

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
10:00 a.m.- 1:00 p.m.  
FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1979

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have all been following with a great deal of interest and concern probably one of the most human interest stories in this century involving the Boat People - now that Canada is accepting several thousand, and I do not remember the exact number of Boat People in Canada - I wonder if the hon. gentleman could indicate to the House if any of these Boat People will be coming to Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not have the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker. I can undertake to get the answer to the question as it relates to the federal programme, or the Canadian programme for accepting Boat People. I can indicate to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that in the last ten days or so, the government itself, the Government of Newfoundland has been looking at that very human interest problem, if you will, that has gained the attention of people everywhere and a fairly strong outpouring of humanitarianism and generosity has been displayed by people on all continents, I guess, and we ourselves are just reviewing the stand the government representing all the people of Newfoundland should take and whether there are initiatives that we can take in our own right to show our concern as well. Hopefully, within the next couple of days, perhaps sometime next week, we might be in a position to indicate our kind

PREMIER PECKFORD: of response to the  
Boat People.

MR. NEARY: Just a brief supplementary,  
Sir.

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

MR. NEARY: Sir, I thank the hon.  
gentleman for his answer and I would like the hon.  
gentleman to try to find out, when he is getting the  
information, how many will be coming to Newfoundland  
and where they will be - if indeed any are coming, and  
I have heard that some are coming to Newfoundland,  
they will probably be coming to every Province of  
Canada - how many are coming to this Province and  
where they will settle in this Province and what kind  
of a programme either the Government of Canada or the  
Province has to receive these people. I would like  
for the hon. gentleman to get that information too  
if he could.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the reason  
why I answered on the Canadian side the way I did was  
because as I understand the programme, and I just  
scanned it in the papers or heard it on the news the  
same as anybody else, is that there is this private

PREMIER PECKFORD: programme, if you will. Canada is saying that we will allow a certain number and then it can be sponsored by groups, individuals and so on and there are families who are accepting one or two and there are non-profit charitable organizations accepting so many, etc., etc., etc. And I understand we know off a number that are coming to Newfoundland on the auspices of a church group or individuals and so on. We will try and get the list for the hon. member in the next couple of days and meanwhile, we are ourselves cognizant of the problems and seeing whether, given the restraint, given our limited resources, there is something special that we could do as well.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: I have a question and in view of the weather and the time of the year it is an important one. It is directed at the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Power) and results from a public utterance by the minister earlier this week, I think it was on CBC radio and involves a fairly large community in Newfoundland, namely, the trailer people and the outdoor campers and so on. Can the minister elaborate on a statement he made earlier in the week that the government plan to close off all gravel pits and other areas of the Province that are not particularly designated now for trailer parking and camping? Could he tell us whether or not they plan to do this right across the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as the member for Lewisporte obviously knows being involved in the tourist business, there is a great deal of problems with trailering, trailer parks and the like. We, as the government of Newfoundland supply a great deal of camp sites through means of our Provincial Parks. We, as a government and as a Department of Tourism are beginning to realize that in order to fully satisfy the demand for trailer needs within the Province, a lot of it is going to have to be done through private business people. In order

MR. POWER: to do that we have to make certain conditions that would be suitable to a person getting involved in business in the trailering aspects, to start a trailer park or that type of thing. In order to do that, we cannot have the situations that arise now in many parts of the Province where a man starts a small trailering outfit but because there is a gravel pit down the road the man simply will not be able to make a dollar and possibly go broke. We are now preparing a policy for government to try and protect those persons who are in private enterprise in the trailering business, to make sure that if they do invest a great deal of money to start a trailer park they will not go broke because down the road there is a gravel pit where people can park free of charge even though there are no services in those areas. Still, for some reason, people in Newfoundland decide to use a gravel pit where there are no services as opposed to a trailer park where fees may be five or six dollars a day for all the services that are required. So we are trying to develop a programme to accommodate businessmen who want to get involved in the trailering business and give them a certain degree of protection.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary. The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister how soon he plans to move on regulating the camper-trailer business in the Province and also to ask him about the environmental aspects of people going into gravel pits and other areas. Certainly there must be other reasons for doing this rather than just to protect private enterprise, the environmental aspects of it. I wonder if the minister has considered, or the government has considered looking at areas that might be set aside with environmentally controlled aspects to it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, yes we are. The member for Lewisporte also is aware of, as I said, the environmental problems because one of

MR. POWER: the real problems of using gravel pits and that type of thing for trailering, which happens along all our major highways and probably almost all of our secondary roads, is the fact that there are no dumping stations, there is no garbage collection, and inevitably almost all of this - the sewerage dumping thing - is dumped around the gravel pit itself, there is a great deal of garbage left around almost every gravel pit, almost every little side road is being strewn with all kinds of garbage, and this is one of the reasons that we as a Department of Tourism which takes certain controls, I guess, over trailering, although not the environment itself, but over camping and that type of thing, that we are now trying to - yesterday my staff was preparing a paper to see where we could put more dumping stations within the Province along key parts of our highroads for the sewerage part of it. Again, that is one of the major reasons why we have to involve private enterprise in developing campsites, because no provincial government in any province should take sole responsibility for providing that type of consumer product such as trailering parks. So as I say, in order to get the whole thing going the private sector of business has got to get involved. In order to do that we have to put it on an environmental level and on just a business level to protect those persons so as to make it feasible for them to get involved in business. Again, we as a department, are extremely concerned about what is happening to the environment as a result of camping. I would say that probably the only real complaints we get as a Department of Tourism from people outside the Province is what is happening to the environment from car wrecks to things around gravel pits and that type of thing.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if the government has changed its philosophy with respect to provincial parks. I also heard him say publicly that from now on the government would not take such a high profile with respect to provincial parks and may, indeed, phase out of it altogether. Could he elaborate on that, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) obviously has either misconstrued something I said or added to it. I did not say that we are going to phase out of provincial parks. Obviously, any government has the responsibility to supply that type of service to the public. What I did say is that we as a provincial government should re-evaluate our position of being the sole major contributor and the sole major supplier of campsites, that if the tourist business is going to do for a province what it should do, it has to be done through private enterprise. Obviously, the government should not get involved let us say, in the area of Lewisporte, putting in a very large provincial park and therefore putting three or four private business persons out of business in the trailering business or discouraging someone else from getting in. If the tourist industry is going to do for the economy what it should, it has to be done through the private sector. So all we are saying in the Department of Tourism is that we would much prefer to encourage a private businessman to get involved in setting up campsites than for us to expand a provincial park in an area.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: I would like to ask the minister,

Mr. Speaker - as he is aware, right

MR. G. FLIGHT: now in the Province, certainly along the Trans Canada or the major trunk roads, there are only three or four private campsites or trailering facilities as he has indicated.

Has the minister got any indication that there are enough people interested in setting up private campsites and trailering areas in Newfoundland that would take care of the thousands and thousands of people who do choose to park in gravel pits, as he calls it, and other areas, that they were put in a position to say now that we are about to close down those various pits and that? Is he aware of people who will, indeed, put in the facilities that we require in this Province to take care of the problem that he is referring to?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. Since I became the Minister of Tourism in March, one of the greatest, commonest occurrences at my office is persons coming in with a proposal to start some type of small cabin systems, trailering, set up some campsites, for water and sewer hookups and electricity hookups, and almost daily we have people come into my department who are looking for the wherewithal of setting up different trailering parks all across the Province.

Now, obviously, they can not do that on their own if they do not have some degree of protection. I mean, obviously, if we, as a provincial government are going to supply campsites, even though they be unserviced in the sense that we are only supplying just a campsite itself and a little fire pit—we, in our provincial parks do not supply the electricity hookups, the water hookups or the sewer hookups, but even then, if we are going to supply a campsite to a camper at \$2.50 per day, then, obviously, it makes it almost impossible for a private entrepreneur to go out and supply a campsite that is \$6.00 a day or \$5.00 a day, because that is what it is going to cost if someone wants to go in where there are electricity, water and sewer hookups. So, quite simply, all we are saying is that we, as a department, have got to try to encourage



MR. C. POWER: that type of business. One way to do it would be to - if a guy is going to build a trailering park, say look, ten miles either side of him, as a possibility, we will not allow persons to camp in gravel pits and that type of thing. Now, that can only be done on a very graduated scale. You could not do it on the Avalon Peninsula where there is much more demand, or maybe even close to some of the cities where there is a much greater demand for campsites than would ever be available even from the private or public sector.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of questions that could be asked about that but I would like to change the subject to another emergency we seem to have and may be the Premier can tell me who is handling the emergency caused by the Red Cross strike? Is it the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House) or is it the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn)? Which minister should I direct the question to?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I take it the Minister of Health who is not here, he should be handling that. If the hon. member is looking for some information relative to the supply of blood through the Canadian Red Cross because of the strike that they have ongoing, we will try to get that information to the hon. member this morning. I will have somebody check with the Department of Health right now to bring the hon. member up to date. Unless he has a specific,

PREMIER PECKFORD: particular question relative to it rather than the general question of where we are on it.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and thank you Mr. Premier. No, I think that illustrates the point. I think we have an emergency. The first news report that I have heard on this indicated that when the negotiations broke off last December there was a conciliation board asked for and that was refused and something has happened in the meantime. And there seems to be a long period of time gone by and very few issues, some very minor issues and it looks to me that there seems to be a need in the government for somebody to monitor -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I regret to have to rise on a point of order to the hon. member but the Question Period is for asking questions, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman seems to be getting into the area of a speech or a commentary on the question itself.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: My hon. colleague, Sir, is only following the procedure that they follow in the House of Commons in Ottawa and that is that he is allowed to give a little background before asking the question and that has been generally accepted in this House too, Your Honour. So I would suggest that my hon. friend is in order and he is just giving a little preamble to his question.

MR. L. STIRLING: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member.

MR. L. STIRLING: The Premier asked me a question and I was trying to give the information of why I had to ask the question. That is all I was trying to give as a preamble and then I was going to ask the question.

MR. S. VEARY: Then the hon. Government House Leader gets snarky.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): On the point of order the Standing Orders are very clear. Standing Order 31(c), "In putting any oral questions, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same." And the same applies in an answer. I will allow the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) to ask a question if he wishes to ask a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The question that I have to ask is who is responsible for making sure that this kind of thing, which on the surface appears to be minor, does not develop into a disaster, is it the responsibility of the Department of Health or the responsibility of Manpower?

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry I did not hear who you were directing your question to.

MR. L. STIRLING: I was answering the Premier's question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have changed the whole format of Question Period. The dispute is between the Canadian Red Cross mainland office and their employees, not the nurses as represented by NAPE, so I imagine the Department of Labour and Manpower is also involved here. But I am getting the

PREMIER PECKFORD: information now for the hon. member.

And in this particular case, as it relates to health and so on, the Department of Health obviously would be monitoring the situation to ensure not that the labour dispute would have to follow the normal course of events under the legislation, etc., that is in place and any assistance that Labour and Manpower can be under the legislation and of course both sides, the employer and the employee can proceed down that avenue, down that road. But as it relates to health, and the welfare of our people, because of the strike and perhaps the shortage of blood to the various institutions, then the Department of Health would be monitoring that situation very carefully. And I will have an up to date report as it relates to that.

So number one, it is between the Canadian Red Cross Mainland office and their employees and not the nurses who are represented by NAPE, and Labour and Manpower then would get involved as it related to the question of the dispute, not in relation to the health of people or whether there was a supply. As far as the supply of blood is concerned then the Department of Health would enter into the picture. The Department of Health are now being contacted and we will provide the hon. member with the report on that momentarily.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.  
Does the Department of Health have any emergency strategy with regard to the supply of blood, particularly the Health Science Complex which is not now having any elective operations.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is I would assume that the Department of Health has emergency measures in place, if and when circumstances like this arise and I will get more about that now soon. But one would assume that the Department of Health, being involved in this for as many years as it has, I would be very surprised if they were not fully up to date on this and had measures in place to get

PREMIER PECKFORD: additional blood so that all necessary surgery could be performed naturally and ordinarily as if nothing was happening and the elective surgery, obviously, would have to wait until the strike was over.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) that I directed last week. Does his department intend to pay the fishermen in Nain, Makkovik, and so on along the Labrador Coast, in the Torngat district in particular where his department is operating two fish plants, does his department plan to pay the fishermen more than \$1.80 per pound for salmon as is being paid now?

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the matter of the price being paid to fishermen in that area for char and salmon is now under review

Mr. W. Carter: by the department, but I should point out that the price being paid now is, in fact, less than that being paid fishermen on the Southern part of Labrador. The cost, of course, of collecting the salmon is much higher. We are operating five very expensive collectors in the area costing government anywhere from \$300 to \$800 per day, and for that reason I presume the price being paid is a little less. But I have asked the people in the Department of Fisheries to take a look at it and see if it is possible to increase the price a little more than is being paid now, maybe not as much as the Southern part of the Coast but certainly more than is being paid presently.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, at least I have an answer from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter). It is satisfactory at this time. But a supplement probably to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie). Seeing that the government operates five retail stores in the same district, and the cost of fishing gear that is supplied by these stores and sold to the fishermen is close to the highest in the Province, will the department take into consideration if there is no increase in the price of salmon paid by the Department of Fisheries, will the Department of Rural Development take into consideration the cost of the fishing gear and probably give the fishermen in my district a discount on the gear that they are purchasing from the store, which is a 30 per cent markup I understand?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In reply to the hon. member's question I am not sure of the percentage of markup on any particular given item sold in the Labrador Services Division stores on the Coast of Labrador. but certainly it is a suggestion worth looking into. I understand that there is also a gear programme, I believe, in the Department of Fisheries which may assist fishermen as well, although if one is already equipped

Mr. Goudie: with gear then I do not suppose there is any need for assistance under the gear subsidy programme.

However, we can have a look at it, if the situation becomes in such a state that fishermen are suffering in the event that they do have to purchase new gear and prices are high, that kind of thing. But I would like to suggest that it is not the policy of our department or the retail stores on the Coast to add on any percentage of markup which will adversely affect the lifestyles of coastal people. As a matter of fact, the record that the stores have operated under for the past number of years has been that government has subsidized to a great degree the cost of supplies and provisions and so on to coastal communities and on the North coast of Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor) or the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). With regard to the construction of the airstrip, the first phase of water and sewerage at Cartwright, as well as construction of some roads,

MR. HISCOCK: could the minister, either one of the ministers, give a date when this is going to take place?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not know. The Minister of Transportation may be able to give a more accurate date. The proposal is, of course, that the two projects will be done jointly, as the hon. member has already discussed with me privately. It makes sense, in an isolated area such as Cartwright, to get whatever work can be done while you have a contractor there with the necessary equipment. This is why both projects were proposed for this year and it is proposed that the two contracts be done basically as one. I do not know if the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) can give more details of when tenders can be called or awarded or whatever. I am not sure at the moment but we will undertake to get it.

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to that I am quite aware and the people down on the Coast are also quite aware that the logic of having the two contracts go ahead is quite logical. But in the meantime, because of the short shipping season and construction season, the cost of bringing material in, and with the freeze-up of bringing it out and going out, where the freeze is on now, with not having the road surveyed, the people in that part of the district would like a definite date, whether one week, two weeks, three weeks, the Fall. Could we be given a little bit more definite answer on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will undertake to get that.

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



MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Could the hon. minister tell this House if BRINEX has been allotted 150 housing units in Goose Bay? I understand there has been ongoing meetings and so on with BRINEX and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing concerning housing units in Goose Bay. Could the hon. minister tell us if there are some housing units allotted to BRINEX to begin in September?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there is. I will have to check on that one as well. It is possible, if BRINEX have come up, there are a number of units there. I do not know that we have 150 units available at the moment that we would allocate. If we had a large number of units at our disposal and BRINEX wanted a large number we would certainly consider it but not at the detriment of the people of the Goose Bay area. Certainly, if there was a great demand for them then we would not freeze that many. But I will check.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the last semblance of the minister's comments is worth noting, 'as long as it does not affect the residents of Goose Bay.' It is

MR. WARREN: very important because I understand at the present time there are people in Goose Bay, residents of Goose Bay waiting for housing and they have been waiting two and three weeks for housing. So I am glad that the minister did say that in the hon. House.

MR. SPEAKER:(SIMMS) The hon. minister.

MR.N.WINDSOR: If I would just respond very clearly. I have had that situation checked into recently because I had been told that there were a lot of units there that were available and that people were asking for them and they could not get into them. I have had that checked out and it is not accurate. There are a number of units available but they are being repaired, painted and renovated or whatever and they are moving very, very quickly. There is no great backlog, as I understand it from our office in Goose Bay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Mines and Energy is here I have a question for him. The minister in the House a few days ago told us that the recent submission to the Public Utilities Board by Hydro, that the Newfoundland Hydro says this in their submission, "Does not reflect recent OPFC increases in the price of oil." Now, in view of the fact that the Canadian level, I think, was to have raised one dollar a barrel in July and is due to go up another dollar a barrel in January, could the minister tell the House what effect that will have on the submission, this latest submission by Hydro to the Public Utilities Board and can we expect Hydro to be going back to the PUB again, say in January or February to reflect those latest increases in the rise of Canadian energy to the world levels?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I believe Hansard will show that I answered that question in the course of answering a previous question on an earlier occasion, and that is that Hydro has

MR. BARRY: taken into account the existing federal policy which is to have this phased in increase in oil prices, one dollar of which came in July and another dollar which will be in the January, as the member opposite has mentioned, and this is already reflected in the rates which Hydro is requesting in their application for the Public Utilities Board.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary. The hon. member.

MR. RIDEOUT: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell the House what the dollar a barrel increase would translate to in terms of, say, kilowatt hours to the consumer so that we might have some idea what the increase that we know is coming in January will do to the consumer price of electricity in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. minister.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check the exact figure. The one dollar in itself will not be a significant amount but added to the fact that this is a regular phased in increase, it does have a significant impact upon the price to the consumer over time.

MR. BARRY: And the present policy of the Government of Canada, as was established by the previous administration, is that the price of oil in Canada, which is presently now being subsidized by government payments, will rise to the world price at the rate of \$1.00 every so many months. We do not yet know whether this policy will be changed by the present federal government, but we do know that if the present policy remains in effect there will continue to be an increase in the price of oil and, therefore, this will be reflected in a continuing rise in the price of electrical energy, a phenomenon, Mr. Speaker, which is occurring everywhere in the world.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary, the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell the House whether there has been any ongoing discussions between his department and the Government of Canada with a view to escalating more rapidly towards the world energy price, the OPEC price. I think there is some discussion on the federal scene that the present government would like to see that happening more quickly than in it has been in the past. Could the minister tell the House whether there has been any consultation between him and his federal colleagues on that particular matter?

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

MR. BARRY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier, Sir. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House, when the change-over of ownership of E.P.A. took place back on November 16th of last year, if that transfer of ownership had to be approved by the Newfoundland Government because the Newfoundland Government held a chattel mortgage on the aircraft because of money outstanding, \$6 million, owing to the Province - if that transfer of ownership had to be approved by the Newfoundland Government?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am not sure what approval procedure had to be gone through. I remember about it vaguely, myself, when it came up. I do not know if there was any specific approval, Order-in-Council by Cabinet had to be issued or not, but I will get the information for the hon. member for Monday.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Would the hon. gentleman also get me the information on the sale of a Boeing 737 jet made by E.P.A. shortly before the transfer of ownership whereby a profit of over \$3 million was realized by E.P.A. that was paid out to the shareholders as a dividend? Should not the profit of the sale of the Boeing 737 have gone to the Public Treasury to retire the \$6 million debt to the people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, my gracious me, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I can get that information. I guess the hon. member should either write or call the President of the company and see if he can get the information that way. It is a company transaction, the purchasing of a 'plans.

MR. NEARY: No, the government held a chattel mortgage on (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to complete my answer without being interrupted. Now, you know, the agreement for financing or guarantees between the Government of Newfoundland and a company is one thing - and I do not know whether in that kind of an agreement there is a clause which says, 'And if you sell or buy, or purchase or sell something and make so much money, so much of that has to come back against that guarantee.' I do not think there is, I think a company has the flexibility after a transaction is made for financial assistance, to go about its business and if it meets the terms and conditions of the financial arrangement that was entered into between the government and the company, then the

PREMIER PECKFORD: government has no action against the company for various purchases which do not fall under the terms and conditions of that financial arrangement. And if that is true, what I am saying, then this was just a normal transaction that the company entered into. Whether it is legal or illegal

PREMIER PECKFORD: or proper or improper is not for me to comment upon. It is a transaction made by a company called Eastern Provincial Airways Limited who have head offices in Gander so I do not know whether it is proper for me to undertake to get that kind of information I would have to check it out. I do not know if it is or not.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) Order, please!  
The time for Oral Questions has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.  
DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 51 of the Financial Administration Act I would like to table details of Guaranteed Loans paid or in part since the last sitting of the House.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.  
MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I will table the answer in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) Order Paper of July 25th., I believe, and the question was. Have any representations been made in the past three years by the Minister or his department to the Federal authorities requesting changes to present laws concerning the use and distribution of marijuana?

In answer to the question, let me say to the best of my knowledge there have been no such representations during the past three years, certainly in written form. Now, whether there were oral representations, obviously I do not know and really would have no appropriate way of knowing. But I am not aware of any written representations within the past three years.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.  
PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed I would like to give some information to the House relative to the questions asked in Question Period on the Canadian Red Cross situation. The strike is one which - the question is not one of supply of blood so much as distribution of the blood, especially in the St. John's area.

PREMIER BECKFORD: The Department of Health is daily in touch with the Canadian Red Cross and they are monitoring the situation. If it becomes necessary for transportation of blood to have to take place, the Department of Health has in place a system whereby they can get the blood to the various institutions so that there will be no emergency, the supply will be there. There is an advance, one week supply available at the present moment. The cottage hospitals around the Province have their own system of blood supply so there is no problem there. The main problem is distribution within the urban centres and there is a transportation plan in place to handle that if and when it is necessary so to do. I think that provides the information that the hon. members wanted.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition on behalf of the people of the communities of Mary's Harbour, Lodge Bay, Fox Harbour, Battle Harbour, Cape Charles, White Point, Camp Islands, Carrols Cove, Indian Cove, and Mattis Cove. Mr. Speaker, there are 140-odd people who have signed this petition. The prayer of this petition is that the airstrip at Mary's Harbour be constructed at the earliest possible moment. Because of the federal freeze this petition has been - the tender has been called and let and the company has been notified but because of the freeze this airstrip is now frozen like all the other projects that are under review. I would like to point out in particular, because of the short fishing season and construction season in



Mr. Hiscock: Labrador that it may be wise to freeze certain things in urban areas. In Labrador, I would like for the ministers to impress upon their counterparts in Ottawa that in bringing the supplies in for the construction season, it has to be before the freeze up or they will have to bring them out and then bring them in again in the Spring.

The reason for the freeze in the first place is to save money, and I am afraid and the people in the district express the same fear, that if it is approved this year that the season will be so short that nothing will, basically, be done.

So I ask the ministers to make the appropriate acknowledgement to Mr. Crosbie, the Minister of Finance, and also Mr. Jim McGrath the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition so ably presented by my colleague, Sir, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). Is that the first petition, by the way?

MR. HISCOCK: Yes.

MR. NEARY: That is the hon. gentleman's first petition, Sir. I have a feeling that it will not be his last. Because that part of Newfoundland, as far as I am concerned, is the most neglected part of the Province, that part of Labrador that the hon. gentleman just presented a petition on on behalf of his constituents in the Mary's Harbour area. And that part of Labrador - Northern Labrador gets all kinds of assistance from the Government of Canada, because they have a special agreement with the Government of Canada, to take care of the needs of the native population. But down in Southern Labrador, Sir - I do not know if hon. gentlemen have had the opportunity to travel through Southern Labrador. I have gone through several times myself and I never cease to be amazed at the patience of the people in that area, it is the most neglected part of Newfoundland. And now we have that glorious and gallant Minister of Finance for the Government of Canada (Mr. Crosbie) who once used to be in this House, who turned out to be the most expensive minister that we have ever had in the whole

Mr. Neary: history of Newfoundland. now up in Ottawa putting the gears to the people of Southern Labrador, the hon. John C. Crosbie. And I would like to say to my friend that he has high hopes that this administration here in the Province will be able to persuade old bully boy to change his mind before the freeze up takes place in Southern Labrador.

But, certainly, I agree with the hon. gentleman that the Premier, who is also Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, should put the pressure on the Government of Canada to lift the freeze as far as Southern Labrador is concerned, because if they do not lift the freeze now then Southern Labrador is going to be froze up, they will not be able to get the material and the supplies in that are necessary to construct that airstrip. It is a very valid request. Sir, it is a reasonable request, and I hope that it will not be like some of the other petitions presented in this hon. House, just fall on deaf ears. Perhaps it might be very worthwhile if the hon. gentleman who created, who was responsible for creating that district before the House was dissolved and the election was called would care to have a few words on it. And maybe the press will pick it up and the word will go out to hard-nosed Crosbie who believes in just a balance sheet rather than looking at things in a humanitarian way. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might care to have a few words in support of this petition and maybe the hon. Mr. Crosbie will get the message up there in Ottawa.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of words on it. Primarily because of my association with the area that the hon. members represent, especially the area concerned on the petition, Mary's Harbour, Battle Harbour, Lodge Bay, Cape Charles, and Fox Harbour area which I am very familiar with, travelled their in boat many times. I got lost there one time, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, on a twenty-seven foot skiff out of Mary's Harbour, an eight horsepower steward. We got lost there for a couple of days in the fog, shot a

Premier Peckford:        few birds and jigged a few fish and had a great time.

                                But the need is unquestionable. You know, I understand that knowing the area like I do, and I can understand the reason why the petition was circulated and now presented in the House. And I would like to assure the hon. member that in talks that I will have with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) in Ottawa in the next few days, when I talk to him, which I will, I shall mention that particular project, it is one of fairly high priority as it relates to that part of the coast.

                                And the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is really

PREMIER PECKFORD: correct that that area is sort of a transition zone. You are not into the Northern part and you are out of the Strait part and it is just that that blob is the twilight zone that a lot of people can ignore. But it is beautiful country, beautiful people and they work hard and they deserve better service.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order 2, Committee of Supply.  
On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!  
Shall 302-01, carry?  
The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Yesterday, Sir, when we were discussing the Premier's salary, we had a very worthwhile discussion indeed. I must say that two hours of the House yesterday afternoon - I do not think I ever enjoyed the House as much as I did yesterday afternoon during the two hour period from 4:00 o'clock until 6:00. And I do not believe, Sir, at least in my experience in this hon. House in the past seventeen years, I believe I have got about twenty sessions under my belt, that I ever saw a Premier on his feet as much as the hon. gentleman. And it was quite a hot day, warm day, everybody was sweating but the hon. gentleman did manage to react to some of the remarks made by my colleagues on this side and gave us some pretty straightforward and frank answers and opinions. And nobody in this House, Sir, appreciates that as much as I do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: And when I went home last night, Mr. Chairman, reflecting back on the House yesterday afternoon, I could not help, Sir, but developing in my mind a sort of respect and admiration for the hon. gentleman who occupies the chair of Premier at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: And I said, Mr. Chairman, in my mind when I was sitting around last evening, I said to myself, if the hon. gentleman keeps it up, if the hon. Premier keeps up, at least, the appearance of honesty and integrity which, as far as I am concerned, is the most important asset for a Premier or a member of this House, ministers and so forth, if he keeps it up, if the hon. gentleman has the will and the strength to keep it up then, Sir, his name will be engraved in bronze in this Province, not in lead like some of his predecessors, will be engraved in bronze as one of the most outstanding and better Premiers that we have ever had in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) mellow.

MR. S. NEARY: And so, Sir,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: No buts, no ifs, ands or buts, Mr. Chairman.

The problem is, of course, the hon. gentleman will find it very difficult to keep it up. As much as the hon. gentleman would like to keep people honest and maintain integrity, and I have no doubt at all but the hon. gentleman is sincere in that regard, it is going to be a very difficult task indeed and he is going to need the co-operation and the help of every member of this House. And I want to assure the hon. gentleman that he will get my co-operation and my help in trying to keep the administration half honest. That is a problem. You have got to have eyes sometimes in the back of your head. And the hon. gentleman will probably realize that over the past several years that I have tried desperately in this House to keep the administration honest by exposing what I considered to be fraud, wrongdoing, mismanagement and the like, sometimes, Sir, much to my own detriment but I have done it. I have done my job here on the floor of the House.

MR. NEARY: sometimes I ran up against a stone wall. Many times I ran up against a stone wall. Many times I was criticized inside and outside of this House by both members and the media who called me anything but a gentleman. I was an unpatriotic Newfoundlander. I remember, and any members who were in the House at the time will remember, back in 1975 when I was sitting down there as a lonely independent I raised the matter of the Marystown Shipyards at that time and Hansard, if hon. gentlemen want to research Hansard they can find it. But here is a clipping from the newspaper, "Neary charges mismanagement at the shipyard." And at that time I tabled a letter in this hon. House from a former manager of the shipyard, Mr. Millan, who got sort of the heave ho, who left under duress, left the shipyard under pressure, under mysterious circumstances, I tabled a letter that he had written to the minister who was responsible for the shipyard, telling the minister - if the hon. gentleman will just forgive me, I am trying to get a message across to the hon. the Premier there, if the hon. gentleman will just forgive me for a moment - I tabled a letter where Mr. Millan, a former manager of the shipyard stated, and it is in this news item, that the procedures used at the shipyard for estimating were incorrect, were improper, and that the shipyard was deliberately underestimating to get the contracts knowing that the government would pick up any deficit. That was back in 1975, Sir.

The bully boy who is now up in Ottawa, Minister of Finance (Mr. J. Crosbie), will sink Canada the same as he sank this Province, he will do the same thing up there. He will mismanage the affairs of the nation the same as he mismanaged the Fishermen's Gear Replacement Programme, the same as he mismanaged the Linerboard mill, and the same as he -

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: We are now engaged in considering Heading 302-01 which is the Premier's Office salary. While the hon. gentleman's comments may be of some interest, he is into the Marystown Shipyard and he is now into extraneous matters with respect to his perception of the Minister of Finance in Ottawa (Mr. Crosbie), and I would suggest to Your Honour that the hon. member is not being relevant to the heading now being considered by the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who just raised that so-called point of order knows full well, Sir, that when you are debating the Premier's salary that that is a very wide-ranging debate, very wide-ranging. It is as wide-ranging, as a matter of fact, as the Throne Speech or the Budget Speech when you are on the Premier's salary, where we are getting philosophy and policy and I am in the process of giving the hon. gentleman an example of the kind of honesty that I would like to see in his administration. So I would submit, Sir, there is no point of order. The hon. gentleman may not like what I am saying but I would submit to Your Honour that I am completely in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), your remarks are irrelevant. These kinds of remarks can be made to the Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. NEARY: My remarks are what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Irrelevant to 302-01.

MR. NEARY: What I am leading up to, Sir, and the hon. the Premier is listening to what I am saying there, is the difficulty that we have had in getting the message through to the administration. And I am giving a specific example and I will give others when I get an opportunity, I have to leave at 11:30, I have a domestic problem to take care of, but before I go I hope I can get the message through to the hon. gentleman because after heaping great praise on the hon. gentleman there a few moments ago, I would like

MR. NEARY: to point out to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that he can make a name for himself by putting the distance between himself and Frank D. Moores, by reviewing the salmon rivers, by reviewing Mr. Nutbeem, by reviewing the Action Group, by reviewing the Atlantic Place leasing agreement, by trying to get a better deal, and by taking a look at the lodges on the Salmon River and Adlatok. These are all



MR. NEARY:

very good, very good, and

I commend the Premier, I congratulate him. All very good. But if you put them all together they will probably involve a substantial amount of money, of taxpayers' money. You are probably talking about a few million. But, Sir, what I am saying here is that you cannot, the hon. gentleman cannot just say, Well we are going to look at the minor things, we are going to look at the small things and not look at the larger things. That is the point I am making, Sir.

And while I congratulate the hon. gentleman I will be very disappointed indeed, very disappointed if the hon. gentleman does not take a look at the big things. Like the mismanagement and the scandals involved in Labrador Linerboard where we saw, when the government took over Labrador Linerboard, we saw a cancellation of a marketing agreement with Alfred Heinzl in Europe known throughout the world, a company and an individual known in every part of the world for his experience in marketing paper products, who had an agreement, a signed agreement with Labrador Linerboard to market the product of the mill at Stephenville. That agreement, Mr. Chairman, was cancelled, it was cancelled, the government had to buy its way out of it. It cost the taxpayers one quarter of a million dollars to get out of that agreement and then, Mr. Chairman, this fly-by-night, this two-bit outfit down in Massachusetts, a company incorporated under the Companies Act of Massachusetts, was given an agreement in the same week the contract was cancelled with this experienced firm in Europe, given to a two-bit outfit that never had any experience in marketing linerboard, given to them. Their accounts could not be audited because they are South of the border and then the -

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

Order, please! The hon.

gentleman's time has expired.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I would just

like to provide some additional information to the Committee relative to some of the questions that were asked on dealing with the Premier's

PREMIER PECKFORD: office, Intergovernmental Affairs, Cabinet Secretariat and so on. A lot of the information has already been given but there were a couple of questions both by members opposite and members of the press dealing with this Governors Name Board.

MR. NEARY: Governors what?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Governors Name Board. There is a \$40,000 allocation in the estimates. This is a hand carved plaque to record the names of all former governors in Newfoundland to display at Government House. It will be approximately five and one half feet by eight and one half feet in size and it will be hand carved out off English oak.

MR. SIMMONS: Not out of Newfoundland bark?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Or of Newfoundland pine , very little of which is left. The total cost is the \$40,000 as indicated in the estimates. I thought I would give members that information. It is a plaque to record all the names of all the governors of Newfoundland and it was initiated by the present Lieutenant-Governor and will be, undoubtedly, a worthwhile asset to Government House. The other point is I want to table the public proposal document which has never been tabled in the House, relative to space. You could get it for ten bucks downstairs. of course, those people who wanted to tender on space. It was based on this proposal call that the Crosbie group were accepted as giving the best proposal. I want to table that now because I think it should be tabled in the House. And on Monday I will make a further statement on it. I have not had a chance this morning to do it. I have people working on it now so I will have a statement on that space, relative to that proposal call on Monday. But I think some of the members might like to take a look at that proposal call itself that was there and the requirements and so on because perhaps members have not seen it before. That is the only information that I wanted to provide at this time. I thank the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)

PREMIER PECKFORD:

for his comments and I hope that he and I can see eye to eye on these things, as we do now, three or four years from now and I am sure we can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I want to carry on with the trend. I thank the hon. gentleman for saying a few words so that I could have another ten minutes because I am dead serious about this Labrador Linerboard thing and the scandals that

MR. NEARY:

were involved in.

No, there is a fact, Mr. Chairman,

there is a fact that the newsmen should take note of: the fact that the contract with Heinzl to market linerboard was cancelled, the government had to buy its way out of it. They ended up with this two-bit inexperienced outfit that nobody ever heard of down in Massachusetts and I think the news media, in particular, and members of this House, should be asking the question, Why? And how did they manage the affairs of marketing linerboard when they had the exclusive contract? Now, that is a fact. I did not make it up. I do not have to produce documentation. Mr. Moores - the newsmen go out and say, 'Mr. Neary did not produce any documentation or any evidence.' Mr. Moores answers, and he does not produce any documentation or any evidence of anything. The man is incapable of telling the truth - he never told it in his life - and yet I have to produce the documentation and the evidence but he does not. I am not saying that he was the one who did this, it was Mr. Crosbie who was responsible for setting up this International Forest Products.

Now, getting back again to my question to the Premier. Does the hon. gentleman not feel that that one fact alone would justify an inquiry? But here is fact number two: The shipping contract was also cancelled. And then several weeks went by and Mr. Crosbie and his gang renegotiated the shipping contract to bring the pulp from Labrador to Staphenville - renegotiated it with the same company for more money. That is fact number two, Mr. Chairman. There are two facts alone, two major items that cost the taxpayers a small fortune - justification enough for a Royal Commission of Inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act - these two items alone notwithstanding, Mr. Chairman, the evidence of wrongdoing and scandal that we have in front of us. And, Mr. Chairman, let me say this too: When the government took over that Linerboard mill there were tree harvesters brought in by the previous owners down in Happy Valley, Goose Bay, never used. These tree harvesters - let that sink in - were never used. And then all of a sudden somebody gets a big order for more tree harvesters that were brought in and never used.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, look, as far as I am concerned, this is the biggest rip-off and the biggest scandal in Canadian history - not only in Newfoundland history but in Canadian history. And I have to stand here year in and year out and beg the administration to have a commission of inquiry or send the Auditor General in and all I get from the news media is, 'Oh, he produced no evidence.' Well, there are two facts alone that warrant a commission of inquiry. Forget the wrongdoing and the scandal and the example I have here in front of me. an invoice and an internal memo from Stirling International that shows that they put \$121,000 in a secret account, a secret commission, which is a crime in Canada - a crime against the Criminal Code - put it into the bank account of a company called Egret, an offshore company, a dummy company. And yet the government stonewalls and refuses to set up a commission of inquiry. So I say to the hon. the Premier, while the things that he has done so far are good - he reviewed the freeze on the salmon rivers in Labrador that his predecessor brought in. Good! I am all for it. He reviewed the \$30,000 that the hon. gentleman voted himself and another former Premier and all the other goodies - the hon. gentleman reviewed that. Good! I commend him for it. The hon. gentleman took action on the Action Group. I am all for it. We have been preaching that for the last eighteen months. The hon. gentleman took a look at the leasing agreement for Atlantic Place and the hon. gentleman took a look at the Gander lodge and Adlatok - incidentally, how is the salmon running now?

AN HON. MEMBER: Just great.

MR. NEARY: But the hon. gentleman cannot do these things and let the big things go. As good as all these are - and they will mean a saving to the taxpayer - the hon. gentleman cannot let the big one go, the biggest scandal in Canadian history, involved in the operation of Labrador Linerboard from the time Mr. Crosbie and his gang took it over up to the time it closed. That is the one the Premier should take a look at.

Mr. Neary: and I will be awfully disappointed if the hon. gentleman does not do that.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know, it is very difficult in ten minutes to get your message across. I want to run through this Stirling International thing again just in case the new members do not understand what it is all about. And I will run through it briefly and I will summarize it the best way I can. Look, here is what happened, International Forest Products that had the exclusive marketing right from Labrador Linerboard to market the product they sold - and here is the document to prove it, because there is the order, they sold 1,500 tons and 500 tons of Labrador linerboard to International Stirling, a middleman, a broker in San Francisco for shipment to Ghana for \$320 a ton - \$320 a ton was the price to be paid to Labrador Linerboard. And there is the bank draft to prove that they acted in good faith and they paid the mill \$320 a ton.

But, Mr. Chairman, what nobody, but nobody in this Province was told was that - and this came right out of Stirling International's office, and came out by the gentleman that handled the sale, who is not now working for Stirling International, is now working for another paper company so he does not care, but wanted to expose this graft and corruption, here is an internal memo from the Comptroller of Stirling International to somebody in that company by the name of David saying, "Please telegraph today to Butterfield Bank in Hamilton, Bermuda in credit to the account of Egret Company Limited, Account Number 201027095-9 United States funds \$121,220 or down at the bottom \$55 a ton." For what? For what? A straight fraud against the Labrador Linerboard mill. International Forests. by the way admitted that they own Egret and they made a public statement through their law firm in New York saying that the money was used as a guarantee against shipping.

So I went back to my source, and I discovered that shipping was never discussed. Shipping was not discussed. As a matter

MR. NEARY: of fact, the company bought the linerboard f.o.b. Stephenville. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that? That it was not for shipping as Mr. Bobbie Kraft and his colleagues, International Forest Products stated?

And, Mr. Chairman, what do I have to do with it? I know the news will say now, Well, Neary went through the same example again. He had no new examples. The same one again. The same one, Sir, if this is a pattern in the industry, if this was a pattern followed in marketing Labrador linerboard, if this pattern was followed you are talking about over \$30 million. And I have every reason to believe that the pattern was followed. I have sent enquiries out all over the world. I am not a law enforcement officer, Mr. Chairman - if I was I would have the thing resolved long a ago - I am a member of the House and had to lay out a prima facie case that I think there was wrongdoing, that I think there was gross mismanagement, that I think there was skulduggery, that I think there was fraud, and I do not say these things very lightly unless I can back them up and bring witnesses and evidence.

And yet, Sir, the government up to now, at least, have refused to send in the Auditor General or set up a commission of enquiry. Now if there is no wrongdoing, if the government set up a commission of enquiry then I would be proven to be wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time is up.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, all I can say in answer to what the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is talking about now is that, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has indicated in an answer to a question in the House this week, there are investigations ongoing dealing with the Labrador linerboard as there is with any other development in the Province over which there are allegations or over which there are people who, you know, have demanded certain enquiries be made.

July 27, 1979

Tape 366

PK - 3

Premier Peckford: So investigations are ongoing. And, you know, there is no attempt by me as Premier, or anybody in this government,



PREMIER PECKFORD: to in any way push anything under the table. I mean, things are being investigated and when the investigations are complete then charges will be laid in the normal course of events and if charges are not laid then a report will be given by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) to the House, or to the hon. member on what has occurred, and what the investigations show under the terms and conditions under which all investigations are conducted. So there is no attempt here by me or by anybody in the government to in any way diminish the fact that there might have been, I do not know, there might have been irregularities in the way Labrador Linerboard was operated. I do not know. But I know that investigations are ongoing as it relates to a whole bunch of aspects relating to the whole development of Labrador Linerboard and, hopefully, these will ensure that justice is done as it relates to the whole operation. And if there are irregular acts performed by whosoever, then they will be brought to the courts and be dealt with in an appropriate fashion, you know. Until those investigations are completed, so that we can get some idea of what the situation is, I think the enquiry would not be in order right now. I think these investigations have to be completed and if these investigations show irregularities of the magnitude that the hon. member is suggesting or implying, well, then, undoubtedly, government would have to assess whether, in fact, such enquiries or whatever would be necessary. But just for the record there is no intent on our part to in any way diminish the allegations, nor is there any attempt by us to sweep them under the carpet, or to hide them away in a back corner somewhere. If there are irregularities these investigations that are now ongoing will bring them to the attention of the appropriate authorities and proper action will be taken to ensure that justice is done. That is just as important to me as is any other issue or development in the government.

July 27, 1979

Tape No. 367

NM - 2

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY:

I appreciate what the hon.

gentleman said, Sir, very much and I know, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) knows, that there are ongoing investigations. But these ongoing investigations, Mr. Speaker, only zero in on a specific item. These investigations are not looking at why the marketing contract was cancelled and a company given the contract down in Boston, Massachusetts, when the ink was hardly dry on the incorporation order in Boston. That is not being investigated. Does the hon. gentleman understand that that is not being investigated? Why this company was given the marketing contract, why the other one was cancelled, why the shipping contract was cancelled and renegotiated with the same company involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, that is not being investigated.

Look, there are any number of aspects. RCMP investigations zero in on specific items, and that is not good enough, Mr. Chairman. And the hon. gentleman knows full well that when my colleague and myself argued that there should be a royal commission of enquiry into the Public Works contracts tendering procedure, that there was a police investigation going on there and as a result of that charges were laid - but the government of the day decided to set up the commission of enquiry, known now as the Mahoney Royal Commission, even though investigations were going on in that department at that time. Is that not right my friend? My hon. friend says, yes, that is true. And that is what I am asking the Premier to do here. I triggered some of these investigations but I am not satisfied that the whole broad spectrum is going to be looked at. And that is what I am asking for.

And, Mr. Chairman, as I said to the hon. gentleman, if I am proven wrong so be it. I am prepared to take the consequences if I am proven wrong. If the

MR. NEARY: government have nothing to hide why do they not set up the commission of enquiry? Why not? We have had enquiries set up for things far less. My hon. friend the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe), a commission of enquiry; a colour television set, a commission of enquiry; a judge of the Supreme Court. Here we are talking about one of the biggest scandals in the whole of Canada, no enquiry. And the hon. gentleman says how can I say that. I have already given the hon. gentleman a few facts. I cannot go any further than that. I am not a law enforcement officer. I cannot go out and seize documents. I cannot get a search warrant and go out and seize the documents. There is where I am hamstrung. If I could I would. But I lay out a prima facie case in the House, that is all I can do. That is all

MR. S. NEARY: can do in the House of Commons, that is all he can do in any House. And this case of Stirling International is open and shut. And you do not need any more examples. They come back and say, "Ha, ha, give us a few more examples." What do they think I am, Mandrake the magician? I am lucky to get that one. If there was not an honest, decent gentleman on the face of this earth, I would not have gotten that one, who wanted to see wrongdoing exposed.

Fact number one, Sir, And here is another fact, by the way - I have to leave now in a few minutes and I am going to get off this subject but I will come back at it again and I am going to stay at it until something is done about this, because the more I delve into Labrador Linerboard, the more it looks like a rotten cesspool. And I have been at it now for a couple of years, a couple or three years myself. Every audited account - does the hon. gentleman - look, this is not being looked at. Peat, Marwick and Mitchell audited the accounts of Labrador Linerboard and every year, year in and year out as the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) knows, who tabled the copies in this House when we were debating the Abitibi takeover, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell said we can not audit your accounts Mr. Labrador Linerboard because you are not giving us sufficient information. It is not a proper accounting. It is not. Every year they said that in their audit reports. I do not know if I got one here with me or not, I believe they are down in my office. Yes, they are down in my office, I think.

Now, these audited reports were buried down the the Department of Finance. We could not get them in the House of Assembly. We got them when the Abitibi deal was on for the first time and that was the first time I saw them, the first time any member of the House saw them. I bet you there are members that did not know to this day until they heard me say it now, Peat, Marwick,

MR. S. NEARY: who are world renowned, who have the reputation of being amongst the top accounting firms, and auditing firms, in the world said, "Mr. Labrador Linerboard we can not, we can not do a proper job on your accounts. This is not a fair accounting because you have not given us sufficient information to give you a fair accounting." And that has to be ignored, Mr. Chairman? We have to ignore that? Plus the fact, Sir, and here is another little fact, this is a fact - I have thrown out five facts so far, how many more? I will throw out one more. While we were being told in this House that there was no market for Labrador Linerboard, somebody in Labrador Linerboard went over to Hamburg, Germany and negotiated a marketing contract with a company called Schofield, in Hamburg, Germany, to market the full production of Labrador Linerboard. And they did indeed market Labrador Linerboard and they have \$2.5 or \$3 million in an account in Germany belonging to Labrador Linerboard. A dispute apparently arose over the agreement and the government did not even bother to put it to arbitration. There was a clause in that agreement, by the way, when a dispute arose between the two parties that it would have to go to binding arbitration. The government never took the steps to put it through binding arbitration and as a result Schofield have \$2.5 to \$3 million sitting in an account in Hamburg, Germany that the government apparently is ignoring.

That is fact number five, How many more do we need, Sir? And these are not minor details, these are major items. \$2.5 or \$3 million, in my opinion, is more significant than a colour television or whether or not somebody leaked a report out of the police department where we had Royal Commissions of Inquiry.

So, Mr. Chairman, all the hon. gentleman has to do to complete his track record so far, which is excellent, which is good, which is the best I have seen so far, but

July 27, 1979

Tape No. 368

SD - 3

MR. S. NEARY:                   the hon. gentleman just can not concentrate on the minor items. And it is not going to go away, I can tell the hon. gentleman it is not going to go away, it is going to keep recurring. The couple of police investigations that are going on are not enough, not enough because they are only zeroing in on specific items. And there is a precedent for carrying on a Royal Commission and police investigations at the same time.

MR. S. NEARY: we had one only last year when the Mahoney Royal Commission was established at the same time the RCMP or the Newfoundland Constabulary were investigating the procedures used in the Justice Department and charges were laid and those who were charged - the matter is still before the court and the Commission of Inquiry is still writing its report so there is precedent for it, Sir. And so I am asking the hon. gentleman again, to do the honourable thing and the hon. gentleman has shown me so far that he has what it takes. And as I said when I started out this morning, it is going to take an awful lot of guts and an awful lot of strength and the hon. gentleman will certainly get the co-operation from me when I see examples of wrongdoing. I will not hesitate to bring it to the hon. gentleman's attention or to the attention of the House. The hon. gentleman is going to need a lot of help, human nature being what it is. If the hon. gentleman can clean up 80 or 90 per cent of the mess I would say he will have done an excellent job for Newfoundland. If the hon. gentleman can get 80 per cent, I would say, that would be an excellent track record and I believe we can accomplish that. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman must realize that he just cannot expose the Nutbeems and the Bob Coles and all this sort of thing and let the major items be swept under the rug, that is not the way to do it. And I trust, Sir, that anything I said this morning may influence the hon. gentleman. Set up the Commission of Inquiry and let the chips fall where they may. I am prepared - it is not the first time I have been scarred - I am prepared to bear the brunt if I am wrong. But I would say let the chips fall where they may and set up the Commission of Inquiry and that is what I am asking the hon. gentleman to do today.

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on another subject but still on the overall subject before the Committee itself. I want to put two or three points, basically seeking information, to the Premier. I am looking at the moment at 303, the Cabinet Secretariat and I notice quite a discrepancy in amounts with that Head as compared to the amounts provided last year. I also note that in last year's Budget we had a Planning and Priorities Secretariat which Head does not appear in this year's budgetary estimates. I would first of all assume that there has been some marrying of the two there. I am wondering if, indeed, some of the functions of the Planning and Priorities Secretariat have, indeed, been put under Cabinet Secretariat because there quite a discrepancy in amounts if you look not at the revised figures for last year -

MR. MARSHALL: What subhead are you on now?

MR. R. SIMMONS: I am referring to 303. Is it fair to assume that some of the functions of P and P are now in what is called Cabinet Secretariat?

PREMIER PECKFORD: All of them.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Well, I was coming to that point. I doubt whether all of them are or else my friends the mandarins ought to re-write the description of the Head just a little better because I do not know if I should read a philosophical message in the two definitions. Last year Planning and Priorities is defined as being responsible for making recommendations on policy matters etc. as well as recommendations on the establishment of long-range government priorities. I notice by a careful comparison of the wording of last year and this year that only the last phrase is missing, that somehow either in the phraseology or in the deed, government has abandoned its commitment to long-range government priorities. I hope that is just a semantic omission only, because I felt from the very beginning that there was some need in government for the kind of function that was purported to be performed by P and P, the function of taking a long hard look well down the pipe to determine what the long-range effectiveness of various government



MR. SIMMONS: programmes might be and what, indeed, the long-range priorities of government ought to be. But as I say, I hope that is just a semantic difference, and perhaps the Premier will want to comment on that one.

I want to come back to the matter of the so-called revised Estimates. If members of Committee will look at this year's Budget, on the right, of course, by now they have discovered that column of figures called Revised 1978 - 1979. And I would suggest to the Committee and particularly to those who have the responsibility of the detail of this Budget and also to the Minister of Finance, on this matter, that that column of figures has the effect of being very, very deceptive. I am not suggesting that was ever the intent - I am sure it was not the intent - but it has the effect of being very, very deceptive. For example, the point I just made a moment ago about Cabinet Secretariat - if you look at the right column it says \$713,000; if you look at the left column it says \$769,000. And there is nothing in those two figures that would raise your suspicions or would suggest that there is any basic departure from last year's way of doing things. The figure rises from \$713,000 to \$769,000 and one could assume that with salary increases and inflation and so on, that is the normal increase of \$50,000 or \$60,000. It is only when you go back and compare last year's Budget document that you realize that there has been a full-scale reorganization of the Cabinet Secretariat and that, indeed, the amount budgeted last year for Cabinet Secretariat as such was not at all \$713,000 but, indeed, was \$165,000. And that is why I say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) that this right column is very, very deceptive. Now, I have not picked a good example because there has been a fairly full-scale reorganization or more particularly, a marrying up of P. and P. and the Cabinet Secretariat, as I understand it. But there are other examples. And I give this kind of example without pointing to a particular one: You often have the situation where last year when the Estimates were before Committee we had a projection of X dollars, somewhere later in the year after that Estimate passed Committee and passed the House - somewhere later in the fiscal year

MR. SIMMONS: it was prudent or it was advisable or necessary in the department concerned, going through the appropriate mechanisms in terms of Treasury Board approvals and so on - but it was prudent in the department concerned to alter that figure and then the new figure got called the revised estimate. And it is that revised estimate, I presume, which shows up here in this year's document. Now that is deceptive in this sense, I say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) - and I will just take a ballpark or a hypothetical example - say the figure in an item in fisheries, for example, last year was \$100,000, but because of particular circumstances, gear lost or whatever, the \$100,000 was put up to \$2 million by a special Order-in-Council -

AN HON. MEMBER: It was (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: - and it was all aboveboard - I am not suggesting that - it was all done with the right Treasury Board and Cabinet minutes or whatever the case might have been, but the amount that was budgeted last year, say, was \$100,000 and then by due process outside the House it got put up to \$2 million, so that when the figure comes before us this year it says Revised Estimate \$2 million, and it is deceptive, because it does not show what the intent of the House was last year. And I would submit to the Minister of Finance that in future there ought to be either three columns showing the original estimates and the revised and this year's or else two columns showing the original estimates last year and this year's estimates. Now I prefer the former. I would like to see the three sets of figures so one could fairly readily see what happened since the Estimates passed the House last Spring, as is normally the case.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet - I think I have two or three minutes, do I? Personally, I would say to the Premier, we would like to move through his Estimates during the morning. We do not make any commitment to finish them although we may well be able to do so, but we would like to take it head by head fairly soon, as I am sure he would, because some of our people have some particular questions they would like to raise. But while I am under the general head of his salary, could I also raise 306, The Economic Development Advisory

MR. SIMMONS: Council? Now again, I say to him, a perusal of last year's estimates for his department does not turn up any such title as Economic Development Advisory Council, it must have been tucked away as a subhead or something. I cannot seem to find it although the Budget shows that there were some expenditures - only \$4,600, mind you - but I cannot seem to find the label at all in last year's Budget. And my point is this, really;

MR. SIMMONS: it appears to me that it is a new head this year and then I read the little asterisk, the little star, and it tells me that the functions of this group will be transferred to other government departments during this fiscal year, and I get the message, I get the feeling that the Economic Development Advisory Council is something that was just brought into being this year and I assume we are talking about that group of businessmen that were appointed. Is that correct to assume? That is what the label means. And I get the feeling it has just come in the front door and out the back door or the other way around, in the back door and out the front door but it does not seem like it is going to have a very long life unless for structural reasons or functional reasons it has been put somewhere else. But the Budget is not too clear on that particular point and perhaps the Premier would care to address himself to it in the next few minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to - seeing I am in the mood for tabling things, I would like to table the issue that came up yesterday. I do not know if it came up under my estimates or not but I should table it anyway. It is a copy of the grant or the transfer of the Roaches Line house and the -

AN HON. MEMBER: It was in Question Period.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It was in Question Period. Was it? If nobody minds I will table it. "The hon. Joseph R. Smallwood, Roaches Line, Port de Grave district, provided to him until he dies and his wife dies and then after that point in time it was supposed to revert as a residence for future Premiers or the Lieutenant-Governor of Newfoundland if he so desires it. Maintenance and so on will be handled by the occupant and so on." Anyway here is the documentation on it that I table for hon. members. Perusal over the weekend? The Planning and Priorities; that was just a semantic omission. I did not pick it up when I was going through the estimates. It could have been Planning and Priorities there just as easy as it could have been Cabinet Secretariat. There is no particular reason for it and

PREMIER PECKFORD: it is still carrying out the functions which it has carried out over the last couple of years. It is doing some useful work and we are really getting involved in it now and using the group that are there extensively in the whole development of our five year plan which is getting off the ground pretty quickly now.

The hon. member's point on the revised, the original and the one for this year is a good point and I have no objection, I do not know if the Treasury Board people or Finance would, of putting in the three columns. That would be the one I would prefer rather than the original and the new one. I think the three should be in there and I would agree with the hon. member that that would be the way I would like to see it go. The estimates for the present year, the revised for the last year and the original because then you can really get a real quick picture and then the ministers could give reasons why change. The Economic Advisory Council - where that was last year? I do not know. I see under the revised that it was \$4,600 and the \$17,000 there now is just to clean up outstanding bills that were incurred last year. I guess the note refers to that a number of reviews were under way. The Economic Advisory Council which were a group of businessmen that were established by the former Premier and they charged or had initiated a number of studies which cost money which the government had to pay for in reviewing a number of areas of government. That is to pay the consultants and so on, that \$17,000. Research for various studies: The note refers to that some of the functions that this Economic Advisory Council were carrying out are going to be done by the departments themselves. They are going to do the reviews themselves or money will be allocated there. The concept that I am interested in pursuing is under 308, the Economic Council of Newfoundland and Labrador which is advice on the economy and fiscal matters. The general economic and fiscal performance of the government and ways that this council can advice government on ways to stimulate the economy, fiscal matters

July 27, 1979

Tape No. 371

AH-3

PREMIER PECKFORD:

that government could take rather than having a council which would- I hope the hon. member is listening to me - which would review whether Crown lands should be changed, or review whether some other programme or division of government should change. I think government, for the most part, should be able to respond to those kinds of changes. I think one of the things that they were looking at was

PREMIER PECKFORD: Crown Lands and a couple of other areas as I remember it now. But what I would like to have is a group of individuals from around the Province, small businessmen, labour men and so on, ten or fifteen people who would participate with government financially, in setting up an independent group who would advise government three or four times a year, however long it took, on the performance of the economy, the performance of the government, and say, "Look, we think that if next year you did a, b, and c as it related to your taxation regime that you would get more out of it." or that, "you would stimulate jobs." And a comment upon the economic activity in Labrador, or in the Southern part of the Island or whatever, on the fishery or on the forestry. "This is where you are going wrong. You have a big DREE agreement government, of \$55 million but you know those access roads are just a disaster where you are putting them," or "you are going about it the wrong way." On broad matters of policy where some impact could really be made. That is the kind of council I would like to see and have broad representation on it. I would like to see them also participate financially in its existence. We are putting in \$10,000 there to get the thing started. And even do some studies on it relative to those broad areas. Because that is what is important. If we cannot as a government - I mean we would be really, in my view, not doing our job at all if we need somebody else to tell us that Crown Lands is not working, which is my bugaboo always, every time I want to think about inefficiency, you know, and a couple of other areas of government. Holy smoke, we know that! We do not have to spend any more money on that. But I do think we need an outside independent view on how we, as a government through our budgetary process and how our budget has affected the economy during that year and whether there should be changes in forestry, constructive suggestions coming from them.



PREMIER PECKFORD: "Look, you should change that forestry area," or whatever. Fisheries; major comments on fishery development and how we are handling that. And the whole area of fiscal policy - "If you are really strapped government this is the way you should go about it," And perhaps give us some new ideas. I think that is the way some of the other economic councils around the country perform. And the Conference Board does a great job. You know, two or three years ago I remember standing up in the House and talking about the Conference Board and hardly anybody on this side or on the opposite side knew anything about it. I do not know if any members remember. I brought up the figures and so on at the time. And I ran into it in reading it in the paper one time and I accidentally almost ran into somebody who worked for the Conference Board, while on a trip to Ottawa one time and I was able to get a lot of information. And that has performed a very, very valuable function and I mean it hits the headlines in the right way. It just does not say, "Government you are bad and you are doing everything wrong," it says, "Look, if you are really interested in doing something here are the pros and cons of it. Here is what - you know, this policy worked half way but if you want it to work more than half way this is the way you should go about it." And most governments are very responsive to that kind of thing. And that is what I envisage in having an economic council, not to get into a programme review. We have enough people in the secretariats now. 'Go and do a programme review on that or whatever' - and under our planning agreements and so on, Sir. We have all kinds of ways to do programme review. It is just a matter of somebody showing a bit of leadership and say, "Go do it. I want a full independent review on it, and get it done within the next three months because I want to take a look at it." I should be able to do that and the ministers should. That is what we



PREMIER PECKFORD: are getting paid for, hopefully.  
But we do need outside independent views and analysis of our performance as a government in the field of our economy, our fiscal measures and things like that and that is how I envisage the Economic Council going.

Where it was last year I am not sure. To answer the member directly, I do not know where it showed up in the estimates. I can find out for the hon. gentleman. But there was some money in it. This is just to finish off some of those studies that were done.

MR. SIMMONS: The Conference Board is just probably something that was reallocated because this item came up since the last fiscal year began.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. So it was created after the budget and the estimates went through the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Which is the point I make again about the other column.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Absolutely.

MR. SIMMONS: If you had the original column you would see there was nothing budgeted.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not argue with you at all. It is a point well taken and I am in full agreement with the hon. member and I think it is a good idea for us to look at for next year in our budget, no problem at all.

On motion subhead 302-01, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Shall 302-02-01 carry?

The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to ask the Premier a question relative to the automobile that he is driving. He inherited the one, that monstrosity from

Mr. White:

the former Premier, and I was wondering if he plans to keep that or get rid of it or what he plans to do in the next little while on it?

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not know yet what we are going to do with it. We are having all kinds of problems with it. Someone ran into it yesterday or the day before in on the parking lot of a garage or something.

MR. SIMMONS: Did you get a paint job done on it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, we had a paint job done on it because it was rusted out.

MR. SIMMONS: They are making good Hondas these days 'Brian'.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. I am used to the rusting out, by the way, You know. Did anybody notice the old red and white Mercury Meteor I had? I had 104,000 miles on it. It rusted out three times. I had it redone three times and it rusted out.

There is some thought been given, I think, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) mentioned it to me on a couple of occasions in the last week or so that perhaps what should be done - those Lincoln Continentals are not being made any more -

MR. WHITE: They should not be either.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is a monstrosity. It is hard meandering around. Perhaps it could be used just on special occasions or something seeing we own the car now, keep it as a momento and put it in the garage back there and purchase a more modest car for the Premier to drive, to flick around in.

MR. WHITE: Buy yourself a nice Mercedes.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Pardon?

MR. WHITE: Buy yourself a nice Mercedes that will last ten years.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will have to bow to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and see how he got on. But I would rather just have something like I got out by the door now, a Matador or something along

Premier Peckford: those lines to spin around town in, and, you know, hopefully not get stopped too often by the Constabulary, as was my wont from time to time in the last three or four weeks, getting additional tickets for speeding or jumping stop signs. That is the kind of way that I would like to go. Perhaps the best thing to do with that car is to just keep it for special occasions and so on, and the Premier or whatever- you know, the official opening of the House or whatever, use it for all those kinds of special occasions, which would be nice for dignataries coming in. For example, I think there are four or five of the boys from the Middle East coming in here the latter part of August, the Saudi Arabian people and we have to be good to them, and the Venetian people, and the Jordanian people.

MR. WHITE: They will probably fly their own -

PREMIER PECKFORD: If ambassadors are coming in, well then we could have someone from the car pool go greet them, you know, in a pretty nice looking vehicle. Meanwhile, I can keep darting around town in my more modest medium size car. That is the kind of thing we are looking at for the information of the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. SIMMONS: I could lend you my Datsun, if you like.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT) Shall 302-02-01 carry?

On motion Clauses 302-02-01 through 302-02-02 carried.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on 302-02-03?

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

MR. SIMMONS: I think I understand the intent here, I am on the item of "Grants with respect to Former Premiers" and I understand the purpose is to allow them to put down on paper for posterity the essence of their time in office. That is a noble intent as long as that is the way it turns out. I have a suspicion on this particular subhead, and I would go so far as to suggest that it would never be in the estimates for this year if the immediate former Premier were not the person he is, individually is. Indeed, a strict application of the

Mr. Simmons: criteria laid down by the Premier would disqualify the original former Premier since it is hardly the first three years since he - the three years coming up are hardly the first three since he left office. It has been, now, nearly or over seven years since he left office. And let us be under any illusions, Mr. Chairman, this was created, doctored if you like, for a particular individual and to look like fair play, to make it look like fair play we had to write the rule in general terms, and I do not knock that at all. If you are going to do it for one, you are going to do it for all, of course.

But my concern is the one that I alluded to first, just a couple of minutes ago, and that is that if the intent of the grant is to allow us to preserve for posterity the essence of that person's time in office, then we ought to ensure that it be used for that purpose, and I am not being mistrustful of either Mr. Moores or Mr. Smallwood. I am not suggesting that at all. What I am saying is that the grant ought not to be a de facto, an automatic thing, it ought to be there

MR. SIMMONS: if the individual requires it for those purposes, and perhaps that is the way it is set up. To say it another way, the provision of office and the provision of secretarial ought to be not for anybody just because he has been Premier, but because having been Premier, he wants to write his memoirs or wants to put on the record things for posterity. It should not be a free office and a free secretary to do whatever he wants to do during the first three years after he leaves his office as Premier. And perhaps I have made the point sufficiently well that the stipulation and perhaps the control is already there. I am sure the hon. the Premier will indicate this to me when I sit down. The stipulation ought to be that it is available to a former Premier should he want to take advantage of it for the purpose intended, the purpose being to write memoirs or to otherwise get his records in order, which in time, I would think, he would transfer to the Public Archives or wherever so they are available to posterity, to people who want to do historical research into that individual's period in office. Perhaps the Premier could comment on that point if he has heard my point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the member's point is very well taken and I appreciate it immensely that he makes that kind of a point. You know, that is what it was done for.

In May after the leadership and I assumed this office and I reviewed the ad hoc way that we were looking after former Premiers and so on, things did not seem to be quite equitable so I reviewed the whole thing and said, 'Okay, from now on, even though, you know, Mr. Smallwood had been a former Premier now for a long period of time -

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - let us do it right from now. I mean, you draw the line somewhere, so that is what I did, even though one could make a case, I suppose. But I was not doing it to justify Mr. Mooras, the former Premier, having to give him some money. I did not do it in that

PREMIER PECKFORD: vein at all. I mean, I do not have to justify anything for that. If I thought it should be done and it was a reasonable thing to do, I will justify it by saying what I am saying now, I will not justify it by also giving it to Mr. Smallwood, that was not the point. But I thought it was fair and equitable to start from that date, from that point in time, even though one can make the argument about a long time before. But this point is well taken, it should not be used for other purposes. The former Premiers involved should spend that money on what it was intended for and that was for them to prepare the notes and the documents and all the things that they had while they were Premier so that then it can be passed over and used by historians and by whosoever wants to examine that period of our history sometime in the future. The point is well taken and I appreciate it that the hon. member brings it up.

On motion, 302-03, carried.

On motion, 303-01 and 303-02-01, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

Shall 303-02-01 carry?

MR. STERLING:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STERLING:

Mr. Chairman, I read the document that the Premier tabled on the Cabinet Secretariat. It seems to be a very important group and presumably, they have been there for some time - that group at least has been intact. Has it?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, it has been there for a number of years and there is really a two-fold procedure here. There are a number of Cabinet committees - there are really now three Cabinet committees, the Social Policy Committee of Cabinet, the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet and the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet, and what happens is if a minister, for example - the administrative or the practical function that this group performs is, as Cabinet papers are prepared by departments they are put into the system and they are referred to the Social Policy Committee of Cabinet or the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet, depending upon the department, and then the Secretariat does research upon that paper

PREMIER PECKFORD:

and goes back to the department.

And then the ministers meet on that paper, with the research being done by the Secretariat, and the Secretariat says, yes, they agree with the department's paper, or from a social policy point of view, there are long-range problems here that we should be aware of and so on. A comment goes on then from that Cabinet committee to the full Cabinet. So it has been analysed from a financial point of view because it has gone to Treasury Board; it has been analysed from a social or resource policy point of view before it goes on to Cabinet, so there are two comments on it, a financial one and a policy one. Those are the practical functions of those individuals in the Cabinet Secretariat. And in the larger question, they are also charged with the responsibility - and now they are really getting into it - to do some long-range planning as it relates to health care, as it relates to social services



PREMIER PECKFORD: social services and so on in their various avenues.. and we are doing that right now for our five year plan, for example. They are getting well involved in that right now and we have got even a timetable done up, a specific timetable for doing all the studies, reviewing it with the departments. For example, sitting down with deputy minister and so on in the Department of Social Services and saying, now, look, what are we doing right and what are we doing wrong from the policy point of view? How should this thing be changed in the next five years? So they have been there for three or four years and they are there to, first of all, help research, from a policy point of view, a given initiative a department wants to take and secondly, in the long range, to study and research for long-range planning as it relates to social or resource policy.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) Shall I carry?

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: I would like to spend a minute or two on this, Mr. Chairman, because I think it is very important. From the point of view - I appreciate that the Premier has established, certainly with the people of Newfoundland and the people of Newfoundland accepted it, that he is a new Premier and this is a new government. I had a little bit of involvement with government to know that government is not like buying a new car, you turn on the key and you start it, or buying a new house, Government, 90 per cent of it, is rolling along and there is a great deal of continuity. I intend to get into this in discussing it with the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. L. Barry). I am a bit concerned that there is, in the attempt to say this is a new administration, there seems to be no acceptance that the government did not start a month ago. This government has been an ongoing government. The Premier himself has done a very good job as a minister and he highlights his involvement in one of the departments - Mines and Energy - and the regulations. The minister has also done



MR. L. STIRLING: other good work in other departments.

Obviously, the Cabinet Secretariat must have been involved in, for example, the five year blueprint. Maybe I could just pause for a minute while the Premier indicates whether or not that is the case. The five year blueprint that was in the last Budget, the 1978 Budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is difficult to answer directly.

You are only involved in it to the extent that your department was affected and you then prepared proposals to the Premier of the day and to the people who were preparing it at Treasury Board and Finance who were taking directions from their ministers and from the Premier on that matter, so insofar as it affected your given portfolio, I am sure the hon. member knows how the system works, that there is a fair amount of flexibility in it and that if the leader of the government wishes to proceed a certain way, well, you know, it does proceed that way. So one has input, yes, in a confidential manner but that is all I can say. There was some input from the department of which I was minister at the time as it impacted upon that department, that was the major area in which I had input.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Premier, but that was not the question, I meant the Cabinet Secretariat in their role, or the Planning and Priorities Secretariat in their role of the five year development programme.

PREMIER PECKFORD: They would do the research then, yes.

MR. L. STIRLING: They must have had a fairly heavy input from the Premier's description of them and the importance of them in the new role in long-range planning. Essentially, if they are the same people doing that five year blueprint then, presumably, the same people would not have a sudden change of views as a result of preparing the new five year programme?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, they are primarily researchers and the policy is developed by the people on the front bench and you know, I am very high on that. It is a matter of leadership. We are the ones who must determine what the policies are going to be, or the programmes are going to be and what we ask this Cabinet Secretariat to do is to do research on given items dealing with that so that all the information is known and then we can make a policy decision on it. So, their main role is not in the policy area but research on the policy and then the policies are articulated and discussed and laid down by the Cabinet Committees, by the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING:

I would just like to stay with that for a few minutes. I accept it is the leader's responsibility and the Cabinet's responsibility. You mentioned Committees of Cabinet and I think we have now, in keeping with the new rules, set up Committees of the House of Assembly which roughly approximate the same areas. And in keeping with your intention, which I also accept at face value and in good faith, in keeping with your intention I am sure that you are aware that the members of that committee, if they are going to have an ongoing input in that committee and not just deal with estimates and become knowledgeable, presumably will also have access to some of the information, not of a confidential nature but some of the information that you have outlined in this document, some of the information, for example,

MR. STIRLING: dealing with the economic research and analysis which presumably is hard-fact type of thing and it is up to interpretation and policy, presumably members of the committees which we have now established will also have access to that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member could have access to most of that information now if he wanted to, that kind of factual, statistical information that is available which is not policy orientated or something that the government is considering.

MR. ROBERTS: But not analysis or such policy the ministry are considering or contemplating.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Right. Exactly. Otherwise it would be available, no question.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I think this is an awfully important point and I think one that could be of immense value to the members on both sides. Now, obviously, a policy that the administration are considering or that the Cabinet Secretariat are analysing, well that is quite properly confidential, it is quite properly something that should be kept privy and private until the Cabinet has made a decision and at which stage the appropriate announcements are made. But it is very generous of the Premier to say that within reasonable bounds information can be made available. I would like to go a step further and say, How do we know what kind of information there is? Nobody on this side has had the Queen's Commission for eight years. There has been an immense growth in these secretariats, sometimes almost an obscenely large growth, in my view. I suspect they could do with some judicious pruning. I think we have seen the tendency of bureaucracies to expand simply for the sake of bureaucracy. I do not say that in any destructive but in a very constructive sense. I think bureaucracies by definition tend to

MR. ROBERTS: expand. Professor Parkison in his third law, I believe, "Work expands to fill the time available," and then the sublaw is that, "Staff expands to fill the work available." But is there any way the Premier can suggest that members on this side, in particular, and I would think it might apply to his own backbench supporters who have no role in the day to day running of the government, the executive government, can find out just - could, for example the Secretariat Secretaries, whatever they are called, the Executive Directors, I am not even sure I know the names of them because, of course, they change from time to time, but could these men perhaps be made available to sit down with members from both sides to brief them on the sorts of information that might be available. Now, somebody might say, What about confidential material? Then I would simply say that I would have and I am sure the Premier would have sufficient faith. These who are very senior public servants, top-notch men in every sense of the word and I am sure if they were asked about something they are quite capable - I think they have sufficient discretion to be quite capable of saying, "I am sorry that is something we cannot really talk to you about." Could that be done? I know that, for example, a couple of the deputies have made themselves available, doubtless I assume, with their minister's concurrence. That is between the deputy and the minister. My friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I think, has talked to the Deputy Minister of Social Services - he is our spokesman on Social Services - I have no doubt with the minister's approval and the deputy said, well here is the kind of legislation we administer. Here is what we can legitimately tell you. Could that be done, seminars or something scheduled?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I tend

to go along with that. I do not see any real problems. It is just a matter of establishing it. The other thing is - I do not know if hon. members - I do not know if this was passed around to all members or not but it really should be, and that is that quarterly review that the

July 27, 1979

Tape No. 376

AH-3

MR. ROBERTS:

The economic.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

I have seen it but I am not sure if the hon. members have.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is not automatically passed around.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It was available but we should really, I guess, have it distributed automatically to all the members because it is information. There is nothing of any confidential nature it is dealing with, by and large it is not. And I think that is one area we could do immediately because I think a lot of members would gain some valuable backdrop.

MR. ROBERTS:

Even the flash sheets.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And the flash sheets as well. Exactly! I think that could be set up so that a lot of information flow not now getting out - nobody's fault really, it is just that we have been lax in it.

MR. ROBERTS:

Most people just do not know what is available.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is right. They do not know what is available. Meetings like that could be established with the Executive Director of Planning and Priorities, Mr. Vardy and his two secretaries, who are secretaries to the two policy committees of Cabinet, Mr. Peters and Miss Baird.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Vardy is Executive Director of Planning but is he not Clerk of the Executive of the Cabinet?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

He also punches in both roles.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, which is not a bad marriage really when one looks at the -

MR. ROBERTS:

It is a curious offspring but it is not a bad marriage. I think it makes a lot of sense. The two jobs are -

Mr. Roberts: in the full Cabinet a section deals with Priorities and Planning.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is right. And then he has his two assistants, if you want to call them that, who are secretaries to the two Cabinet Committees on Resource and Social, and they spearhead the research on each of the papers that come up through the system to them, and they spearhead the research and the comment. It then goes to the Cabinet Committee itself. Cabinet Committees are now - for example, we have established a system each week so that the thing really gets moving, you just do not have people - The Social and Resource Policy Committees of Cabinet meet on Mondays, both of them. Tuesday is Treasury Board, Wednesday is the Planning and Priorities Committee, Thursday is full Cabinet, so that you get a flow each week. And the last last one -

MR. ROBERTS: Does anything ever get done with all the paper work?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well it is. We have a bit too much paper. We are going to have to try and cut down on some of the paper. But if you keep to a system like that you will get the flow at the end of the week to Thursday, you see, right in the Cabinet after all the analysis has been done. And as the hon. member knows as well as I and perhaps better, you know, unless you schedule and really move that thing into a time frame and a schedule the whole thing goes -

MR. ROBERTS: Well the system functions just for itself.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The thing goes haywire. That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, would the Premier undertake, because, I mean, if one of us rings Mr. Vardy he will be polite and that is quite properly as far as -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the Premier have a word with Mr. Vardy?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: I think my friend for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) who first raised this new flower in the Legislative soil could -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, I will do that, so that any member then who wants, or group of members who want to get together to review, he will provide the information

MR. ROBERTS: Sort of brief them on them on what could be available.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Brief them on the whole thing. Yes, no problem.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: I would like to thank the Premier for that, because one of the things that I think will help us all do a better job is if we can have that kind of rapport. And eventually, I know, we will get to a question that the answer has to be "no", but then that is acceptable. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 303-01 carry?

On motion 303-01 carried.

On motion 02-01 through 02-02 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 303-02-03 carry?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, 03. Maybe the Premier could just briefly tell us the substantial difference there in the consultant fees under Cabinet Secretariat? And that is just all I will say, maybe a brief explanation will be okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, I should have jumped to my feet in any case and sort of explained it rather than having to wait for somebody to ask me the question.

The provision is made to enable Executive Council, Cabinet Secretariat to continue two evaluations during 1979 and 1980. The evaluations presently in progress are the St. John's Urban Region Subsidiary Agreement \$42,000, and the Labrador Interim Subsidiary Agreement \$32,000. And the funds are provided to engage employees, consultants to gather information relating to the aforementioned agreements. Monies will also be expended by employees and consultants engaged in this information gathering process who will be required to travel in the course of their duties. Since these are DREE agreements,



Premier Peckford: the Government of Canada will reimburse the Province at the rate of 75 per cent with respect to the St. John's Urban Region Agreement and 90 per cent with respect to the Labrador Interim Subsidiary Agreement. So we will cover a lot of that money through those two agreements.

The idea here is that we have got - you know, like on the St. John's Urban Region Subsidiary Agreement, the new one that would be signed. - Okay? - and so we can get some of this money now through a planning agreement or through those agreements later on which DREE will agree that that kind of study was necessary and should therefore be funded out of the agreement. You know, the whole question in the St. John's Urban Region now, because we got the Bay Bulls Big Pond finished and the arterial road finished - Okay? - What is the next? So you have to really look at the ring road and the bifurcation road, and the sewerage treatment facilities that are ongoing here, you know, and other areas, okay? It is to put together a decent proposal. And the same thing on the Labrador thing. We are doing an awful lot of work done there right now, and that \$32,000 which is broke out of \$140,000 is for that Labrador to make sure we have got a good job done there. So there are studies so that the proper proposal can be put forward to DREE. So then, after Cabinet Secretariat or P and P takes care of it. That is done in consultation with Intergovernmental Affairs, who are all on the same floor and all come under my office, if you will, or under me, then that proposal is put together with Intergovernmental Affairs and the group who did the research and the proposal then comes to Cabinet and then it is gone to DREE.

MR. RIDEOUT: And a lot of it will be reimbursed.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And it is reimbursed, 90-10 on the \$32,000; and 75-25 on the \$42,000.



July 27, 1979

Tape 378

EC - 1

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Sir.

On motion, 02-03, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

Shall 02-08 carry?

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for the Strait of

Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

(Inaudible) allocation, is it, (inaudible)

is it?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Right. And I would like to see even more,

you know, to be quite frank about it. A number of programmes planned for the fiscal year include income tax, tape storage, payroll statistics, mortgage system, food pricing statistics, terminal usage, package maintenance, retail sales tax statistics, corporate income tax reports and so on. These are plans that we have in order to computerize a lot of that information.

MR. ROBERTS:

Oh, yes, I see what you mean.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

It sounds like 1984 is coming.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, all willing, in its approach

we are -

MR. ROBERTS:

(Inaudible) people.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

1984 almost gets us the five year plan.

MR. ROBERTS:

(Inaudible) speak.

On motion, 02-08, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall 03 carry?

MR. ROBERTS:

Can the Premier, simply as a matter of

interest - I know what the Classification Appeals Board is supposed to do.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

You know, it may even be what it does do.

Are there many or any appeals?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

We are paying \$45,000 bucks. What is

the work volume of that outfit?

July 27, 1979

Tape 378

EC - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not have that here, I do not think,  
but there is a fair amount of -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) no more  
than the briefing (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, right. Exactly.

'Travelling expenses, members of the board  
who travel to various areas of the Province' - sometimes they have to travel  
to do the appeals. 'A person requested to appear before the board regarding  
classifications, members' fees and other expenses.' I do not have the  
number that was there for last year. I will try to get that for the hon.  
member.

MR. ROBERTS: Are there any staff involved?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just some secretarial help.

MR. ROBERTS: Who is on the board?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Dr. D. Facey Crowther, C-r-o-w-t-h-e-r,  
Chairman -

MR. ROBERTS: Sounds like a good stagger, yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - Mr. E. Thoms, member -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, not now anymore, that was the late  
Esau Thoms.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So there is a vacancy there now -

Dr. Susan McCorquodale.

MR. ROBERTS: They are outside people.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Right - Mr. F. C. Anderson, that is who  
is there now.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that the F. C. Anderson who used  
to be at the bank?

PREMIER PECKFORD: It could be, I do not know. I do not know  
the man. I do not know the name.

MR. ROBERTS: I owe money to them all.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Give me three or four years and I guess  
I will too!

On motion, 03, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

Shall 04-01 carry?

MR. ROBERTS:

Let me ask the obvious question.

I assume this is the minister's office, my learned friend, the President of the -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, I guess so.

MR. ROBERTS:

The minister's salary is shown there

for the -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, I noticed that.

MR. ROBERTS:

Anyway, maybe I should mention,

my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is not here today. He was being questionable or querulous as the case may be, yesterday about why I refer to my learned friend as 'my learned friend'. Well, simply for the record, my learned friend is my learned friend in a parliamentary sense because he is learned in the law. And I think that is a very old tradition. And the other term that is sometimes used is 'gallant'. I think that applies only to a man or a woman who has actually served, not just in the Services, but I think in some sort of combat role. For example, Mr. Chairman, the Speaker noted that in the galleries was Mr. Myles Murray, the former, or I suppose still, Judge Myles Murray, who, I guess, is one of the few men who was honourable, learned and gallant in this House, because he did serve during the war and he is a member of the Bar and he was an hon. member.

MR. STIRLING:

All members of this House should be entitled to 'gallant'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS:

My unlearned, ungallant but hon. friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) thinks that anybody who serves should be gallant, and that is combat pay that the hon. member is seeking, not the title.

MR. STIRLING:

Yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Chairman, could the Premier tell us -

I assume it is the salary of my learned friend - Is he drawing a full ministerial salary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, I do not think the hon. the President of the Executive Council (Mr. Marshall) - he is drawing half salary, is he not? - half a ministerial salary, not a full one.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, why are we showing \$23,000?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A good question. I do not know - it is travel besides, I suppose, and just office - just to have it in there. There is no other explanation for it. I will have to check with somebody down there. They have just ticked the figure, I suppose, as being half of the Cabinet minister's salary plus some travelling at the -

MR. ROBERTS:

Would the minister have a secretary here? The hon. Mr. Lewis, for many years we used to pay him a grant towards his secretary downtown because - I think the minister is entitled to half a secretary if that is possible.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I guess the rest would be travelling, you know, primarily.

MR. ROBERTS:

What? From here to St. John's East?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no! As President of the Executive Council, sometimes he is travelling on behalf of government somewhere in the Province or

July 27, 1979

Tape No. 379

NM - 1

PREMIER PECKFORD: to Ottawa or something like that  
that will be charged against that vote.

MR. MURPHY: I think as we used to say of  
Ank Murphy, we did not mind sending Mr. Murphy at one stage to  
Basutoland but paying to bring him back, that was too much.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So that if we, for axample,  
when we travel to Ottawa to make some proposals I will be  
inviting the hon. Government House Leader, and President of the  
Executive Council to be with me on a number of those jaunts. I  
mean, that is no great secret to anybody I am sure that he would  
be one of the people who would be coming with me. Then his  
travelling would be charged against that vote.

MR. ROBERTS: An invitation from the Premier is like  
an invitation from the Queen, it is in the form of a command.

MR. MARSHALL: I thank the hon. member for informing  
me of how you can get a subsidy for your law office.

MR. ROBERTS: From what I hear of the hon.  
and learned gentleman's law office he needs all the help he can get.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a pretty busy spot.

MR. ROBERTS: But Phil Lewis did it and I do  
not think it is improper at all.

On motion subhead 303-04-01, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 303-05 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: That is Michael Kirby's outfit  
is it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Where are we now?

MR. ROBERTS: The institute for research on public  
policy, Michael Kirby's?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, that is the research on public  
policy.

MR. ROBERTS: Money well spent.

July 27, 1979

Tape No. 379

NM - 2

MR. ROBERTS: Tom Kent is gone on their board now.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is okay.  
On motion subhead 303-05, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 303-04-01 carry?

MR. RIDEOUT: 303-04-01, that is Treasury Board.

MR. ROBERTS: 303-04-01, no we passed that earlier.  
That was the minister's salary was it not?

PREMIER PECKFORD: There is some confusion.

MR. ROBERTS: It may be 304-01 we are on now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 304-01, I am sorry.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, that is different from  
303-04-01.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Exactly.

MR. ROBERTS: We are on 304-01?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Any increase in the numbers of  
people on the Treasury Board? This is an immense administrative  
monster and I have real doubts about it to be quite candid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If I can just return for a second.  
I am very sorry, I got totally confused at what was going on at the  
table there and I could not follow the numbers that they were saying  
because I wanted to say something about a subhead back, just for the  
benefit of the member of the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout)  
who talked about x number of consultants, the related revenue is  
there \$122 million which shows up -

MR. ROBERTS: \$122 million?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now on to 304-01, is that where  
we are?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I am wondering whether there are  
any new positions? I mean with the normal increments it is up about  
ten per cent.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is right.

July 27, 1979

Tape No. 379

NM - 3

MR. ROBERTS: Of course this is the -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, sure if you want to. I have it all here if you wish to go through it.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Four out of -

MR. WINDSOR: Fifty-four.

MR. ROBERTS: Four out of fifty-four. Are they secretarial help or are we employing more - Maybe the minister could just take a minute or two about -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Sure. No problem.

MR. ROBERTS: - to tell us how the Treasury Board is functioning. It is going a long way from Vic Young and three of us sitting around in that - whatever it was called - the Finance Boardroom ten or eleven years ago.

MR. WINDSOR: Just very briefly, I have some detailed notes here. I do not want to go through all those for the -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR: There are a number of divisions in Treasury Board. The Budgeting Division of course, which is basically responsible for assisting various departments and co-ordinating various departments' budgets and analyzing on a continual basis.

MR. ROBERTS: Did they prepare this document?

MR. WINDSOR: Basically, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: I will come back to that in a minute.

MR. WINDSOR: A great deal of the estimates were prepared. The hon. minister and his department, of course, are responsible for the final document. But a great deal of the leg work is done by Treasury Board Secretariat, in fact, yes. On the expenditure side.

MR. ROBERTS: The department still needs a lot more than leg work.

MR. WINDSOR: The minister is responsible for revenue. The minister can take the blame for the revenues and I will

MR. WINDSOR: take the blame for the expenditures.

So the Budgeting Division is a very, very active one. The Collective Bargaining Division, of course, you are not doubt well aware of, we are quite often in the lime-light. That is part of Treasury Board as well.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think it is important for the House to understand that outside of the Budget Division which is a very important division and then another one just as important is this is the Collective Bargaining Division which we sort of forget comes under Treasury Board.

MR. ROBERTS: Who is director? If Norris is secretary of the board, who is director of Collective Bargaining?

MR. WINDSOR: Of Collective Bargaining?

Mr. Andrews.

The Budget Division has five full-time employees and one contractual employee. The Collective Bargaining Division basically -

MR. ROBERTS: Tell us more about the contract.

We have heard a lot of talk about contracts.

MR. WINDSOR: The Collective Bargaining Division?

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, in the



July 27, 1979

Tape No. 380

DW - 1

MR. E. ROBERTS: budgeting there is a contractual employee -

MR. N. WINDSOR: A contractual employee?

MR. E. ROBERTS: He is getting a portion of \$54,000.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I am not sure I will have to check that for you.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Perhaps while the minister is at it, Mr. Chairman, I am interested to know why a contractual employee and I could see it in the case of Mr. Martin or somebody at that level but why a contractual employee - true a responsible and senior but nonetheless what I would have thought ought to be a regular public servant position.

MR. N. WINDSOR: (Inaudible) contractual employee.

MR. E. ROBERTS: In the budgeting division it is shown there are budget officers; one contractual for a total of \$54,000 in estimated salary - now that may be one at four and one at fifty, who knows? - but it just shows two. But let us assume there are \$27,039 each. I mean I am just interested why a contractual employee -

MR. N. WINDSOR: One of the additional four employees this year is one of the contractual officers which was added to the Budget division because of the increased work load there.

MR. E. ROBERTS: But why contractual?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Why contractual? I do not know.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are finding out now, There is a phone call being made immediately on that.

MR. N. WINDSOR: We will check that for you.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, maybe that item could just stand on the subhead -

PREMIER PECKFORD: We will get that for you.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Before we leave we will get that for you.

The Collective Bargaining division, the hon. gentleman wanted to know how many people were in there. There is a director and three positions of negotiators. There are only four people, really, in the Collective Bargaining division and at the one moment we have one vacancy. So we only have a director and two negotiators at the present time.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Classification and Pay is responsible for classifying and setting salary levels on all Public Service positions -

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, I know I set it up.

MR. N. WINDSOR: - and the number of employees there is twenty-four, a staff compliment of twenty-four. I think there is one vacancy. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collias) points out there are twenty-three employees at the moment, I think.

Pension and Policy Division as it is a very small division it just basically has two employees, a Director of Pension Policy and one research manager. The Insurance Division again is a reasonably small one. It has four employees which basically advises government on various insurance -

MR. ROBERTS: I am sure there are only three shown in the -

MR. N. WINDSOR: Well, perhaps. The notes I have here say four.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister is only estimating for three according to this document.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Perhaps there is a vacancy which we are expecting to fill.

MR. ROBERTS: I know estimates are only estimates, but -

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is basically the various divisions - oh, sorry, Organization and Management which is responsible for doing ongoing analysis of various management programs within the government system -

MR. ROBERTS: That is where the minister can save \$103,000 any time he wanted to.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Well, no, I disagree with you there. That division actually has done some excellent work, gone into various departments of government at the request of various ministers and looked at the way in which the administrative structure was set up -

MR. ROBERTS: The minister is still young enough at government to believe these things. Tell me that in five years when you are in the Opposition.

On motion, 304-01, 02-01 through to 02-03, 02-08, and 03, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Butt) Shall 04-01 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Can the Premier tell us if he is planning to appoint - that is a token vote. I assume we are now using \$100-token votes instead of - I am sorry, thousands instead of hundreds?

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is basically for travel for myself as President of Treasury Board. Previously any travel expenses that the President of Treasury Board had were charged against his portfolio. In other words, my expenses would basically go against Municipal Affairs.

MR. ROBERTS: It all comes out of C.R.F., does it not?

MR. N. WINDSOR: So, it is just a small, yes, but it is just a small amount to put it in the correct department rather than having me charge it against the (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I assume we see a thousand-dollar reduction when we come to Municipal Affairs, do we?

MR. N. WINDSOR: I hope not.

On motion, 04-01, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 305-01 carry?

The hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: The salaries Head in this section on the Intergovernmental - the Premier, I think, holds the portfolio of Intergovernmental Affairs, but before I speak for a moment or two on that, can I come back, I do not want to revert or anything, I just want to make a point with the President of the Treasury Board that I had meant and had forgotten. These Estimates are prepared by the Treasury Board, and properly so, and they are presented by the Finance Minister (Dr. J. Collins). I do not really know why we have fallen

MR. ROBERTS: into the habit of presenting the Estimates as if they were somehow part of the Budget Speech, they are not. I think, you know, that we really ought to separate the two, because the Budget Speech is a document by itself and the Estimates are a document. I just mention that, perhaps next year if the Minister of Finance is still the Minister of Finance, as I hope he will be. As he knows, finance ministers have, you know ~

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody loves them.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, with reason nobody loves them, but people do respect them, and they do have a habit of changing from time to time.

MR. E. ROBERTS: But be that as it may, you know, next year we could have them - and if they have got to be Tory blue, well that is fine, we will change them in due course that is no harm there. But I have a little more serious problem that may seem like a quibble but is not. Apparently the Treasury Board has taken upon themselves to do something that only the House of Assembly can do, namely, rename departments. For example, there is no Department of Forestry, Resources and Lands of which I am aware. There is no Minister of Forestry, Resources and Lands. There is no Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, or whatever it is, and according to these estimates there is. There is not. The government has authority under a Statute which we put on the Statute Book ten or twelve years ago called The Administrative Rearrangement of Duties Act, or something along these lines, to assign divisions from department to department but only the House of Assembly, by Statute, can create a department. Only the House of Assembly can create a ministerial position and it offends me, it does not offend me to the extent of feeling that I can not sleep at nights. but, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have a House of Assembly let us pretend the House of Assembly does what, in fact, it is supposed to do and in the world I come from there is just no such thing.

Now, I realize that the bureaucrats who did it did not think anything of it and I am sure the minister, if he noticed it, did not think anything of it but I find it offensive and perhaps it could be corrected because -

MR. STIRLING: We are only MHAs.

MR. E. ROBERTS: well, we are only MHAs, that is true. We are not the government, although our constituents think that everybody in the House is in the government, we are not, we are in the House. But only this House can create a department. I do not know whether the administration intend in due course to bring in acts to make the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. J. Morgan) the Minister of Lands and Forests instead of - he is now the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and that is what the Lieutenant-Governor would have sworn him in as and

MR. E. ROBERTS: that is what his commission says. When the Estimates are reprinted in final form, maybe that could just be corrected, I do not think it needs any action. It does not need any action by the House, but it is minor in itself but it is symptomatic of the fact that most of the public service regards the House of Assembly as being at best, a tolerable nuisance. My friend from Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) and I do not agree on a great number of things and he certainly says things in a way I do not, but we may be fairly close to being of one mind on that kind of thing, but many of the public servants, you know, just tolerate the House, and I find that exceedingly offensive because, after all, the House in theory, at least, controls the public service.

Now, to come back to the vote just before the Committee, Mr. Chairman. This is the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat which has become another monster. It may be an effective and efficient monster, I am not saying it is not, but this is one of these flowers that has bloomed over the last three or four years. I am not going to say much about it. I have no doubt the Premier feels, and I do not quarrel with him, that these are useful people. They are immense numbers of very highly paid public servants, and I assume they are able. I would like to know, perhaps the Premier could simply tell us, who they are, who is the Executive Director; who is the Director of Support Services and what does he or she do for \$31,000 a year which is an awfully high-priced support; who is the Director of Industrial and Resource Programs; who is the Director of Intergovernmental Manpower and Social Programs; who is the Director of Intergovernmental Finance and Public Service Programs; and I notice - oh, no, that is the Action Group. We will save the Action Group for a couple of minutes for more action as my friend from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) says, but could the Premier just tell us who the names of these people are, please?

July 27, 1979

Tape No. 381

GH-3

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Butt)

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will have to get the - I am in the process of getting the names of the individuals. I do not think I have the names of some of the divisions, but I do not think I have that one right here at my fingertips, I will have it in a few seconds.

The contract for that gentleman  
in Treasury Board -

MR. ROBERTS:

The budgeting -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The budgeting fellow.

MR. ROBERTS:

I do not care about the man's name, not now.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It was a two-year contract and he was brought on last January, primarily because there was a workload, too much for the group down there to handle, so they, number one - number two, the person that they have is a C.A. who has some expertise in zero-based budgeting and some other new budgetary techniques that they wanted to just get their hands, sort of thing, to see what ideas he had, and they thought that two years would be sufficient time to pick his brains and to relieve the workload that was there when they hired him so that they would not need him beyond two years and that is their idea.

MR. ROBERTS:

The gentleman has been on for seven months, is that right?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

He is supposed to abolish -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, just for two years.

MR. ROBERTS:

Would the Premier care to place a wager whether the person will be there in 1982?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Great fight in Treasury Board, I can see.

July 27, 1979

Tape No. 381

GH-4

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know if it is a great  
fight in Treasury Board, but if I were Premier I -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, can you not see two years from  
now (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: - would not warrant his continued  
retention of office on the -



MR. ROBERTS:

and what I am really saying, seriously, is that I suspect this position will become a permanent one as is often the case and once again we are, you know -

PREMIER PECKFORD: It has a habit. The one way of getting around the system of freezes in the public service is for departments to come up with contracts for two years and then gradually, as the hon. gentleman said, they become permanent. It is a long way around but it is the shortest way home (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well I do not know if they are still - the other one is, "It is a long road that has no turnings" - but I do not know if the Premier is aware of whether there are still so-called temporary employees but I can recall at one stage -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: - discovering a temporary employee who had been in the employe of the Commission of Government, I think, and then of the provincial government for twenty-six years and every three months it was being renewed.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: And the position had never been "created".

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, the hon. member is so right. There are quite a few still temporary positions in the public service,-

MR. ROBERTS: And that is our kind of -

PREMIER PECKFORD: - zoomedy, zoomedy, zoom, just turned over, revolving. (Inaudible) for several years.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the Premier undertake to keep an eye on this for me?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have an eye on all of those things.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier better be alert while keeping his eyes on things.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, it just suffices to say to the hon. gentleman that he is pretty familiar with the public service and I wager a bet that I am just as familiar. I grew up with it and I know the bowels of the bureaucracy pretty well let me say that.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier was one of the reasons that I learned the hard way about a lot of things. Did you work there when I was there?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, that is right.

MR. ROBERTS: The good that I did lived after.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I tell you.

MR. ROBERTS: Evil is oft interred with men's bones.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You will never know. You will never know the influence you are having.

MR. ROBERTS: Standards have improved since then though.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is incredible. I remember being down in, I think it was in LaScie one time when there was a great kerfuffle on when I refused, Mr. Chairman, to provide transportation to a number of families. The hon. member would not remember it perhaps. I refused to provide transportation to a number of families who were alleging great sickness and pestilence in the community and had to go to Springdale Hospital for treatment. I had just come about ten hours from the time I got the telegram -

MR. ROBERTS: And the minister overruled, the heartless bureaucrat.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And so some of them got on to their member who got on to the minister. I think the hon. member was involved as well as a minister, not of that same department but he and the minister at that time.

MR. ROBERTS: Minister of Health, was I?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. There was some communication between the Minister of Health and the Minister of Welfare.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was in welfare.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And there was this crushing instruction that was sent down from the top which I asked could I have a sort of a little hearing on it. So the supervisors and so on called. Anyway I did not provide the transportation to the families concerned and a full report was asked for and I guess it is still on file now in the Department of Welfare. Anyway I proved to be correct on that.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, once in a while even the Premier can be.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Intergovernmental Affairs, executive director, Mr. Abery. Director of Support Services, Mr. Jerry Korbai who used to be press secretary to the former Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: A familiar name.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Director of Industrial and Resource Programmes -

MR. ROBERTS: Press secretaries are like old soldiers, they just fade away, do they not?

PREMIER PECKFORD: An Assistant Executive, John Fitzgerald. Wilson Barfoot, Director of DREE, Liaison. Director of Manpower and Social Programmes is vacant and Wayne Mitchell is Director of Intergovernmental Affairs for finance and service programmes.

You know these gentlemen, I must say I have had a lot of dealings with them over the last three or four years. These gentlemen, especially, perform a very valuable service. They are doing all the negotiations for DREE, for all the DREE agreements.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the Premier tell me whether it is a matter of government procedure now? This would seem to me to be a sensible arrangement if, in fact, it is done. I know the problem we often had in the ministry was discovering - I would often have to deal with this when I was in the Premier's office, multi years, many, many years ago - discovering departments operating like little empires, negotiating their own treaties with Ottawa.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: The first the Cabinet would hear of it sometimes was when we had to ratify a deal that had been done. Is it now required procedure that any department going to Ottawa first gets in touch with Mr. Abery or with the Premier as the minister.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Dead on. Right. The hon. member again is very right. I remember since I have been involved even there were occasions when there were great howls because everybody did not know about a certain department that had sort of almost sort of gone on its own and done things and they might not be the priorities which Cabinet really wanted to place on it. Instead of a \$9 million planning agreement, they might have wanted a \$4 million one. And the other \$5 million that was available, if the Federal Treasury Board were so kind, that there were other areas, an amendment

July 27, 1979

Tape 382

IB-4

PREMIER PECKFORD:

to the highways agreement to do certain things, where a bush fire  
was burning out of control -

MR. ROBERTS: Or a district could be won.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Or a district could be won or whatever. And the  
hon. member is correct

July 27, 1979

Tape No. 383

GH-1

PREMIER PECKFORD: correct that now everything has to be funnelled through that Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. ROBERTS: So, really, no minister may approach -

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, no.

MR. ROBERTS: - Ottawa to negotiate (inaudible)

ongoing day to day -

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued, not with Gerry Korbai, I think he is a nice guy and a good guy and all that, I have no problem with him, what does the Director of Support Services really do?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, for example, in all the meetings that are being held, for example now, Mr. Jarvis, the Intergovernmental Affairs minister in Ottawa, I do not if you ever heard of Bill Jarvis before, he is -

MR. ROBERTS: Bill Jarvis, yes, briefly, yes.

They come and they go.

PREMIER PECKFORD: He is the minister, I never heard of him before; I do not know where he is from.

MR. ROBERTS: He is from Perth.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We will find out next week.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier just blew about five million bucks right there.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There goes my special little road to get that district back. In any case -

MR. STIRLING: Is it possible with leave to strike something from Hansard?

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, Mr. Korbai would be organizing that full meeting because Mr. Abery and Mr. Fitzgerald and them would be -

MR. ROBERTS: What does 'Organizing with DREE' mean?

PREMIER PECKFORD: - busy with DREE. Well, he was just getting the agendas for the meeting, where the meeting is to be held,

PREMIER PECKFORD: all that kind of interface between the government and any other government in Canada or outside of Canada. For example, the five ambassadors who are coming down from the Middle East, they are coming here in a couple of weeks time, Mr. Korbai would be doing all the arranging, okay, it is an arrangement kind of - that is his job, he does all of that for the government in all the meetings and delegations that are coming and going, some of which I know about, you know, the courtesy calls as the hon. member knows, these courtesy calls from the High Commissioner and the Ambassador from Australia, all of whom have to take trips to all the provinces every year. So they all have to make their courtesy call and Mr. Korbai does all that work.

MR. ROBERTS: Boy, if they only knew in Northeast Crouse where their tax money is going.

PREMIER PECKFORD: How are they doing with the fishing over in Northeast Crouse?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Butt) The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, they all moved out of there, so, not so well.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, they are all gone, are they?

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, in this Subhead and as a specific example in dealing with the person that you were just talking about, on this Fisheries Conference that is coming up, this intergovernmental Fisheries Conference that is coming up in August or September, we have not really been able to zero in on, would it be possible to extend that same kind of thought that we are talking about with the Cabinet Secretariat, for example, that there may be times when observers from this side - the Premier representing a rural district will appreciate that many of the members on this side have quite an interest in fisheries, and there may not be any formal method of getting the federal government to invite members from this side to at least attend as observers in something as crucial as this conference coming up. Would it be possible that we extend the same kind of thinking as in the Cabinet Secretariat that one or two

MR. STIRLING: or three invitations, as a matter of course, could be sent to this side to attend at least with observer status?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Butt) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have no objection, you know, I do not know what the right procedure is. I guess the federal minister who called the conference, you know, would have to go along with it, but I mean I have no objection. I do not know what the - I have seen some of the correspondence this morning, I have to bow to further information - what the structure of that seminar is, but I would imagine it is -

MR. ROBERTS: It is not all confidential?

PREMIER PECKFORD: - it is, I mean, not a confidential or -

MR. ROBERTS: I would not think so.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - no, I think it is open anyway, so -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) confidential you can xerox anyway so maybe the minister can find out in due course.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - so I do not know even if it would - I would imagine hon. members could attend in any case, if they wanted to, you know.

MR. STIRLING: No, I was thinking of something more specific, again going right back to your thinking of involving all members of this House in the Resource Committees and with the very limited funds available at the present time, and I know that is going to be looked at, but something as important as developing some policy in the fisheries, obviously, there should be input from both sides of the House, and if the government, for example, could consider in setting up their delegation that at least an invitation be extended to members from this side, or one or two members or a spokesman for this side, so that the expense does not have to come out of the individual's own

MR. STIRLING: pocket, and it would go at the same way that a member of the provincial government would be funded for that purpose. Now, the Premier has indicated that he is looking for, in the setting up of the Council later on, the Economic Council, input from all over the Province. Well, certainly members that represent districts in that area should have something to offer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Butt) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not know how far you can take that, you know. There is a fine line there where government is elected to govern and oppositions are elected to oppose and I do not know where the fine line comes across where



PREMIER PECKFORD: a minister responsible for intergovernmental affairs who is negotiating something with Ottawa can have observers from the opposing party in attendance when you are negotiating something. So I do not know how far you can take it. That is the only question I would pose on that, the only problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: I was not elected to oppose. That happened by accident. I was elected by members from Bonavista North to represent the people of Bonavista North in this House, and I make quite a distinction. It so happens that if we go back to this great tradition of this House of Assembly and the mother house - it just so happens that the party system has come into existence but in theory, at least, the reason that the Premier is the premier and the Government is the government is because once we were all elected to his hon. House of Assembly, all 52 of us, you managed to attract 33 instead of nineteen. So I was not elected to oppose; I was elected to represent the people of Bonavista North in this House of Assembly. And it is in that context, Mr. Premier, not as a member of the Opposition, that I am talking about it; in the context of the fishermen of Bonavista North or the fishermen in any other district who have something to say through their representative. And if the people of Newfoundland are going to pay for the cost of one of these delegations and we consider going to consultants, we consider going to ordinary members of the public, and certainly the members of the House of Assembly, and I am talking about it in that context, in the context that the Premier is talking about it, and not as a member of the Opposition. It so happens that I am sitting in the Opposition benches.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You can not use one point of the system to generalize the whole system. The fact of the matter is that we all got elected for our constituencies to represent them here in the House, and as far as that goes that is what we are going to do. But then, at the same

PREMIER PECKFORD: time it never so happened. It was a deliberate act on the electorate of the Province of Newfoundland that in so electing people to the House of Assembly to represent them they also were cognizant at the same time that they were electing a government. They were not just electing a member for the House of Assembly; they were electing parties. I attach myself to a party and the hon. member attaches himself to a party, not for the sake of just representing people in the House but for the purposes of determining who was going to have the majority of seats to form the government or to form whatever. So one can not isolate one part of the system and generalize it over the whole. Otherwise, the whole thing becomes unmanageable. So the political realities of the system are simply that the hon. member does represent a constituency and at the same time he represents a party. And that party's aim and objective is in the system to become the government, not become the opposition. Unfortunately, it did not work out that way. So I think the hon. member is being very narrow in his view in just using one aspect to generalize the whole which I do not think he can do.

Cabinet Secretariat Classification  
and Appeals Board, the volume of activity for the past year was 110 formal appeals. Perhaps the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) -

MR. ROBERTS:

(inaudible)

On motion, 305-01 through 305-02-02, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

Shall 305-02-3 carry?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Baie Verte -

White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Maybe the explanation is the same - but

the same explanation - Is it okay? I will leave it at that.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Government of Canada stated

revenue down further sees how much we get back on it.

July 27, 1979

Tape 384

RT-3

MR. ROBERTS:

Who hired these?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

These are studies.

MR. ROBERTS:

Federal/provincial committee?

Was it Cabinet or joint special

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Federal/provincial committee.

MR. RIDEOUT:

So, Mr. Chairman, in actual fact we are getting back \$100,000 and we are spending \$200,000. So it is going to cost us \$100,000 whereas there was no vote the year before. Are they working on those same programmes that the Premier referred to earlier?

So, Mr. Chairman, in actual fact we

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. This money is coming directly from the Planning and Subsidiary Agreement.

Yes. This money is coming directly from

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

Shall 02-03 carry?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Infrastructure Requirements of the greater St. John's urban region to 1990 and to develop an integrated plan for their provision.

The Infrastructure Requirements of the

MR. RIDEOUT:

It sounds like we are going to have a field day.

It sounds like we are going to have a

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And there is a balance there. It is not all being used for that. There is \$23,000 to \$25,000 there just as a requirement thrown in there in case additional consultant studies would be needed and that would be our ten per cent of the whole.

And there is a balance there. It is

MR. ROBERTS:

My hon. friend for Lapoile in due course will undoubtedly be asking a question about it.

My hon. friend for Lapoile in due course

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

Usually with good reason.

Carried, whatever you are doing -

On motion, 02-03 carried.

MR. ROBERTS:

This one intrigues me.

Just a bald -

PREMIER PECKFORD: What is that?

MR. ROBERTS: Just a bald statement, grants.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh yes, grants. Made to pay, three grants due for payment in 1979-1980, \$22,000 made payable to the Canadian Intergovernmental Affairs Conference Secretariat as our share of the provinces - every province contributes and have to -

MR. ROBERTS: Is that Henry Davis, the lovely voice?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I guess the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Hollett) knows Henry like many of us do. \$15,000 for the Community Services Council of Newfoundland which government had agreed to fund community services councils.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean what is that doing in - Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the community services council.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not know what it is doing there.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean what in all that is sacred is it doing in with -

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not know.

MR. ROBERTS: - Intergovernmental Affairs. I mean it is a social welfare -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Ask me another question.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a social welfare grant.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. I do not know how it got here.

MR. ROBERTS: What are we doing. I thought only the feds had bitten that particular apple, succulent though it may be.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. I do not know what the reason is. There must be a reason for it. I will try to find out.

MR. ROBERTS: No doubt there is a reason for it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Sometimes there is not.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes there is a reason. It may not be of justification but there is a reason.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will find out.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the third one?

PREMIER PECKFORD: \$6,000 for Eastern Canadian Premiers, New England Governors.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) high living in Quebec, was it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: It always used to be the former Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) would always be the government representative to go to those things.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I know him intimately.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is our contribution towards that instrument that they have.

MR. ROBERTS: Is love not grand. I would like to know why the community services -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Quite seriously. I mean the Treasury Board President will want to look at that. It ought to go surely in the estimates of the gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, unless there is some agreement with the feds on it or something. I will try to find out from the hon. member before -

MR. ROBERTS: I mean maybe we can find out just how much has gone - this Community Services Council is an interesting venture. It is awfully good at getting grants.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Fine. I appreciate that.

On motion 03 and 04-01 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Shall 06 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Why are we paying to the Unity Train when it does not come here? Is that just -

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is coming here, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: How is it coming here?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not know how but it is coming here and the funds provided in this vote relate to expenses such as advertising, government sponsored lunches and dinners, etc. pertaining to the visit to the Province of the Unity Caravan during 1979.

MR. ROBERTS: And this is for drinks and meals and -

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are supposed - I remember it coming up when I was on Treasury Board I think there a few months ago - we are supposed to cough up our share of something or another. Otherwise it would be awfully discourteous and unusual -

MR. ROBERTS: I do not mind us paying for the Unity Train.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, but I am just saying, I am just giving you the reason for that part of it. You know it would be awkward, unusual -

MR. ROBERTS: I do not mind it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: But I want to explain it whether you mind it or not, explain the reason for it.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) problem, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are going to put it on trucks or something.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Putting it on trucks or something, yes. Anyway we are all going to be one great country before the year is out.

MR. ROBERTS: We are now if the Tories do not make a mess of it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Do not worry. Sleep silently and peacefully.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I know Joe Clark better than you do so I -

PREMIER PECKFORD: No you do not.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes I do my friend.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No you do not.

MR. ROBERTS: He ran a newspaper badly twenty years ago when I ran one well and he has not improved.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, you people seem to want to attract yourselves to newspaper editors and I do not see why you would discriminate one from the other.

MR. ROBERTS: Well some are good and some are not so good.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was that when you were in the P.C. (inaudible)?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I left the P.C.s when they would not censure John Diefenbaker when I came to my senses. The hon. gentleman will come to his in due course.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Anyway, come on, let us move on.

On motion 305-06 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Shall 306-02-03 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Could we have a word of explanation please, Mr. Chairman?

MR. STIRLING: Are we on 306?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have already given information on that one (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): The hon. member for Bonavista North.

Yes we are on 306.

MR. STIRLING: On the Economic Development Council, as the Premier said, he did give some information. This question about the Economic Development Advisory Council was brought in by this administration or by this government. The Premier reminded me that you cannot have it both ways, so that works both ways. He said he ran as a P.C. This was brought in by the P.C. Government. Did they do was brought in with a great deal of fanfare. Are there any reports to be brought in? Are there any recommendations? Is there anything to show for their work?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, there are. I do not have them here, the reports. That \$17,000 is to cover two things, some consultant work that was done on programme reviews which I think one or two of the reports are in on some aspects of the different departments.

MR. ROBERTS: They were having a look at the Companies Act which I think caused considerable heartburn and heartache.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes they were looking at the Companies Act, that is right. That was one. They were also looking at land



PREMIER PECKFORD: policy and, you know, Crown lands, and Mr. Channing, the former Clerk of the Executive Council, was a part-time worker for the Economic Development Advisory Council, so some of that \$17,000 is to pay for his salary the time that he worked, the part-time work that he did for the Council. The rest of it is for consultants that were engaged to do some program reviews. I will have to get those program reviews and I undertake to table them.

MR. ROBERTS: What is going to happen to the Council?

Is it to be -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, it is gone.

MR. ROBERTS: Gone.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh yes, this is only money incurred that has to be paid, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) four of them?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, they are gone. They have submitted their resignations and all.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) gone.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh yes, they -

MR. ROBERTS: They are no more.

PREMIER PECKFORD: They are no more, no.

MR. BARRY: It goes to show (inaudible) concern (inaudible).

On motion, 306-02-03, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Butt) Shall 307-01 carry?  
The hon. the member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go a long time on this, but I have a couple of questions and I expect the Premier has anticipated them. If he has not, I would be somewhat taken aback. First of all, let it be recorded that, while





PREMIER PECKFORD: Very glad you asked me, of course.

All of the questions the hon. member asks -

MR. ROBERTS: If I keep it up the Premier will not even know what is happening.

PREMIER PECKFORD: They motivate me to pleasure and happiness beyond anybody's comprehension.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier is simple as well as simplistic.

PREMIER PECKFORD: This is not for the regular operation of the Community Services Council, which would be under the Department of Social Services, but we do not fund the Community Services Council under Social Services or anywhere else.

MR. ROBERTS: The 'feds' do.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So that takes care of that.

Now, let us get on to special Action Group.

MR. STIRLING: Related to that, has that anything to do -

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Butt) The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Related to that item, that is a very important study, I would suggest, social costs of unemployment in Newfoundland. Has it started and when would we expect to receive copies of the report.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Wondering if somebody nearby is listening and can give me that figure, that timetable, time frame? So we will get that for the hon. member.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was not (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. member is finding it is Friday morning. He was not recognized by the Chair.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That was a new school of herring just came in Old Perlican Harbour.

MR. ROBERTS: That is more Dildo.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is Dildo, is it? Special Action Group, how I intend

PREMIER PECKFORD: to deal with the Director of the special Action Group, I am still thinking it through, and we will be meeting with the Director to see what the best way is and talk to my Cabinet colleagues about it and so on. We have not resolved what is the best way to go.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier plans possibly to offer the gentleman to stay on in the -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, I would rather indicate that to him first before I do it to the House.

MR. ROBERTS: That is fair enough, but it will not be forgotten.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, obviously I will not forget it either, do not worry.

Mr. Chairman, all I have done so far is to indicate to the Director that the Action Group is going.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) anybody that was with him.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In fact, in due course, in a few days when time permits we will sit down and talk about other matters of import. The people who were seconded from the departments, of course, will return to the departments from whence they came.

MR. ROBERTS: Where their jobs were already filled, no doubt.

PREMIER PECKFORD: In some cases on a temporary basis though. So I do not think there is really - we reviewed it a little bit yesterday and I am not totally sure but I think in most cases - it is not started yet, our study. We are waiting for the federal government to confirm funding. When started the study will take about one year.

MR. ROBERTS: But these are the people who are regular public servants -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Exactly.

MR. ROBERTS: - and they are entitled to the protection.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Exactly. The other people who were just taken on by the Action Group, their jobs will be terminated, obviously.

MR. ROBERTS: How many will be terminated and how many will be -

PREMIER PECKFORD: There was some money for extra Summer help and overtime. Out of ten employees in the special Action Group, four officers had been seconded. So there could be six who are not a part of - so if you take out Mr. Cole that would be five I guess.

MR. ROBERTS: And they will be laid off, those five?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Wager?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. Oh, wager, oh absolutely.

MR. ROBERTS: Double or nothing.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, absolutely, no problem. The hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle has not worries about that one. So the others will go back into the departments and hopefully we will be able to streamline and use a phone number which is necessary.

Now, the major expenditure here under this Heading is the \$382,000.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no election this year, you do not need that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is bills from last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is bills from last year.

MR. ROBERTS: Why is it not shown under last year's -

PREMIER PECKFORD: McConnell Advertising group who did the advertising for the special Action Group.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean if the bills were incurred they have to be paid over (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: And I have reviewed it and they have to be paid.

MR. ROBERTS: Why are they in this year's supply and not last year's.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, it spilled over. I do not know what the accounting procedure is. All I can say is that they are coming out of this fiscal year. The bills were incurred last year and they are coming out of this fiscal year. These costs relate to the preparation and production of a variety of radio and television commercials depicting opportunity for resource development in the Province and so on. And they did some work on post secondary education, brochures or whatever. So that is what it is for. It is the McConnell thing. Of course, there are no new initiatives being taken by this administration in that field.

MR. ROBERTS: Not for three years.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And there are zero amounts of money to be expended on it over and above the \$382,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Premier. I mean if the money has been incurred it has to be paid. There is no point in complaining over that. That is one that I think legitimately he could lay at the feet of his predecessor, Mr. Moores. But I would simply ask, first of all, I understand from the Premier that there is no money being voted here for any more of this - you know I am not getting into an argument, it is five to one on a hot Summer's Friday afternoon. We all know what it was and we all know what it represented and that is that. Would the Premier undertake to have prepared and made public a statement as to exactly how much was spent.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Because I notice that is is nearly \$1 million here.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, sure.

MR. ROBERTS: And heavens knows how much else was carried in preceding years or anywhere.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Or in another department.

MR. ROBERTS: We all know how it can be, you know, spread around and so forth and so on. Could he indicate how much was spent, how much went for media and how much went for other contracts. You know just a full and complete statement. I would think he would be just as delighted - he is walking away from everything his predecessor did. If he wants to walk away from it I would think this is one of those things he would want to walk away from.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is not a question of walking away, it is a question of providing information to the hon. House as I want to start off to do and which I started to do in May and which I am going to continue to do as long as I hold this position.

MR. ROBERTS: We agree on the results, anyway. We agree on the result.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So I will undertake to provide the whole works there. It is \$1 million there and I do not know if there are others and I will provide, table it in the House.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Premier, the McConnells group did this work I understand, all this public work. Was that not the same firm that, in fact, suggested to the government that it should set up the Action Group to start off with? Was it not McConnells Advertising that recommended to government that they set up an Action Group, recommend to the Premier and was it dealt with by Cabinet. And secondly, this work that was given out to McConnell Advertising, were there tenders called for this or were

MR. E. ROWE: they just give him the work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I can not answer - I do not know if McConnell actually recommended the Action Group, or not. I do not know what the procedure was there. But all I can tell the hon. gentleman right now is that they did do the advertising work for the Action Group.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, with your permission -

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

MR. F. ROWE: How long would it take to find out, number one, whether it was McConnell's Advertising who, in fact, recommended that the Action Group be set up to start off, and would be also undertake to find out whether tenders were called for these particular jobs.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, I will undertake it. I will give a full statement on that.

MR. F. ROWE: Good.

MR. ROBERTS: Sorry. Go ahead. We can not do -

MR. F. ROWE: No, I got my answer, thank you.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: I am wondering if the Premier, Mr. Chairman, would undertake to table in the House or to give us now if he has the information, the number of jobs - you know, we spent a lot of money on the Action Group, it is going to be well over a million dollars, I guess - and just what was achieved as a result of having that group in place? How many industries were provided in the Province? How many industries exist in the Province as a result of the Action Group being in place and having offered guidance to the applicants and that kind of thing? And how many jobs exist in this Province now that come as a direct result of the Action Group being in place? Would the Premier undertake to give us that information?

PREMIER PECKFORD: There is a report on that, I can table it. Yes.



MR. MARSHALL: I move this Committee rise as I think it is nearly one o'clock.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Butt) The Committee of Supply has considered matters to them referred, has made some progress, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that it has considered the matters to it referred and has directed him to report progress and ask leave to sit again. When shall the Committee have leave to sit again?

MR. MARSHALL: Tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Tomorrow.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Before moving the adjournment again I would like to give notice to the House as to the proceedings on Monday. They will be, first of all, the Interim Supply Bill. We will be considering Interim Supply measures. Then we will be getting back into the Committee of Supply and, of course, I can not anticipate how long the request to the Executive Council is going to last. But if we do finish this and this, of course, is in the Opposition's hands mainly, we will then be proceeding into the Budget Speech. So I would like the Opposition to know because they have the lead-off speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable and learned gentleman. Perhaps he could answer a question that I have been asked and I am not sure that I understand.



MR. ROBERTS: Let us assume that, say, in another hour we clean off the Executive Council which is the only Head not referred to a committee and not previously dealt with. We have dealt, I think, with Heads 1 and Heads 2, and this is Head 3; - the other 16 have been referred to the committees. Let us assume that when the score is given to us by the Clerks at the Table, allowing the nine hours, say we have 15 hours still to go out of our 75 hour maximum, what do we do with that? Do we allocate that? Do he and I meet with one of our secret covenants, secretly arrived at, and allocate this among and between the three standing committees so we have longer debates on their reports? Or what happens? Do we just lose the time?

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

MR. MARSHALL: My understanding, subject to this hour of the day, so that you think it over, that the way it is is that we will consume whatever we have left in Committee of Supply and Committee of the Whole and then whatever Interim Supply and then the nine hours, and that is it, but as far as the committees themselves go they can meet for as long as they wish to within the 15 days.

MR. ROBERTS: I know the committees can but can we spend the extra time on the concurrence debates?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I would like to take that under advisement and it is a matter really of interpretation of the rules more so than for me - it is not for me to make that edict.

MR. ROBERTS: No, but I appreciate -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: - what my hon. friend says and I really raise it simply to raise it. I think it is a matter of interpretation and perhaps what we might look at is using that in whole or in part for concurrence debates. Because we are not extending the 75 hours; that will stay. Otherwise, the tendency - and this is not a threat as my

MR. ROBERTS:                   learned friend knows I do not play that kind of game, nor does he - but the tendency might be for us to waffle off Interim Supply. You know, why should we give up anything. He understands the feeling. He was over here and he will be again.

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

MR. MARSHALL:                   I understand we have it all under advisement but really I think probably notice has been given really to the Speaker so that we can come up with interpretation.

MR. SPEAKER:                   I will take the matter under advisement.

MR. MARSHALL:                   I move that the House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3 o'clock, and that this House do now adjourn.

                                  On motion, the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3 o'clock.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JULY 27, 1979

*Called by Hon.  
Minister of Justice,  
27 July, 1979*

In answer to the question whether representations have been made by the Minister of Justice to the Federal Minister during the past three years on the subject of changes in the law governing the use of marijuana, to the best of my knowledge there was no written representation during the past three years. Whether or not there was oral representation it is impossible for me to say.