

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 1978

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that I have today regretfully accepted the resignation of Mr. Denis Groom, Chairman and Chief Executive of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Mr. Groom's resignation will become effective on June 30 of this year.

Mr. Groom has served this Province well over a number of years, firstly as Financial Advisor to Premier Smallwood's Government in 1966, and then as comptroller and Deputy Minister of Finance from 1967 to 1969. During this period Mr. Groom initiated many of the changes in the Province's financial relationships, and in the operation of the Department of Finance and Treasury Board, which today provides for the more effective operation of the public service and have contributed to the maintenance of the Province's credit rating.

During the period 1970 to mid-1974 when he returned to Newfoundland to assume his present position, Mr. Groom successfully held top appointments in industry in the U.K. At the request of the government, Mr. Groom returned to Newfoundland in July 1974 to assume responsibility for Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation, to oversee the construction activity on the Gull Island project, and to bring together under one organization all the Province's interests in electrical energy. Under Mr. Groom's direction the separation of the CFLCo operation from BRINCO and the subsequent transfer of activities from Montreal to St. John's has been successfully accomplished in a new organization; Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro has been established.

Mr. Groom has advised me he feels this is an opportune time for him to leave as Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro is now well established on a stable basis, and arrangements for

Mr. Peckford: developing Gull Island with federal assistance have not yet progressed to a point where his departure would create difficulties. Mr. Groom tells me that he has received an attractive offer from a major British corporation to join their main board as Group Finance Director, and that he has decided to take this opportunity to return to the private sector. I have therefore reluctantly agreed to accept his resignation in order that he may be permitted to do so. During the coming weeks government will be reviewing with Mr. Groom and the Board of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro the question of his successor, and I hope that a decision on this important matter can be reached quickly.

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a word of two if I may, Sir, with the indulgence of the House on this very important matter. Another resignation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: One a day now.

MR. W. ROWE: There seems to be one a day. They are alternating between the ministry, ministers themselves, and senior public servants. You will soon see the whole upper echelon of the Government of Newfoundland gutted of its leadership and talent.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy was noticeably reticent as to the reasons why Mr. Groom would decide of his own volition to step down from what can only be characterized as an exceedingly attractive job for anybody. Certainly the prerequisites of office as well as the recompense for the undoubtedly onerous duties involved were very attractive. I am wondering if the minister could indicate whether he has received a letter of resignation from Mr. Groom or not on this matter?

MR. NEARY: On what date?

MR. W. ROWE: The minister, Sir, is too busily trying to find out the reasons himself, apparently.

MR. NOLAN: Or did he have it for a week or two?  
MR. SIMMONS: He is not sure.  
MR. W. ROWE: He does not know.  
MR. NEARY: You did not have it in your pocket -  
MR. W. ROWE: He does not know whether he has received a letter  
or not, Sir.

I would ask the minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!  
MR. W. ROWE: - if a letter has been received? Would the  
minister undertake -  
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!  
MR. NEARY: It is not like the Bill Saunder's letter, no.  
MR. PECKFORD: I do not know ....  
MR. W. ROWE: Would the minister, Sir, would the minister  
undertake to table that letter in the House of Assembly?  
MR. SIMMONS: They would never keep you down for three days,  
"Brian".  
MR. PECKFORD: What?  
MR. SIMMONS: They would never keep you down for three days,  
'Brian'.  
MR. W. ROWE: Sir, if I could have the protection of the Chair, -  
MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
MR. W. ROWE: - in order to make my few modest remarks.  
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman wishes not to be interrupted.  
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!  
MR. PECKFORD: Would the former leader of the Liberal Party  
keep quite .  
MR. W. ROWE: I do not blame him, Sir, he is sorely provoked  
every time he looks across this House and see that man. Very  
provoked.  
AN HON. MEMBER: Lots of leaders on this side.  
MR. W. ROWE: So I understand the government being exceedingly  
jumpy , touchy and twitchy, As a matter of fact, Sir, thirty twitching  
heaps across the House of Assembly never knowing what minister is  
going to go next, never knowing what senior civil servant is going to

Mr. W. Rowe:       toss in his hat and bail out from this sinking  
ship, -

MR. NEARY:        They are so worried, Mr. Speaker, they are so  
worried.

MR. W. ROWE:       - known as the Government P.C. Government of  
this Province.

MR. NEARY:        They are so worried they had to have a caucus.

MR. W. ROWE:       They had a caucus yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in order  
to say, Yes, Sir, we took a vote and we reaffirm our faith in the  
Premier pro tem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:       Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: The Chairman of caucus himself, Mr. Speaker, has not seen fit to come in. I do not to take votes in my caucus, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not have to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: I do not have to take votes. When I go into my caucus, Sir, the love and affection melts, melts me when I walk in -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, Lord!

MR. W.N. ROWE: I do not have to say 'Who is for me today? Mr. Speaker, Are you for me today or are you against me?'

MR. DOODY: I do not have to do it, Sir. You would not dare ask! You would not dare ask!

Mr. W.N. ROWE: If I had that hon. member!

out front. No, wonder he has got him pushed

AN HON. MEMBER: Was it a secret ballot, do you know?

MR. W.N. ROWE: It was under this minister, Sir, that the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs resigned as well, my colleague points out to me, which I was going to mention in any event, This minister seems to have a track history of driving out of the government the senior and talented and skillful civil servants who want to make an effort, make a contribution to the development of this Province.

Sir, a couple of questions for the minister, if he would not mind, later on, 'Would he mind deigning to give the House the reasons for Mr. Groom's resignation? Is it because, Sir, he suspects a certain amount of hocus-pocus, and I hesitate to use

MR. W.N. ROWE: the word fraudulent statement and so on, but a certain amount of deception, misleading information being given out to the public by the government regarding the Lower Churchill development. Mr. Speaker, is that the reason he resigned? And he cannot tolerate that kind of attitude by his political masters, so the minister might also indicate whether there is somebody in the wings whom the minister or the government would like to see take Mr. Groom's place.

AN HON. MEMBER: Probably a new -

MR. W.N. ROWE: So this time, Sir, can I make this humble beseechment on behalf of my fellow Newfoundlanders; is there anyone in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, good enough to take over the job as chairman of this corporation -

MR. NEARY: Do we have to import someone?

MR. W.N. ROWE: or will we again import somebody and have to pay the kind of salary, Sir -

MR. PECKFORD: What about Van Ess? He was brought here.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Van Ess? Who is Mr. Van Ess?

MR. PECKFORD: on the strong recommendation of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. It would appear to me that the procedures under Ministerial Statements are being strained.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will simply conclude with saying one more resignation, one a day, who will it be tomorrow, why this resignation now? No information by the minister and I hope, Sir, that some worthy Newfoundlander can now be appointed to this very important post.

MR. NOLAN: At \$100,000 a year -

MR. W.N. ROWE: Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. HEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have to apologize to Your Honor, I was unable to get the proper format to Grand Bruit. As Your Honor knows, Grand Bruit is an isolated community on the southwest part of the Province and it will take a little while for Her Majesty's mail to reach Grand Bruit, but this is the best they could do. And it is not a bad petition, Your Honor, so I hope Your Honor will be a little tolerant in my tabling this petition. It is addressed to me. "We, the concerned, salmon fisherman - and it is a federal matter too, Your Honor, so I want to point that out to the House right from the out-set. - "We the concerned salmon fisherman of the fishing community of Grand Bruit would like to present to you at this time a petition concerning the salmon fishery. We, the fisherman of this community, depend mainly on the fishery for a living. This year they are taking five days away from us but there is going to be trouble about it. We want the five days back again or pay the fisherman \$1,000 a man for the five days lost. If we do not get five days back or receive payment for these five days, then we are going to put the nets out on May 15th. regardless." And it is signed by fourteen fisherman in the community of Grand Bruit, all of whom are Billiards except one, who is a Mr. McDonald. And the others are all Billiards and they are all good fishermen, Mr. Speaker, and they feel very strongly about this matter. What is happening is that the federal government regulations



March 21, 1978

Tape 327

DM - 4

MR. NEARY:

Now for conservation purposes are taking away five days from their salmon fishery season. This is not the first petition I have had on this matter, by the way, I had a petition from the Rose Blanche, Harbour Le Cou, Diamond Cove, Petites area on the same matter some

MR. NEARY: time ago and I passed it on to the hon. Mr. Jamieson and to the hon. Mr. Romeo LeBlanc, the federal Minister of Fisheries. These fishermen feel very strongly about this, Sir, and you can see from the wording of this particular petition, where they say they are going to put their nets in the water regardless if they do not get compensated for the time that they will lose in the salmon fishery which is very short as it is any way. So, I do hope, Sir, that our own Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs will take this petition and make representation on behalf of the fishermen along the Southwest coast and strongly urge the Government of Canada, the federal Minister of Fisheries and the provincial Minister of Fisheries to try and remedy this situation, to rectify the situation, do whatever they can to try and resolve this problem for these fishermen along the Southwest coast, Sir, who are going to lose these five days. The fishermen down in Grand Bruit as I say have very strong feelings on this and they are very civilized people in Grand Bruit, Sir, and the salmon fishery is a large part of their income, in the community of Grand Bruit and LaPoile. So I do hope, Sir, that something can be done either to compensate the fishermen or give them back their five days.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand and speak in support of the petition presented by the member for LaPoile on behalf of fourteen fishermen of Grand Bruit. Sir, the problem here is one basically of conservation of the salmon stock and the economy to the fishermen of this particular community, and it is a delicate balance as to when we should take days out of the actual salmon fishing season in order to protect the salmon stock. You have to balance that against an income or the economy worth approximately \$14,000 to this particular community. And I would, Sir, ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and also the provincial Minister of Fisheries to contact their federal counterparts locally here in the Department of Fisheries in Pleasantville or on the Mainland in order to ascertain whether or not in fact these five

MR. F. ROWE: days taken out of the salmon season will make that much difference to the depletion of the salmon stock in this particular area. It is a very difficult decision that governments have to make, Sir, in trying to have this delicate balance between the economy and the saving of the fishermen through conservation of the salmon stock and other species as well. So, Sir, I do hope that we hear from some minister on the other side, Intergovernmental Affairs or the Minister of Fisheries, indicating what he is prepared to do to make representation on behalf of these fourteen fishermen of Grand Bruit.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: As acting Minister of Public Works the annual report to the Public Service Commission -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are back again, 'Joe'!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Back again. - and also the copies of the information required under Section 1V of the Public Tender Act, the Act No. 68 of 1974 which lists all but other than the lowest tender which was tendered during the period January 1, 1977 to December 31, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not know if I am up under the right heading now or not. I want to table the report of the Rural Electricity Authority Power Distribution District for the year ending March 31, 1977.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker,

MR. W. N. ROWE: the ambition, Sir, behind me here knows no bounds, growing daily. A question, Sir, for the hon. the Premier, if I can get the Premier's attention. He seems to be too interested in something else. Sir, in view of the fact that the Minister of Mines and Energy would give no information whatsoever on the reasons for the resignation, an important resignation, Sir, a resignation which will affect this Province for better or for worse, would give no information on the resignation of Mr. Groom, will the Premier indicate to the House if Mr. Groom has given him any information, any indication as to why he resigned as the chief executive officer of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, yes, obviously I have spoken to Mr. Groom on the subject. The fact is that he has been made an offer by a very large and I think prestigious firm in Great Britain which is his right to announce and certainly not ours, and being a person who wants to further his career that is exactly what Mr. Groom proposes to do. And I am sure the Leader of the Opposition of all people would understand that ambition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. N. ROWE: What was that last little bit there?

MR. F. ROWE: Surely you can understand what it is to rise.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh, yes, I understand that.

Sir, a supplementary on the subject of resignations. In view of the fact that the Premier made a solemn pledge, a solid commitment to the P.C. District Association of Grand Falls to resign if the hospital expansion in Grand Falls did not start this year, will the Premier indicate to the House when he intends to tender his resignation to the Lieutenant-Governor?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Presently by leave, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. POWE: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to try to get some information from the Minister of Health in connection with legalizing denturists in this Province. Could the minister indicate if the denturists will be legalized in this calendar year in Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Appropriate legislation will be presented to the House in due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. minister indicate when, what year the legislation will be presented to the House?

MR. H. COLLINS: Last year -

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Sir, told us last year we were going to have appropriate legislation for the last session of the House. Will we have legislation in this session of the House -

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - legalizing denturists?

MR. H. COLLINS: Appropriate legislation.

MR. NEARY: This session?

MR. H. COLLINS: This session.

MR. NEARY: The minister can stand up and tell the whole House.

MR. H. COLLINS: You sit down and I will stand up.

MR. NEARY: Sure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. COLLINS: I said, Mr. Speaker, we will have appropriate legislation in this session.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. minister indicate to the House whether the denturists will be allowed to have any input in this legislation? Will they have equal rights with the Newfoundland Dental Society? Not any more or less, but equal rights, and have they been consulted, will they be consulted? Will they get a copy of the legislation so that they can look it over? Have any meetings been asked for by the denturists, and if so has the minister agreed to meet with the denturists?

MR. H. COLLINS: Why did you not write me?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, come on.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have given the House information to the effect that appropriate legislation will be presented in this session. I am not about to go into what it might or might not contain at this particular time. The legislation, when it is prepared, will be presented to the House and everybody will have the opportunity to read it and there will be an opportunity for debate.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the original questioner.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked me why I have not written him. I have written the questions on the Order Paper and I have forty questions on the Order Paper so far addressed to the hon. gentleman and not an answer yet, and the House has been sitting three weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: We have the whole department tied up!

MR. H. COLLINS: We will get back to you after a while.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just want the hon. gentleman to indicate to the House, Sir, whether or not the denturists have asked for a meeting with the minister, and if so, has the minister granted the Denturist Association an audience to date?

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we have had numerous meetings over the past couple of years with the denturists and also with the Dental Association, the Medical Association and other interested groups. Before the legislation is tabled in the House certainly we will be going back to the appropriate agencies again.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Health in answer to a question from me, and from others I might say, in the last session of the House of Assembly, stated that he would bring in a legislation on the denturists in the last session, I can only assume surely, accepting the minister's word, that something was wrong which he never gave any reason for. Now therefore, if the minister misled the House surely he has no choice but to resign.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That question was out of order. It was not a question.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the matter of the resignation, or the alleged resignation of Mr. Groom from Hydro. Would the Premier indicate to the House whether there was in fact a letter or resignation from Mr. Groom, and the date of the resignation if there was one? Or did he get the flick as he should have, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it was not alleged but it was verbal.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. WHITE: A \$90,000 a year job and no letter.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the Premier there is no written resignation at this point in time, Did the resignation indeed come about, or the parting of company come about as a result of the attractive offer? How it can be more attractive than the present position I do not know, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: It has to be a -

MR. SIMMONS: Did it come about as a result of his more attractive offer or did he in effect get the flick? Did the Premier or the minister ask him to vacate the position, as they certainly should have?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, there was certainly no question of the government asking, or any member of the government asking Mr. Groom for his resignation. It was quite the reverse. He came and saw me, he saw the minister and said that this was the situation. And something that probably, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would not appreciate, but we do take a man at his word.

MR. SIMMONS: I am trying to.



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

AN HON. MEMBER: Grand Falls.

MR. ROWE: A man of his word.

MR. NEARY: Can the hon. the Premier assure this House that before Mr. Groom departs for overseas to his new position where he is going to be promoted, moving ahead in life, would the hon. Premier assure this House that any outstanding amounts that are due the Newfoundland Hydro in the way of interest free loans to purchase real estate, and that sort of thing, that all these matters will be tidied up and all the money will be recovered before Mr. Groom gets aboard the aircraft headed for Shannon or London or wherever he is going?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, obviously whatever legal obligations are outstanding will be done in the proper way and certainly from this side of the House I would like to make it very clear that Mr. Groom whilst he has been subject to a great deal of criticism which is obvious for anyone, or likely for anyone in charge of a hydro corporation, the fact is that from our part at least we wish him good luck and bon voyage.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. I am referring to a statement made by him in this House last year after he had met with a delegation from the Burin Peninsula Regional Hospital Committee and, Mr. Speaker, here in the House the minister made the following statement, speaking of the progress made towards the planning of the hospital the minister went on to say in this House, to inform the House, he said, "The Committee was informed by me that the date given at this time for the completion of the detailed plans and specifications," he is referring to the regional hospital, "was the Fall of 1977." And my question, Mr. Speaker, is have those plans and specifications been completed as then promised to the Committee and stated to this House on that date?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member is referring to something which was said in 1977- that was the calendar year of '77?

MR. CANNING: That is from Hansard of April 5th., 1977, last year.

MR. H. COLLINS: 1977.

MR. CANNING: Your commitment to the House and to the committee.

MR. H. COLLINS: The meeting to which the hon. member refers did take place with the citizens committee from the Peninsula

MR. H. COLLINS:

refers did take place with the Citizen's Committee from the peninsula and a statement was made in the House that it was hoped that the planning could have been finished at a particular time. I do not have the information, I do not have the benefit of Hansard as the hon. member does.

I think it is a well known fact to all of us, Sir, that last year with the restraints programme, not only did we defer further planning for hospitals, but at the same time we took the position of closing some beds, and planning for the Burin Peninsula Hospital, the Port aux Basques Hospital, the Placentia Hospital and Clarenville Hospital was deferred at that time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, and it refers to this advertisement that has been in the papers the last few days regarding the occupation of Crown lands. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not, in fact - especially as number two goes, "Anyone taking possession of Crown lands following January 1, 1977" - I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not his department took the courtesy of sending the relative legislative and information on to town councils in the Province so they would not issue permits for people to occupy lands within their boundaries after that date?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the information was sent out to the town councils at the

MR. MAYNARD: time the legislation was passed, the rules and regulations were again sent out a few days ago bringing to their attention that they should not issue permits within the town council boundaries on Crown land unless a permit was first received.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The original questioner.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated in his answer that the legislation was sent out when it was passed which I believe was two years ago, 1976. I want to know whether or not the councils were informed when the legislation was proclaimed and were they informed when charges would be laid under his act? And as the minister indicated in his answer also, I understand, this was only done two or three days ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: The information was supplied to the town councils of various municipalities in the Province when the legislation was passed. I did not say that the legislation itself was sent out to them but the information was supplied to them and we reinforced it again a few days ago with another letter to all municipalities in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The original questioner.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would tell the House whether or not it is a fact that municipalities in the Province have issued permits to residents to build on Crown lands within their boundaries since January 1, 1977, and whether or not it is a fact that some of these residents have now been taken before court, tried and convicted and fined \$200?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: The first part of the question: I know that town councils and municipalities have issued permits to build without the applicant having a valid Crown Lands lease or grant. Whether any of the people who built have been taken to court I do not know. I would have to find that out.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The original questioner, then the hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of this matter, and in view of the obvious bureaucratic mess that has gone on here, I wonder would the minister undertake to postpone the execution date, I suppose is the right way to put it, of March 31 and put it off for a couple of months so that people will have a chance to register their applications for deeds and so on? Let us not be so fussy to take people to court.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not postpone the date, there was ample opportunity given by everyone over the past few years to know these dates, they were published in the papers at various time. I will not put off the date. No!

MR. SPEAKER: hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and shortly preamble it by saying that about two weeks ago there was perhaps one of the most major and most significant conferences in terms of Canadian Social Services held in Canada. The minister attended that conference representing the Government of Newfoundland and to date he has given no report to either the media or this House. My question to the minister is why not?

MR. RIDEOUT: He had not got anybody to write it for him.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I attended that conference in Ottawa and there were two major items discussed. One was block funding and the other was the proposed legislation by the federal government on the young offenders. I have never given a report to the House - I do not think that is usually done-however, as far as I know I did report to the media. In any case, Mr. Speaker, whether I did or not I do not think that it was mandatory that I should report to the media upon my return.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, is it implicit by the minister's silence that the conference was not of public significance? Is that what the minister is saying?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, of course the conference was important and of major significance and I think that everybody who wants to know is aware of the fact that block funding was accepted at that meeting in Ottawa. I do not wish to go into the technical details of what block funding is all about. There was no decision

MR. BRETT: made on the proposed legislation, The Young Offenders Act, and again I was talking to the media on that. I indicated before I went to Ottawa and after I returned that we, this government, this Province were opposed to some sections of the new legislation and the federal government agreed to take a second look at it. But I do not think there will be any decision made on that new legislation until after our next meeting which will be in Nova Scotia sometime in September.

But as for block funding, if the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) wants a report of course I can take up the rest of the Question Period, if that is what you like. Most people are aware that block funding is replacing the Canada Assistance Plan and it is under this plan that the Social Services is funded. For some years now, Mr. Speaker, all of the Provinces have been looking for changes in the Social Services legislation mainly because we would like to have more autonomy, I would say, in bringing in our programmes, because under CAP every time we want to introduce a new programme we have to go to Ottawa to get permission. Sometimes they will not fund programmes and we find this to be very confusing. Of course under block funding we will have autonomy and we will be able to bring in whatever programmes we desire.

The technical details are rather long and I will not go into them, but I will say that this Province stands to gain approximately \$1 million this year and over a period of twenty years I think is the period when they will bring us up to the national average, we will gain many millions of dollars. The exact amount I do not have but certainly block funding will mean that we will have much more autonomy in the Social Services and also we stand to gain several millions of dollars.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Fogo.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary and then the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister repeat to the House whether block funding means that the money that is coming from Ottawa goes into the general revenue of the Province or is it earmarked for projects in the Department of Social Services? Can it be controlled? If there is a saving, for instance, if the minister decides to save, to take it out of the hides of the poor people, will the savings be passed on to some other department, go back to general revenue, be spent on highways or be spent on helicopters or airplanes or action groups? Could that happen? Could money that is now being spent - if this Province gets control under this block funding, could the money be funneled into other department of government? Is there any safeguard against that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT: There is no safeguard as such, Mr. Speaker, the money will go into general revenue. But as the hon. member says anything can happen. He was almost elected leader of the Liberal Party, that almost happened, so I guess anything can happen. But I would assume that any government, and I do not want to be partisan, but I would assume that any government that is in power will spend that money in the Social Services because everyone is aware of the fact that every province will have to get more heavily into the Social Services. Not necessarily more spending, but we have to come up with new services and while it is true that it will go into general revenue I would still like to think that it will be spent in the Social Services and not on buying helicopters or paving roads.



MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. gentleman for Fogo.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Would the minister explain or tell the House whether the fishermen along the Northeast coast - and I would assume fishermen in other parts of Newfoundland who have Summer cabins on the islands - are they subject to the same regulation and restriction in making application in paying \$25 for application to occupy those cabins during the fishing season?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, the notice that was put out referred to people who want to acquire title for land under the so-called squatter's rights provision, and these are people who have permanently occupied land for some period of time; and people who have not occupied land for a certain period of time are required to make an application before March 31. It has never been applied to the fishing cabins that are normally used along the Coast of Newfoundland, as these are pretty well all temporary structures and no one has ever bothered with them to my knowledge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary? I am sorry, I thought the hon. member had risen on a supplementary.

The hon. member for Terra Nova followed by the member for Eagle River.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower, and this was a question that I asked the minister a couple of days ago, but because of the expiration of the Question Period the hon. members were denied the minister's answer. And the question is in reference to the strike situation at Labrador City, and in view of the fact that one of the reasons given for the strike by the workers has to do with the company's

Mr. Lush: policy of contracting out, and in view of the fact that the Bartlett inquiry made some recommendations respecting contracting out, the question to the minister is, I wonder if the minister can indicate to the House just when the government intends to implement the major recommendations of the Bartlett inquiry?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, just first of all to put the strike in Labrador City in perspective, there is the question of health and safety, the question of contracting out, the monetary package, and forty other issues on the table at the moment, unfortunately. There are a lot of issues. I do not think that the forty issues would be difficult to overcome once the main health and safety for Labrador City and contracting out for Sept Iles. I think these are the two major issues in each area, although they influence both areas, and where the monetary package is settled the other forty will flow, I would hope. And as hon. members must be aware I have ordered both sides back to the table and they will be meeting tomorrow in Labrador City or Sept Iles. I do not know the area yet because there is a joint co-ordination on the negotiations up there.

In respect to the Bartlett Commission report, we have held a number of series of meetings with the unions and the companies, and I have a senior official of my department meeting with other companies in the area outside the mining companies because obviously I am unable to meet with all 125 companies, 120 or 125 companies, to get their reaction to it. We have met with the company. We had a number of things that should be ongoing but unfortunately because of the strike they have been held up. I made a statement a couple of weeks ago about purchasing on the Island part of the Province as well as in Labrador in respect to the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush Mines. I have been given certain other commitments with them. As I understand it, the Iron

Mr. Rousseau:

Ore Company of Canada has now appointed a purchasing agent in Labrador City which they did not before have. Wabush Mines also has a gentleman to travel back and forth, and if the volume is large enough they will look at the same possibility. There are a number of other statements that can be made on it, but, you know, with the strike the thing has been held up, The advertisements that were suppose to be put in the paper, which I said in my statement were to be put in the paper by the Iron Ore Company of Canada, were held up pending the end of the strike, Some problems associated with the strike have caused action not to have been taken and it should be taken as soon as the strike is over, which I hope is in a short time. We will continue to review that, but the strike has kind of overtaken the thing now.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: I thank the minister for his answer and we are delighted to know that there will be action taken with respect to these recommendations. But the minister mentioned also that one of the reasons - that there were many reasons given for the strike. It seems as though in the media there are two given, one for contracting out and the other one that he just referred to, health and safety measures, and it appears that legislation is necessary to take the necessary measures to include this into an agreement. And I am led to believe that the government is contemplating legislation with respect to health and safety, so can the minister indicate when he intends bringing this legislation into the House, particularly in view of the fact that there is another strike contingent upon this, that is the one at Baie Verte, so we now have 2,500 workers on strike contingent upon this health and safety measures.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I think I am going to hold it off. I hope to be making a statement within the next few days. I will not take up the rest of the question period but I can say this, and I think we should say this, that in 1976 - because I am in a very difficult situation and the government is now - in 1976 there was a conference on occupational health and safety, there were six members elected from the management across the Province, there were six members elected from unions across the Province and there was an independent chairman appointed. That was called the Interim Advisory Board on Occupational Health and Safety. Now they have asked me, and I have asked government, that we not take action on occupational health and safety until they have had the opportunity to review it. I have said yes, if the unions across the Province, or if management across the Province do not want that representative democratically elected body in

MR. ROUSSEAU: the October 1976 conference to portray their views in respect to occupational health and safety, I am prepared immediately to reassess that Advisory Committee. And I have a problem right now: We have a draft act on my desk now as a result of meetings of the Interim Advisory Council a couple of days ago, a special meeting to look at this act; they have made a few changes in it, and government will take a look at it.

Now I hope that that act will be in in this session of the House. But if management and the unions across the Province want to take a look at it then it is not going to be in this session of the House because by the time they get it and take a look at it then we are not going to have the opportunity to present it in this session of the House.

If the unions say yes, the six people will represent us, and pretty well goes for all unions across the Province are represented, and if management say yes, the people on the management areas represent us, then we can do it in this session of the House.

I have talked to the Steelworkers in my area, which is a big area, I intend to talk to the people in Baie Verte and explain it to them, If they are not satisfied with this situation then I am prepared to look again at the Interim Advisory Committee and start doing thing in an ad hoc manner that I do not think would be the right way to do it. I would rather do it all in a lump sum and have the whole thing set out with reaction from both union and management through this committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the people in Central Labrador and specifically the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area over the last two years have suffered a great deal from the shut down of Gull Island the first time and the shut down of Labrador Linerboard with the major exodus from there, plus last year's sinking of the William Carson, which threw a great deal of the companies into

MR. STRACHAN: a tailspin. The people have been holding on, believing that the area will develop, it will move, and that Gull Island will go ahead this year and there have been some mutterings to that effect. I would like to ask the Premier whether he can indicate to the people definitively, yes or no, whether any major work will start in the Gull Island area this year so that people will know exactly what to gear up for since they are now starting looking at the short shipping season and trying to arrange supplies or decide exactly where their businesses should head?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, obviously before any work can start on the Gull Island project, agreements for the sale of the power and the method of that sale will have to be drawn up and although legal documentation entered into. That will obviously take a considerable length of time, and even if every system is go and everyone working full time on it, the earliest that it could start would be this Fall or more likely early in 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question again is for the Minister of Tourism. In view of the fact that on the February 25th. weekend the Minister of Tourism said that he hoped that the testing programme would be completed by mid-April, and then following the completion by mid-April that the testing teams would go back over ground already covered to give people a second chance who had failed the test, in view of these facts when does the minister expect that

MR. CALLAN:

the testing programme will be completed and also when will people be in a position to apply for big game licences? Will they be able to apply in time to plan their holidays and so on?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question depends on the weather and the answer to the second question in due time.

MR. NOLAN:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary by the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN:

A question for the Minister of Tourism on the same subject. I wonder if the minister would be good enough to inform the House whether the hon. the Premier and other people who are entitled to special licences will have to pass the same tests as ordinary people in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, there are only two gentlemen entitled to complimentary licences that I recall, the former Premier and the present Premier. Knowing the present Premier, he is a very sharp shooter as a hunter and as a politician.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

But also, Mr. Speaker, the former Premier - I am not too sure whether he has fired a gun in his life or not - but the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, I am of the opinion he is also a very sharp shooter.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is that I leave the Chair. Those in favour, 'Aye', contrary, 'Nay', carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins)

Order, please!  
The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins) A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the tradition at least in this Committee has been for the speakers to switch from one side to the other. We have already had a speaker from the Opposition side, Mr. Chairman, in the person of the Leader of the Opposition, and we had a speaker yesterday in the person of the Minister of Mines and Energy. Unlike in the House, a member cannot adjourn the debate, and so, as I understand it, the Minister of Mines and Energy in sitting down had forfeited his opportunity to continue and must now get the recognition of the Chair the same as any other hon. member. And I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that it would only be fair now to recognize a member from the Opposition side, beside which, Mr. Chairman, I might mention that I had risen considerably before the Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Most assuredly that is not a point of order. The hon. member is fully aware that it is totally and absolutely within the discretion of the Chair in Committee following adjournment in coming back the next day to recognize any hon. member who rises, and he recognized the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy. And I thought things have been going very well. We had a lengthy address yesterday by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and seven minutes by the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, and I commend the Chair on its fairness and equity.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if I may address myself to this point of order.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the House sitting on the government side that two years ago a precedent was set where I, myself, was speaking in Committee stage at 6:00 P.M. I was not finished what I had to say and when I returned in the evening to resume my speech, the hon. gentleman, the very gentleman who just



MR. F. ROWE: spoke to that point of order, rose in his seat before me and was recognized because I did not adjourn the debate and he was first on his feet, as was my colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. PECKFORD: Well, to that point of order, as I understand the situation as put forward by the Government House Leader, the points that he has made, additionally, I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that if my hearing was correct, and I think it was, the Chair did recognize me when I stood, and therefore I take it that there is no point of order and that therefore I am entitled to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! I think I have heard sufficient arguments on the point. I think the matter is reasonably clear. As the Committee will recognize, the Committee is not constituted in terms of our tradition until the Mace is under the table, and I do not consider that it is my place to call order until the Mace is so placed. On this occasion I did wait until the Mace was placed and I called order. On that occasion there were two members on their feet - I am aware of that - although I did not pay particular attention to either one of them until that time. I would direct hon. members' attention to Standing Orders No. 47 and 48. Number 47 reads: "Every member desiring to speak is to rise in his place uncovered and address himself to 'Mr. Speaker.'" This, I presume, also applied to Committee, so for Committee one would say, 'Mr. Chairman'. And number 48: "Where two or more members rise to speak, Mr. Speaker calls upon the member who first rose in his place, but a motion may be made that any member who has risen be now heard or do now speak, which motion shall be forthwith put without debate." When two members are on their feet at the one time, I am in the invidious position of having to call on one. I did so do and I called on the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy. As hon. members will recognize, there are means of taking action if it is so desired, but until such time as that is done I am recognizing the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
Thank you very much. I recognize the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I am assuming that the word 'shame' is directed against the hon. minister and not against the Chairman of the Committee. Because this, of course, would be entirely out of order and it could not be allowed to pass.

The hon. Minister of  
Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for your ruling. I appreciate having the opportunity to continue my remarks. As I began them yesterday, I think I had just begun my remarks, Mr. Chairman, in response to some allegations and accusations made against this side of the House as it related to the ongoing programmes of government, as it related to the Budget and Interim Supply, and I think I was making the point, Mr. Chairman, that I was astounded by the lack of concern displayed in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition as they related to rural development in this Province and as they related to fisheries.

As I remember it, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition began speaking yesterday. He spoke for over an hour, perhaps an hour and-a-half or more, and in all that period of time, in which he said he wanted to address himself to the concerns of the Budget in general rather than just Interim Supply, he refused in all that time to make any direct indication of the Opposition's views as they related to fisheries - he never even mentioned fisheries - and the Opposition's views as they related to rural development. As most hon. gentlemen in this House, and most people in the Province know, Mr. Chairman, the two main thrusts of

MR. PECKFORD: this administration since 1972 have been primarily in these two areas of government, and that we consider that if this Province is to have a real chance to survive in the long-term we must now divert whatever kinds of dollars we can muster, both capital and current, and put them into those resource departments that will most effectively give us a good return and which are most natural to the quality of life in this Province. Hence, nobody can deny and challenge that both fisheries and rural development fit into those two categories extremely well.

Mr. Chairman, it is an interesting comparison, yea! not really a comparison at all, but a contrast to look at the staggering growth that has occurred financially in the resource departments since this administration took office in 1972. Suffice it to say, for example, Mr. Chairman, that in 1971, the last year of the ancient regime, the last year of the Liberal Party, the last year of the hon. crowd opposite, many of whom are still the leaders of that party, that in that year, 1971, that they could only muster up \$3 million to put into rural development. It was not called then, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Rural Development, they did not recognize even in words the great concern that most Newfoundlanders had at the time towards building up their communities. They were more concerned in consolidating communities and hence the department at that point in time was called the Department of Community and Social Development and it was that department, Mr. Chairman, which wanted to move people out of small communities in this Province, who by doing that were really, and this is why, of course - it was all part of a deliberate policy - why they could

MR. PECKFORD: not put too much money in fisheries. Because the overall plan, as designed by planners that were brought in here and paid substantial sums of money, was to consolidate the population of Newfoundland. They wished to evacuate effectively Placentia Bay. They had on the list many of the communities now comprising the Leader of the Opposition's district. They wanted to, for example, eliminate some of the islands in my own constituency of Green Bay. One of the most viable - and I will challenge any hon. member on any side of the House to contradict this statement - one of the most viable communities in this Province today happens to be the community of Little Bay Islands in the district of Green Bay. There is an employment problem in Little Bay Islands; they do not have enough people for the jobs that are there on Little Bay Islands. It is that kind of community that the Opposition at the time wanted to centralize, to move into Springdale, move in the bottom of Halls Bay, to move somewhere else to further their own ends. Hence, one is not surprised at all, Mr. Chairman, to find that \$3 million was allotted in 1971 and that that figure has now gone up five times. In the present year we will be spending in rural development, in the Department of Rural Development, \$15 million, five times, fivefold.

And what have we done?

Not only have we scrapped, Mr. Chairman, the whole question of resettlement, the whole question of centralization, we have indicated through a Rural Development Authority which was established by this administration that not only will we eliminate and allow the people, "allow" the people to stay where they now live, but we will provide incentives so that they will be able to get a living where they live.

MR. PECKFORD: In other words, instead of trying to get them and attract them away, not only will we eliminate that programme,

MR. PECKFORD:

but we will implement programmes to ensure that they will stay where they are. That one of the major tenets that anybody today in Newfoundland recognizes is that if Newfoundland is going to have the chance to survive it has to be in rural Newfoundland, it has to be based on the fishery, it has to be based on the forestry, it has to be based on those areas of Newfoundland which have an agricultural opportunity, for example, like the Cormack area, like the Codroy Valley, like a small part of Green Bay, like Musgravetown - Buchans does not have a very large agricultural thing, there was a study done on it - Musgravetown area, Lethbridge area, and also on the Avalon Peninsula. But let us put our money where it can do the most good. Let us not be, Mr. Chairman, silly enough to provide an agricultural programme by a subsidiary DREE agreement which allows for substantial sums of money to go in areas that do not have a very high agricultural promise or potential. Let us put our money where there is a real good chance of success in agricultural. And one of the failures over the last number of years by both governments, in some instances, has been to try to standardize agricultural policy geographically. In other words, no matter where you live in the Province that you could qualify, whether it was on rock or on clay or on loam or whatever, for the same funds. And I think that that is a fairly substantial waste of money.

In any case, Mr. Chairman, my point being simply that in talking about what this administration is doing for resource development, talking about the thrust that we have been taking over the last six or seven years, which reflects itself again both in Interim Supply and in the Budget Speech, we are continuing to increase the amount of sums of money that have been provided in the resource departments to ensure that where people live now in rural Newfoundland they will have a chance to make a decent livelihood.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, one need only ask any Newfoundlander to go to many of the people who have obtained loans and grants and so on, federal/provincial as well as totally provincial, under the Rural Development Programme, and they can easily attest to the success of this programme.

There are many sawmill operators today, there are many pulpwood contractors today, there are many cabinet makers today, there are many handicraft makers today, who would not be in business and employing three or four or five individuals, had it not been for the kinds of programmes that have been brought in under the new Department of Rural Development that came into effect because of this administration. Gone from \$3 million to \$15 million, five times an increase in one single department, and at the same time eliminating that curse that everybody recognizes as a curse of centralization, conceived down in the bottom floor of this building by people who knew no more about Newfoundland than I know about the other side of the moon, people who were brought in and paid fat salaries that this administration had to get rid of when it came into power.

In Fisheries, Mr. Chairman, just look at the difference in Fisheries. This year \$24 million to \$25 million, as opposed to \$4 million. \$4 million in 1971, that is the kind of priorities that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland had as it related to the fishery. They wanted everybody to burn their boats and they were going to provide a couple of jobs for every man. That was enunciated by the Leader of the Liberal Party of the day. And it has been a real difficulty for the Opposition to adjust from a fishery orientated -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: - to a fishery orientated society, which we have succeeded in doing.

MR. PECKFORD: At the present time this administration is in the process of building several large longliners around the Province, being built by Newfoundlanders, which in the first instance provides employment now and more importantly in the long term will provide the kind of catching capability, inshore and mid-water, our fishermen need. The most prosperous parts of Newfoundland today are rural Newfoundland and with the 200 mile limit, with the kind of stimulus in the Fisheries budget and in the Rural Development budget that we continue to give to it, hopefully it will succeed. But, Mr. Chairman, it has to be recognized by everybody, and I think it is recognized by people in rural Newfoundland more than in the semi-urban centres, that somewhere, if you continue to provide that kind of level of financial assistance, then



Mr. Peckford: you do it to the detriment of stabilizing some of your social programmes, at least in the interim, until those resource orientated programmes provide the new dollars to continue on again with your social programmes; to provide more money for education construction or for education in general, and to health, and to social services and all the rest, but it is not done without a price. There has to be a price. And, Mr. Chairman, if I have to articulate that the price must be a stabilization of social programmes in the short term and put what money we have into the resource sector, I would rather take that alternative because it is all relevant than take the other alternative as was reflected in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in which even he did not get into economy activity or resource development. I would rather take that alternative than take the other one of continuing to pork-barrel the social programmes, needed though they are, needed though they are, to the detriment of the resource programmes. We have had enough of that, and now it is time for us to readjust our priorities and put our money as much as we can into resource development. That is to say, there will still be - I am only saying that the rate of increase in the social programmes will be less, I am not saying there will not be any increase in the Education budget; I am not saying there will not be any increase in the Social Services budget or the Health budget or the Recreation budget, but the rate of increase of those budgets will be limited, will be less, where they were 12 per cent or 14 per cent they will now be 6 per cent or 5 per cent, and that in return the money will go into the resource departments to try to provide the new dollars because that is the only way that it can be done.

So in the Fisheries Department we have gone to \$24 million from \$4 million, a six times increase, a sixfold increase.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, to continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

A motion to rise is always in order. It is moved that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

All those in favour "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Aye".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would say that the "Nays" have it.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, to continue, it was a sixfold -

AN HON. MEMBER: The "Nays" have it?

AN HON. MEMBER: A standing vote, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A standing vote is requested.

AN HON. MEMBER: You cannot have a standing vote in Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question will be put again. It has been moved that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. All those in favour signify by rising in their places. And I would indicate that those members who may have entered since the question was originally put should not stand or if they so wish should leave the Committee.

All those in favour rise in their places.

All those against signify by rising in their places.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I think that this procedure should be clearly understood and accordingly I will ask members to signify again, that is, that those members who signify in favour of the motion should rise in their place, and this applies to those members who voted originally in favour, that is, those who were in Committee at the time. Following that I will ask those who are against the motion to signify by standing in their places, and similarly this applies to those members who originally voted against the question when it was put on a verbal basis, and therefore applies to those members who were in Committee at the time.

Now I would ask those who are in favour of the motion signify by rising in their place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those members who are against, signify by rising in their place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! It has been moved that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has requested I report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have considered the matters to them referred, made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion Committee ordered to sit again now.

The motion is that I now leave the Chair.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Before we start the proceedings in Committee we have the exact same situation to which I alluded originally and the Chair is put in the position of recognizing an hon. member when at the very beginning of proceedings two members have risen in their place. Now in a situation like that I think the Chair has to use its discretion, it has to recognize that the debate involves both sides of the House. The Chair has to be careful so as not to appear to have bias or give preference to one side or the other. It is not an easy choice. However, if a choice is made and the Committee feels that the choice might be overturned, there is a means available to Committee to do that; this is in our Standing Rules and I would again refer to Standing Rule 48. At the present time we are in the situation

MR. CHAIRMAN: where one side of the House has had the attention of the Committee for a prolonged period of time on a set issue before the Committee. Due to a procedural event, the other side of the Committee who were addressing the Committee had not a similar length or even approaching a similar length of time. Now as I say the Committee is put in a position where no one is right and no one is wrong; there were two members on their feet in their places, quite correctly, when the Committee rose, and therefore the Committee has to make a choice when it is not a black and white situation. It is my choice and my decision that in the circumstances that prevail I am going to recognize the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has risen.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, my point of order will be referred to in a second but just as a preliminary remark let me mention to the Chair that Your Honour's remarks concerning the length of time taken by a speaker in the House are completely, Sir, I would submit humbly, completely irrelevant. I was a member of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition, speaking in reply to a government motion and therefore had unlimited time. The minister on the other side of the House rises now and has forty-five minutes according to the rules in which to speak. Your Honour's ruling - which I assume was a ruling, and

MR. W.N. ROWE:

it may not be. Your Honor's ruling, by having a loud, dishonorable gentleman to be recognized twice in a row, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Three times.

MR. W.N. ROWE: -No, twice in a row, Sir - prolong the speaking ability or the time for speaking of this hon. minister from the twenty minutes that he had yesterday, forty-five minutes again that he could have had today. Now this committee has risen and has come back again. According to Your Honor's ruling this hon. minister can now speak, presumably, for another additional forty-five minutes in this debate. Now, Sir, that is according to the government side of the House a privilege Sir, and a right that does obtain to every member in this House of Assembly, Sir, and I rise on a point of order in order to say that Your Honor should recognize the hon. member, my colleague, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, having being on his feet twice in a row, Sir, in advance of the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. What Your Honor said, elucidated, just now is so fair, so equitable, so clear, so necessary to the smooth running of this House that I am surprised anyone would even attempt to raise a specious point of order on it. Your Honor recognized the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy. And when two hon. gentlemen rise at the same time and the Chair recognizes one instead of the other, then obviously that is the decision and the prerogative of the Chair. I commend Your Honor for the very fair and equitable way in which you have been operating since assuming that Chair since you have been appointed by this House.

March 21, 1978

Page 340

78 - 2

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please.

MR. NEARY:

I reluctantly move that Your Honor's move be appealed, seconded by my hon. friend, the member for Trinity - Dav de Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Before I respond to the hon. House Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Leader of the Opposition did rise on a point of order. I feel that a point of order was not before the House at this time. The hon. member for LaPoile has appealed a ruling of the Chairman and I will therefore rise the Committee and report to the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): Mr. Speaker, I have to report that a ruling in Committee was appealed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Now the motion that will go before the Chair is that the decision of the Chairman of Committees be upheld. Those in favor "Ave", contrary "Nay". In my opinion the Ave's have it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Divide, divide!

MR. SPEAKER:

Let the House divide, Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that the decision of the Chairman of Committees be upheld, those in favour please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower, the hon. the Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, the hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. the Minister of Justice, the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development, Dr. Winsor, Mr. Marshall, Dr. Collins, Mr. Young, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Goudie, Mr. Neil Windsor, Mr. Cross, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Carter, Mr. Woodrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed please stand.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hodder, Mrs. MacIsaac, Mr. Strachan, Mr. Fred Rowe, Mr. Neary, Mr. Simmons, Mr. White, Mr. Lush, Dr. Kitchen, Mr. Callan, Mr. Flight, Mr. Canning, Captain Winsor, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Rideout, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Jack Winsor, Mr. Moores.

MR. SPEAKER: On the division, affirmative twenty-five, negative nineteen, I declare the motion carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that I leave the Chair, Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the hon. member for -

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: - Trinity Bay de Verde, that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir -

MR. PECKFORD: I would like to continue my remarks in silence, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I would like to make a motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I do recognize the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to move, Sir, seconded by my colleague, the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde, that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir be recognized by Your Honour and that the member do now speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been moved that the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir do now speak. Those in favour indicate by "Aye", those contrary, "Nay". I rule the "Nayes" have it.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding now that the Chair has recognized the Minister of Mines and Energy for the fourth time in a row?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is correct in his general assumption. The Chair has recongized the hon. minister.

MR. SIMMONS: I wanted some information on which to base my point of order. Has the Chairman of Committees now recognize the minister for the fourth time in a row?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is correct.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if there is a point of order before the Chair or not, The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) got up on a point of order. Am I recognized to speak now, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not aware of a point of order being before the Chair.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.



MR. PECKFORD: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I am happy to be on my feet again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

MR. SIMMONS: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there was no need to recognize the Minister of Mines the fourth time, because he had been recognized a third time, at 4:13, and that after he had been recognized by the Chair there were then some procedural matters which interrupted his speech. However, under the rules and the tradition of this Committee and this House, we have been accustomed to moving the clock from the time the member is first recognized and I would therefore submit that while there is no need to recognize him a fourth time, because he had begun to speak technically at 4:13, and that his time should be clocked from that point in time.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that over the past fifteen or sixteen minutes here in the House a very serious situation has arisen inasmuch, Mr. Chairman, as under the Standing Rules of this House, on this side of the House we have exercised our rights under the rules, and I moved that the Committee rise, which meant, Mr. Chairman, that at that moment all discussion then ceased, The government members could have been in their seats and supporting my hon. friend who is speaking, listening to the speech that was being made by the hon. gentleman. They were disinterested. They did not sit in the House and therefore the majority on this side carried, which meant that all Committee of the Whole as of that moment ceased, and then Your Honour, even in keeping with the spirit of the House, did not have to recognize the Minister of Mines

March 21, 1978

Tape No. 341

NM - 4

MR. NEARY:           and Energy. The debate had been stopped by this side of the House, not by the government side, Sir, under the Standing Rules and therefore I submit to Your Honour that my hon. friend should have been recognized.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I do have to point out to the hon. member that he is going back to a situation where a ruling was made, the ruling was appealed, the Committee dissolved, and the House was reconstituted and that ruling was upheld by the House. So I cannot hear further argument on that situation. I am not aware otherwise that there is a point of order before the Chair. The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) made some observations which do not in any way constitute a point of order. He has every right to make them as he thought it was a point of order, but all the Chair can decide is whether there is a point of order or not before it. And I did not hear a point of order coming within the ambience of our rules.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, (inaudible) when the minister's time has begun whether it was indeed at 4:13 as I understand it to be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

On a point of information I would point out to hon. members—I am not being difficult, I am sure hon. members will realize that - that questions of procedure should not be put to the Speaker or indeed to the Chairman of Committees. Information can be obtained from the table in a private way, and the table, myself included, will be only too glad to do it, but it is not proper for the proceedings of the House to be interrupted to ask procedural questions of the Chair.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: I would submit, Your Honour, on a point of order that the hon. gentleman's time has now expired, that we have been now longer than forty-five minutes on estimates, on points of order, on rising

MR. NEARY:

the Committee, coming back into Committee of the Whole. And it all totals up, Sir, the clock does not stop, Your Honour did not stop the clock. Now I would submit that forty-five minutes has expired and now my hon. friend, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), should be recognized.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The officers of the Table inform me that the hon. minister's time has not elapsed. The hon. minister.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: Could Your Honour indicate to the House how many more minutes the minister has in which to address the House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the House Leader for the Opposition care to approach the Chair?

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, we have witnessed one of the most despicable displays of procedural wrangling that I have ever seen since I have been in this House since 1972. Effectively the Opposition, condoned by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. Rowe), that great urban princeling -

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

MR. PECKFORD: - who wants now to take again -

MR. W. ROWE: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: - the time away from me left to speak -

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: - because he cannot stand to listen to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! A point of order.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, my point of order is based on the Standing Orders of the House which require strict relevancy. Sir, we are debating a resolution having to do with interim supply being voted to Her Majesty. I would submit, Sir, that the hon. minister's scandalous remarks a moment ago concerning procedure of this House are

MR. W. ROWE:

strictly irrelevant and therefore strictly out of order, Sir, and I ask for a ruling on that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The Committee is now debating supply, in other words, the Budget, and

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins) In other words, the Budget, and it is traditional in this House that in the Budget debate, including estimates, that these be broad ranging and, of course, we have ample and recent precedents for this attitude of Committee.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: I recognize what the Opposition are up to. I also recognize that we have some fair-minded people in the gallery who recognize and have witnessed - I hope it has not been their first time in this House of Assembly so that they go away with the kind of impression that anybody would gather in the gallery today. It is an unfortunate situation. We on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, during this debate which was started by the Leader of the Opposition, listened intently to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, some of which were totally relevant, others of which bordered on irrelevancy. We gave him the opportunity to lash out at the government, to indicate from his side just where they thought as an Opposition party the government was going wrong both in the Budget Speech and in Interim Supply. We listened intently, we did not bring up any specious points of order, any technicalities, and here we witness now this afternoon for many, many minutes a filibuster, an attempt by the Opposition to muzzle a minister of the Crown from having the right to get up in his place and give his opinions as they relate to Interim Supply and the Budget Speech. Surely, Mr. Chairman, it is just another indication of why the hon. gentleman is over there on that side of the House and why the people over here form the government of this Province. Because the people of this Province recognize the irresponsibility of the Liberal Party of this Province at the present time - not the party so much as the members that make up the party, and there is a big, big difference.

Mr. Chairman, I was indicating before I was rudely interrupted on numerous occasions that the big difference

MR. PECKFORD: that separates the government of this Province from the Opposition is that the government of this Province is committed to rural development and fisheries development, something that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, that the Opposition, has been against from day one, since 1949.

MR. SIMMONS: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

A point of order has arisen.

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I have known the minister for a long time as a fairly fair-minded person and I do not think he deliberately meant to assign some motives to us just now as to why we were rising on points of order, I think whatever his motive was he has in effect given the impression that somehow we have been filibustering or otherwise interrupting. Mr. Chairman, the minister has been recognized four times. That is unprecedented in this House for the same member to be recognized four times in a row. We have chosen the procedural mechanisms available to us to make that point and we have made it, that in a very unprecedented fashion the Chairman in Committee has recognized the same member four times in a row. That was our reason for doing it, Mr. Chairman. That is my point of order, that the minister in saying that we had attempted to do other things, has assigned motives to us. My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that the minister in assigning certain motives to us other than those which we were guided by, has been unparliamentary, has violated the rules of this House and should be instructed by the Chair to retract his unparliamentary allegations.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, number one, it is not a point of order. The Chair has ruled, Mr. Chairman, has ruled so many times now that one has ceased counting, that the kind of remarks made by the Minister of Mines and Energy at the very most is a difference of opinion. And yesterday we heard the same sort of approach from across the House and no one thought or even suggested that it was

MR. HICKMAN: out of order or even that indeed there was a point of order. Simply to set the record straight, Mr. Chairman, when we went into Committee today, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy was recognized by the Chair very properly. Since then, any recognition that has been necessary from the Chair has not been the cause of this side of the House.

MR. PECKFORD: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The question has arisen of whether unworthy motives, or motives other than those avowed, have been ascribed. I would point out to hon. members of the Committee that it is unparliamentary to do such in regard to an individual hon. member when one is referring to an hon. member: however, as far as my memory serves me, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy did not refer to any individual member of Committee in his remarks in this fashion and I do not think, therefore, that a point of order is before the Chair.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, thank you once again for recognizing me and putting down in due fair, common sense fashion the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir as so often has been the case over the past number of days.

Mr. Chairman, I was trying to point out to the Committee in response to the remarks by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, that this administration since 1972 has recognized the need for



MR. PECKFORD:

major resource development in rural Newfoundland and that this was being accomplished through major increases in expenditure and the creation of a new Department of Rural Development and through funds being channeled into that department on a progressively higher basis as well as in the Department of Fisheries, two areas which were ignored totally by the former administration and by the Liberal Party which was, of course, the administration of the day.

I was going on, Mr.

Chairman, when I was so rudely interrupted, to indicate that these were not the only fields from a pure financial point of view. If one looks at the Department of Mines and Energy, the present portfolio that I hold, the budget has gone from \$17 million in 1971 to \$30 million in 1978, the Department of Forestry and Agriculture has gone from \$7 million in 1971 to \$23 million in 1978, and so on it goes. In the Department of Tourism, a department that was established by this administration we have in 1978 and expenditure of \$14 million contrasted with \$3 million in 1971. And on it goes, Mr. Chairman. If one looks at all the resource departments and does up one's totals, one will come to a grand total of \$149 million, or \$150 million as contrasted to \$57 million in 1971. This is a cause, I would say, for a great deal of pleasure on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman. To think that during this period of time when simultaneously we were bringing in under the health scheme - bringing new hospitals on over the last six or seven years, that the costs of both construction and operating on those hospitals - bringing the Health Sciences complex on, the Twillingate Hospital on, the Carbonear Hospital on and other extensions. The big extension to the Waterford Hospital out here, to the

MR. PECKFORD: Western Memorial Hospital and other major renovations that have been done over the last years. The ongoing increases based on the cost of living essentially that have been given to those people on social assistance. The introduction in 1974 of a totally new revamped social assistance programme which was not in before that time and at the same time increases ranging from 30 per cent well up to 90 per cent in the amount paid to welfare recipients. In the same time as we were increasing from \$49 million to \$150 million the resource departments, at one and the same time were increasing our social commitments to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, both through new welfare programmes, through new health programmes.

Who can deny the great ambulance programme that was brought in by this administration to serve not only urban centres but all over the Province - rural Newfoundland - to ensure that the sick and needy got to hospital in the quickest way possible? Who can deny that kind of programme? Who can deny the ongoing increases in transportation and Communications that have been identified and have been increased by this administration over the same period that we were still providing much higher increases to the resource departments, that we were going ahead simultaneously, that we just were not hitching our wagon to star, but that we were recognizing social responsibility and at the same time saying to the people of Newfoundland that if we are ever to have a chance we must create new dollars and they can only be created through the things that we know naturally.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, at the same time that we were increasing our financial input both into the social sector as well as the economic sector, we recognized that new legislation, new programmes

MR. PECKFORD: that had to pass through this hon. House would have to be put in place. Who can deny, Mr. Chairman, that at the same point in time when everybody accuses this administration of closing down mines, as if they had some responsibility for creating the ore which mother nature must always have, at the same time as we see a reduction in mining activity in this Province, is it not ironic, Mr. Chairman, that at the same time that that is occurring the amount of revenue accruing to the treasury of this Province has gone up over three times in mining taxes because we had the audacity and the forward looking vision to revamp all the mineral legislation in this Province over the last three or four years, that it is this administration that has increased upon the companies the amount of tax that they have to pay to the provincial treasury, and that now in 1977, not 1978 in 1977, over three times the amount of revenue came into the Province of Newfoundland in the way of mineral taxation than came in 1971-1972, even though we have reductions in the mining industry around the Province?

This indicates a fairly forward look to eliminate completely the concession system which served us so badly over the years and which condemns now additional exploration in this Province. It is because of the concession system that we are strapped, that because of our new mineral programme, our new mining legislation we have taken those areas that are not under concession

MR. PECKFORD: and we have opened them up and that claim staking in '77 is up over '76 even though the climate economically in Canada and Newfoundland is not all that attractive. This administration did that, both in the realm of taxation and increasing the revenue that we could then use for social programmes and simultaneously bring in new reform legislation.

Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder then that three or four weeks ago when I attended a major conference on mining in Toronto, the Canadian Association of Prospectors and Developers, that around 200 delegates from across Canada and representatives from the United States, could articulate and say before all the mining community of Canada that one of the few provinces in Canada that has forward progressive legislation, even though they had to pay three times more taxes, was in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador? They said that at that conference, that this was progressive legislation because we consulted with the companies and consulted with the unions and brought in legislation that is good.

Mr. Chairman, who would deny that presently on this Order Paper of this very day we have a major piece of legislation that is going to circumvent a very bad regressive system of mining concessions that was brought in by the Liberal Administration? We are now going to impose a tax upon those areas that are held under perpetuity or for a long period of time by mining companies, and we are saying to those companies that you either have to pay this tax, which gets quite burdensome in the fifth year of the programme from now, for five years, or otherwise relinquish it. And if they agree to relinquish it so that they will not have to pay the tax, then it comes under the open system of claim staking to allow additional companies to come in.

MR. PECKFORD: I was part of a conference, Mr. Chairman, at the Holiday Inn here in St. John's several months ago, Canadian Institute of Mining and Metalurgy, where I stood up at that conference and indicated to all the companies who were then doing business in this Province, and prospective companies who wanted to do business in the Province, Would you please tell me over the next two weeks whether this new mineral impost legislation is harsh, is anti-investment, is regressive? I did not, Mr. Chairman, get one negative comment. I had just about every company that was then doing business, as well as companies that were not, come to me and say, "We know we live in a different world. We know that private enterprise is still the best vehicle to bring on jobs and investment, but we know we will in a different world that we did in the forties or the thirties, and that the concession system that major concessions on any front are no longer the order of the day and that they were willing for their company's part, to recommend that this kind of forward, progressive legislation go through. Hence we have now revamped totally the whole mining legislation of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, in 1974 we took another step, a major step legislation wise, which changed the whole face of the forest industry in this Province. We brought in forestry legislation that will impel the two major forestry companies, pulp and paper companies, to do a full survey of their forestry resource, that it would be split up in blocks around the Province, that it would be determined an annual allowable cut on that block, and that if they could not cut that annual allowable cut because it was not in their programme for that mill that year, they would either pay a tax on it or relinquish that wood to some other operator or sawmill operator in the area, to allow him to do it if they did not want to pay the tax.

This has resulted in my district, in the

MR. PECKFORD: district of Green Bay, in major expansion in both wood contracting and in lumber producing. Price (Nfld.) I think it was who gave up the Mooney Block on the Great Northern Peninsula and one of the reasons why they gave it up was because of this. On the Burlington Peninsula, which is on the Baie Verte Peninsula, there has been major concessions made by Bowaters to private contractors because they did not have it in their programme to cut this wood. And it is making a great difference not only to the level of activity in the forest industry but simultaneously, deliberately causing the companies to think about conservation and reforestation for the first time in their history. That was major legislation. That was not a policy resulting from an Order-in-Council, resulting from an announcement by a minister; that is law that is in this Province right now and that is legislation that the companies now have accepted and are working with the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture on, and providing increased activity, increased jobs and increased money to the Provincial Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I think my time has just about run up and I am just getting started on the many, both financial and legislative means by which this administration proves beyond a shadow of a doubt why it is on this side of the House and the party opposite will continue to dwindle and have many, many more leaders in its day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it was The Evening Telegram, Mr. Chairman, one of the papers - yes, The Evening Telegram - a few days ago that either unwittingly or otherwise found a term, a single word, that sums up at once the value that you can place on anything the Premier says in particular, anything the Minister of Finance says in particular, anything the budget says in particular, anything the so-called blueprint says in particular, any promises or commitments that the Premier made in Grand Falls about the hospital, or in Clarendville, or promises about a multitude of other items; The Evening Telegram found a term, I say perhaps not deliberately, but found a term in its editorial of March 18th. The editorial relates to the resignation of the former Minister of Rural Development. But in the second paragraph of that editorial, the editorialist says in part: "He resigned because the government did not plan to keep its often repeated vommitment v-o-m-m-i-t-m-e-n-t. Is that not just the most beautiful word you could coin? Is that not the most beautiful word you could coin to describe the kinds of promises the government makes and what it ultimately does in terms of following them through, or in this case not following them through? A vommitment, not a commitment, Mr. Chairman, a vommitment, v-o-m-m-i-t-m-e-n-t. I think that is the most descriptive term for the shenanigans the Premier has been pulling over the people of Newfoundland for the past five or six years. And now the new albeit temporary Minister of Finance has joined forces with the Premier because this document, this Budget, Mr. Chairman, I am forced to call it a budget because it says so, on the cover, very little inside that would tell you it is a budget, everything inside would tell you it is some kind of a pipe dream, some kind of a new effort at hoodwinking more people, but I suppose we will have to refer to it for purposes of reference as a budget.

There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when you could look to the Minister of Finance on Budget day to stand up in this House and review in a fairly statesmanly manner the fiscal position of the

MR. SIMMONS: Province, to tell us as members of the House and therefore custodians of the public purse, to tell us exactly the state of the Province. The Americans have a mechanism whereby the President goes before the media once a year and gives a State of the Union address. And in somewhat parallel form, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that that is what the Minister of Finance ought to be doing when he stands in this House to deliver his budget speech. He ought to be telling us what is the state of the Province fiscally and economically and then he ought to be telling us what the government proposes to do in fiscal terms over the next twelve months, over the next fiscal period.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you look closely at the budget you will find that the minister does make an effort at the latter. He does indicate almost incidentally what the government intends to do over the next twelve months, but he takes most of the time, and I say very deliberately, Mr. Chairman, he takes most of the time to wax eloquent - and he was eloquent, Mr. Chairman, let there be no doubt about that; the Minister of Finance was eloquent and for a very good reason which I will come back to - he waxed eloquent for an hour and a half or whatever on just about everything except direct budgetary matters. There was that pipe dream of pipe dreams, the five year plan, reminiscent of the Russian five year plans.



MR. SIMMONS: No one, Mr. Chairman, would ever compare this crowd to the Russians. Nobody would ever be that unkind, Mr. Chairman, that undemocratic as to compare this crowd to the Russians. It would be most unkind to the Russians, because the Russians at least, Mr. Chairman, keep their five year plans. They at least follow through, if you can believe the press. They at least come reasonably close to achieving what they set out to do. You might not agree with what it is they do, but at least they have a single-minded purpose which gets them to their goal over the stated period. Not this government, Mr. Chairman. This government, which now puts before us a five year plan, has demonstrated - and who better, Mr. Chairman, but the former Minister of Rural Development would know this - this government has demonstrated that it cannot even keep a one year plan. It cannot pursue a five or six month plan, let alone a five year plan. What utter, complete rubbish! What nonsense! Who believes it? Make no wonder they needed a vote in caucus, Mr. Chairman, to find out where everybody stood. The chairman of caucus over there tells us that they voted to uphold - or whatever the word was - to uphold what the Premier has been up to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was that a secret ballot?

MR. SIMMONS: - yes, it was probably a secret ballot and it was probably -

AN HON. MEMBER: I doubt it.

MR. SIMMONS: - the same kind of vote result as the Premier would get from his caucus if he were desperately ill in a hospital. At the right point in time the card would come, or the telegram with flowers and would read, 'Your caucus wishes you a speedy recovery by a vote of fifteen to fourteen.' I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of vote that they probably had in that caucus, but the irony of it is that they needed that kind of a vote at all. The Premier must be on a double prescription of paranoia pills these days.

Mr. Chairman, the Grand Falls hospital is an example I use simply because it is perhaps most in the public eye,

MR. SIMMONS: most in the public mind of commitments this government has not kept. And this is not an alleged promise, this is a well documented public commitment. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it goes beyond the status of a commitment. It is one thing to say you are going to do something, but if you have already begun to do it, if you put up a beautiful eight by twenty-four billboard saying not only that the hospital is going ahead or the extension is going ahead and how much it is going to cost, but also telling who the design engineers are, who the general contractors are, who the electrical contractors are, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that is more than a commitment - that is a project actually undertaken. That is a project which is actually begun. Or it is something else. It is another example of how elaborately this hon. crowd set out to hoodwink people. Imagine going to the extent, Mr. Chairman, of getting your billboards all painted, getting them placed in Grand Falls and on the Burin Peninsula, as the Minister of Finance well knows, and in Clarendville - not only some kind of an announcement saying, 'One of those days we are going to build a hospital here.' No, more than that. The whole thing, Mr. Chairman, chapter and verse, who the various contractors are, who the architects are, who the subcontractors are, the value of the project, the expected completion date. That is more than a commitment, that is a project well underway. Now let us place it in time. I saw the billboard for the first time about August of 1975, that is the billboard in Grand Falls as well as the one in Clarendville, about August, 1975. We will all remember, of course, that in September, 1975 we had a general election and then after the election we had that infamous so-called mini Budget which I submit was the real Budget the year we had two budgets, the bluff Budget in the Spring and the real Budget in the Fall.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier today during Question Period muttered something during one of his brief and infrequent visits to the House. He muttered something about he did not need a written resignation from Mr. Groom, he  
word.

MR. SIMMONS: believe in taking people at their word. Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of people in this province who have long subscribed to trusting people and they have had a pretty good track record. They have not always been let down. But that same group of people, Mr. Chairman, the many tens of thousands of trusting Newfoundlanders who have enough faith in people to trust them when they say something they know they mean it, that same group of people, Mr. Chairman, are having second thoughts these days and their teacher, Mr. Chairman, is the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador. He is telling them in loud and clear terms - Look at me. You cannot believe a word I say. If you want examples look at the hospital extension in Grand Falls, look at Clarenville, look at the pronouncements about the extension to Come by Chance. Now, Mr. Chairman, what an aboutface. What a turn around. The last few days we hear this crowd talk about Come by Chance like it is the worst thing ever happened to the province. They try and shame certain people, whoever got involved in the project but that is not what they were saying in September 1975. The Premier himself was in Clarenville about ten days before the election in 1975 and he was singing the praises of Come by Chance and announcing that a great expansion would go forward and that there would be another refinery in Come by Chance. There would be a petro-chemical plant in Come by Chance. Then it was okay, Mr. Chairman, because they needed to buy a few votes. Today somehow it is a shocking thing to even mention Come by Chance.

MR. CALLAN: Come by Chance was not even mentioned in the Throne Speech or the Budget.

MR. SIMMONS: My colleague from Bellevue reminds me rightly that the matter of Come by Chance was not even mentioned in the Throne Speech or the Budget. Let us watch when the next election is upon us. There will be lots of song and dance then about those no-no projects - Labrador Linerboard and Come by Chance and the others. We will hear lots about them again, Mr. Chairman, But the people of Grand Falls and Central Newfoundland are teaching us a good lesson. They are teaching us not to be nearly as gullible about this crowd as we have been up till now.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is no member in this House who is quite as hard to listen to as the Minister of Mines and Energy. I think if you had to take secret ballots around here on that very subject he would come out on top. He would come out very much on top, Mr. Chairman, as a person hardest to listen to by any member on any side of the House. I heard him rave on about how the Leader of the Opposition did not say what he wanted to hear him say. You are right, Mr. Chairman, he did not. You are right, Mr. Chairman. The Leader of the Opposition and I and every other member, at least on this side of the House, will have our say about fisheries and resource development and a number of other issues if we are given a chance. If this crowd, Mr. Chairman, this hon. crowd has the guts to call the Budget debate you will hear from the Leader of the Opposition and from the rest of us over here about matters affecting the future economy of the province.

In case the Minister of Mines and Energy and others do not know what we are doing here we are making a few comments on the matter of Interim Supply. I understand that the Minister of Finance would like to get on with this and like to get it through by the end of March so he can pay the civil servants and pay the other commitments that are accruing to the public treasury, and in the spirit of co-operation we have undertaken to allow him to do that but, Mr. Chairman, within reason. If the government members insist on pursuing a full-scale Budget debate irrespective of what label is on this particular exercise now, if the government persist in pursuing a full-scale Budget debate we shall do likewise and if it takes till the 20th of April or the 15th of May to get Interim Supply through, so be it. It takes two, Mr. Chairman, to keep a bargain and right now, Mr. Chairman, if we are forced by circumstance into engaging in

MR. SIMMONS:

a full-scale debate or answering for not covering every subject every time one of us stands on our feet because we are operating under the constraints of an Interim Supply motion and we are operating under the constraints of an agreement to get on with this in the next two or three days, Mr. Chairman, they cannot have their cake and eat it too. If they want that kind of co-operation let them do one of two or three things; either let them pursue this debate in Committee as an Interim Supply and let us get on to the larger question of the Budget debate, or withdraw this motion - I do not mean withdraw it, but not call it again for a while and let us get on with the Budget debate as such which is where all of us over here would like to be right now, on the Budget debate. And it is not the fault of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, that we are now, March 21, trying to rush through \$165 million in the next few days so the government can pay its bills. That was not our fault. We did not delay the opening of the House until March 6.

There was lots of time, Mr. Chairman, for the government to have brought the House together last Fall to have dealt with the fairly heavy legislative programme which I understand is going to come before us, and then to adjourn for a brief period of time during Christmas and to come back here about January 10 or January 15, have the Speech from the Throne and give us time to debate it. We have only had two or three days on that debate yet. We should have had behind us now at least six or seven weeks on the Throne Speech debate. It is not our fault that it was not delivered until the sixth day of March, at least two months after it should have been. It is not our fault that within ten days of the opening of the House, or seven or eight days, the government brings in the Budget. Not too soon, Mr. Chairman, too soon in terms of the opening date of the House but not too soon overall. About two months too late overall. That is not our fault, Mr. Chairman. That is the fault of a government that is not doing its job, that is reneging on its obligations to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SIMMONS:

Perhaps one of those days, Mr. Chairman, we will have some rhyme or reason into the House schedule so that we can come here in the Fall and do some legislation if there is legislation to be done. We can come in here in January and talk about the broad direction the Province should be taking under the aegis of a Throne Speech debate. And then probably in February get a Budget and a Budget debate and then there will be no need for the exercise we are going through now, Mr. Chairman. Does everybody realize, Mr. Chairman, the only reason we are spending the next two or three days on Interim Supply is because this government has dragged its feet, that this government has not done the things it should have done in terms of fiscal management of the Province? Does anybody realize, Mr. Chairman, that the reason we are here now, a scant week before the end of the month, is because this government neglected to bring in a Budget a month or two months ago. Now last year, Mr. Chairman, there was a good reason and we understood. Last year the explanation had to do with the then impending closing of Labrador Linerboard. There were large financial questions involved, so we understand. But how long, Mr. Chairman, do you go on understanding when in effect you realize what is really happening is that the government is afraid to open the House? They put it off until the last possible minute and when they once do open the House, Mr. Chairman, they put up a buffoon who screams at us for an hour or so, impresses only himself. Certainly they could have put up one of the men over there, Mr. Chairman, at least.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: So, Mr. Chairman, let there be no doubt as to why we are here on March 21 discussing Interim Supply—because the boys here on the hill did not do their homework. And, Mr. Chairman, while this crowd was not doing its homework let it be said, Mr. Chairman, certain other boys were, certain other fellows were. The credit boys in New York were doing their work. The P.R. boys in Montreal were doing their work and we have the result right here, Mr. Chairman. Do not blame

MR. SIMMONS:

the Minister of Finance for this document. Do not give him the credit for the document. The credit, the blame is not his, Mr. Chairman, he was but the mouthpiece. He was but the Lieutenant-Governor without the trappings. He was doing just as the Lieutenant-Governor does when he comes in here and reads the Speech from the Throne. He was reading a document that was put together for him by other people. And in that respect, Mr. Chairman, this document represents a couple of important firsts in this Province and in this House.

First of all,

MR. SIMMONS: I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is the first Budget Speech, if I may call it that loosely, it is the first budget speech written outside the Province, written outside the Province. Let there be no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, this document was written by the PR guys in Montreal. The beautiful language - is it any wonder the minister was so eloquent? - written in Montreal, Mr. Chairman, the PR boys in Montreal wrote that one, the credit boys in New York dictated it. Written in Montreal, dictated in New York, foisted in Newfoundland, foisted on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, but do not blame the minister, Mr. Chairman, do not. He was put in that position for a very good reason, Mr. Chairman. One thing the Premier has and that is good political savvy on most issues and when he picks a Minister of Finance he picks a dilly. It is not the Minister of Finance should we be blaming, but the administration as a whole that has allowed themselves to be manoeuvred into a position where the memo from Montreal dictates that the Budget will be written there, that the Special Action Group will be concocted there, that most of the money on it will be spent there in Montreal, that dictates that the seal hunt fiasco will be packaged in Montreal, the money for it will be spent in Montreal. Blame the administration as a whole, Mr. Chairman, for that. Blame the administration as a whole, Mr. Chairman, for the fact that they have manoeuvred themselves into another corner, where the overall consideration is not the needs of the people of this Province when they determine or cogitate on whether to increase taxes or decrease them, or whether to create job opportunities or whether to close Labrador Linerboard or leave it open.

The people of Newfoundland and Labrador are not then the ones who dictate the terms of this Budget, but rather the credit boys in New York.



MR. SIMMONS: A few days ago we were talking about Hydro and the increase. What was the best reason, what was the only reason we got for an increase? Did we hear anybody say, did we hear the Premier say, did we hear any minister say we need the increase, Hydro needs the increase so it can better serve the customers? Did you hear that anywhere? Did you hear any rationale that the real reason an increase was allegedly needed is because somehow Hydro wanted to serve the customers of Hydro better. Not a chance. What reason did you hear? We got to look good in the bond market. The bond market is calling the shots on Hydro. It is calling the shots on this particular budget, Mr. Chairman. It is a sad day when we become de facto a colony of New York, a fiscal, economic dependency of New York. The people of Newfoundland did not make it so. This administration made it so.

Mr. Chairman, I made reference a moment ago to that shamefully infamous game called the Special Action Group. It is special, Mr. Chairman, Never before has a government sunk to such depths to lash out some slush fund money. It is special in that sense. It is action, Mr. Chairman, If I were the vice-president and general manager of a PR firm sitting in Montreal, and I wrote a memo in June 1977 proposing this to the premier of a province, and seven months later not only was my proposal accepted, initiated, but also I was getting a \$2 million kickback, I would call that action. I would call that action, Mr. Chairman. How is that for action?

MR. SIMMONS: It is rightly named, Mr. Chairman. It is special. I will say it is special. It is action. A fellow in Montreal cannot be complaining about the action he got. This Special Action Group, Mr. Chairman, I believe announced sometime in January, since then in about two months they have managed to lash out \$1,100,000 on pictures - \$1,100,000 on tv, radio, newsprint advertising. And one other item I did not mention, there is a fair fee in there, a fair fee. Do not get the impression that the media of this province are getting all that money. They are getting just a drop of it, just a drop. Most of it is going to Montreal. Two months or three months \$1,100,000 on a resource public relations programme. Now, Mr. Chairman, when you see that kind of a subhead in a budget, Mr. Chairman, you assume it is there for a reason. You ask yourself the question, why would they need a resource public relations programme? And you have to assume that they need it because the message of what loans are available, what government assistance is available has not got across to the people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the honourable crowd that has had the Rural Development Authority going since 1972. This is the honourable crowd that claims credit for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation which was actually in motion before they got into power. There are two agencies, Mr. Chairman, which together dispense just about all the money that is available through provincial sources, provincial government sources - Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and the Rural Development Authority. They have been going six years under this administration. Are they telling us six years later they failed to get the message across, that the RDA is there, that the development corporation is there?

MR. PECKFORD: The RDA was not there?

MR. SIMMONS: I have said, and the minister probably was not listening, but I said that the RDA was brought in soon after this administration came in. And in that six years, Mr. Chairman, they have obviously now admitted that they do not have the message across that these loans were available, this funding was available. Because, Mr. Chairman, what is

MR. SIMMONS: this special action group? It is a number - 737-3800, on one point the Premier has brainwashed me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Let the record show that I know the number. I have not used it personally. I have advised a number of other people to use it. I should certainly use it, Mr. Chairman, if the money is as easy to get as this. If the money is as easy to get as this I should call right away.

But, Mr. Chairman, this action group, apart from the slush fund which it is, is a telephone number. And the night the Premier was on for a half hour I thought he looked beautiful. He looked gorgeous. He looked absolutely fantastic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: The smile was absolutely ear splitting. I hear he is getting rave reviews about last night. But you know the highlight -

MR. W.N. ROWE: CBC Tory Hour.

MR. MURPHY: He had competition from the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. SIMMONS: No, he had no competition with the Minister of Mines. He had none there. But what impressed me I suppose - I did not see the programme but if I could only get a tape I would look at it tonight before I have supper, preferably before I have supper, mind you. But, Mr. Chairman, last night I understand as a result the Premier is getting absolutely rave reviews. I believe the highlight of the entire show was when he recognized the mystery guest and the mystery guest was the Minister of Mines and Energy, I am told. But I am told that that was certainly the highlight of the show. I did not see the show but I was not -

MR. PECKFORD: Did you read The New York Times today?

MR. SIMMONS: No, not today. I do not have the government jet. I cannot get down there.

MR. PECKFORD: A good review.

MR. SIMMONS: Is that right? Everywhere. Good. Excellent, well for me, Mr. Chairman, the highlight -

MR. DOODY: Did you read the report in the Morning News?

MR. SIMMONS: The Morning News - The St. John's News. Printed here in St. John's?

MR. DOODY: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Who told you?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the highlight last night clearly, without question, was when the Premier recognized the

MR. SIMMONS:

Minister of Mines and Energy, <sup>but</sup> I mean really, was it any surprise? The Premier has been listening to that childish voice for four years. He knows those babblings when he hears them, he knows.

Mr. Chairman, 737-3800.

That Special Action Group, Mr. Chairman, is first and foremost a telephone number. And the night when the Premier was on television for a half hour - it took him a half an hour to announce it - I could not help think, thank God we are on the same area code here in the Province. If he had to announce a couple of area codes too he would have been there for an hour and a half; but it only took him a half an hour, just a half an hour. I know the Premier is tender; he is walking around with his pockets bulging with resignations, I suppose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

It is first and foremost and even last - I cannot say last telephone number because it is also a slush fund. It is also something else; if you call that number here is basically what you will be told 'Call RDA', 'Call the Fish Loan Board!', 'You should be talking to the development corporation!', 'Where are you calling from? Makkovik?'. You should be talking to Goose Bay! The telephone number is one more thing - it is another mile of red tape; it just adds to the red tape that the fellow has to go through before he gets let down. And it is one more thing, Mr. Chairman, which is even more serious: It was a sickening exercise in raising false hopes. There was no new money - that is wrong, Mr. Chairman, there was new money but it all went to Montreal; there was new money but it all went to Montreal. <sup>but</sup> what is left, Mr. Chairman,

MR. SIMMONS: after you do the Public Relations program? You have salaries; that is understandable. These people would either be working there or in the respective departments of government from which they came, with the exception of Mr. Cole who was taken on as director but the salaries, you know, \$149,000, until I see the details I cannot be critical of that. They are probably well within reason if you got -

AN HON. MEMBER: \$147,000.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, we will find that out when we get the salary details. But, to my overall point, travelling, \$8,000, you cannot really argue with that if you have five or six people involved. Office expenditures are \$3,000 and you cannot really argue with that.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is one other item in this year's budget - well there are two others: one, \$16,000 I suppose for office space or something voted in the Department of Public Works; and then there is one other item, \$900,000 for public relations for McConnell. There are five items, Mr. Chairman, let us understand now there are five items: \$150,000 for salary, \$9,000 for travelling, \$3,000 for office, \$16,000 I suppose for office space - I have not checked that one out but I presume - and fifthly and lastly an item of \$900,000 for public relations. Now, Mr. Chairman, the people of this Province, the many people who would be potentially business operators, had hopes that night in January when the telephone number was announced, they had hopes, perhaps there is something there for me! But all it is, Mr. Chairman, apart from the other things I said, the slush fund and so on, the snow job and whatever, all it is, Mr. Chairman, is another telephone to be answered, another mile of red tape to be gone through, that is what it is. There is no new money

MR. SIMMONS: here, it is information, Mr. Chairman; I cannot beg the question of information. Whenever you can give information to the public about what is available to them by all means do it, and if you got to establish a new telephone by all means do it. My Lord, do not take two million dollars in public relations money to get the telephone number across! We are not that stunned. Mr. Chairman, The Premier thought the crowd in Grand Falls were stunned but he is finding out the difference this week. He thought the Minister of Rural Development was stunned, but he found out the difference a few days ago, and thought the member for Naskaupi was stunned, but if the Premier had listened to the radio in Labrador today he would have found out otherwise: he would have heard the member for Naskaupi telling the people of Labrador that the blueprint for development contains nothing for Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: So the member for Naskaupi is not as stunned as the Premier thinks he is either. The people of Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, are not nearly as stunned as the Premier thinks they are. And even if it takes time to remember a number, I get it, I proved it just now that I can remember a seven digit number. It took some doing, Mr. Chairman, but I memorized

MR. SIMMONS: it after going over it several times. And I would expect, Mr. Chairman, that equally we could have found a less expensive way to get the message across if the Rural Development had not fallen down on the job and in six years had not got the message across, or if the Development Corporation had fallen down and in six years had not got the message across, or if the Fish Loan Board had fallen down and in six or seven years had not got the message across that they had money available to potential small business operators, or if the Premier and his Cabinet felt that the Federal Business Development Bank was not doing its job, because it does have an agency very similar to the so-called special Action Group which makes available information about what funding is available both provincially and federally and privately. There were other agencies doing this same job so let us not be hoodwinked into the argument that somehow this is unique. It is not unique in the sense that it provides information, it is unique in that it is the lowest, most skulduggerous attempt to hoodwink the people of this Province, to raise their hopes falsely and to give them nothing for it but a telephone number and a lot of disappointing answers.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Now we will hear all kinds of claims, Mr. Chairman, we will hear all kinds of claims about how many jobs are created. I have to laugh when I hear some of the commercials. I heard one the other day, Mr. Chairman, and you know, it had to be cooked up by a crowd in Montreal, Mr. Chairman, who are full-time trying to sell snow to Eskimos. They are expert at it. And I had to laugh when I heard this little case history, this little anecdote about the farmer out in Green Bay. They do not ever say, 'This man is successful today because we helped him.' They do not say that, but the message is clearly there. The truth of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is - and I know that man personally very well - that that man to this date has not got one cent from any of the provincial agencies unless it has happened in the last



MR. SIMMONS:

twenty-five or thirty days since

I last spoke to him. Not one cent! There is nothing wrong with parading him as a successful businessman, but the suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that somehow he is one of the persons who has been helped by this Special Action Group or by various provincial funding programmes is dishonest. And they are using my money and your money, Mr. Chairman, to get that dishonest message across and hopefully buoy up their sagging, plummeted image in the public eye. They would do better, Mr. Chairman, if they took that \$2 million and spent it on the hospital in Grand Falls so that the people in my district who go up there from Bay d'Espoir would not have to spend two nights on a cot in a corridor as they have been doing for the last two or three years because this government has reneged on its health commitment to that area. My people in Bay d'Espoir would be a lot more turned on by the news that something is going ahead at the hospital than by seeing the Premier, Colgate smile and all, spend another half hour on television. Let the records show, Mr. Chairman, that 90 per cent of the Budget on the Special Action Group is going for PR - 90 per cent of it is cosmetic, 90 per cent of it is to sell it. Now, Mr. Chairman, what kind of a programme is it? What kind of a programme is it when we know that 90 per cent of it is make-up, that 10 per cent at the most is substance? What kind of a programme is it that it requires 90 per cent of its own budget to sell itself? Did you ever hear anything as astounding, as ridiculous as that in all your life, Mr. Chairman? And all the PR boys have had a busy time since this government came into power, an awfully busy time, Mr. Chairman. They must be hiring new staff every day of the week. Too bad they are not here in the Province where some of the people they hire would be Newfoundlanders. But this crowd, Mr. Chairman, does not think the Newfoundlanders are good enough. We have a few PR firms, Mr. Chairman, and apparently none of them are good enough for this crowd, and so if there are any extra jobs here they are in Montreal and perhaps we could say, Mr. Chairman, in standing back and looking at the performance

MR. SIMMONS: of this Premier who promises all kinds of jobs coming out of your ears - He promised full employment in 1972. He has smartened up somewhat now and he has only promised 10 per cent unemployment, but his first promise in the Fall of 1971 was full employment, not 10 per cent, 5 per cent - full employment. I suppose as you stand back and look at this Premier one thing can be said for him: he cannot be accused, Mr. Chairman of not creating any employment.

MR. SIMMONS:

This Premier has created employment in Montreal. This man has created jobs, Mr. Chairman, in Montreal. The P.R. boys are very busy. Not only were they busy selling their \$2 million Special Action Group idea where they get most of it, they get ninety per cent of the total, ninety per cent of last year's, ninety per cent of this year's, they were busy on other things. Remember the spots last year on the Department of Forestry? Remember those? Another McConnell special, another place where McConnell sat down and wrote a memo and the Premier jumped and said, 'Yes, boys, anything you suggest. How much is it going to cost? What shall I make the check out for?'

Now, Mr. Chairman, as if they were not busy enough, they are just winding down from an election, this McConnell crowd. They were busy a year or so ago, Mr. Chairman, they worked for a party trying to get a party elected. God knows they had a difficult job. And McConnell was the same crowd, Mr. Chairman, that helped get this hon. crowd elected in September, 1975. So they have been busy. But that is not all, Mr. Chairman. They also spent a fair amount of time in the past few months putting together that \$160,000 seal hunt fiasco. What a fiasco! The Toronto Star - I could not find the editorial but the Toronto Star rightly said a few days after that the Premier should have known better than to pull the old stunt of calling a press conference, that he could only attract all the people who had an ax to grind, which he did, and he gave them a forum in San Francisco and in Europe and all over the place.

Now the crowd on the other side will stand up, Mr. Chairman, and tell you how I am against the seal hunt and that kind of stuff. But that is okay. In their benighted minds they might even believe what they are saying. I do not particularly care. But I do care, Mr. Chairman, if \$160,000, or I suspect a much larger figure, is spent on the travelling around of a cortege of ministers and other assorted types if that spending has the effect of kicking us in the teeth, if it, in effect, hurts us, and that is what that has done.

MR. SIMMONS:

I realize my time has just about expired now and I want to return to that particular theme at a later time

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, just let me say that the Special Action Group, if the Premier has learned anything at all he would disband it, disband it right away, take McConnell to court if necessary to get the money back on the grounds that he was hookwinked and then spend the money on something much more worthwhile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I hope now on the balance of the time we have left on Interim Supply, which is only about a half an hour this evening and maybe an hour or so on Thursday when the House meets, that we can put some questions to ministers on the various heads.

MR. HICKMAN: I would like to answer the questions that the hon. the member for Burgeo-LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I presume as Finance critic is putting to me, if I may.

MR. NEARY: Yes, well of course the minister can answer but I just want to put a couple of questions to the Premier myself.

The first subhead is the Executive Council.

MR. W. ROWE: It is just as well to go down the subheads in rough order with a few questions.

MR. NEARY: Perhaps if the hon. government House Leader and ministers will agree, all the shadows on this side have questions that they would like to ask ministers under the various heads. I think that is the best procedure to follow, to get information, to get it out to the people, because that is what we are here for.

MR. HICKMAN: May I answer? You know, I do not know where the hon. the Premier is.

MR. W. ROWE: Here he comes.

MR. NEARY: Well the hon. the Premier may want to respond to the criticism of the Action Group. But I might say for the benefit of members of the Committee that the Director of the Action Group's salary is \$47,500. Now hon. members are at a slight disadvantage at

MR. NEARY:

the moment because I have in front of me a copy of the departmental salary details. They have not yet been circulated because of a breakdown in the printing, I understand, from the government House Leader. So the salary details will be distributed on Thursday. So I have a slight advantage at the moment. And I might say in Executive Council there are about forty-three or forty-four positions where the salaries are over \$20,000 a year,

MR. NEARY: and that includes Intergovernmental Affairs. And the first question I would like to put to the Premier is this, will the Premier indicate if in the cutback of 300 jobs, 300 full-time and 200 part-time jobs, if any cut will be made in Executive Council where we have the really high paid executives? Now I might just mention a few, just for the benefit of the Committee because they do not have it in front of them. But, for instance, let me give you one example; in the Premier's Office there is a press secretary - \$23,823, and I wonder if that is really necessary. And there are four special assistants, apart from all the other assistants that the Premier has, there are four special assistants earning \$68,257 total. And one executive officer earning \$22,247. And then we have Treasury Board Secretariat; we have the secretary to Treasury Board earning \$43,364, and we have an assistant secretary, financial, earning \$34,500. Listen to all these big salaries, these whopping salaries and we are talking about a year of austerity! My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, yesterday dealt with that. And in Budgeting Division, one Director of Budgeting - \$28,393. And then we have two budget officers - \$42,376. And we have a budget analyst - \$21,188, and a Director of Collective Bargaining - \$28,393. Two staff relation specialists - \$46,942, one Director of Pensions - \$28,393, one assistant secretary management - \$33,000, assistant secretary management - \$33,000, a senior treasury board analyst - \$23,359, two treasury board analysts - \$46,718, Director of Organization and Management - \$28,393, two organization and management officers - \$47,886, Director of Classification and Pay - \$29,812, one personnel officer III - \$27,042, three personnel officers II, a total of \$69,292. Then we have a Director of Government Insurance earning \$24,527. One Executive Director for Planning and Priorities - \$41,107, a whopping \$41,107.

AN HON. MEMBER: All more than MHA's make.

MR. NEARY: All these salaries are more than the MIA's make, by the way. I am not complaining about that but just an interesting observation for the record. One resource programme analyst - \$22,247, and so on, a Director of Development Division - \$28,393, programme review and development. Social Policy Division, one director - \$28,393. One Executive Director under Intergovernmental Affairs - Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Chairman, it should be abolished, it should be wiped out. An Executive Director - \$41,107.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Who is he?

MR. NEARY: And we would like to know who he is and what he does. One Director of Industrial and Resource Programme and Assistant Executive Director - \$35,066. And this is the crowd who are talking about socking it - putting \$3 on a hospital bed. A Director of DREE Liaison - \$24,527. One Director of Intergovernmental Manpower and Social Programmes - almost \$29,000, \$28,393. One Intergovernmental Affairs Analyst - \$20,179, one Director of Intergovernmental Finance Public Service Programmes and Director of Anti-inflation, not doing a very good job with the anti-inflation in the Province, but he gets for that - \$27,042. And of course the Director of the Special Action Group - \$47,500, the highest of all. Now I do not deny the fact, Mr. Chairman, I do not deny the fact that Mr. Cole is worth every cent of it, but not in this so-called Action Group, which is really only a glorified hot line. And I would like for the Premier now to stand up and justify all these high salaries. I would suggest, Sir, I would suggest in this year of austerity, when we are taking it out of the hides of the sick and the children and the poor of the Province, that the Premier immediately put a freeze on all salaries in his Executive Council portfolio and in Intergovernmental Affairs, everybody

MR. NEARY:

over \$25,000 be frozen. The salaries in this Executive Council, Sir, are unbelievable. I have only just read out fifteen or twenty. There are forty-three or forty-four positions over \$20,000 and the most of them are closer to \$30,000. And then we heard the Budget - austerity, a year of austerity asking the people to pull in their belts, tighten up, make sacrifices, get back to the work ethic. Well that is the kind - I am sure the member for Bay of Islands when he gets this departmental salary details will go berserk, will go bonkers trying to explain it to his constituents. So let the Premier stand now and justify all these big salaries and the Action Group. I have nothing against Mr. Bob Cole. I think he is a fine Newfoundlander and a fine gentleman who has made a name for himself, but I think his services could be better utilized in some other capacity rather than this glorified telephone number that the -

MR. W.N. ROWE: The McConnell rip off.

MR. NEARY: And the McConnell rip off. And I want the Premier to react to this now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I will gladly just answer those very few questions. The hon. member knows as well as I know that the senior people who work in the executive council, people like Mr. Channing, who is the most senior civil servant there is, the secretary of Treasury Board, the Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the Director of the Action Group. who has Deputy Minister Status, any of these people if you are going to get people of the caliber of themselves they have either earned it through promotion in the service and knowing that they are deputy minister level, which in a great many cases means that they are the most competent people in the service. Mr. Chairman, if you are going to have people and keep them in the Civil Service, where we do need competent people, you are going to have to pay them at least approaching what they can earn in the free world, in the land of free enterprise outside. It is no use for us to sit here with



PREMIER MOORES: 28,000 civil servants and say that we should not have anyone over \$25,000 because we may have 28,000 people but we would not have many people giving direction as to which way they should go on a permanent basis.

Mr. Chairman, as we know the Interim Supply is for two months of the twelve approaching, and the logical time to debate this in full and to give the detail and the job description if required of each and every position and also the function of each subhead that was discussed, is through the proper time of estimates. Now I do not think any of the ministers here now have the backup material or the backup staff to have a mini estimate debate. One of the things that amazes me, Mr. Chairman, is that as the Speech in Reply from the Throne was going to be called this last three days why the Opposition would waste these three days in giving speeches that could easily have been done in the same manner under that heading and which is now being deducted from their estimate time.

We told your House Leader that we were going to call the Throne Speech Debate when you could have said exactly the same things as you have said in the last two days. Instead of that what you have done is had it deducted from your seventy-five hours in estimates. And with that sort of judgement, Mr. Chairman, I think it is no wonder they are astray over there.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: I wish to straighten out a few things, Sir. The Premier should not stand up here and accuse the Opposition of not speaking in the Throne Speech when the Throne Speech was not called until a week or so ago. The House itself was not brought together until the latest time in the history since Confederation and the Budget Speech has yet to be called. There may be one exception to that generalization, Sir, or two but, Sir, the fact of the matter is that aside from 1972 which was a unique year, a year that the people of Newfoundland will not soon forget - 1972. Ordinarily the House of

MR. W.N. ROWE: of Assembly meets in November or right after Christmas, Sir. It never goes until the first or second day of March. So it little behooves the Premier to be accusing us, Sir, of not taking advantage of an opportunity to speak.

But that is not why I am on my feet now, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Premier-if he can stop reading the paper for a moment-I would like to ask him if he would give this House the answer to a reasonable question that cannot wait until the main estimates are debated a month from now, and that is what is the breakdown of \$2 million of public funds - \$1.1 million of which were spent without authorization from this House already in this

MR. W. ROWE:

financial year in a two month period - under this subhead. Sir, on the Action Group, \$1.1 million spent over a two or three month period already according to the revised estimates for 1977-1978, another \$900,000, a total of \$2 million to be spent in a thirteen or fourteen month period for the Action Group in addition to the salaries, Mr. Chairman, already referred to by my hon. friend, the Opposition House Leader, including a \$47,000 salary for the director of that group. In addition to that \$2 million of public money in a year of austerity and hardship and cutbacks, \$2 million of public money to be spent for advertising and P.R., I would like to know, Sir, what is the breakdown of the expenditure of that money. And the Premier, I hope, does not rise, Sir, and say that he does not have this information with him. He can send down now, make a phone call, call anyone of these \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year men in his department and they should be able to tell him what the breakdown of \$2 million of public funds is going to be spent on. And the Premier himself should know.

In this year of austerity surely, Sir, the government combed over every single, substantial item in the Budget before they decided to put a three dollar head tax on people forced to use beds in wards, before they forced an increase in school taxes, before they forced a two dollar fee on children who require dental health for each service provided by a dentist, before, Sir, requiring these stringent and drastic moves, including a one per cent increase in the sales tax which hits the poor off far worst than the rich and well off, Mr. Chairman, before taking these stringent, drastic moves surely the Premier looked at this \$2 million figure in the Budget to be paid in respect of this Action Group as P.R and advertising and found out for himself, satisfied himself what the breakdown of that \$2 million figure was.

So my question, Sir, directed to the Premier of this Province in an austerity year is what is \$2 million of public funds

MR. W. ROWE:

for P.R. and advertising going to be spent on, what has it been spent on in the past two months, what is it going to be spent on in the next eleven or twelve months?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, first of all one of the items under that particular amount of \$1.1 million and \$900,000 for this year was a matter that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. Rowe) or certainly his House Leader has divorced himself from, that is telling the people that matter in the various legislatures and the various media around North America and Europe what the seal hunt means to this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$1.1 million.

PREMIER MOORES: No, that is about \$200,000 of it, just short of \$200,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: I am saying that came out of this particular vote which was put in here.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that that is \$200,000 of that amount and the reason that that had to be spent, I think, is fairly obvious to most people-with the possible exception of the Opposition. There are times, Mr. Chairman, when I am not sure if the Opposition are in favour of the seal hunt or not. They are in favour of what is politically opportune, and they have no, absolutely no scruples in destroying an individual or an industry if they think it is going to be of immediate value politically. Equally, Mr. Chairman -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Premier is long enough in this House to know that you cannot accuse the members of the Opposition of being unscrupulous or having no scruples. That is unparliamentary, Sir, and I am sure the hon. the Premier just mentioned it in the heat of debate and I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if you would ask the Premier to withdraw that statement because that is unparliamentary, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: I certainly did not hear any such accusation made by the hon. the Premier. I heard the hon. the Premier advance an argument which most assuredly would be characterized as a difference of opinion between both sides of this hon. House, and as the Committee are aware the hon. the Premier chose his words very carefully, very carefully indeed, and did not use the word 'unscrupulous' in a way that could be attributed at all to imputing a bad motive or improper motive or any kind of motive that is not totally acceptable to the rules of this House. And I am sure Your Honour -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman finished?

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, Sir, the hon. the Premier clearly, Sir, accused the members of the Opposition of being without scruples and that, in my opinion, Sir, and I believe, in the opinion of the Chair, is unparliamentary, and if Your Honour wants to send for Hansard, well, we might have to rise the House to do it, but the Premier did make that statement. Every member on both sides of the House heard the hon. gentleman. It is unparliamentary, Sir, and the hon. the Premier should withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Young) Order, please! As the word 'unscrupulous' is unparliamentary, I will ask the Premier if he would withdraw it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly say that the Opposition as a body are not unscrupulous by any means and I certainly would think that none of them as individuals would be unscrupulous. Mr. Chairman, I think they are absolutely a marvellous bunch of individuals, I think they are totally with scruple. I think they have the thoughts of the Province and its people far beyond themselves. I do not think that there is any question whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that each of them is an absolute scion of impeccability in our society. I think all Newfoundlanders look on each and every one of them as a special person. I hope that is an adequate withdrawal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN:

Now where is the Action Group?

PREMIER MOORES:

Mr. Chairman, getting back to the Action Group; unfortunately even the high paid civil servants leave the building at 5:00 P.M. and to get the exact detail is impossible right now. One of the things I can say regarding the Action Group: Since it started it has had over 3,000 inquiries from people of which over 20 per cent had never contacted government before. The fact is that their job is not just refer them to the various departments such as Rural Development and Fisheries and Tourism and so on, but rather after that has been done their obligation then is to follow up on that procedure after a couple of weeks to insure that the applications have been followed through, and followed through with expediency. And that being the case, Mr. Chairman, I think it is worthwhile to point out that there has been red tape and there is red tape in this government or any government, I would suggest, or any bureaucracy. And I do not think anyone either on this side of the House, on the government side, would deny that. But any mechanism that can be set up to expedite the people who want to use government programmes, if that mechanism works, in my opinion, Sir, it is beneficial not just to the individual but to the Province as a whole. The fact is, as I say, there have been in excess of 3,000 applications. I will have a complete detail of how many have been processed and in which manner as soon as I get the information, And as I say, I think the logical place to give the breakdown of this amount of money - which I would gladly do today if I had the information from the office - and equally the breakdown of the functions of these various people and what their performance has been, I will only too gladly make it available to the House.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

Just a follow-up on that,

Mr. Chairman. Do I understand the Premier to be saying that on Thursday he will have some data, when we again deal with this matter he will have some information on the Action Group? Is that my understanding?

PREMIER MOORES: I will not be here on Thursday but the House Leader can have it to pass on at that time, I would think under the normal estimates is where you would want to look at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is happy about that. Look at -

PREMIER MOORES: I can tell that is all right. I am not worried if he is happy or not, But you know, I mean - what is it? - two hours you fellows have down for Executive Council at that time? As far as I am concerned I would only too gladly do it then. Because I mean it will be a lot better if I am here and I have the information.

AN HON. MEMBER: Okay.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Young) A point of order has been raised.

PREMIER MOORES: Did I unset you?

MR. SIMONS: No, not at all. The Premier always leaves me even more relaxed than I normally am.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier has indicated that my cheering section over there, the Minister of Transportation or whatever. Mr. Chairman, the Premier has indicated now that the information is not available. The civil servants have gone home. The Cabinet is not ready with information. We are not on the Budget debate, Mr. Chairman, we are on the estimates, and while the practice has been that we let them go through

MR. SIMMONS:                               fairly expeditiously,  
In view of the particular circumstances this year,  
Mr. Chairman, we feel, and this is my point of order,  
that we ought to rise the Committee until such time  
as the ministers can get ready and have their civil  
servants here to provide the specific answers that  
we are going to be raising in Committee. With that  
in mind, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order  
and move that the Committee rise and report progress.

MR. HICKMAN:                               Mr. Chairman, it is  
certainly taking advantage of the rules of this House  
for any hon. member - I rise now on a point of order -  
that an hon. member of this House would rise on a  
point of order, because when an hon. gentleman rises  
on a point of order he has an absolute responsibility  
to this House - he may be wrong on occasion - for this  
House to assume that that is a genuine point of order,  
or as the hon. gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan)  
says, or privilege.

No hon. gentleman can get up and  
having taken up the time of this House for a couple of  
minutes on a point of order say, "Your Honour, this was  
not a point of order at all, I withdraw it and I move  
the House rise." That is just, to my opinion, a  
flagrant abuse of the rules of this House. This  
Committee is anxious to get on with the business. We  
are anxious to accommodate the Committee and we are  
doing our very best to do so.

MR. SIMMONS:                               What are you talking about?

MR. HICKMAN:                               The hon. gentleman has  
been on his feet for the last two or three minutes and  
then saying he did not have a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young):                   Order, please!

I recognized the hon. member  
for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) on a point of order



MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): and I feel there is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: I move the Committee rise and report progress in view of the fact that it has been indicated to us by the Premier that there is no information forthcoming on the estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): It has been moved that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. All those in favour 'aye', contrary minded 'nay'. The 'nays' have it.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: A question to the hon. Minister of Finance. Pertaining to section 403, Loans and Advances to the Labrador Linerboard -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (YOUNG): Order, please!

MR. MCNEIL: - the advancement is - operating - \$9,200,000 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Order, please!

MR In all due respect to the hon. member for Stephenville, I feel that whoever he directed the question to did not hear it. I did not hear the question. The Minister of Finance, was it?

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Chairman, my question is to the Minister of Finance. In the estimates under subsection 403, Loans and Advances: Labrador Linerboard - operating advances of \$9,200,000 and the second part of the advances - capital \$31,400,000 for a total of \$40,600,000. Could the minister indicate, number one, the advances of

MR. MCNEIL: \$9 million, is this operating itself the first part of the year of Labrador Linerboard, and in that sum is the fees for the consulting firm of Woods Gordon whom you have employed as the selling agents of the mill, is that in that figure as well or is that separate?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the president of Labrador Linerboard is my colleague, the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and if the hon. gentleman from Stephenville has no objection I will divert that question to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: The hon. member for Stephenville is discussing the head under the main estimates, I think, rather than the Interim Supply amount for the Department of Finance. This \$2 million sum, which represents one-sixth of the total

MR. DOODY: budgeted allowance for the department, obviously, part of that can be broken down mathematically and applied to that Labrador Linerboard Limited statutory requirement.

The \$9 million operating part of that vote for Labrador Linerboard Limited is the moth-balling and maintenance operation for the year.

As to the question on the projected amount for the year; on the question of the Woods Gordon commitment or portion of the Labrador Linerboard Limited expenses, part of that amount is paid for through the Department of Industrial Development in their vote under some particular subhead, which I would have to look up, which requires assessment and research. The rest of it would come under the direct advances to Labrador Linerboard Limited under operating when these people from Woods Gordon are employed for a specific programme. The actual amount of Woods Gordon's fee from Labrador Linerboard Limited and the amount of time that they have been working there, and the amount of people who have been employed from Woods Gordon by Labrador Linerboard Limited or by the Department of Industrial Development and/or Finance is not available to me right now. The hon. member asked that question, Sir, several days ago and I have asked the officials in the appropriate departments to try to haul together that information for me. It goes back quite a number of years and they are trying to get the information.

It is not a simple question; it is a complex one because it is in an area that has to be subdivided among various departments and various programmes and various projects. As soon as the information is available it will be answered under the Question Period bit and piece. If the hon. member does not get it within

MR. DOODY: a reasonable period of time he should remind me again. But I have asked for the answer. It is not on the Order Paper but I am trying to obtain that information for him. How much of that \$9 million is actually attributable to Woods Gordon? The simple answer is that I am not in a position to be able to break it down for you at this point.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, March 22, 1978 at 3:00 p.m.