll.' And that is the reason why the present Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) will not reply to his letters that he receives from the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees.

MR. DINN: Will not?

MR. NEARY: Will not. On April 10, 1984 the hon. gentleman was written by the Secretary/Treasurer of the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees. Just to show you the arrogance and, Mr. Speaker, the contempt that this administration have for their public servants and for the people of this Province, they wrote the hon. gentleman on April 10, 1984 and they wrote me on May 3, 1984. They said, 'Dear Mr. Neary: On April 10, 1984 I wrote the Minister of Labour, the hon. Jerome Dinn, requesting a copy of the observations (counterarguments) the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has prepared in response to our complaint against Bill 59, amendments to the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act. To date I have received no reply to this request and now I am asking that you, as Leader of the Opposition, ask that this document either be tabled in the House or such similar action that would enable us to review the government's arguments against our complaint. If you need any further explanation, please contact me at telephone' so and so. Signed,

MR. NEARY: the Secretary/Treasurer of the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees.

Mr. Speaker, in our offices, in our filing cabinets we have literally hundreds and thousands of similar letters.

MR. DINN: That is the only letter that was not answered.

MR. NEARY: That is the only one that was not answered?

MR. DINN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot argue with the hon. gentleman.

MR. DINN: You have got hundreds and thousands down there, so bring another one up.

MR. NEARY: Of complaints against the administration, I am not saying against the hon. gentleman but against the Premier and ministers they are numerous. They are just pouring into our offices. People all over the Province are frustrated and confused and bewildered and have given up hope. At least in twenty-three years of Liberalism in this Province there was a bit of hope, there was always a project on the go, there was always a few jobs, a bit of work here and a bit of work there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, today people have given up hope, they have abandoned hope. They are frustrated and they are angry. There are a awful lot of angry people in this Province right now. I guarantee you the people down in Labrador City who were given an assurance by this administration that their mortgages would be fixed up when they sent down this farcical Task Force are angry. The hon. gentleman went down and told the people down in Labrador City and Wabush, 'Do not worry, your mortgages will be taken care of'. I can get the hon. gentleman 100 names of people who did not have their mortgages fixed up. They are angry. The people in Corner Brook are angry, Mr. Speaker. The people in Gander are angry. The people over on Bell Island are angry because the member and the administration there opposite turned their backs on the people of Bell Island during the recent power outage.

MR. DINN: They did not run off to LaPoile, though.

MR. NEARY: They are angry. They are on the phone to me night and day; angry with the administration for turning their backs on them, Mr. Speaker. And practically in every community and settlement and city in this Province people are completely bewildered, frustrated, confused and angry. And I am amazed. I heard Mr. Crosbie the other day saying that he is surprised that they have not been marching on Parliament Hill. Well, I am more surprised that they have not been marching on Confederation Building. Newfoundlanders must be an awfully civilized people, Mr. Speaker, and they probably are because none of us advocate civil disobedience.

MR. STAGG: No?

MR. NEARY: No, we certainly do not. I for one do not.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member has never advocated civil disobedience?

MR. NEARY: No, I certainly never advocated civil disobedience. I have often been on a wildcat strike and

MR. NEARY:

I have participated in picket lines. I walked side by side with one of the greatest Newfoundlanders, I suppose, who ever lived, one of the greatest labour leaders who ever lived, the late Nish Jackman, D.I. 'Nish' Jackman, the President of the Mine Workers Union on Bell Island. I am rather proud of that, Mr. Speaker. But they are civilized people. Newfoundlanders do not believe in smashing windows or slashing tires or violence. They do not believe in that. But, Mr. Speaker, not because that is not happening that I do not think there is a quiet revolution going on in this Province at the moment. I travelled this Province as much as anybody, and I believe there is a quiet revolution going on in this Province at the present time.

MR. NEARY: And I would say that hon. gentlemen there opposite are aware of this quite revolution.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for St. John's North, a point of order.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot quote an exact reference because I do not imagine there is any single reference to it in Beausheue. But there is no doubt in my mind that it is highly unparliamentary to suggest that Newfoundlanders should resort to violence, and I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To that point of order: The hon. gentleman did not suggest any violence in his speech.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact quite the opposite, Mr. Speaker, that I do not subscribe to civil disobedience but I can understand people's frustration and anger, always have. I took an oath when I came into this Assembly that I would uphold the law of this land. Now, Mr. Speaker, so therefore people have lost confidence in the administration, they have absolutely no confidence in the administration there opposite. And hon. gentlemen know that. If they are in touch with their constituents, if they go to the banks or the supermarkets or the stores or the taverns or the night clubs, the dance halls or the restaurants, they surely must hear the people talking. They must hear the conversations, they must listen to what is going on, unless their heads are buried so deep into the sand that they cannot hear what is going on around them,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, surely they must realize that the people have lost confidence in this administration. They have mismanaged the economy, they have taken the Province to the brink of bankruptcy. We have a debt of \$3.6 billion and next year it will be \$4 billion. We are borrowing at a record rate in this Province. We have the highest per capita debt in the nation, we have the highest taxes, the highest unemployment and probably the highest - if not we are in the top three in Canada - electricity rates in this Province. All we hear day in and day out is bad news. All we hear and read in the ~~papers~~ is one failure after another, one blunder after another from this administration. They have failed at everything they have put their hands to. And not only with the Premier of this Province go down in history as one of the greediest and the laziest that we have ever had in our whole history, but will probably go down as the biggest flop in Newfoundland's history, a man who failed at everything he put his hands to. He cannot point his finger at one success, Mr. Speaker, that we have had under the hon. gentleman's leadership in this Province. One industry after the other shut down, chaos in the fishery, in the pulp and paper industry and in the mining industry. And what do they do? They walk away. There is nothing we can do, they say, nothing we can do. That is the way it is, that is the way it is in the United States and the way it is all over the world, there is nothing we can do.

MR. NEARY: Let her drift on and let the people hang tough, hang tough while we ourselves, of course, live in rent-free apartments, have a plane for flying around in, private dining rooms and the like. And hon. gentlemen can look over and say, yes, we heard it all before. Well, Mr. Speaker, it has to be said a thousand times over and over again because they never seem to learn even though it has been said before. And it will be said again, yes, and again until the people get an opportunity to go to the ballot box again.

So, Mr. Speaker, because the administration there opposite has made such an incredible mess out of running this Province, because they have created so much havoc in the Newfoundland economy, they have created so much unemployment among young people, graduates of the University and the College of Trades and the College of Fisheries, and young people who are adequately trained who cannot find jobs. Because, Mr. Speaker, of the ever-increasing electricity rates and the ever-increasing fees, everything has gone up.

They say, well, we have not increased taxes, but now it costs you \$10 to get a birth certificate and a month ago it was \$5. Now you go down it will cost you \$10 to get a birth certificate, 100 per cent increase, for these and other reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I will mention as I go on. Because of their neglect of the sealing industry because of their neglect and the cruel way they deal with municipalities in this Province by forcing the municipalities to increase their taxes -

AN HON. MEMBER:

How do we do that?

MR. NEARY:

-through government restraint - because of the abuse that is being heaped on the teachers, the most respected professional group in this Province by the likes of the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt), because of the contempt these people have for the unemployed in Labrador West and Buchans and Baie Verte and Bell Island and Happy Valley-Goose Bay and Corner Brook and

MR. NEARY: Gander, because, Mr. Speaker, of these and a variety of other items that have led us to the chaotic state that we find ourselves in in this Province at the present time, because of these reasons and other reasons that I will talk about shortly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by my friend, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the following amendment to the 1984-1985 budget, that all of the words after 'that' be deleted and replaced with the following-

MR. MARSHALL: The member for Fogo?

MR. NEARY: The member for Fogo, yes.

What about him?

MR. SIMMS: None of your business. Carry on.

MR. NEARY: Well, seconded by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) then, if the hon. gentleman -

MR. MARSHALL: Who is it going to be seconded by ?

MR. NEARY: Seconded by the member for Bellevue. Because I can see -

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The point of order is this, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Bellevue has already spoken in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Right on!

MR. MARSHALL: So it is a fact that the hon. member for Bellevue, having spoken in the debate, is not able to second this motion.

MR. SIMMS: Right on! It is out of order.

May 8, 1984

Tape 1403

PK - 3

MR. MARSHALL:

That being so, Mr.

Speaker, I would submit that the hon. gentleman has now submitted a motion that is defective in itself and cannot be submitted again. Once

MR. MARSHALL:

has been submitted to the House of Assembly and it has been ruled out of order, it cannot be submitted again during the same session. So I just pass to Your Honour that the hon. gentleman has now proposed a vote of non-confidence and by its very nature it is not able to be accepted, and it cannot be accepted by putting on another seconder as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order,

the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Let me say for the benefit

of the Chair and members of the House that I did not even finish my motion. The motion has not been put yet.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, it has.

MR. NEARY:

No, Mr. Speaker, it has not.

I got down to the part where I was about to move the vote of non-confidence in the administration when I was cut down by the hon. gentleman. I have not even finished reading the amendment yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

You moved the motion,

though, when you moved the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You moved the amendment.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have not

moved the amendment yet. My colleague, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), has not spoken in this debate and I would submit that I am completely in order. The whole trouble is the hon. gentleman does not like to hear the truth. And they can try to muzzle members of the Opposition all they want, they can turn themselves into a dictatorship all they want, they can try to badger and bully the Chair all they want, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that I am

MR. NEARY: completely in order.

MR. ANDREWS: You blew it again.

MR. NEARY: Do you want me to do it again? Yes.

MR. ANDREWS: You blew it again.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour will have to rule, no doubt.

MR. SPEAKER(McNicholas): To that point of order.
I am not quite clear on who seconded that motion.

MR. NEARY: I will read it again, Your Honour.

I move, seconded by my friend from Fogo(Mr. Tulk)-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - the following amendment:
That the 1984 - 1985 budget, all the words after 'that' be deleted and replaced with the following: Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the important part. 'This House regrets the government's failure to put forward any plans to improve economic conditions in the Province or create jobs.' I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that is in order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman cannot have it both ways. I mean, there is an order in this House. The hon. gentleman got up, as the records of this House will show, got up on his feet and said, 'I move, seconded by the hon. the member for Bellevue(Mr. Callan)' and he started to read the motion that Your Honour has in his hand.

MR. CALLAN: That is not true. Not true.

MR. SIMMS: You said Fogo first and then you said Bellevue.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, the thing is that the hon. gentleman said that he moved, seconded by the hon. the member for Bellevue, and it is a fact that the hon. the member for Bellevue cannot second that motion because the

MR. MARSHALL: hon. the member for
Bellevue (Mr. Callan) has already spoken in the debate.

MR. BUTT: Right on.

MR. MARSHALL: So, therefore, the motion
is rendered void. It is completely unacceptable because
it has been presented in that way, and it cannot be
presented again at this same session.

MR. DINN: That is right.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): To that point of order, the
hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: That is completely false
and untrue, the statement that the hon. gentleman just made,
and if Your Honour would just go to Hansard and check he would
find that I said, 'I move, seconded by my friend from Fogo
(Mr. Tulk),' and then there was an interruption.

MR. SIMMS: You said 'Fogo?' and you then
said, 'No. the member for Bellevue.'

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, there was
an interjection then from the parrott, the hon. gentleman who
is trying to influence the Chair all the time -

MR. SIMMS: It is in Hansard.

MR. NEARY: - who should sit over there
and not show his ignorance of the rules of this House, because
he is a former Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: Stop your personal attacks.
Speak to the point of order.

MR. NEARY:

And I said; 'Well, whom does he want to second it, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan)?' As a matter of fact, in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, the amendment had not even been put.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes it has. 'I move, seconded by.'

MR. NEARY: Now, the hon. gentleman can try all the legal arguments he wants, the fact of the matter is that we still have rights in this House. The hon. gentleman can try to turn it into a dictatorship if he wants to, Mr. Speaker, but I would submit that I am completely in order. The hon. gentleman can try all he wants to aggravate and harass the Opposition, he can try all he wants to use forty-four members against eight, to harass the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, he can try all he wants to intimidate us, but it is not going to work.

MR. CARTER: The majority rules.

MR. NEARY: Now, listen to the aristocrat, listen to the snob, Mr. Speaker, the big snob!

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, if I could, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): To that point of order, the hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: I think we have seen this House come to a new low now. I was out in the common room dealing with constituency business, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - so I cannot comment on whether the member for LaPoile, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) referred to the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) or the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). But, Mr. Speaker, let us assume, even if it was a reference to the member for Bellevue, it was a slip of the tongue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - but, Mr. Speaker, we have the statement by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that it was not, that it was seconded by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). Well, Mr. Speaker, what we have here is an attempt by the government to muzzle the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition is cutting too close to the quick.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: The Leader of the Opposition is hurting them, Mr. Speaker. They are trying to muzzle the Leader of the Opposition, they are trying to cut him off from debate in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, could we have silence?

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

MR. PATTERSON: He has beaten you and Cashin out for the leadership. Take care of your party.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has had another restless night, I can see that! But, Mr. Speaker, what we are asking for here is the protection of the Chair to permit us to do the job which we have to do, which is to provide opposition, Mr. Speaker, to the bad government which is coming from the other side.

Now, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) cannot, Mr. Speaker, get away with attempting to muzzle the Leader of the Opposition by getting up on technicalities to cut him off from a legitimate non-confidence motion on a very important Budget Debate. This is unprecedented, Mr. Speaker, it is bringing the House to a new low, and the Government House Leader should

May 8, 1984

Tape 1405

EC - 3

MR. BARRY: not be permitted to get away
with bringing the state of democracy in this Province to
this new low.

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order,
Mr. Speaker. I am going to give Your Honour some

MR. MARSHALL:

authority now. The hon. gentleman is very exercised over there. You know we never try to muzzle the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). Many people have tried to muzzle the Leader of the Opposition and we will be the first to admit that the Leader of the Opposition will not be muzzled. He will be buried from time to time but he will not be muzzled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, because these are rules, you see. It is not a case of the hon. gentleman there opposite being muzzled or anything like that. We have rights in this House too. Everybody has rights and there is a way to carry on parliamentary affairs.

Page 99 of Beauchesne,
the fifth edition. The hon. gentleman, page 99 -

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SIMMS: That is the red book.

MR. MARSHALL: That is the page after page 98,
and the one before page 100.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, paragraph 304, and it reads as follows. "The Member who makes a motion may give the name of his seconder who will, if necessary, indicate his consent, and the seconder will then be allowed to speak on the question. But if the seconder should rise and say only a word or two, for instance, 'I second the motion', he is precluded from again addressing the House.

MR. MARSHALL: "Having moved the adjournment of the debate, a Member has spoken on the question and cannot make a second motion during the same debate."

Mr. Speaker, that is what it is. The hon. gentleman has spoken and, there is no doubt about it, the hon. gentleman was on his feet in the House. The records of the House will show that he said, "not the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), but the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan)". See what this goes to, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen there opposite are never in their seats in the House and the only one who was there was somebody who had already spoken in the debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, the situation is that this is not an amendment which is acceptable. The veteran of the House, twenty-five year veteran in this House does not realize the rules. This is not an acceptable motion, Mr. Speaker. The rules of the House do not allow it. And the hon. gentleman is precluded from moving that motion again. It is simple.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): I think I have heard enough on this motion. I have been listening carefully to this motion as it was presented. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) originally moved the motion, seconded by the member for Fogo, and then he changed his mind and moved it, seconded by the member for Bellevue. And then he rechanged his mind and had it seconded by the member for Fogo.

So for that reason the motion is in order. And the motion moved by the member for LaPoile is I move, seconded by my friend from Fogo, the following amendment to the 1984/85 budget, that all of the words after 'that' be deleted and replaced with

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): the following; 'This House regrets the government's failure to put forward any plans to improve the economic conditions in the Province or to create jobs.'

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another victory for the old veteran. Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that if you were to go back and research the Hansard you would discover, Mr. Speaker, that I have won more

MR. NEARY: points of order, more technical arguments in this House than all the other hon. gentlemen over there put together. Earlier today I won a point of order.

Earlier today, despite the coaching -

MR. SIMMS: You have been ruled out of order more times!

MR. NEARY: That is not true, by the way.

MR. TOBIN: The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) calls you a parliamentary disaster.

MR. NEARY: Despite the coaching by the hon. gentleman -

MR. SIMMS: You must have been ruled out of order more times!

MR. NEARY: 'Must have been.' Yes. But despite the coaching from the former Speaker (Mr. Simms) there was a ruling today on a very serious point of order, an attack made on the Justice system and on the courts of this land by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), and I won that one. That is two, two major victories in the House this afternoon.

MR. STAGG: I gave in on that one. I was not prepared to make an issue of it.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, what it reminds me of is two hockey teams. You have forty-four on that side, eight on this side, and we have the Wayne Gretzkys over here, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And they have what is known in the hockey business now as -

MR. BARRY: The midnight league.

MR. NEARY: No, not the midnight league. The goons, I believe they are calling them now. I will not say the goons are on that side, but I will only say that the Wayne Gretzkys are on this side.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am just reminded of something else, by the way. Right on the table I see the Canadian Parliamentary Review. That blue book on the table is the Canadian Parliamentary Review. Now, Mr. Speaker, you talk about victories. Well, I was in Saskatchewan there last year, last Fall, and I participated in a debate, the American Congressional system versus the British Parliamentary system of government. And I had as my debating partner Sir Charles Gordon, a retired clerk of the House of Commons at Westminster, one of the most knowledgeable men in the British Commonwealth.

MR. SIMMS: How old is he, by the way?

MR. NEARY: I would say probably he is getting close to seventy, I guess, if he is not over seventy. I know he was there when Sir Winston Churchill sat in the House.

Now he was my debating colleague -

MR. SIMMS: He made all the good points.

MR. NEARY: - and we debated against two outstanding Canadian debaters, one a member of Parliament and the other one a constitutional lawyer in Western Canada, by the way, Morris Shumiatcher is it? And, Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen would just take the trouble to pick up the Canadian Parliamentary Review and read it. They thought so much of the debate that they reproduced it in its entirety.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, who does Your Honour think won the debate?

MR. SIMMS: The other crowd?

MR. TOBIN: The guy from England.

MR. NEARY: And if hon. members, by the way, want to see the debate our Clerk can arrange it, because the Clerk brought back from Saskatchewan a videotape of the debate.

MR. STAGG: Oh, no. When will they ever learn!

MR. NEARY: It was televised. The debate was televised in Western Canada. You know, Mr. Speaker, I had calls from former Newfoundlanders who are now living in Saskatchewan telling me how proud they were when they heard on radio and television -

MR. CARTER: Out in Saskatchewan?

MR. NEARY: - yes, - of how I had participated in and won this debate. So you talk about victories!

So, Mr. Speaker, in effect what we have done here today, we have moved a non-confidence motion. I moved a few minutes ago a motion of non-confidence in the administration.

MR. TOBIN: Yes, seconded by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry).

MR. NEARY: I moved a vote of non-confidence in the administration there opposite.

MR. SIMMS: 'Steve Neary' represents a St. John's riding when he is outside Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: No matter what we do, Mr. Speaker, St. John's wants to take credit for it.

MR. TOBIN: You misled the people of Western Canada.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, why have I moved this motion of non-confidence? And, by the way, I do not expect to

MR. NEARY:

win this one, because

44 to 8, I know we are pretty good stickhandlers, I know we are pretty good, Mr. Speaker, at debating on this side of the House, against the forty-four that we can win an argument or win our debate any day in the week, but when it comes to brute force, then it is pretty difficult for eight to be able to beat forty-four, when it comes to brute force.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, that they will use brute force to vote us down, then I also have to add this rider, that there are hon. gentlemen there opposite who are having pangs of conscience, whose conscience are bothering them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

There are members, Mr.

Speaker, on that side of the House if they were not toeing the partisan Tory line, if they were not whipped into line by the Premier and the Whips there opposite, if they were not whipped into line and made toe the partisan Tory line, Mr. Speaker, if they could only just have their lips freed up, if they could only have the shackles and the chains removed, if we only had real democracy in this Province -

MR. SIMMS: I saw your interview on cable television last night, by the way. They replayed it.

MR. NEARY: Which one?

MR. SIMMS: The one for the panel of journalists.

MR. NEARY: Absolutely brilliant. Was that not brilliant?

MR. SIMMS: No, I did not think so.

MR. NEARY: I could not figure out what I did on television last night, I was getting calls at home from people saying, 'I saw you on television.' If that is the case I was on all three channels last night, all three stations and I could not figure out which one it was.

MR. SIMMS: That is good for us the more coverage you get

MR. NEARY: Not quite the same, though, as getting the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) on television.

MR. SIMMS: He is good on radio, though.

MR. NEARY: Yes, when you cannot see him. He is good on radio where he cannot be seen.

MR. TOBIN: He is some good in the newspapers.

MR. NEARY: But you know, Mr. Speaker, when the people of this Province watch him on the television, I am told, everywhere I go in Newfoundland and Labrador, he is the most despised and hated politician in the Province. People, if they had an axe or a sledge hammer in their hand, or a hobnailed boot they would drive it through the set every time the hon. gentleman comes on. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we attempt every day here in this House, we put questions to him in hopes to get him interviewed. Another thousand votes before the day is over.

MR. SIMMS: How many calls did you get last night?

MR. NEARY: I do not know, a dozen or so.
I mean, I get so many complaints from people at home about this administration.

MR. SIMMS: You try to get through to people.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right. And the hon. gentleman will find my line pretty busy. It is a hotline. I have never gone the route of an unlisted number.

MR. SIMMS: He takes it off the hook.

MR. NEARY: My number is always listed.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have done is we have moved a motion of nonconfidence in the government and I will bet you dollars to doughnuts that 95 per cent of the people, if they were here in our place in this House today, would vote in favour of this motion.

MR. TOBIN: Did you listen to open line this morning?

MR. NEARY: I am coming to that.

They would vote in favour of this motion. But hon. gentlemen there opposite will tuck their tail between their legs and they will either slink out of the House or they will be instructed by the Whip (Mr. Patterson) or the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to toe the party line, as much as they would like to vote for this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I hate to be wasting my time and saying that I am moving a motion of nonconfidence in the government and I expect it to be defeated, because I do not expect it to be defeated. Mr. Speaker, maybe in the next forty-five minutes or hour - I think I have about an hour left - I might be able to persuade one or two hon. gentlemen to either vote, Mr. Speaker, for this vote of nonconfidence or, better again, move their seats away from the administration that have this Province on a disaster course. They do not necessarily have to move their seats

May 8, 1984

Tape No. 1409

MJ - 3

MR. NEARY: over here with the official
Opposition. They could move their seats down to my right,
down by the rail. And I am

MR. NEARY:

convinced, Mr. Speaker, with the snarky remarks that I hear about the Premier from some hon. gentlemen there opposite -

MR. SIMMS:

You do not hear any snarky remarks from over here.

MR. NEARY:

- from the snarky remarks and the rude remarks and the sarcasm and the screwing up of their faces and the wrenching of their hands, and saying, I wish he would do something. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be a little bit too much to ask them to move their seats, but certainly it is not too much to ask them to vote for this motion. Because there is not one member over there, there is not a backbencher sitting over there who does not believe what we are saying. Every one of them believes what we are saying.

I have made speeches in this House - no doubt, now, they will be a little more cautious after what I say today.

MR. SIMMS:

You have not said anything.

MR. NEARY:

I have made speeches in this House and I have gotten in the elevator and I have heard - religiously I have a member for the West coast who will come to me and say, "My God, you are right, boy. You are right".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

"You are absolutely right. I wish I had the courage." He will say to me, 'I wish I had the courage to do or say that.'

MR. BUTT:

Stephenville?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we will give it the old college try. We hope that we will be able to persuade the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid), for instance, who is unable to look her constituents straight in the eye these days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, that is not nice.

MR. NEARY:

Maybe the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) wants to vote for this amendment, or to move her seat over on this side of the House.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, there is a matter of decorum in this House, and there is really a matter of decorum always, and when somebody gets up and moves a non-confidence motion I do not really believe it is permissible, or it looks unseemly for somebody to be half standing on the floor and half standing on the chairs.

MR. NEARY:

That is really something, is it not?

MR. SPEAKER:

I did not notice.
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, how childish can you get?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the fishery for a moment. I made a few general and sweeping statements there when I was talking about restructuring the super company and let me start out by saying that it is taking a long time to get a Chief Executive Officer for that super company. It is taking too long. I would like to have an answer as to what the trouble is. We only heard of one candidate that was interviewed, a few weeks ago, and, we are told, offered \$250,000 plus fringe benefits - \$250,000, a quarter of a million dollars.

MR. BUTT:

They would have to raise the ante before I would go at it.

MR. NEARY:

They would have to raise the ante? Well, I am afraid that the gentleman they made that

MR. NEARY: offer to did not take
the job. As attractive as the salary was, he did not take
it. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why? Can somebody see something
that we cannot see?

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no money in it.

MR. NEARY: No money in it? - \$250,000

MR. NEARY:

plus an insurance package, plus fringe benefits is not bad to have in your back pocket. It will manage to put something in the oven for Sunday dinner, I believe, a little better than welfare. But, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering why it has taken so long to get a chief executive officer for that super company? Is there something wrong? The leaders in the business community in Canada, especially here in this Province, can they see trouble brewing on the horizon? We all want to see that super company work for the sake of the deep-sea fishery. But are they reading something there that we cannot see? We hear all kinds of statements being made unofficially, that the company is in trouble before it even gets started. It is not true.

MR. SIMMS:

What is not true?

MR. NEARY:

Who said it is not true?

MR. SIMMS:

Nobody, boy.

MR. DINN:

You are hearing voices again.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, that may or may not be the case, we will just have to wait and see. We want to see it be a success.

MR. TOBIN:

You heard voices in the wind.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to say this, that the Fishermen's Union are anxious to see that Chief Executive Officer put in place so that they can get to the bargaining table. Because obviously the interim president is not going to sit down and negotiate with the Fishermen's Union. They are trying to get a collective agreement. They are anxious to get an agreement signed, they are anxious to get negotiations started so they can find out where they are going, so they can find out what is in this restructuring for their

MR. NEARY: members. Is the restructuring strictly for the banks? Is it only to bail out the banks and bail out the government, and nothing there for the inshore fishermen, the trawler men or the plant workers? Because that is certainly what it looks like now, Mr. Speaker. What they have done is bail out the Bank of Nova Scotia. That is what it looks like. The Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) asked the union to enter into a social compact, another way of saying a wage freeze, a restraint programme, tighten your belt, asked the plant workers and the fishermen and the processors to tighten their belt. Were the Bank of Nova Scotia asked to tighten their belt? Was National Sea or Nickersons asked to tighten their belt? No, they certainly were not. But ask the fishermen and the plant workers to tighten their belt. Mr. Speaker, whose side are they on over there? Are they on the side of the banks, big business, or are they on the side of the fishermen? I think the answer is obvious. There are no negotiations and it does not look like there are going to be any in the foreseeable future.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how can this company be a success when they cannot even get a Chief Executive Officer in place? Now, in the restructuring of the deep-sea fishery all kind of things happened, Mr. Speaker, but I suppose one of the things that happened, bad things that happened was the fact that the independent processors and the inshore fishermen were neglected. And that is a fact that cannot be denied. But there was something else that happened. I will come to the inshore fishermen and the independent processors, but there was something else that happened, Mr. Speaker, that almost made me tear every hair in my head out of root and that is they wanted to close Grand Bank.

MR. TOBIN: Who?

MR. NEARY: Who wanted to close Grand Bank? Whoever, the hon. gentleman name them - the administration he is a member of, the federal government, the owners of the company wanted to close Grand Bank. Now let me say something -

MR. TOBIN: Michael Kirby

MR. NEARY: Well, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, just to put the hon. gentleman's mind at rest as far as Mr. Kirby is concerned, I said publicly the man is a menace to the fishery in Atlantic Canada. We do not need super bureaucrats from Upper Canada to come down here for the sake of giving them something to do.

MR. TOBIN: The only time I ever agreed with you was when you said, 'Give him the royal order of the boot'.

MR. NEARY: He should have been put on a raft and put adrift and let go down off the Funk Islands somewhere, Mr. Speaker. The man was a menace, a complete menace. And I guarantee you that -

MR. TOBIN: He got rewarded for his mission, though.

MR. NEARY: He got rewarded, Mr. Speaker, and no doubt financially he got well rewarded, too, and then almost ended up, by the way, on the Board of Directors of National Sea.

MR. TOBIN: And only for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) here in Newfoundland he probably would have been.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, I just do not want to get sidetracked because I have a couple of very important points to make, at least I think they are, and I want to talk about Grand Bank.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in the world today fishing nations want to put out a quality product. One quality fillet - the hon. gentleman should know what I am talking about - one quality fillet is the thing that is selling today in the markets of the world. To put out cod blocks you are like a Model T Ford, are you not? You are back in the dark ages. So the ultimate in the fishing industry is to put out a one quality fillet. That is the thing that is selling. Now, I am going to tell the hon. gentleman something that he probably does not know, that the plants in Newfoundland have been designed and built like Model T Fords, that all they have is a drum; they can produce a fillet but they do it with a drum. In order to produce the product that is demanded in the marketplace today you have to do it with what they call the tunnel process.

MR. TOBIN: IQF.

MR. NEARY: IQF, the tunnel process. And where is the only plant in Newfoundland that has the IQF, the tunnel process? Where is it? There is only one in Newfoundland and where is it? It is in Grand Bank.

MR. TOBIN: Trepassey has the tunnel process.

MR. NEARY: I do not know, I mean, well, the hon. gentleman could be right, but my source of information tells me the only one in Newfoundland where you can produce this quality product that is demanded in the marketplace is in Grand Bank,

MR. NEARY: and that is the plant they wanted to close. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering for a while if somebody had not taken leave of his senses when this was pointed out to me.

Now, I might say also, before I get away from the board of directors of this company, that I am not happy, I am not happy at all with some of the people who were appointed to the board of directors, especially one individual who cannot even operate a small fish plant in Piccadilly, the one who did not look after the plant workers when he was given the licence by the administration there opposite, and the one now who is trying to do away with the union, will not recognize the union; that gentleman is on the board of directors of this super company. Is there not some kind of a conflict of interest there?

MR. CARTER: Who is that?

MR. NEARY: The Tory appointee on the board of directors.

MR. CARTER: Well, what is his name?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I have to -

MR. CARTER: That is quite an accusation.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is quite an accusation, Mr. Speaker, and it is something that the hon. gentleman should take note of. You have a man appointed on the board of directors of that super company who is refusing to recognize a union at his plant in Piccadilly -

MR. CARTER: Who is it? What is his name?

MR. NEARY: - who wants to market his product, by the way, through the super company.

Mr. Speaker, is there any clearer conflict of interest in this world? If there is any conflict of interest, is there any one clearer than that?

MR. SIMMS: Who are you talking about?
Say the name. Name names. Anybody can make accusations like that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, sure I can name names.

MR. CARTER: Okay, who is it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Pike.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Pike.

MR. CARTER: What is his first name?

MR. NEARY: He is the provincial Tory appointee on the board of directors, operating a small fish plant under a licence from this government -

MR. CARTER: When is his birthday?

MR. NEARY: - refusing to recognize the union.

MR. SIMMS: How do you know that?

MR. NEARY: Because, Mr. Speaker, I have talked to the employees, that is how I know it.
Mr. Speaker, I was in Port aux Basques the other day and the employees came down to see me.

MR. SIMMS: And they said that he does not recognize the union?

MR. NEARY: That is right, refuses to deal with the union, and he is trying to market his product through the super company.

MR. BAIRD: What is wrong with that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, he cannot even operate a small fish plant, let alone a super company.

MR. STAGG: Who is that?

MR. NEARY: Your buddy.

MR. STAGG: My buddy?

MR. NEARY: Your buddy, who used to be out in Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: My buddy, is he?

MR. NEARY: Your buddy, yes.

MR. MATTHEWS: He has a lot of buddies in
Stephenville.

MR. NEARY: Well, this one he is very
familiar with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a
conflict of interest, in my opinion, and that gentleman
should be booted off the board of directors of that
company.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And they can tch! tch! all they
want. Where is their courage? Stand up for the fishermen,
stand up for the plant workers!

MR. MATTHEWS: Michael Cashin and Michael Kirby
you are getting on with now.

MR. NEARY: Stand up for the plant workers.

MR. STAGG: You could put Harry Steele on it
now.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is up to
the hon. gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the
sympathy of that particular gentleman is with the party
there opposite.

Mr. Speaker, they can try to
intimidate me all they want. The situation, in my opinion,
is not good, it is bad. And if hon. gentlemen want to
stand up for the plant workers and the fishermen who were
done in by the previous owners of that plant -

MR. TOBIN: May I ask a question?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. TOBIN: Is he the only one you have
problems with?

MR. NEARY: No, there are a couple of others,
but that one especially. I am concerned that there is

May 8, 1984

Tape 1413

EC - 4

MR. NEARY: nobody on the board of directors
who is knowledgeable in the fishing industry in this
Province.

MR. NEARY:

We have a couple of car dealers and a few other people, construction people, but Mr. Speaker, nobody who is knowledgeable in the fishery.

MR. CARTER:

What about John Shaheen?

MR. NEARY:

Well, he is knowledgeable in business but I do not know if he has that much experience in the fishing industry.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get away from -

MR. CARTER:

Name them all.

MR. NEARY:

No, I am not going to do that. I am not going to go down through the Board of Directors. They may be all fine gentlemen in their own right, Mr. Speaker, and I have nothing personal against any of them, but I am very concerned about this one, the provincial appointee, appointed because he supports the administration there opposite. He took over a plant in Piccadilly, did not honour the debts of the old company, and will not recognize the union.

MR. STAGG:

The old company was National Sea.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman can be technical all he wants. Mr. Speaker, I am told that these fishermen down there lost hundreds and thousands of dollars. They lost hundreds and literally thousands of dollars after that takeover occurred, the fishermen. And the union was there, and under the laws of this land -

MR. NEARY: Well, look, all you have to do is ask your colleague to your left and he will be able to give you all the information you need on that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one appointee who needs to be watched. It is a conflict of interest and they can interrupt all they want and they can try to intimidate me all they want, but that gentleman should be booted off, should be kicked off the board of directors of that company.

MR. TOBIN: He was Vice-President of the Liberal Association of Stephenville.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, regarding the fisheries there is something else I have to say that may come as news to hon. gentlemen.

MR. TOBIN: The cod blocks, do not forget that one.

MR. NEARY: No, the cod blocks, I will come back to that. The cod block is just like producing a Model T Ford. The products that are designed in this Province -

MR. TOBIN: That is basically Fishery Products. (Inaudible) paid off for Fishery Products and that is what you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Speaker, anybody who has spoken to people involved in the fishery in Iceland, in Norway, and in Scotland and all our competitors will tell us that the marketing of our product is about the worst in the world. You have the people down there in Boston - I went down to see them myself a couple of years ago they will play one against the other. They are like the Mafia. They are just like the Mafia, on the wharves in Boston, they will play one against the other

MR. NEARY: and they will force one company to break, lower their price, and once they get one to lower their price then they set off a chain reaction.

MR. TOBIN: That happened here.

MR. NEARY: No, but let me make my point. I have not even gotten to my point yet. What is even worse than

MR. NEARY: that, these countries that I spoke of, Iceland and Norway, and all the other countries, they have more or less agreed that that you only sell in the marketplace for a certain price. Let us say for argument sake that they have all come to an understanding that we will charge a \$1.80 for a prime fillet and in Newfoundland we ship prime fillets, say, to England for less than a \$1.80, say, for \$1.20 - okay? - 60 cents difference, do you know what happens?

MR. STAGG: Tell us! Tell us!

MR. NEARY: I will tell the hon. gentleman what happens: The country in the common market that that fish is going into from Newfoundland will put on a sixty cent tariff, they put on a tariff, and I found out recently, and I got the shock of my life when I found this out, that the sixty cents they collect in tariffs, or duty is used in the fishing industry, it is paid back to the fishing industry in the countries I just mentioned. In other words, Newfoundland is subsidizing the fishery in these other countries -

MR. STAGG: Is this the policy of the Newfoundland Government?

MR. NEARY: -subsidizing the fishery, Mr. Speaker, in countries which are competitors.

MR. STAGG: That is Alan J. boy. Talk to Alan J. about that.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, marketing is a provincial responsibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what they are trying to do is protect the price of fish. Now what we need, by the way, anybody who knows anything about the fishery in this Province -

MR. STAGG: Who gave away the caplin?

MR. TOBIN: 'Steve' you are partly right.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not only partly right, I am 100 per cent right.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult, because the Newfoundland processors and the super company will find itself in the same boat. There comes a time when you get so much stock on hand, your inventory, you have to reduce it, you have to get rid of it, you do not have room for it.

MR. STAGG: The same old story.

MR. NEARY: The problem is - it is the same old story - that we do not have the facilities to hold the inventory until the price stabilizes. So what happens? Dump it, get rid of it as fast as you can.

MR. TOBIN. I can tell you another story about that.

MR. NEARY: Well, I hope the hon. gentleman does. But that creates havoc in the marketplace and as a result, Newfoundland processors, fishermen, and plant workers lose literally hundreds of thousands, millions of dollars annually.

MR. STAGG: We are with you.

MR. NEARY: But that is the first time I ever heard that said in this House about subsidizing the fishery in Norway and in these other countries who are our competitors, because that is what is happening.

MR. STAGG: That is a good point.

But whose fault is it?

MR. NEARY: Whose fault is it?

MR. STAGG: Alan J. must have something to do with that.

MR. NEARY: No, Alan J. does not have anything to do with it. The fact of the matter is, that the big problem in the Newfoundland Fishery for five hundred years has been marketing, and it still is. It is as plain as the nose on your face.

MR. NEARY: Now, in order for us to market our product in an orderly fashion there have to be sufficient facilities.

MR. STAGG: There has to be a national will.

MR. NEARY: Well, first of all the will has to be there, but you have to have the facilities to hold the stock while the price is going down, and not be forced to dump it, to get rid of it, not to panic, not to have the banks tell you, Look, sell your inventory or we are going to put you into bankruptcy.

MR. TOBIN: That is what the Bank of Nova Scotia did.

MR. NEARY: Exactly, that is what they did. Sell your inventory, get rid of it for whatever you can get or we will put you in bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: That is right, and I agree with you 100 per cent.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what you call panic. They panicked.

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible) for this House again?

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am getting -

MR. TOBIN: Wait now, wait now, 'Steve'.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are two or three over here agreeing with you, boy.

MR. TOBIN: Yes, I am agreeing with what he is saying there about the Bank of Nova Scotia threatening the companies.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, what they did and what they are still doing, by the way, because now the banks have lost confidence in the fishing industry as a result of the terrible financial situation that developed a year or a year and a half ago. Now they have lost confidence.

MR. NEARY: Now they have lost confidence, they have tightened up or they are demanding their money and they are going to force the processors to get rid of their inventories.

MR. TOBIN: The biggest competition was between Fisherv Products and Nickerson and National Sea when they were in the marketplace.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the banks have lost confidence. Now they are going to demand the payment of their loans and their guarantees and they are going to force operators to do things that they ordinarily should not do. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, because I do not want to run out of time without saying this, and I am putting this forward -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. NEARY: No, I got lots of time yet. I still got over a half an hour or more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me put forward our position as far as the independent processors and the inshore fishermen are concerned. Hon. gentlemen will recall a few moments ago I said that I would deal with this matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, the first point that I want to make is that I think that it is time that both levels of government, more especially Uncle Ottawa, realized that we need a price support fund established quickly. It is time they realized that. They were the godfathers of it, they developed it. The price stabilization fund or price support fund, whatever you want to call it, Mr. Speaker, was an ingenious invention as far as I am concerned, and why they let that fund dry up and why they let it go out of existence is beyond me. I would put the question to the hon. gentlemen in this House today, will they support a move to have a price support fund reactivated and will they participate in such a fund? It

MR. NEARY: is a very important question, Mr. Speaker. And it is a voluntary thing, by the way. It is not something you force on the processors or plant owners, it is voluntary, it is there when they want to use it. It was of tremendous value back in the 1960s and the early 1970s, when the fishing industry ran into all kinds of problems because of difficulties in the marketplace, and that fund should be reactivated as quickly as possible. And by the same token, Mr. Speaker, we advocate from this side of the House that a line of credit be established quickly for independent processors, be implemented expeditiously, and a line of credit for inshore fishermen. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, and I am just plucking this figure out of the air, that in this line of credit that the fishermen or the independent processors not be charged any more than 3 per cent interest if they have to borrow. I think they

MR. NEARY:

could manage that alright. But, you see, one of the biggest problems created by the super company is the fact that there is nothing there for the inshore fishermen, no help for the inshore fishermen and no help for the independent processors.

MR. HODDER:

None whatsoever.

MR. NEARY:

There is none, n-o-n-e, and it is criminal. If something is not done quickly, Mr. Speaker, they are going to drive the independents to the wall and they are going to bankrupt the inshore fishermen. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of suggestions, there are others, these are not the total answers, but there are a couple of suggestions; a price support board, a line of credit to the independent processors, interest of 3 per cent, say, and a line of credit to the inshore fishermen, and other forms of assistance. Because that is not all the inshore fishermen need, Mr. Speaker. The inshore fishermen at this moment need reassurance from both levels of government that the inshore fishery will be kept, that it is here to stay. Because, Mr. Speaker, there is a danger that it will disappear, that the family operation, the family fishery, the family ownership of independent plants may vanish and disappear unless their problems are recognized soon. And I mean this now. We are overdue now. And so, Mr. Speaker, these are just a few suggestions.

MR. TOBIN:

Get back to the cod block now.

MR. NEARY:

Well, I could tell the hon. gentleman about the cod block. Well, first what happened

MR. NEARY: was, in Newfoundland we started to get into breaded fish sticks. We thought that was going to be the Saviour of the industry in the late '50s. Again we are talking about Model T Fords. What people want today is the real McCoy, they want a number one quality fillet. I do not know if there is any real market for breaded sticks today. Is there any real market?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But, anyway, I hope there is. But, Mr. Speaker, the cod block is so far back in the dark ages I should not even have to talk about it. Now, mind you, McDonalds, in the United States, love it because they can buy cod block for \$1.05, \$1.10 or \$1.15 US and they use 95 per cent of our cod block that goes into the United States. And, therefore, in the summertime when you have chicken, barbecuing steaks, ribs and all that sort of thing, and there is no demand for these little fish pieces at McDonalds, what do they do? They drop the price, overnight they drop the price five or ten cents American and in the process crucify the processors in this Province. A lot of the poor old processors are forced to dump their fish or go into the market charging less per pound than it cost to produce the fish. I know that for a fact. I do of plants in this Province-

MR. STAGG: A moment ago you were being so critical of them and now it is "Those poor old processors", you know.

MR. NEARY: Yes, kind of a poor old processor all right. I do not know many processors in this Province who own an airline. I do not know too many. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be too hard on the gentleman, apart from what I said. I was critical,

MR. NEARY: I have been critical enough. I do not even know the gentleman, I would not know him if I tripped over him.

MR. TOBIN: He was Vice-President of the Liberal Association in Stephenville.

MR. NEARY: Well, he may have well been, Mr. Speaker.

The cod block is so outdated. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what is so hard for me to comprehend, it is the fact that the design and the construction of fish plants in this Province in the last twenty to twenty-five years have been Model T plants. Model T, that is what they are. Even the big one in Marystown, as good as it is, is a Model T plant. It is unfortunate, you know.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, these are just a few thoughts I had on the fishery. I want to, before I take my seat -

MR. TOBIN: You are right on about Kirby.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am right on about the other things, too.

MR. TOBIN: And you are right on about the Bank of Nova Scotia.

MR. NEARY: I want to talk for a few moments about the seals before I get off the fishery. Mr. Speaker, as much as we hate to admit it, as much as we regret it, we have lost the battle of the sealing industry in this country and in this Province.

Greenpeace and their gang have beaten us, they have won. They have won the battle.

MR. WALSH: Whose fault was that?

MR. NEARY: It is not my fault. I fought them, and we fought them, and I am sure hon. gentlemen there fought as hard as they could with the resources that we have.

MR. NEARY: But I will tell you what worries me now, I will tell you what concerns me very much about the seal population in this Province. Mr. Speaker, here is what concerns me about the seal population: The seal population is escalating, it is going up in leaps and bounds. Mr. Speaker, I checked, I do not know if anybody else did, with the scientists and the scientists tell me that seals, although they do not eat enormous amounts of cod - they do not, by the way. Contrary to what I have heard, the scientists tell me that the seals do not eat enormous quantities of cod. They eat some.

MR. HODDER: A pound and a half.

MR. NEARY: A pound and a half a day.

MR. HODDER: A pound and a half a day.

MR. NEARY: Well, a pound and a half a day, I suppose - how many seals are there? - a couple of hundred million? One hundred million? Anyway, it runs into quite a bit. A pound and a half a day sounds like a good figure.

MR. MATTHEWS: It is not a great lot.

MR. NEARY: It is not a great lot, but when you take a million seals eating a pound and a half a day -

MR. WALSH: One hundred pounds per day per adult.

MR. NEARY: No, no, it is not.

MR. TOBIN: The overall consumption of fish.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, the overall consumption, but not cod. Because I checked with the scientists. They have a tendency to go to the bottom and get the shellfish and that sort of thing more so than cod. They do not eat enormous quantities of cod, but if they only eat a pound a day that is a million pounds of cod a day, 365 million pounds a year.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one point. That is a good thought but here is the point: I am told by people who know that the drippings from the seals - are my hon. friends aware of this? - that the drippings from the seals - I am not allowed to use the other term because it is unparliamentary - cause parasites and worms in the fish.

MR. TOBIN: You cannot catch codfish in Sydney Bight, where they are numerous, because those codfish are filled with worms.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know anything about that, what I want to know is this, what are we going to do to keep the seal population at a certain point? We have been drastically cut back in our harvesting of seals, and if we do not try to control the population it is going to take control of us.

MR. CARTER: Are you finished (inaudible)?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the drippings will create worms and parasites in the fish, and they will eat a certain amount of fish and they will eat a certain amount of shellfish and other species of the sea. But this is something that bothers me very much, something that we have not addressed ourselves to yet. I mean, with all due respect to the anti-sealers and the pro-sealers and everybody else, Mr. Speaker, we have to face one fact and the fact is this: That we have to control the herds. Now, you cannot, as one of the members in the Nova Scotia Legislature suggested the other day, fly over in an airplane and drop a herring with a birth control pill in it and control the population that way. Mr. Speaker, you know, he was probably joking. We cannot use the birth control pills, Mr. Speaker, you cannot use a diaphragm on them -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - or whatever it is, an IUD, maybe the doctor over there could tell me. You cannot bring them all in and do that with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Tie their tubes.

MR. NEARY: Vasectomies, you cannot do that with them. You cannot issue them all condoms, with all due respect to the ladies there opposite, Mr. Speaker. I know there is one there who would not mind, being a women's libber.

But, Mr. Speaker, seriously, what is the answer? Mr. Speaker, the answer is that we are going to have to address ourselves to this question. I would not be a bit surprised if the reason the seals were down off Flat Rock this year was because the herd is growing so fast that they are likely to turn up anywhere. We will have seals running out of our ears, Mr. Speaker, if we are not careful. And we have to control the herd and so, therefore, there is going

MR. NEARY: to have to be an orderly harvesting, whether Greenpeace, or whether the politicians, or whether this one or that one likes it or not.

MR. WALSH: There is a way.

MR. NEARY: What is the way?

MR. WALSH: (Inaudible) and train them.

MR. NEARY: Well, you cannot train them. All the trained seals are on that side of the House. But they will devour us and, Mr. Speaker, they will ruin our fishery. I mean, that point was never made. In all the propaganda on the television, and in the ads that were bought in the newspaper that point was never made and it was staring you straight in the face. Mr. Speaker, it is something we are going to have to address ourselves to sooner than you think. And whether people like killing seals or not, we have to protect our own environment, we have to protect the fish stocks. That is pretty important to us, you know, pretty important to us.

MR. SIMMS: That is a good point.

MR. NEARY: It is a good point.

MR. DINN: And a new one.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I have made a lot of new points here today. The hon. gentlemen heard things today, and when I started out in my first ten minutes they said, 'Oh, we are going to hear the same old stuff again'. I have thrown a few new things at them. I hope I persuaded one or two over there to vote for the amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who is standing in the doorway interrupting me

MR. NEARY: should be reminded that the people who run the Mary March Museum are anxiously waiting with bated breath to find out if this administration are going to give them any assistance.

MR. SIMMS: They will know.

MR. NEARY: They will know. Well, it will soon be too late for them to know.

MR. SIMMS: No, it will not.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, it will.

MR. SIMMS: You do not know anything about it sure.

MR. NEARY: The Mary March Museum people have been waiting longer than the people in East Meadows have been waiting for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) to make a decision on whether or not they are going to be allowed to come into the City of St. John's, Mr. Speaker, whether they will be allowed to become a part of the City of St. John's, or whether they will not be. They voted some time ago to join the City of St. John's, and the hon. minister has not decided yet, has not been able to make a decision. That is a long time ago now, and she has not been able to make a decision whether or not they would be allowed to join the City of St. John's.

MR. SIMMS: 'Steve', Jim Morgan is running for Mayor of East Meadows.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, another thing, by the way, of interest to the members on the Burin Peninsula that has to be watched very carefully is St. Pierre and the 200 mile limit. I raised it last year in this House. There were meetings on yesterday and today concerning St. Pierre wanting a 200 mile management zone, the same as we have. You know, 200 miles would take in Confederation Building, take in the whole of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if they are talking about the windshield wiper effect or not, or if they are talking about 200 miles in a circle, right around.

Negotiations are going on with France.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have a representative over there, Hiscock.

MR. NEARY: Now, what I would like to know is if the administration there opposite has any input.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: They do. Do we have observers sitting in at these meetings to protect our interest?

MR. HODDER: We cannot be too hard on them because they will not get any ice cream. You see, they get it off Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Do we have observers sitting in at these meetings? I do not know. Perhaps somebody there opposite could tell us.

MR. SIMMS: If the Feds have anything to do with it they will move Confederation Building to St. Pierre.

MR. NEARY: We have to address ourselves to the Corner Brook question soon.

MR. HISCOCK: Peter is going to look after it. That is underway now.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not underway. Before I run out of time I have something I want to ask the Minister of Education, so I hope when the minister participates in this debate the minister will

MR. NEARY: be able to tell me, and tell the people of Labrador West if they are going to get the financing to run the Labrador Collegiate, to run courses in Labrador Collegiate that they have been running for years, that are the equivalent of first year university.

MR. SIMMS: Is that the only place in the Province?

MR. NEARY: That is the only place in the Province.

MR. SIMMS: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is.

MR. SIMMS: It is not true.

MR. NEARY: Labrador Collegiate, as far as I know -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not the only one.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe it is not the only one, but as far as I know it is. But, anyway, Labrador Collegiate got financing from the iron ore companies and from the Province to run a first year university level course in their school. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is being discontinued, and the people down there want to know if it will be reinstated this September. Now that is not very much to ask.

MR. SIMMS: Did they have it last year?

MR. NEARY: No, they did not have it last year.

AN HON. MEMBER: They had it last year.

MR. NEARY: They did not have it last year. And apart from running out of funding, I do not know if the new expanded -

MR. SIMMS: How many courses?

May 8, 1984

Tape No. 1420

NM - 4

MR. NEARY:

I do not know how many courses. I have all the information in my office. I do not have it here with me. I do not know if the expanded high school system had anything to do with

MR. NEARY:

it or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a question that has to be addressed. And when I was on the fishery, I suppose I should have dealt with the commercial salmon fishery, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) had been in his seat, I think I would have addressed a few questions to him as to whether or not a reply has been received from the Government of Canada on what is going to be done about the commercial salmon fishermen. The three week delay in opening the commercial salmon fishery is devastating to the Southwest Coast, devastating! They are practically wiping out the salmon fishery on the Southwest Coast. I am glad to see that the union is going to Ottawa soon to ask for compensation for the commercial salmon fishermen. I wish them luck, I hope they succeed, because that is something that I put forward in this House two or three weeks ago.

A couple of months ago, I wired Mr. De Bane, who is a gentleman I consider not to be very knowledgeable in the fishing industry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, my!

MR. NEARY: He may be knowledgeable in a lot of other things and he may be an able man, but he is certainly not very knowledgeable in the fishing industry or he would not be making the stupid decisions that he is making. One of the stupid decisions he made had to do with the commercial salmon fishery and it is devastating for the people on the Southwest Coast. And it is still up in the air - they do not know where they stand yet today.

I was watching a programme on television last night about the catching of lobsters in a little port in Nova Scotia where the fisheries officers - you talk about civil disobedience! The fisheries officers

MR. NEARY: and the fishery patrol boats had to take guns and ammunition aboard. They burned a couple of fishery boats, they were threatening to ram them. They drove them ashore.

MR. MATHEWS: That was last year.

MR. NEARY: Last year it happened, but it was only on T.V. last night. I hope that does not happen in Newfoundland.

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible) civil disobedience?

MR. NEARY: No, the salmon fishermen - I heard them myself - are pretty frustrated and angry and there are going to be some pretty heavy losses of income unless there is a programme put in place to compensate the fishermen for their losses. They are not unreasonable people. If they want a salmon enhancement programme, if they want to conserve the salmon stock, if they want to build up the salmon stock, do not do it at the expense of the fishermen. They should bring in a five year programme, tell us how much money they are going to spend on salmon enhancement. Right now, for instance, the salmon fishermen who are thinking about selling their licences do not know if they will be compensated for their nets and their gear. They know they will get their highest three years multiplied by three over a five year period, Mr. Speaker, but what about their gear? What about a man who is sixty-two or sixty-three or sixty-four years old

MR. NEARY: who is forced to sell his licence back to the government? What about his gear? Does he get any compensation for that, his life-time investment? I mean, it is absolutely scandalous. I can hardly believe it. Certainly I know, I can believe, because I know the decisions are being made by people who are not very knowledgable in the industry, who do not understand the local psychology, do not understand the custom and the heritage and the tradition of this Province. That is the bloody trouble. They have not got a clue.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. gentleman was here in his seat today because he could address himself to that question.

MR. HODDER: Where is he?

MR. NEARY: I do not know how much more time I have left. Could the table indicate to me?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member has unlimited time.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I am unlimited.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: How wonderful! How wonderful,
Mr. Speaker! Unlimited time!

MR. SIMMS: You moved the motion of non-confidence.

MR. STAGG: Oh, come on now, 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: No, I have to tell hon. gentlemen that I will not take advantage of unlimited time.

MR. SIMMS: You are very interesting, though. It is the best speech I have heard you make in the House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: I have to go to my district again tomorrow evening and I will not be back for a couple of days.

MR. SIMMS: Maybe we should adjourn the House while you are gone.

MR. NEARY: No, boy they love me so much out there, unless the hon. gentleman will agree to not having the Budget Speech while I am away.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) while you are away.

MR. NEARY: Well, will the hon. gentleman agree so that I could pick it up when I come back?

MR. MARSHALL: No, the Queen directs me that her business has to go on.

MR. NEARY: All right, then, I will have to finish up at six today, which I will gladly do, because I do not want to take advantage.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman is worried.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman need not be worried.

MR. TOBIN: Take advantage of it, boy, do not be foolish. You are making a good speech, I must say. I am enjoying it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I may go on until about five to six and then I can take my seat and the House can rise. I will not give any hon. gentlemen over there today a chance to get a dart at me, to condemn my motion of non-confidence in the administration.

MR. MARSHALL: How is the campaign going for the Senate. Tell us about the campaign.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when everything else fails, then he resorts to the low personal blows. Everything else fails him.

MS. VERGE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, I know the hon. gentleman, it is only wishful thinking on his part.

But while I have a few minutes left perhaps we could talk for a moment about the increase in crime in this Province.

MR. SIMMS: You should use this as your leadership case.

MR. NEARY: Is that so?

MR. SIMMS: Yes, Sir, because I will tell you you will wipe the delegates off the floor. Leo and Ricky Cashin, they would not even know what to do.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman keeps that up I will make him my campaign manager.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I certainly hope that I can get the hon. gentleman to vote for this motion of non-confidence, because I may be away when this is voted on unless members speak. Because, now,

MR. NEARY: anybody who has spoken on this side of the House will have an opportunity to speak again, those who have not spoken will have two kicks at the cat, and so the budget debate may be still on when I get back on Monday or it may not. I have to go to Port aux Basques, I have to go to Wesleyville this weekend. The demands are so great on my time now -

MR. SIMMS: What is on at Wesleyville?

MR. NEARY: We are having a big banquet down there.

MR. HODDER: They were going to have it May 7 but they are having it this weekend.

MR. NEARY: They are having it this weekend because my colleague, who is the guest speaker, was away so they postponed it until my colleague returned from attending urgent matters in Europe.

MR. SIMMS: He was over talking to the seals.

MR. NEARY: We will be all off to Wesleyville this weekend, but I have to go to my district for a couple of engagements before that. I know how anxious the hon. gentleman is to close the House, but, Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues are quite capable. There is an old saying that governments open Houses and Oppositions close them. I believe my colleagues are quite capable of keeping the House going until I get back on Monday. We have a number of money bills on the Order Paper, but very little else on the Order Paper. by the way.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think they have been passed.

MR. NEARY: No, they are not. We are still on the loan bill. And that is the one I would like to have a go at.

MR. MARSHALL: We have had great co-operation, great co-operation.

MR. SIMMS: We will pass the budget on Friday.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a go at the loan bill. And they cannot close the House until the Budget Speech is finished. But while I am on that matter, last year they asked for a cushion, they asked for some flexibility. As the hon. gentleman calls it, a cushion. When they go out to borrow they are going to borrow more than they need, so we have been told. This year they are asking to borrow \$72 million more than they need, and they are calling it flexibility or a cushion. Now what happened to the cushion last year?

MR. SIMMS: We did not have one last year.

MR. NEARY: Yes, we did have a cushion. I will get it for the hon. gentleman if he would just be a little bit patient. Yes, here it is. I do not have my glasses so I am going to have a job. This was the hon. gentleman, the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), who said, 'Now, why the difference between the \$150 million and the \$225 million? The difference is approximately \$75 million, and that is, Mr. Speaker, to enable there to be a flexibility given to the government towards the end of the year.' Okay? Now, in 1983 we gave the government, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would just pay attention -

MR. SIMMS: He is listening. He has a photographic memory.

MR. NEARY: - we gave the administration a \$72.4 million cushion or a \$72.4 million flexibility.

MR. MARSHALL: Every time I make a speech the hon. gentleman photocopies it.

MR. NEARY: \$75 million this year for a cushion, \$72.4 million last year for a cushion. Now, what I would like to know -

MR. SIMMS: It is a traditional thing.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not a traditional thing, that is the trouble. My colleague, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the other day raised a very valid point, by the way.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the real reason for this cushion is that they are expecting a larger deficit in current account than they have budgeted for. That is why they are asking for that cushion.

MR. SIMMS: It is all going on the election. We are having an election this year.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) screws up his face again. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what happened to the \$72.4 million cushion last year? Was the money borrowed at the end of the year and put in a trust fund where we could collect the interest? Did that happen?

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is not in his seat while we are debating the budget, but it is a good question: Are they expecting a larger deficit in current account this year than they budgeted for? And is this the real reason behind the \$75 million cushion.

MR. CARTER: That is just the product of dirty minds.

MR. NEARY: Do we have dirty minds over here or are we suspicious?

MR. TULK: That was a pillow, not a cushion.

MR. NEARY: A \$72.4 million cushion last year, and what happened? Could the hon. Minister of Finance, when he gets to his feet, tell us what happened to the \$72.4 million cushion in the 1982-83 budget?

MR. SIMMS: What did you do with that \$75 million. 'Bill'?

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook) has to tell us about East Meadows. The government would be prepared to allow East Meadows

MR. NEARY: to go under the jurisdiction of the City Council, and, if so, what would be the future of the Metro Board if East Meadows, which is the biggest -

MR. SIMMS: What about the money bill?

MR. NEARY: The minister was out of the House when I raised this matter and I still have ten or twelve minutes. I am asking the minister but perhaps I should save it for the oral Question Period. Mr. Speaker, if I could get the attention of the hon. ministers, East Meadows voted some time ago to come into the city of St. John's. Now I understand that they contribute more taxes to Metro Board than any other area under the St. John's Metropolitan Board.

MR. SIMMS: That is right.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) because the area, I believe, is in his district, or part of it -

MR. DINN: It is in East Extern.

MR. NEARY: In East Extern. Well, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen are aware that they contribute more in taxes to the Metro Board than any other area under its jurisdiction. Now the big question then arises, What happens to the Metro Board?

MR. SIMMS: Why?

MR. NEARY: Because the Metro Board are going to find themselves short of money. They are struggling now, they are finding it very difficult now to keep their head above water. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I would like is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to tell us, if we can only get the minister to forget about the news reports that she is going to be

MR. NEARY: dropped from the Cabinet,
if she only could forget that for a few days and
concentrate on her department and tell the people in
East Meadows what they can expect in the way of -

MR. TOBIN: East Meadows is not supposed
to contribute the most to the Metro Board.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they are.

MR. TOBIN: No, Kilbride.

MR. NEARY: No, I think it is East Meadows.
And if the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook)
could only just for a minute get her mind off the
newspaper reports that the hon. minister may get
caught up in the shuffle, that somebody in the back
benches has their eye on her job, if she only could
forget that for a minute and concentrate on the job
of running the department, well maybe, Mr. Speaker, and
only maybe, and I have to say this, we might get some answers.

MR. NEARY: In all honesty and in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) I have to say that although the minister can be quite political - I guarantee you she can use the sharp scalpel when she wants to, no doubt about that - but I have to say this about her, at least in my experience, that if you put a question to the minister in this House, you will get a straight answer, you will get an honest answer, sometimes to the detriment of the administration. But I guarantee you, the minister will give you a straight answer. And if you happen to write the minister or call her on the phone or meet her outside of this House, Mr. Speaker, I do not think you could find a more fair person, and that is an absolute fact. But what we need is a commitment from the administration.

MR. BAIRD: Boy, sit down, you are getting more boring every minute. Sit down and give your mouth a chance to relax.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should get a big ice cube; of course, it would melt on impact, I am sure!

MR. BAIRD: I would like to get you in a big ice cube and freeze you to your foundation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I only have a few minutes left and I do not want to get into the financial matters because my colleagues will deal with that. I want to deal with one other matter before we reach the time of adjournment, one matter only, and I am sure this will be very dear to the heart of the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: But before I do that, I still have a few minutes, let me say this, that I am rather amused at how members of the administration talk out of both corners of their mouths and sometimes at the same time. On the one hand, they criticize the Russians, and they do it Crosbie style. They criticize the fishery deal with the Russians and then they turn around, Mr. Speaker, and put up the money to finance a synchro-lift down here at the federally owned Crown corporation so that we can keep the Russians inside of our 200 mile management zone. Now, you talk about a trade-off! Because that is the only justification for that expansion down at the CN dock, to look after the Russian factory ships and the Russian trawlers that are coming here. Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious how hypocritical they can be about that, but listen to this: We have Reagan down in the United States trying to get the Russians out of Nicaragua and out of Central and South America, a real threat to the North American and South American way of life, and while he is doing that, Mr. Speaker, and our crowd here are criticizing their own federal government for making a deal on the fishery with the Russians, what else happened in this Province? What did we do? How foolish and crazy are we? We gave the Russians the right to bring their own fuel in so they can fuel their aircraft to take the fishing crews back to Russia and bring new crews over so they can change their crews in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, if you did not hear it and did not see it, you would not believe it, would you?

MR. BAIRD: Send this Hansard out to the one hundred handlers in Gander working on that project and see what they will say.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only one it

May 8. 1984

Tape 1425

EC - 3

MR. NEARY: will help is the gentleman who got the contract. There will be very few jobs in Gander resulting from that. But, listen to this! We have an administration there opposite who criticize the Government of Canada for trying to make a deal to sell Newfoundland fish and then the crowd they criticize, the

MR. NEARY: Russians, they finance a federal Crown corporation to build a synchrolift to keep the Russians here. Then they allow them, and I did not hear one word of protest, to build storage tanks, bring in their own fuel so they can fuel their aircraft, to change the crews fishing inside of our 200 mile management zone. And then they were the same crowd that got upset. I think they are pro-Russian, I think they love the Russians. Of course, the way they govern is similar to the regime in Moscow. They got upset because of the way the Americans boycotted the Russians over the South Korean incident.

MR. DINN: I think you are a deeper shade of pink than we are.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they are a dark shade of pink over there, if you ask me, the way they kowtow and give in, on anything involving Russia. You can hear them over there; I heard the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook) say they are going to create jobs. How many jobs? How many jobs will they create? Do not be silly. Here we are trying to get them outside of North America, get them out of Central America, people losing their lives, and here we are bringing them in, welcoming them in with open arms.

MR. CALLAN: They are not going to the Olympics in Los Angeles.

MR. NEARY: They are not going to the Olympics.

Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous!
How hypocritical!

MR. NEARY: Here is another thing. Sometimes political expediency overrules peoples minds, Mr. Speaker, just because they think they can grab a few votes on the spur of the moment. When the West Germans were condemning our seal products but wanted air space in Labrador for low level flying to practice their bombing so they could go out in a nuclear war and kill people, did we object to that? There was an opportunity to trade off. Did we trade off? No, we let them come in, 400 or 500 coming in this year. Apart from affecting the environment, Mr. Speaker, we could have said and we should have said to the Russians and the West Germans, go - I was going to say block yourself, but that would not be parliamentary, I suppose - go leap in the Red Sea because we have -

MR. STAGG: They do not border Red Sea.

MR. MARSHALL: This is one of the most ridiculous speeches I have ever heard.

MR. NEARY: I do not have time to cultivate that subject because if I did I could spend all day on it.

Mr. Speaker, what must our allies think of us? What must they think of us?

MR. BAIRD: You do not have any allies.

MR. NEARY: Here you have an administration saying to Ottawa, do not trade off caplin to sell fish, but we will give the synchrolift, a federal Crown corporation, \$25 million or \$30 million to build a synchrolift -

MR. SIMMS: You are against that?

MR. NEARY: - to keep the Russians here.

MR. NEARY: I am against keeping the Russians here, or any other foreign country, inside of our 200 mile management zone. And, Mr. Speaker, the same thing when they had an opportunity to bargain with the Germans, when they had a chance to deal with the West Germans, what did they do? Mr. Speaker, they thought it would not be politically expedient to talk about these matters because there may be a few votes at stake.

Well, there are not going to be many jobs in Gander as a result of the Russians bringing in their own fuel, not many jobs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: 100, that is all.

MR. NEARY: 100. Did Mr. Bennett tell the hon. minister there is going to be 100? Because I heard 6 would be closer to it. Where are the 100 jobs going to be created? Do not be so naive. Six or 8 jobs.

MR. RIDFOUT: 900 meals a day they want.

MR. NEARY: Six or 8 jobs and what do we do? We sell out our allies and we talk out of both corners of our mouth at the same time. We talk about democracy and freedom and we let the Russians get established in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat I can only appeal once again to hon. gentlemen to vote for this motion of non-confidence. It is a good motion. I have put forward convincing arguments why members there opposite should vote for this amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I have no doubt but my colleagues in the

MR. NEARY: next two days, when I am out on the hustings, when I am out hobnobbing with the grass roots, I know my colleagues will be able to add some of their own points, they will be able to add, Mr. Speaker, to what I have already said to try to convince and persuade hon. gentlemen there opposite in conscience, to let their conscience be their guide, forget partisan politics, let their conscience be their guide and vote in favour of this motion of non-confidence.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m.