

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 P.M - 6:00 P.M.
Monday, July 30, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. J. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House of Assembly about some new initiatives that we are taking in the Department of Forestry to improve the sawmilling industry in the Province.

The situation now is that this year we will be producing as a Province 46 million board feet of lumber. This is a record high for the Province. Last year it was 9 per cent lower; however, Mr. Speaker, it is still 45 per cent below the needs of this Province. Our aim, of course, is to be, one of these days, self-sufficient in production of lumber.

My department has been working on a number of initiatives in this regard. These initiatives have been directed at improving log supply, increasing the access to the timber stands by new forest access roads and means and ways of achieving better utilization of the sawmills in general, and to provide a better quality of lumber.

In 1975 the total production in the Province was 37 million board feet. In 1976 it was increased to 42 million. As I mentioned, this year it is 46 and we aim to go on up from there. So I am pleased to announce, Mr. Speaker, that with the assistance from the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion that we are arranging to sponsor a study tour by the local sawmillers themselves, the more enterprising sawmillers in particular in this case to take a look at the medium and small size sawmill operations, similar to those in their own operations in this Province, in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In fact, today we have five of these

July 30, 1979

Tape No. 389

SD - 2

MR. J. MORGAN: sawmillers, owners and operators, in Nova Scotia, accompanied by two senior officials of the Department of Forestry and accompanied by an official from the Department of Industrial Development, and tomorrow they will be joined by an official from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

They will look at the operations today of two sawmills and tomorrow three more in Nova Scotia, and Wednesday follow on to look at three in New Brunswick, and I think it is five on Thursday.

These study tours are being sponsored by the Maritime Lumber Bureau and we are convinced will help

MR. J. MORGAN:

the local operators in our Province to improve two things: Number one, as I mentioned, the quality of their production and, number two, their overall production in general, to increase their production. We are convinced that this is going to be of extreme benefit to those operators in learning the expertise and the technology of others who are, by the way, Mr. Speaker, quite successful. The operations of a sawmill operation in New Brunswick and in Nova Scotia in comparison to the same size sawmill in our Province are operating much more efficiently and a much greater production. We are convinced the study tours will benefit the local sawmill operators. Now this is, as I mentioned, a pilot project, if you wish, sponsored by both governments and if it is successful, and we are convinced it will be successful and beneficial, we intend to carry out further of the study tours over the next number of months to improve the overall sawmilling industry in our Province.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, the minister's statement seems to be motherhood. I have absolutely no objections, and I think it makes a good deal of sense and I am sure that everyone in Newfoundland will welcome the idea of acquiring more expertise. I am not as sanguine as he is about what has been happening over the last three or four years, or indeed what has been happening in the sawmilling industry over the past decade or so. We keep hearing all manner of forecasts about how we can be more self-sufficient and yet the sorry story is, I think it is fair to say, that for every mill that is opened up, every one that expands to some degree, we hear another sad story about one that has gone under because of high costs or for some other reason. I must say I doubt very much if the gentlemen concerned on this tour are going to learn very much that they do not already know. It is fine for them to go, nothing wrong with that all, but I have talked to many of them, I have talked to some of those who have been helped by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation,

MR. D. JAMIESON: by DREE, by a variety of other organizations over the years, and I think it would be far better for the minister to listen to what it is that they tell him is wrong in Newfoundland in terms of the sawmilling operations. Part of the problem, I gather, is the ability to dispose of the totality of the wood production, but part of it is also the marketing. There are a variety of other things that are involved in it, and consequently I think what they will do at the end of this tour will probably come back and say, 'Well, there is no doubt about it, these people have a better, in a sense technique than we have but they have not shown us anything that we have not known before.'

MR. JAMIESON: My only other objection is that I have not started to keep score but I better do that fairly soon to see how many studies and analyses this government has got underway. When we started with the Throne Speech, then we went on to the Budget, and now we have this, nothing is happening. All we are hearing about is the fact that the study is going to be done, that there is another group gone somewhere else to take a look at something else, or that, "We are not going to proceed with this," says the government, "because we have not got all the data that we want." So that I emphasize once again if it is beneficial, and I suppose it is for operators in Newfoundland to go elsewhere, that is fine. But I would not hold my breath in expecting that as a result of this pilot project, or no pilot project, we are going to see a revolution in the sawmilling industry in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the hon. the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that he is the one who is quoted, he may wish to enlist the aid of some of his colleagues. I am back on the question on the future of Come By Chance. This morning it has been indicated that the environmental report will be in the hands of the government this week. May I, as my first question, ask, is this an environmental report that is concerned only with the effects or likely effects of the type of crude oil which it is proposed that First Arabian use, or is it an environmental study that in addition includes and embraces possible impact on the fishing industry, for example, and other marine activities in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition was quite correct that the environmental aspects are not just a single facet, they are multi-faceted; there is the navigational problems in the bay itself, there is the water effluents from the refinery, if it should be reactivated, which find their way into the sea; there is the disposal of solid wastes, and then finally there is the air pollution aspect.

DR. J. COLLINS: The particular reports we are awaiting deal with the air pollution aspects. The navigational problems, we have had discussions over those but that question was by and large settled, I suppose, one might look at it that way, settled when the original refinery was opened. The decision was made that there were navigational hazards, certainly, there are navigational hazards whenever there are ships involved, but that these navigational hazards were looked upon as acceptable provided the good navigational techniques and

Dr. Collins: navigational equipment was in place. So it would seem that there is little argument we can raise in that regard now, although we must make sure that these proper procedures are followed.

The effluents, the fluid effluents going into the sea, that is a federal responsibility; that deals with the federal protection of the waters, the tide waters, and that is essentially within the federal field. The waste product pollutants, that is a Provincial responsibility, and we have had discussions with the proposed reactivators of the refinery in that regard to make sure that proper waste, solid waste disposal is affected, and we feel that there is no real problem there although continued surveillance clearly will be in order. And we are therefore left then with the air pollutant ones, and this is the one where we felt that our own expertise, of which we have a considerable amount in Consumer Affairs and Environment, we felt that was not sufficient nevertheless to give us the guarantees we were looking for, so we went to two other sources, we went to Environment Canada and they very kindly seconded an official of high expertise in this particular area to our aid; and secondly, we went to recognized experts in the field, specifically on air pollution from refineries.

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

MR. JAMIESON: To be quite specific then, am I correct in assuming that the environmental standards that were in operation at the time of the close down of Come By Chance as they relate to the effluent and the various other matters that the minister has raised, that these are not in question at the moment, that basically the study is concerned with the possibility that the type of crude oil, which First Arabian is bringing in or proposes to bring in, is of a high sulphur content and that these studies are only and exclusively aimed at seeing whether this creates a more serious environmental problem than was the case in the past? Is that a correct deduction?

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

DR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is essentially the situation. As time has gone by, the type of crude that is being refined throughout the world has changed from the sweeter towards the sourer type. There is a progression that way. And when one says? 'sweet and sour' one is not talking about Chinese food; one is talking about the amount of sulphur in the particular crude that is available. And in this year, 1979, there is on an average a higher sulphur content of the crude being made available to the refineries throughout the world than there was, say, when the refinery opened, which was

DR. COLLINS:
date like that.

in 1973 or 1974, some

MR. JAMIESON:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)
Opposition.

The hon. Leader of the

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, that is not entirely a full answer but I will not press it further. I hope I will have an opportunity in estimates or somewhere to go into it in detail. But may I ask this supplementary then: Since so much emphasis has been placed on this environmental study, does this mean that the government is now satisfied that First Arabian is adequate from the financing point of view, that it has an adequate supply of crude for the foreseeable and that is for a reasonable period of time, and that the marketing problems have been solved? Does this mean, in other words, that if the environmental finding is satisfactory that Come By Chance can go ahead?

Mr. Speaker, that is not

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, in our negotiations we have made it clear throughout that we were not going to approve this packet in bits and pieces, that we would investigate the various aspects that were of a concern to us but we would not say, "Alright, that is approved," and then go on to the next one. We would seek information and, once we had all the information available to us, we would then sit down over the total packet and either say, "Aye" or "Nay". I might point out at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, we are not engaging these people to reactivate the refinery. The first mortgage is the owner of the refinery. The first mortgagee has merely asked the Province, as the second mortgagee, if it agrees with the proposal that the first mortgagee has basically accepted. And this is what we are asked to do, to say either, (a) we support or (b) we do not support, and our basic position is that we will not support until we have seen the whole package.

Mr. Speaker, in our

Now the points that the

hon. Leader of the Opposition has brought up, all these have been given

DR. COLLINS: consideration and none of these are as immediate as the air pollution one. We feel that we have at this point in time essentially sufficient information. I do not know if we will have all information right up to the last minute on all of them, but we are not hung up, shall we say, if I might use that term, we are not hung up on any of the other aspects. We are now just awaiting the air pollution resolution.

MR. JAMIESON: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A final supplementary.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: I apologize for taking so much time on this subject but it continues! the hon. the Premier quite openly and frankly, and I think honestly, said the other day that we were many months down the road. Now here once again we have a situation in which we are saying that the environmental study will be in the government's hands within a short time and once again we have this generation of expectation. The hon. member says that there is nothing as urgent as the environmental standards. There will not be an environmental problem unless the refinery is reactivated. So what I am saying is when are all of these

MR. D. JAMIESON:

bits and pieces going to start to come together and what is the timetable? And I do not ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) to be specific, but are we talking here in terms of weeks or months? You know, there is an August 15th deadline, I am informed, which has to be extended. Perhaps I can put my question best by saying to the hon. Minister of Finance, does he now anticipate that they will have to extend beyond that August 15th deadline?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. Minister of Finance

DR. J. COLLINS:

To answer that point first, no, we do not anticipate we will have to extend beyond that. If the circumstances should arise whereby they ask for an extension, we certainly will look at it and if it seems reasonable we will do so.

The deadline is a deadline we hope to meet whereby we will have all the information available to us and we will then give or not give our support. That does not mean and I am not raising expectations, I wonder if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) is raising expectations? I am merely saying that when the deadline comes, if we hold to it, we will have said we will support or we will not support. There are many things that have to take place after that for which the Province is not responsible. The Supreme Court of Newfoundland has to give its judgement in this. There has to be certain matters of litigation gone through; they may come to something and they may come to nothing. There has to be a review by the Federal Review Board, FIRA, on this. So, there are a lot of things to go through for which the province is not responsible; all we are responsible for is to meet whatever deadlines are set to give our agreement or non-agreement to the proposal as it is put forward to us.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. the Premier if he met with the President of the Iron Ore

MR. S. NEARY: Company of Canada over the weekend or on Friday, and if so would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what topics were discussed at that particular meeting?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: As I understand the hon. member's question, he is inquiring as to a meeting that was held by IOCC officials? I was listening to somebody else at the time.

MR. S. NEARY: I was trying to find out what you did with Brian Mulroney when he was here to get him all upset?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, you will have to ask Mr. Mulroney. There was a Cabinet Committee that met with Mr. Mulroney concerning the operations of the Iron Ore Company of Canada in Labrador City and a review of the company's positions on matters of major concern to them and to the Province as related to the various reports that have been done on the operation and as it relates to ongoing studies on dust that are now in place.

PREMIER PECKFORD: and just a total review of the operations from IOC's point of view so that government would have the benefit of their information and their data and their views.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that would seem to be a very harmless meeting and hardly worthwhile for Mr. Mulroney to travel all the way to St. John's to meet with the hon. gentleman and his Cabinet Committee unless they discussed something specific. Let me ask the hon. gentleman if they discussed the Easton Report, and if so did the government lay down any guidelines or any directions in which they would expect the Iron Ore Company of Canada to take in connection with this report?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The company at the meeting, Mr. Speaker, did express its opinion on various recommendations contained in the Easton Report. As for the Easton Report itself, of course government is examining that report now and will in due course take a position on the various recommendations contained in it.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Did IOC, or Mr. Mulroney or any of his spokesmen indicate to the government, or to the hon. gentleman, what Iron Ore Company of Canada was going to do about the dust pollution in Labrador City? I mean, there must be some sort of specific information given to the government or the government must have given some directions to IOC. It was not just to sit around and have a little picnic. Did they say what they were going to do about the dust problem? Did the government tell them what they should do about it? Was there anything specific that came out of the meetings or was it just a little social get together?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that the purpose of the meeting was for IOC management to indicate to government the present status of various things ongoing in Labrador and their position on various matters concerned with their operation. They did express their views on various aspects of the Easton Report. I do not know if the hon. member is fully aware or not, but I am sure the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) can bring the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) up to date as it relates to dust studies ongoing. There is a tri-level process in being. Mr. Len Leyte, the President of the Steelworkers Union, Mr. Brian Mulroney, President of IOC, the hon. Jerry Dinn, Minister of Labour and Manpower, are a three-man committee which is charged with the responsibility of getting a number of studies going on the dust problem, both in the buildings which process the ore at Labrador City, immediately outside the buildings on the IOC property in Labrador City, and also in the community of Labrador City, which is outside the IOC property per se. These studies will be going ahead.

So that part of the operation at Labrador City I think there is agreement between the three parties involved on a course of

PREMIER PECKFORD: action, and that course of action will now be pursued and on which the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) can specifically answer your questions far better than I. On the other matters dealing with the IOC, Mr. Mulroney and his people wanted to express their opinions, as I said, on various aspects of the Easton Report and give their view, which was publicly put in the paper, but they wanted to get into it in more detail with us as government, being involved. They also wanted to indicate their view as it related to municipal government at Labrador and how they thought that that should be handled. So the whole business of Labrador City and the iron ore operations were reviewed in the light of the company's opinions on them and they were given full opportunity so to present their views and we are thankful and grateful to them for giving us the benefit of their views on these important matters which affect them and affect us. And they will be meeting, various members of IOC, with the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), with the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower and with other people in government periodically over the next number of months to ensure that we have the latest information from the company. Meanwhile, we will also get all the information we can from the union and I am sure the whole thing is on the right track and moving ahead the way it should. So this was the purpose of the meeting.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman indicated that IOC gave their views on the Easton Report and on municipal government in Labrador City. The hon. gentleman did not tell us what views they expressed or what views the government expressed to them. So let me ask the hon. gentleman, what is it they are talking about in Labrador City. Do they want a municipal elected government put in there, a town council put in there - is that what they are asking the government to do? And what about the Easton Report, how do they feel about it? How do they feel about Item II, for instance, that the Government of the

MR. S. NEARY: Province of Newfoundland and Labrador should enact regulations for preference for local labour? How do they feel about the Easton Report? Are they going to implement the recommendations? Are they stalling? Are they procrastinating? Are they objecting to any parts of the Easton Report? The hon. gentleman should give the people of this Province and the people of Labrador West a little more information. It is not secret! The hon. gentleman should tell us, give us some more specific information, elaborate a little more on the meeting.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is a representative of the IOC Company here in St. John's all the time. I am sure he would be only too pleased to meet with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and express the company's views because if I start giving the company's views I might, through some nuance or some particular phrase, not properly reflect the view of the company. And so that, therefore, the hon. member I think should do some homework and listen to the news and read the various press releases that were put out by the company -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and in this way become more knowledgeable as to the company's position. On municipal government, I think the Iron Ore Company of Canada from way back several years ago did publicly

Premier Peckford: indicate to the people of Labrador West and to the people of Newfoundland that they favoured the report that was done at that time on municipal government, which was to transfer the local improvement district now so-called - the members of which are appointed - to a town council, to an elected group.

The issue at stake as it relates to Municipal Government in Labrador City is at what level of guarantee will the company provide for the infrastructure for the town of Labrador City and what will be the level of funding on into the future, what formula can be used? The question is not really one of appointed versus elected. I think most people have agreed that they need an elected form of government. What the people of Labrador City are concerned about is will they suddenly see a large rise in their municipal taxation because IOC wants to get out of the field of financing all of the infrastructure in Labrador City. But they are, in principle, in favour of an elected town council and I think are talking to Municipal Affairs in the last number of weeks about such a transfer from a local improvement district to a town council. Now they have to negotiate with the town officials the level of permanent funding that will be put in place. There are \$17 million or \$18 million, as I understand it, in the ground in Labrador City which is guaranteed by IOC. I think it is fair to say that IOC will see that that is paid off; then that is the capital side of it. Are they willing to finance a certain level of operating over a ten or fifteen year period or are they not? And that is where the negotiations are right now. So I think you will see, my view is that within the next year or so, some change of municipal status for Labrador City.

On the question of hiring, and one part of the Easton report as it relates to local preference, the company did indicate to us - and it is difficult to get into specifics here because there is a lot to the Easton report, but in the general way I can respond to the hon. gentleman right now - as it relates to local

PREMIER PECKFORD: preference, of course, the company has pointed out to government and to the people of Labrador City on many occasions that the level of local jobs at Labrador City is well over 90 per cent right now, and they think they are doing a fairly adequate job insuring local preference. However, they do admit that in certain areas they could have been doing better and they have indicated that they are going to initiate a new system of hiring down there to ensure that even more Newfoundlanders get hired. And they are initiating through ads in the papers, shortly, I think, a new effort to try to purchase more local goods within the Province. There are other specifics in the report that I could not reply to in detail because it would take up too much time, and I am not totally conversant in them today as I should be in order to answer fully the hon. member's question. But I hope I have given him some idea of the kind of issues that were discussed at the meeting.

MR. NEARY: Very vague.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Premier may have been vague, but he was not short. A question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), which I am sure he has anticipated. He has heard of the expressions

MR. ROBERTS: of feeling which came, I believe, originally from people who live in the New Ferolle - Reefs Harbour area, representative of my friend from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), who may well have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. My question relates to an area a little further North which is in my own constituency, of which I know the minister is familiar because he and I have discussed it on occasion, Forrester's Point, Black Duck Cove, Pigeon Cove, St. Barbe itself, the community of St. Barbe and then the community of Anchor Point. Can the minister tell us whether arrangements have been made by him or by his officials to have pavement laid this year through those communities while the work is being done under the DREE agreements on the main highway, the Northern Peninsula highway?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I cannot be specific. I know that there are one or two communities that are being paved in the area but I do not know the whole list. It seems to me that there is not quite that many. I think it is only two.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Blue Cove and Pond Cove are being paved this year, which is a commitment made I believe three years ago when the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was passing through Transportation and Communications on one of his tours. Will the minister then undertake to look into and see whether the pavement can be laid in these communities? I know he is familiar with the feeling of the people there. I am not condoning picketing; if they threaten to picket, well, we will see what comes. But I am sure he is familiar and understands the feeling of the people in these communities, that since the main road is being paved there is a certain skepticism, a certain fear which is expressed by

MR. ROBERTS: saying that once the paving machines leave we will never see them again, a fear which may be heightened by the fact that there is going to be no election for three or four years. So could the minister undertake to look into this, review to see whether this work can be done this year and give his assurance to the people in these communities?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, to answer the hon. gentleman's question, it is most unlikely that that would be included in a programme for this year. Our programme has been finalized, tenders have been called on if not all of the work then most of the work that is to be completed this Summer. It is not necessarily true that once the paving machines move out that paving will not commence again for another four years. I appreciate the concerns of the hon. member and I can only tell him, as I have told other members, not only on that side of the House but on this side as well, that we are looking at all the gravel roads in the Province of course and hope to get them all done when funds will permit.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. I welcome the minister's expression. I have said to people, as he has, that just because the machines leave it does not mean they will never come back; there will be another election and they will be back in good time no doubt. Mr. Speaker, the minister says that his officials have already called almost all of the tenders for work, and that is understandable, this is the end of July. Would the minister make public- or lay upon the table of the House and thus make public-a list of the work to be done by his department this year, separated perhaps into the two categories of work done through the DREE funding and work being done through the normal governmental funding?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT:

I will take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker, but I had anticipated that that question might come up when my estimates are being done. As I indicated, I will take it under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. member for the Strait (Mr. Roberts) as directed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). Yesterday I was into a meeting - I might add quite a massive turnout of people - and they are very concerned. Everything that the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has said I must reinforce.

MR. BENNETT: It seems to me that everything has got to have priority. I would like to ask the hon. minister how we establish priorities, and to what degree does potential resource influence the minister's decisions, especially in that area of paving?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. gentleman that establishing priorities is something that is done with great difficulty. Just before I came to the House, I met with a group of people from Brookside. I spent a half an hour with them. Their road was only one and one-tenth miles long and to them that was just as important as route 340, which the hon. member is concerned about. Everybody, Mr. Speaker, is concerned about gravel roads in the Province this time of the year. It is dusty, it is hard on cars. We were able at least to provide calcium in the built up areas of the Province. We did not put it between settlements. We felt it was better to put it in the settlements.

So as I said it is only with great difficulty and taking into consideration fish plants and that sort of things, You know, for a number of years we have tried to get roads included in our DREE programme and we have not always been successful. I just tell the hon. member again that next year we will be looking at the roads programme. We are certainly not going to finish all of them. We will do as many as we can, as many as time and finances will permit.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if my friend has a supplementary I will yield to him, if not I have a question for the Minister of Health. Mr. Speaker, the strike of the employees, or some

MR. ROBERTS: of the employees at the Red Cross, whatever they call it, the blood unit down here on Duckworth Street in the city - my friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) I believe asked some questions on Friday and I am not sure whether the Premier or the minister answered for the government - I would like to know of the minister, please, whether any difficulties have arisen, particularly with respect to the out-of-town hospitals which, I understand, are reporting some shortages of whole blood or of the plasma and if difficulties have arisen - or whether they have arise or not - in fact what arrangements has the minister made to ensure that adequate supplies of blood are distributed? And I gather if there is a problem it is in the distribution, not, at this stage at least in the - does one acquire blood, or collect it, or syphon it? However one gets it anyway! - not in the getting of the blood but in the getting of it to the hospitals around the Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there has been no indication from any of the hospitals that there is a serious shortage as it pertains to emergency operations. The fact is that they are desisting from having any elective surgery done at this time. I was reading an article, of course, the article today was written in The Daily News, and some of the answers to questions given yesterday -

MR. ROBERTS: Is this where the minister gets his information?

MR. HOUSE: Well, that particular one because I have been in contact also with the health clinic here -

MR. ROBERTS: Who?

MR. HOUSE: The Red Cross Clinic. And the fact was that there must be some kind of representation because ordinarily all the hospitals have been contacted by the Red Cross Centre here and advised of the donors in the area and this is what they would be using in case of emergency. So there is no likelihood that hospitals will not be able to take care of emergencies.

MR. HOUSE: The other thing, of course, is the fact that both groups are in meetings today and hopefully something can be resolved.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, first of all we understand that no elective surgery is to be carried out in the Province during the duration of this strike and, of course, we hope the strike will be settled but that is not in the minister's hands nor is it in ours; it is a lawful strike. So I want to know whether the minister, and I am not clear from what he said whether he has directed his officials, who have

MR. ROBERTS: the ultimate responsibility for the provision of health services, I would submit, in this Province, to get in touch with the hospitals to see, or whether he is just going to wait and hope nobody says something to him or to The Daily News or to The Evening Telegram or anybody else for that matter, and also if some difficulty does arise - because emergencies, as the minister would agree, are not predictable - what arrangements has he made to insure that blood does get to the hospitals? All hospitals, as the minister knows, have stocks of blood on hand at all times. Has he made arrangements to insure that the stocks of blood on hand are adequate? If not, why not, and what is he going to do about it?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, as far as my officials are concerned, there is an adequate supply. And the other arrangement that has been made, all the hospitals have been contacted with the list of donors in the area so that you get it from that source if this other source that they have at the present time seems to run short. But there is no indication that it is running short as yet.

MR. ROBERTS: So that is the only arrangement that is made, a list of donors.

MR. HOUSE: No, it is not the only one because they do have a fairly ample supply on hand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to reply to a question on the Order Paper of July 25th, asked by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), a two-part question. First part, total cost to the Province of RCMP investigation into Societe Transshipping. There was a cost - and I will be tabling this - of \$4,860.77, paid to a firm of chartered accountants for the examination of accounts and records and the report thereof. It is a direct identifiable cost. To the best of my knowledge

MR. OTTENHEIMER: there was no additional or new or supplementary personnel hired by the RCMP for that investigation, nor indeed, from the point of view of the Department of Justice, there were no additional personnel hired for that. So it would be impossible, in my opinion, to give any figure apart from that for which a bill was submitted and the amount paid. Records are not kept, let us say, in terms of RCMP or in terms of a solicitor, you know, in an eight hour day, how many hours he spent on this or on that or on the other matter. Also from the RCMP's point of view the work would be, of course, commercial fraud, and that is almost entirely federally funded, some of it, a small portion of it, paid from the contract between the Province and the RCMP. But there is no way that I can give a figure, there is no way I can give an estimate and there is no making up one. There is no way that I can find out of getting any accurate figure on that.

MR. NEARY: Can the RCMP give you the number of man-hours involved?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No.

The second part of the question, Did the RCMP initiate this investigation on their own or was it carried out under instructions from the Minister of Justice? The RCMP carried out their investigation under instructions from the Minister of Justice resulting from complaints received by him.

MR. NEARY: From whom?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will deal with it, I suppose strictly speaking it should come in Oral Question period, but I think hon. members are aware that it would be most inappropriate for me to identify a source of complaints. I mean, any member of the House or any citizen of the Province would have the right to give information, present a complaint, and if there were some substantiation or sufficient substantiation then it would be followed up. But to identify complainants would be quite improper. A citizen or a member or anybody should, does

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

in fact, have the right to make such a complaint, to give what substantiation he or she has and to feel confident that this will remain confidential. So I can not answer, it would be improper for me to answer that. Somebody want to -

MR. S. NEARY:

I got a few more questions for you

now, 'Gerry'.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. H. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker; I would like to answer question No. 17 on the Order Paper asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) on July 26th pertaining to Mount Scio House. I have a list for the press and also for the hon. member.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

I beg leave, Sir, to present a petition on behalf of six residents of Day's Lane in Portugal Cove. I believe it is a lane that goes by the United Church graveyard. It is a rather unique petition, Mr. Speaker, in as much as the six signatures to this petition are complaining about a previous petition that was presented to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor) for an artesian well to be drilled in Day's Lane.

On the original petition that was presented to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, which is a standard form sent out by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Water Services Division, Water Supply Committee of Day's Lane, chairman, secretary, treasurer and so forth. On this petition there are seven signatures, names of householders represented by the committee and there are seven signatures and they are all in the same handwriting, Mr. Speaker, obviously, all signed by the secretary. The secretary's

MR. S. NEARY: signature is similar to the other seven signatures. So obviously the secretary wrote in seven names on this petition prior to the election to have an artesian well drilled down in Portugal Cove. Now, six out of the seven people whose names appear on that petition to have the artesian well drilled, six out of the seven are petitioning the government to have an investigation made into their signatures appearing on that form because they claim -

MR. E. ROBERTS: That is forgery.

MR. S. NEARY: - that is forgery and they claim that under no circumstances -

MR. J. MORGAN: Do they want a well?

MR. S. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: - they wanted the well but they did not want it in a certain gentleman's backyard who was supporting the member and the Tory Party, they did not want it in his backyard and this is the big question mark, Sir.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Have the well taken up and move.

MR. S. NEARY: No, they do not want it moved, they want to know why their names were put on the petition in the first place without their knowledge?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: And here is the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, "This is a complaint concerning an artesian well which was installed at government expense. It is located at the United Church Cemetery Road." I believe that is Day's Lane, Sir, as I identified it. "The reason for this complaint is that signatures which were used on the application were never signed by these people. Furthermore, we were never approached to attend any sort of a meeting to discuss the location or any other aspect of getting a government funded well. So we, the people who signed this petition as taxpayers and whose names which were used unknowingly to us, would like to have this matter looked

MR. S. NEARY:

into thoroughly by the government."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a fair request. If there was ever a case of false pretenses and forgery, Sir, this is it. And I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if I should lay this petition on the Table of the House and refer it to the Department of Municipal Affairs or to the Department of Justice. I believe if I put it on the Table of the House and refer it to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor) that the minister should have his colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer), investigate this matter. It is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, and brings into focus, Sir, the use of other people's names.

The gentleman who brought me this petition this morning was very concerned about the fact - he had already brought it to the attention of the Minister of Municipal Affairs - very concerned about the fact that nothing may be done about it. The well, incidently, was put there, it was put in the backyard of the one gentleman, the one signature on it, one out of the seven, who is legitimate, the other six are not legitimate signatures, they were all forged. And perhaps the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. T. Hickey) might be able to shed some light on this particular matter. But anyway, Sir, it is a very serious matter and these people are very concerned about it, the fact that anybody could go around and use their names

Mr. Neary: names unknowingly to them. And I hope that the government will not treat this matter lightly. I hope the minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - will ask his colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) to have it investigated, and that these people will be given a satisfactory explanation of why their names, and why their signatures were used without their authority. It is a very serious matter, Sir. I do not know what the legal implications are, Mr. Speaker, or the legal consequences, but I would submit, Sir, that they would be very great indeed, and whoever the culprit is who engineered this, who manipulated this, if he is a minister in the government or if he is a member of this House or somebody outside of this House then he should be severely reprimanded.

MR. MORGAN: Support the petition.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. MORGAN: Support the petition.

MR. NEARY: I am supporting the petition, of course, I am.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: It is a very serious matter.

MR. NEARY: It is a very serious matter, Sir.

In concluding, Sir, I would like to say to Your Honour and to the officials of the House that the gentleman who circulated the petition, got the six signatures on it, brought the original by mistake to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) and was merely able to give me a copy of it. So I am tabling a copy of the petition, Sir, and my name appears on it, and the date that I am presenting it and so forth, and also a copy attached of the original form that was filled out with seven signatures on it that were forged.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: So, Sir, I would like to lay this on the Table of the House -

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A point of order.

MR. NEARY: - and refer it to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is completely irregular to table a copy of a petition. The Standing Orders of the House are explicit on the matter. It says "That a petition shall be signed by the persons presenting it." Standing Order 91 (a), "A petition may be either printed or written and if more than three petitioners sign it, at least three signatures must appear on the page containing the prayer of the petition."

So any petition that is just a copy, Mr. Speaker, is not a petition per se, and it can only be if it has three signatures on the petition itself. And it is highly irregular. I could see where a new member of the House might bring in a petition of this nature, but I suggest to Your Honour it is highly irregular for anyone who has any knowledge at all with Standing Orders.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, the learned House Leader may have a technically correct point I will grant. But surely the purpose of petitions in this House is to serve the greater justice, the ends of justice. And if the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) was covering up this seamy little affair, as apparently he was, then I think my learned friend, if not in the law, learned in many other things friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has done the House and the people of this Province a service to expose this seamy little incident. Now I have no doubt the

Mr. Roberts: Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) will do what he ought to do which is authorize the investigation and let us find out who forged these signatures and whether public money was spent as a result of forgery, because that, Sir, is the gist of this petition, and that is why I say it is in order to bring it in even if some technical -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - little pettifoggery rule which is being misinterpreted by my learned friend opposite appears to be to the contrary.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): On the point of order. I believe I have heard enough argument. And I thank hon. members for their argument. The Standing Order is perhaps a little unclear and I would take the matter under advisement at this particular time.

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure, am I permitted now to speak to this petition?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you very much, Your Honour.

I simply rise, Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of order, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I have no objection at all to the hon. gentleman speaking, indeed I would welcome his speaking, but I would assume if he speaks to it, this means that the petition is being admitted. If not, surely his speech will have to await a decision of the Speaker as to whether the petition is in order or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - on that technical point.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order, I am advised as well that the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has made a legitimate point of order. I have not accepted the petition so, therefore, it will have to wait and see as to whether or not I accept the

Mr. Speaker (Simms): petition before any other hon. members can speak.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Addressed to the Hon. Minister of Finance, "I, The Lieutenant Governor of The Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of ~~sums~~ required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending 31st. March, 1980 by way of additional interim supply and in accordance with the Provisions of The British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

Signed

Gordon A. Winter,

Lieutenant Governor."

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Lieutenant-Governor's message be referred to a 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!

RESOLUTION:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st. day of March, 1980, the sum of two hundred and twenty-five million sixty thousand dollars (\$225,060,000).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

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

MR. SIMMONS: That is me. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) might by way of introduction, however brief, just bring the Committee up to date as to what has been requested earlier and approved earlier by the House insofar as Interim Supply is concerned, and also address himself somewhat to this amount here. Then I have certain observations I want to make and I am sure other members of the Committee have certain observations.

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, you will recall that there was an Interim Supply Bill brought in which covered the period from the 1st. of April to the 30th. of June and the sum at that time was \$354,120,000. That Interim Supply Bill was brought in before the budget was brought down. Now the present Interim Supply Bill goes on from there, goes on from the 1st. of July and extends to the last day of August and, of course, as hon. members will understand this is subsequent to the bringing down of the budget although the debate on

DR. J. COLLINS:

the budget is still going on.

The reason for bringing in interim supply, there are two reasons really, firstly is to pay the bills of government which are coming due. The authority to spend has now run out and to pay our bills we need to have that authority reinstated. And the second reason is that because the Budget Debate will go on for a while further, and it is anticipated that this might interfere with certain new projects, this Interim Supply Bill includes amounts for new projects, total amounts I might add because this is what must be done. If a new project is included in Interim Supply, the total amount to be extended over the full fiscal year for that project must be included. Even though the Interim Supply Bill itself is for a set period of time, in this case two months, even though it is set for that set period of time the new project allocation must be the total amount that will be expended in this financial year.

Another feature about this Interim Supply Bill, Mr. Chairman, is that it will include the amounts of two special warrants which were issued since the time of the last Interim Supply. There was one special warrant issued in early July, before the House sat following the recent general election, and then there was another special warrant issued shortly after the House sat but again, before a new supply bill had been brought in.

Mr. Chairman, I have details on the bill. The hon. members will have had the bill circulated and I think most of the details are in that. I might add that -

MR. ROBERTS:

Are you referring to the back page,

the schedules?

DR. J. COLLINS:

The schedules on the back page.

DR. J. COLLINS: They are just under headings. I might add that this Interim Supply Bill taken together with the first Interim Supply Bill, will give us a total of nearly \$580 million which is approximately 48 per cent of the total allocation that was asked for in the main Supply Bill, in the Budget. And that amount covers the first five months of the year only. But I would like to reiterate again that these two Interim Supply Bills do cover certain projects for which the full amount that will be allotted this fiscal year - that those Interim Supply Bills do include the full amounts for those particular projects.

Those new projects in question relate to cost-sharing agreements that have been made with the federal government, particularly with DREE, but certain other agreements also, and these new projects will amount to \$23 million. They also include funds for the improvement and reconstruction of highways - that is \$10 million, and another sum of nearly \$1 million for further reconstruction of the Trans-Canada Highway, so that these new projects amount to, very nearly, \$34 million.

Mr. Chairman, there are other details I could add but I am not certain if hon. members at this point in time require these, but any that are asked for I will make an attempt to supply.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister. He referred to the amount earlier voted under Interim Supply as \$354,120,000, we are now being asked for another \$225 million, giving us a total of just under \$600 million or \$579 million. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, in a very dubious way we are making history today. I do not suppose ever before did a government come to a House and look for total Interim Supply of the order of 50 per cent of the expenditure programme for the year. It is an unprecedented situation and it takes us back to the mini-debate we had on the first Interim Supply request back in May or April, first when the current minister assumed his portfolio. And I am sure he will remember as well as we do how much he was obliged to squirm when he was asked the question by me and others as to whether, in effect, his Interim Supply Bill of that date was not a Budget. I told him it was. I told him there would

MR. SIMMONS: be no other Budget before the election. He gave us various dates as to when the Budget might come down and he was off by at least three months on any of the dates.

We are now being asked, Mr. Chairman, to give to government a carte blanche for something of the order of 50 per cent of the government's expenditure programmes. I say first of all, that is history, however dubious a sort it is - but we are making history today, and I hope it is the kind of history that will not be repeated in the near future. I hope, also, that we will not again find ourselves towards the end of July asking the House to approve expenditures in a fairly rubber stamp fashion. Because I say to government members of the Committee that these expenditures are incurred pretty much beyond recall at this point in time, and more and more the House is being manoeuvred into a rubber stamp procedure. Now, one can argue that it was not King Henry who cut off Anne Boleyn's head, but the guillotine or the axe as the case may be. But in the same way you can argue that somehow the reason for this is because of the election. And I am sure you follow my point. If you go back far enough it comes back, not to an election or a change of leaders in the Tory Party,

MR. R. SIMMONS: it goes back to a lack of fiscal management. Those who pre-determined the course of events that the Tory Party and the Province governmentally has been on during the past eight months or so, should have had enough fiscal responsibility about them to assign a different set of dates to the various events. I am talking about the Tory Leadership convention, the election, the whole thing. Here we are now in August asking for money that, in effect, has been spent in July, has been spent in June, has been spent in May. I could get excited if we had, as has been paraded, a change of administration, if we had fifteen or eighteen new faces but when I see the same tired faces with new labels then I cannot get caught up in this new administration versus old administration. I cannot. And I must point the finger at the new-old administration, the re-labeled but still tired administration, I must point the finger at them for the situation we find ourselves in today, on the 30th. of July, where the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has to mount enough gall to come in here and ask for half a billion dollars with the money essentially committed anyway. I say, Mr. Chairman, one of the not so complimentary things which will be said about this administration - if they want to split hairs, this administration and their predecessor who are the same people - one of the things that will be hung around their necks, one of the albatrosses of their administration will be that they introduced incredibly bad fiscal management into the affairs of the Province.

Another, Mr. Chairman, will be - another of the footnotes about them will be that they manoeuvred the House ever more and more into becoming a rubber stamp procedure. Everytime this administration comes for interim financing, for Interim Supply rather, or for any authority from the House, it is one of those gun-to-the-head approaches. We have to have it by tomorrow morning or the civil servants will not get paid. We have to have it by Wednesday or the welfare cheques will not go out. Always a very convincing, very forceful, very effective lever which has the effect, Mr. Chairman, of stifling the debate, of manoeuvring the House into this rubber

MR. R. SIMMONS: stamp procedure. Of course, in the example of Anne Boleyn, the axeman had no choice but the axeman did not make the decision. And in this situation here, we have very little choice. Because I bet you my bottom dollar, Mr. Chairman, if we hold her down in this procedure any length of time, we are here two or three days, for example, I will write the speech for the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) on this point-I will not write it, I will just tell you what he said ten times before and he will now say it for the eleventh time. He will be up and saying, 'The poor civil servants will not get paid'. Those people we are paying \$50,000 and \$47,000, these poor people, they will not get paid. They will not be able to put whole wheat bread and dairy butter on their tables this week. The welfare people will not get paid. I will hear his speech before Tuesday is out or Thursday is out if we hang it down that long on this particular procedure.

Well, Mr. Chairman, these things need to be said. We would like to say them at much more length and we may be obliged to if the minister does not give us some answers during this particular procedure. But we will, in the first instance, adopt the stance of saying them quickly. As I say, if we have to say them more slowly and more often and more repetitiously we can do it that way too, that will depend on the kind of answers we get.

Mr. Chairman, one of the observations I want to make about this bill or this request and therefore about the Budget as a whole is this myth, this absolutely unfounded, this malicious myth that somehow this government is big on resource development. In only one way, Mr. Chairman, is this government big on resource development and that is in talking about it. They are very big on talk! Very big on talk! I ask you to take the Estimates, the Summary page, the Roman Numeral Page IV, statement IV "The Summary of Current Account by Department, or you could take the one

MR. SIMMONS: capital account for the department for that matter, the following page, but just the current, just to give you an example, it is one that I have done the figures on. But I believe I ought to do it on the capital account and a little later on in committee I might do so. We hear all the raving about what this government has done in the fisheries area, for example, what they have done in the fisheries area. Well, if you look at the 1979 figures you will find that the revised for 1978 was \$5.7 million and then you see that this year it is \$7.5 and you kind of get encouraged. You say from \$5.7 million to \$7.5, that is a fairly hefty expenditure, that is a sizeable jump, the government is putting their money where their mouth is, until you realize they have played some tricks with the figures, until you go back to last year's estimates and you find that last year they really intended to spend nearly \$7 million anyway. You find last year they intended to spend 6.6 and underspent in that department by amount \$1 million. Now that itself is not a crime. Thank God, we find a department that under spends once in a while. That is not a crime. But the crime, the sin, is in the misconception it leaves. Because you see, Mr. Chairman, in terms of what was needed last year compared to what is being requested this year, the jump is only about \$1 million, from 6.6 to 7.5, or really less than a million, just enough, I would submit, to account for the inflationary factors. Or you could take the Department of Forestry and Lands for example. Last year \$16 million - and here is one I would think that needs some explanation really, \$16 million requested. That cannot be right because the figure is so far off. The net expenditure last year for Forestry and Agriculture, as it was then called, was \$16.1. Now, there has got to be some discrepancies in the figures because - I suppose Agriculture has gone to Rural, but as I adjudge the figures, or look at the figures of the department concerned, Rural, Agricultural and Northern, and Lands and Forests, the amounts being spent on Agriculture are fairly

MR. SIMMONS: minimal in comparison to the amounts on Forestry. And yet I find by looking at the figures that last year's figure both for Forestry, Agriculture and Lands, as it was last year, was 16.1 and yet only 8.8 was spent, only a little over half the amount requested on current account was spent. Now there has to be, I say to the Minister of Finance, (Dr. Collins) some explanation for that. But having said that, I want you to follow me to the next point. If you look at that table on Roman Numeral V in the estimates, you will see that last year the net expenditure was 8.6 and this year they are asking for 12 and so you get all excited, you say, "Bully for them," they are putting up their expenditure by one third or so, they are really going all out in terms of Forestry and Lands, they are going from 8 to 12, until you look back and see that they were supposed to spend 16 last year.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the department.

MR. SIMMONS: No, there is more than that to it I would say to the minister and as he studies the figures he will find out. The point I want to make here, Mr. Chairman, before my twenty minutes expire and I take a spell and get back at it again - Am I out of time, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) No.

MR. SIMMONS: The point I want to make is that all this talk about resource development is an absolute myth, an absolute myth. Two things, Mr. Chairman, are helping our fairly strong performance in the resource sector right now, two things. Two things are helping our strong performance in the resource sector right now and neither of them have anything to do with this government's fiscal management or economic management of the economy, nothing whatsoever. Two things account for our strong performance, particularly, insofar as the fisheries are concerned; one is the 200 mile limit negotiated by that great federal liberal government under Pierre Elliott Trudeau, the 200 mile limit - and our great friend and a friend of the Minister of Fisheries, (Mr. W. Carter), Romeo LeBlanc - that is the first thing, and the other

MR. SIMMONS:

thing, Mr. Chairman,

that is helping our resource sector and helping it have a continued strong performance is our dollar position, our exchange rate in comparison to the United States, the American dollar. And I hope the present administration across the House does not take any credit or blame for that one. If the Canadian dollar began at all to approach parity with the American in the next little while this hon. crowd over there . Mr. Chairman, would be hard put to find some indicators of good health in the fishery sector or the forestry sector or the mining sector.

MR. SIMMONS: This particular sector, predominantly export oriented, is dependent for its health, Mr. Chairman, its good health at the moment, its continuing good, strong performance, not on the economic stimulus which this government thinks it is providing. Indeed, its performance is somewhat despite what this government is doing. But more to the point and more positively, the performance in the resource sector, I repeat, has to do largely with the Canadian dollar relative to its American counterpart, and in the case of the fishery sector particularly, relates, of course, to the initiatives taken federally with no particular encouragement, Mr. Chairman, from the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Cartar) - and I wish he were here now - in the face of a number of fairly obstructionist tactics by the present administration, or if they want to be semantic, their predecessor, the Moores administration, the same administration with the different labels.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that I am just about out of time now, but we will have another go at it in a little while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, first of all, Sir, I want to express great disappointment at the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), as my hon. colleague indicated, on the procedure that he used to introduce this rather substantial Interim Supply bill. The hon. the Minister of Finance, Sir, except for my friend who needled him a little bit, had no intention at all of giving any explanation about this \$.25 billion that the hon. gentleman was asking for in Interim Supply. And add this on to the previous Interim Supply Bill and you are talking about \$.50 billion - \$500 million in Interim Supply. Well, my first remark, Sir, my first reaction, is that we find ourselves in this hon. House in a most unusual and unique situation indeed, where we have two Interim Supply Bills being brought before the House in the same year. I do not believe it has ever happened before. - and two Interim Supply Bills, Mr. Chairman, before the House at a time when we are debating the Budget, when we are examining the

MR. NEARY: Estimates of the revenue and expenditure for the year - most unusual indeed. It is most irregular and most unusual and probably never happened before in this House and I would submit, Your Honour, very rarely happened in any other House throughout the free world - two Interim Supply Bills in the same year and the second Interim Supply Bill before the House when we are debating the Estimates. That is indeed, Sir, a very peculiar and strange situation indeed. I do not know if there is justification for it or not - I personally do not believe that there was. I think the government could have planned better and then we would not find ourselves in this situation. We, in Opposition now find ourselves using up the time of the Interim Supply Bill - the time the clock starts to tick off, as Your Honour knows - the amount of time we spend on the Interim Supply Bill is being deducted from the seventy-five hours that we are allowed to discuss Estimates in this House. Do you realize, Mr. Chairman, that we are discussing \$1.4 billion in the Estimates and we have seventy-five hours to do it? There are 365 days in a year - multiplied by twenty-four hours, how much is that? - 8,000 and some odd hours a year. And out of that, say, 8,500 hours, the government are generous enough to give us seventy-five hours to discuss \$1.4 billion. How generous can they get? And the time we are spending now on Interim Supply is being deducted from the seventy-five hours. And this is the hon. crowd, Sir, that we heard bellyaching for years about how the Legislature was used for a rubber stamp. And on top of that now, Sir, they have three committees meeting.

Mr. Neary: The estimates are not even going to be debated in the House, they are farmed out. And we saw the beginning of the fiasco this morning. That is just the beginning of it. Hidden away! They were generous enough to give us seventy-five hours out of three hundred and sixty-five days a year, twenty-four hours a day, eight thousand and some hours, seventy-five hours. Eighty-seven hundred hours in a year and out of that the government is generous enough to give us seventy-five hours to discuss the estimates.

Mr. Chairman, we could take the whole seventy-five hours just discussing the public debt, which according to my reckoning, page 27 of the Budget, is \$2,601,700, that is the public debt at the present time. That is the highest personal per capita debt in the whole of Canada. And it has tripled, the public debt has tripled in this Province in less than seven years, and we have nothing to show for it.

When the Liberal Administration was turfed out of office back on January 18, 1972, the total Provincial debt direct and indirect, money owing, was between \$800 million and \$900 million. Seven years later it is \$2,601,000,000. It is incredible, Sir. It is enough to frighten you. I would not mind, Mr. Chairman, if we had anything to show for it, we have nothing but a record of failures, mismanagement, corruption. That is all we have had in the last seven years. And the new Premier and his colleagues are now telling us that they are born again, a born-again government, they are not going to accept any responsibility at all for anything that happened in the past, for the tripling of this Provincial debt. The hon. the Premier who was a senior minister in Mr. Moores Government is now telling us that he has been living in sin for the last seven years, but he has been saved, he is born again, and he is in no way responsible for tripling that debt. No way responsible.

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) born again, a minister in the Moores Government, the Moores

Mr. Neary: Administration, the Queen's Government, the Moores Administration, a minister in that administration not accepting any responsibility at all for the mismanagement and the failures and the lack of creativity, of developing new industry in this Province. They have not even found a mine, they have not opened a new industry, they never built a fish plant in seven years, and yet the public debt has tripled. And now the hon. gentleman, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) who had to bail out of the Moores Administration because of corrupt practices and procedures, tells us that he is born again, and he is back into The Born-Again Administration, but wants nothing to do with the tripling of the Provincial debt. No, he turns up his nose at that. Turns up his nose at it.

Well every minister, Sir, every man who is sitting over there now who was a minister in the Moores Administration has to accept his share of responsibility for tripling the Provincial debt of Newfoundland with nothing to show for it, except the highest taxes in Canada, record unemployment. I know this is going to sound like old hat, Mr. Chairman, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - but it will sound like the same - but, Sir, I often wondered why Joey had to keep repeating himself over and over and over and over again. He did not have to repeat himself over and over and over again for the people to understand, or the members of this House to understand, he had to keep repeating himself over and over and over again so some of the editorial writers and some of the newsmen would understand, not all of them, so that some of them would understand, some of those who are serving their apprenticeship, compliments of Canada Manpower in this House.

MR. MORGAN: It is not Wick Collins, for sure.

MR. NEARY: No, not Sticky Wicky. Sticky Wicky knows what it is all about, and he is not very complimentary to the administration these days. But he knows, Sir, what the public debt is all about. And I know what it is all about. But you have got some of these

MR. S. NEARY: gentlemen who say, "Ah well, you know, there they go again, they are bellyaching about the public debt." Well, we know what the public debt is. That is what they are saying, well, you are not telling us anything new.

Well, Mr. - is it ten minutes or twenty we have in this debate?

MR. J. CARTER: Five.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Ten.

MR. S. NEARY: Ten minutes? Oh well, I will have to come back at it again because I want to talk a little bit about the Premier's house. That is included in this Interim Supply Bill.

I got an answer to a question today, Mr. Chariman, from the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. H. Young) who is going to spend \$100,000, \$100,000 to renovate the Premier's house. That could build four houses for ordinary people in this Province and that certainly could give a lot of eyeglasses and a lot of dentures to senior citizens and little children in this Province who need eyeglasses and wheelchairs but I will talk about that - my time is up. I will come back and I will have another go at it, Mr. Chariman, and my colleague, I do not know where he is gone.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is still down in the -

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I do not, contrary to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), I do not propose to waste words, at least I hope I am not going to waste words on matters of the public debt. The resource development, spoken of by the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. R. Simmons) and other such matters are matters that, I would suggest to this Committee, can perhaps be best dealt with when the committees consider the Budget as the Budget is before them. However, I do wish to speak for just a moment on the observations made by both previous speakers with respect to the amount of this Interim Supply Bill.

MR. W. MARSHALL: It has been stated that this House has sought five months Interim Supply. That is not so, Mr. Chairman. The past House sought three months Interim Supply, an election intervened and now we are merely seeking two months Interim Supply which represents the payments which had to be made out in July for which there were special warrants and for August month while the Budget is being considered by the House or by the committees of the House.

Now, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. R. Simmons), when he was speaking, referred in his comments to when the three months Supply Bill was passed in the last session of the last assembly of this House which took place in March of this year. At that particular time I remember well the Opposition - and he mentions the same tired faces over here. Do they not wish they had the same tired faces over there in the profusion that they have over here? There would be a different situation. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that at that particular time when Interim Supply was brought before the House, there was the rational reason for debate that normally comes up in Interim Supply where no Budget has been brought before the House or before the Committee and there were observations made to that end.

At this particular time, the Budget Speech has been given, the Budget is here, all of the items of expenditure have been set out. What is really asked in this Interim Supply Bill is for two months Interim Supply which represents one-fifth or one-sixth of the year's expenditure and can be directly related to the departments as set forth here. For instance, I will not do the mathematics when I am on my feet here but the fact of the matter is that it is just merely one-sixth of the votes for the department as set forth, with one or two exceptions as the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) has indicated, which are for specific capital projects in order to have highway paving continued during the Summer months and in order to do the programmes which are federally funded. So it is not a case of having the House rubber stamp anything, it is not a case of attempting to get approval for expenditure without giving all of the details. I suggest to you,

July 30, 1979

Tape No. 409

SD - 3

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Committee, that the details have been put forth quite fully in the Budget Speech and in the Estimates which are before the Committee itself and I would suggest that certainly, if hon. members feel that it is necessary for debate, debate should certainly continue. Obviously, I am not saying that but what I am saying is,

MR. MARSHALL: there is full information and it is not as the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir indicated that we were seeking supply in the dark and seeking a carte blanche, as it were, which was what he said, of expenditure. We are not seeking that. The expenditures, as I say, are detailed in the Budget itself. As for the other matters with respect to the public debt, resource development and what have you, creativity in the projects that have been started by this government, I will certainly draw issue with anybody in this House with respect to the performance of the present administration, but I think that that could be best left, in my own opinion anyway, in the Budget Speech itself rather than in the matter of Interim Supply.

MR. NEARY: You are not going to tell them what to say or do, are you?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Last person in the world I (inaudible) or even want to.

I do not even want to.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the message was the hon. gentleman was trying to get through to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, but whatever it was I would submit that Your Honour ignore it. This is a wide open debate, and the hon. gentleman again in his own little cute way is trying to restrict debate in this House. We know the rules, Mr. Chairman, as well as the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman does not have to get up and give us a lecture about the Budget being brought down and this sort of foolish nonsense. Mr. Chairman, here is a golden opportunity for us in this House to get some facts and some information brought out on the floor, on the table of the House, rather than down in the back rooms of Colonial Building somewhere, and that is what we intend to do. At least, that is what I intend to do, I guarantee the hon. gentleman that, And I am not going to go traipsing off to some little hole outside of the House of Assembly where we should be debating and discussing estimates, And then the hon. gentleman gets up and tries to relay some kind of a cute little message to the Chairman that the

MR. NEARY: hon. Chairman is not going to fall for. The hon. gentleman has only been here a short while but he knows more about the rules than that, than the hon. gentleman is trying to give him credit for.

Anyway, when I took my seat before, Mr. Chairman, I was talking about the Premier's house, Mt. Scio House, and I was given an answer to a question today by the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. H. Young), and we all know that Mt. Scio House is going to cost \$100,000 to renovate, \$100,000. That could build four houses for the poor people of this Province, probably build five.

MR. YOUNG: You would have to pay that for a building lot.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? Who paid it for a building lot? I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, is the hon. gentleman trying to say something?

MR. YOUNG: What kind of house can you build for \$25,000, name it, where can you get it?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is asking me what kind of a house can you build for \$25,000. Well, Mr. Chairman, give me \$100,000 to take down to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Davis Inlet.

MR. NEARY: - no, not Davis Inlet - to take down to my own district in Burnt Islands or Rose Blanche or Grand Bruit or Lapoile or Petites, give me \$100,000 and I will get four houses built and they will be fit for the hon. gentleman to walk into. They will be fit for the Queen to go into, let alone the hon. gentleman. Four houses. But look at all the eyeglasses it would buy for little children who need eyeglasses, or wheelchairs, or crutches for little children who cannot get them now, the government has no program to give crippled people or to give little children wheelchairs. Ah, the hon. gentleman is screwing up his face at that. Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying

MR. NEARY: to make here is, Sir, that it is about time that we in this hon. House started talking about matters that affected the ordinary Newfoundlander and not just try to make things comfortable for ourselves. I want to point out right from the start, Sir, that nowhere else in the whole of Canada, nowhere in no other province of Canada, does the government provide the Premier with a house, no other province of Canada except Newfoundland, except in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman. Did Your Honour know that before? There is no other province of Canada, apart from Newfoundland, who gives the Premier a house. Well, Newfoundlanders are pretty hospitable and generous people and maybe they say, "Well, the poor old Premier deserves a house". Well, okay, let us say that that is so; let us say that Newfoundlanders are different than other Canadians, that we are wealthy enough here; that we do not pay very many taxes in Newfoundland; we do not have the highest Social Security tax in Canada; we do not have record unemployment; we do not pay the highest taxes in Canada; we do not pay the second highest electricity rates in Canada, so why should we not give the Premier a house?

MR. NEARY: Let us say that is the way they feel about it. The generous Newfoundlanders say, 'Sure, boy, go ahead, have a house.' Okay, that is fine, Sir, I will go along with that if that is what the Newfoundland people say. But to spend \$100,000 then, Mr. Chairman, to renovate it, I would say, Sir, is going a little bit too far. There is an example, Sir, of the original beggar on horseback - \$100,000. And I asked a question on the Order Paper of the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. H. Young). I said, 'Give me a list showing the fixtures, appliances, furniture, painting etc. to be purchased for Mount Scio House.' And back comes the answer, 'Not yet determined. This information will be available after the fitting up, including the purchase of furniture, appliances, etc. is completed.' In other words, Sir, they cannot determine the amount. And then I said, 'Give me the cost of maintaining Mount Scio House after it is occupied by the Premier.' Again, back comes the answer, 'This figure has not yet been determined.' And so it goes, Mr. Chairman. In other words, we do not know whether it is going to cost \$100,000 or \$150,000. The figure, according to the answer the minister gave me today in writing, is not yet determined. It could be more than \$100,000. But I also, Sir, asked the hon. gentleman a couple of more questions in connection with Mount Scio House. And one of the questions I asked the hon. gentleman, and he could have got me the information but he declined to do so, and I hope the born-again Premier will take note of this - this is the kind of co-operation that led us into the chaotic situation we were into in this House for seven years when his predecessor was here - I asked the hon. gentleman to find out if and when Mount Scio House was declared the official residence of the Premier if there was any rental owing on that house. Because remember, Mr. Chairman, that when Mr. Frank Moores became Premier of this Province he rented Mount Scio House for \$650 a month from Memorial University. And the question I put on the Order Paper for the hon. gentleman - Was that rent paid to Memorial University or to the provincial Department of Public Works up to the time it was declared the official residence of the Premier just a few weeks ago? The hon. gentleman came back and here is the answer he

MR. NEARY: gave me: 'My department does not have access to internal financial information concerning Memorial University and its tenants.' Mr. Chairman, that is not right and it is not true. Who is the government of this Province? Who is the government, Mr. Chairman? The hon. gentleman is a minister of the Crown and they are governing this Province and the University is a creature of this House and of this government. And why could not the hon. gentleman call up the accountant down there or send him over the question and say, 'Would you answer this for me?' Why would not the hon. gentleman do it? Because the hon. gentleman wanted to be unco-operative. The hon. gentleman does have the access to that information and can get it and should have gotten it before he rushed into the House with his answer. And then I asked also, Did the University or the government write off any arrears owing in rent by the previous Premier, Mr. Frank Moores prior to Mount Scio House being declared the official residence of the Premier? And again, back comes the answer, 'My department

MR. NEARY:

department does not have access to Memorial University's financial data. The hon. gentleman could have gotten me that information. Now I have got to go about it again to try to get the information, put another question on the Order Paper. Who do I have to get the information from, Mr. Chairman? I come into this House as an elected member of the people of this Province and I ask a minister of the Crown a question. I do not ask the University, I do not ask Newfoundland Hydro, I do not ask the flunkies, I ask the minister responsible and I get pawned off and it is not good enough, Sir. It is not good enough. Because I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that one of the reasons Mount Scio House was declared the official residence of the Premier, I have that strange feeling, was because there was a substantial amount of rent in arrears owing on it. I would think \$40,000 or \$50,000. Take seven years rent, Sir, \$650 a month for six years, that is over \$40,000. I doubt very much, although I could be wrong but I want to find out and that is why I asked the question, but now I have to take a shot in the dark because I can only come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman refused to get me the information and tried to cover up. I have the strangest feeling, Mr. Chairman, that no rent was ever paid on that house and if it was it was only paid for a short while and that is one of the reasons why it was declared the official residence of the Premier retroactively, so that the rent would not have to be paid and we are talking about \$40,000 or \$50,000. I could be wrong. I hope I am. But I want the information and I want it straightened out.

I also want straightened out, Sir - and the hon. gentleman says here, he confirms something I already knew anyway, that neither the University, Mr. Chairman, nor the provincial Department of Public Works authorized any renovations for that house, yet Metro Engineering, an A.B. Walsh Company, went in and renovated the downstairs part of that house. And the hon. gentlemen may look at me and say, well so what, what is wrong with that?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) enough time (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, I only have a minute left, Sir, and somebody else wants to speak and I will get up and I will tell the hon. gentleman what I am talking about. I will tell the hon. gentleman about the gift

MR. NEARY:

that was given to Mr. Frank D. Moores, a gift of renovating the downstairs part of that house without any approval from the Minister of Public Works or without any approval from Memorial University.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) if you can get it.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave, if you can get it.

MR. NEARY: No boy, I have my leave. I have all the time I want.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is going to have a few words now.

But it is something that should be looked at, just another one, a continuation in the series of things that we saw go on in this Province that are not going to be swept under the rug even though the hon. gentlemen may try to portray the impression that they are born again. These matters are going to have to be dealt with. And it would not do us any harm to spend a couple of hours on Interim Supply to try to get some answers and try to get some facts and some information out to the people of this Province. My time is up, Sir, I realize that. So I will yield now and let somebody else have the floor but I will be back at it again.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, a number of points have come up and perhaps this would be a convenient time to answer them. Firstly, the question was raised, whether the first Interim Bill that was brought in in this fiscal year was a budget. Mr. Chairman, that is putting a rather extreme interpretation on things. The first Interim Bill was a housekeeping bill plus certain capital projects and, as I have explained, at that time and similarly in this Interim bill, any new capital projects have to be budgeted in their full amount, the full amount that will be expended over the whole year on those particular projects. So the first Interim Supply Bill could not be called a budget in any way.

The point was also raised that it must be very unusual to have two Interim Supply Bills. I do not know if it is all that unusual, Mr. Chairman. If I recall correctly the federal government has brought in two full budgets in a twelve month period. We have not gone that far yet, ours are just two Interim Supply Bills. It

DR. COLLINS:

was suggested that these are excessively large Interim Supply Bills. They are large Interim Supply Bills, there is no doubt about that. And the reason for it is that the budget is late and this is somewhat unique, I suppose, but nevertheless it is a fact of life. And if government is to have its ongoing housekeeping and other responsibilities taken care of as well as to take advantage of the cost-sharing arranged with the federal government, which if we do not take advantage of will pass us by. So we have

DR. J. COLLINS: to take advantage of these. And then there were especially large expenditures in regard to highway construction. In the two Interim Supply Bills, Mr. Chairman - I have the note here - I think the total amounts that we will actually be expending on transportation comes to a total of \$86,100,000. It was \$39.6 million in the first Interim Supply Bill and \$46.5 million, so \$86.1 million expended on transportation projects which is a very sizable amount.

If we look at this particular bill itself, we will see that again transportation projects come to \$46.5 million, other cost-sharing projects - \$16.4 million. So the ongoing or housekeeping and other routine expenditures of government being funded are \$162.2 million, approximately. Now, if one takes the total current expenditure for the year, which is just over \$1.1 billion, that works out at approximately \$89 million a month and so that \$162 million for this two month period is not out of line with what one would expect for a two month period.

The Committee, Mr. Chairman, may be interested in knowing the details of the cost-sharing projects that are covered in this Interim Supply Bill. In the Department of Health, the Makkovik Clinic - \$100,000. In the Department of Forestry, I should, actually, have the proper names for these, the Department of Forestry and Agriculture, that name is the ongoing name, \$400,000, that is for forestry reforestation and thinning projects. The Department of Tourism, Gross Morne National Park - \$230,000. The Department of Fisheries for inshore fishery development programs - \$375,000. The Department of Industrial Development for NORDCO, this is current expenditure - \$475,000. The Department of Rural Development for Labrador development programmes, including those under the Eskimo and Indian agreement - \$2.9 million. And the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation - \$2 million.

DR. J. COLLINS: The final point I would like to make at this stage, Mr. Chairman, is that the Premier's house, this may well be a subject for legitimate debate but the Premier's house is not actually included in the Interim Supply. That, in a way, should be more properly debated during the main Supply.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, that is wrong. The minister, if I might, is wrong because there certainly is in the Interim Supply money to pay at least one official who is doing some work on the Premier's house, so it is quite in order to debate it. Whether it should be debated or not is another story, but it is quite in order to debate it, I would submit.

DR. J. COLLINS: Well, the expenditure, I will check that out as the hon. member has brought it up by the expenditure -

MR. E. ROBERTS: There may be nothing in there for capital expenditure I do not doubt -

DR. J. COLLINS: Right, that was what I was referring to.

MR. E. ROBERTS: - but I thought I heard him to say that since this amount does not include anything for the Premier's - whatever is to be done at Mount Scio House, that it could not be debated. But the point I was making is simply that Interim Supply really is the most wide-open Supply debate you can imagine because if, for example, as there is doubtlessly, salary for the Deputy Minister of Public Works including, then it would be quite proper to mention Mount Scio House because that comes under the Deputy Minister of Public Works. I think the minister can see what I am getting at, there is no limit at all to this debate that is all I am saying.

DR. J. COLLINS: The hon. member was on his way in, perhaps I did not express myself properly. I did not mean to say that it could not be debated, what I meant was it could more properly be debated as the capital costs are not included in the Interim Supply Bill.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, some may say we will never get to see the capital costs.

July 30, 1979

Tape No. 413

SD - 3

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I was only going to say a few words this afternoon and, indeed, wondered whether I ought to say anything at all or wait for the major Budget debate but when the Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall), as I walked in, suggested that in some way or other there was some impropriety in having members on this side or on the government side, for that matter, deal with specific items under Interim Supply, then I felt the necessity to get up to reassert what is surely one of the most fundamental and unchallengeable aspects of parliamentary democracy and that is, that if the government brings in Interim Supply it runs the hazard of whatever

MR. JAMIESON: kind of debate the Opposition or indeed, some of its own members may wish to bring up. And for the House Leader on the government side (Mr. Marshall) to suggest that because we have established certain committees in this House to deal with certain headings of expenditure that consequently this particular debate ought to be limited and narrow is a repudiation, I repeat, of one of the most fundamental principles of parliamentary democracy and therefore, for my part, I feel that I ought to put that on the record and at the same time say a few words in a general way to also reaffirm that there are no limitations insofar as this particular debate is concerned.

I want to particularly talk about the matters which were raised by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) with regard to the seeming, the illusory developmental policies of this government. But before I do that I also want to say a word about some of the things which the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made reference to earlier this afternoon, and that is that I must say that setting aside the substantive question as to whether or not and what kind of perks ought to be provided for elected members or heads of government or whatever, I find it extremely surprising that it was not possible in this answer tabled by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) today to at the very least indicate the answers in a more specific way than simply to slough it off on the University. Now if that is the case it is probably a completely defensible answer in law and in every other way, but you know and I know - and I emphasize once again - I am not here talking about the rights or the privileges or the concessions that may be made, I am simply saying that when they are made, whether they are made to the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition or any member of this House, the public has a right to know. And that is the fundamental point that is at issue here. And I suggest, in line with the current Premier's, I believe, sincere anxiety and wish, to have the public record as total as it is possible to be, that there is nothing improper about the questions that were asked by the member for LaPoile, and that members on this side

MR. JAMIESON: should at the very least be given the kind of information which even, as he himself has said, may simply be that what he has suggested is untrue. If anybody opposite is quite prepared to say that these allegations or these suspicions or these rumours are untrue, then it is also one of the strongest rules of parliamentary procedure that we must accept that. And certainly for my part, I would be 100 per cent prepared to do just that. So therefore, I want to just in passing say that this kind of answer, the first part, I think, is entirely commendable and I believe it reflects on what the current Premier intends to do. I am perfectly happy to wait to see what this list is and so on and so forth - I have no problem with that. What does worry me, however, is that when we get to certain things in questions d) e) and f) that there is a kind of - well, almost a cop-out by saying, 'My department does not have access to Memorial University's financial data: Now we all know very well that there is a more solid and a more substantive answer than that, and I would urge the government to take another look at some of these questions if for no other reason than to clear the air. Because if we are going in this House to have open and frank debate and if we are going to have, by the way, the type of friendly co-operative, although albeit on occasion combative activity on behalf of the people of Newfoundland - and it is not enough to simply sit back and say, 'Oh, well, this is a smear tactic,' or 'This is just innuendo,' - one has to recognize that some of these questions are raised in a very legitimate and a very fair form. And may I, by the way, compliment the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in this regard. It has been to me a real breath of fresh air to have the minister get up, and, by the way, I thoroughly agree with him this afternoon - whether I disagree with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) or not, I am not sure - when he says that he is not at liberty to give the source of the confidential information on which any kind of investigation is laid. I agree with that. So consequently, this is not just a matter of saying that whatever we do on this side we are all going to be in agreement or whatever is done over there other than in the ministry, you are all going to be in agreement. But nevertheless, the Minister of Justice has set a very good example

July 30, 1979

Tape 414

EC. - 3

MR. JAMIESON:

and has laid a number of ghosts to rest -

MR. NEARY:

Right.

MR. JAMIESON:

- within a matter of two or three days.

Why?

MR. NEARY:

A few more to go yet.

MR. JAMIESON:

Why? Because he was open and he was frank

with the House.

MR. JAMIESON: There was nothing devious about his answers. Where he could give them, he gave them. Where he could not give them, we have a respect for his integrity which is adequate for me, and so, therefore, I recommend that same kind of process all throughout. We are not going to get anywhere if, when a member asks a question which is potentially embarrassing, or if a member asks a question which may be based on the very kind of confidential information to which the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) has referred and he cannot disclose it, he is instantly accused of not having any substance for what he is asking, so consequently, the Minister of Justice's defence is surely precisely the same defence that we on this side of the House have when we ask questions sometimes and people say to us, "Well, give us the facts". So consequently, it is in a feeling of openness and general co-operation that I am quite sure that we can dispell a lot of the unreasonable and unnecessary tensions and the like that have existed from time to time throughout this House. And by the way, you know, in any jurisdiction it is also surely a matter of ladies and gentlemen, as we now are in this House, having the capacity to accept each other's word. Surely one of the most fundamental premises upon which this kind of institution functions is that we have a situation where we are completely satisfied that we are levelling, in a sense, with each other. I make these points in passing lest there be some doubt that I do not support my colleagues or some of my colleagues or the member for Lapoile (Mr. S. Neary) when he asked what I consider to be perfectly legitimate questions and when he gets what are, in my judgement, quite inadequate answers from a parliamentary point of view.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was, as I have said, going to talk at some length about what the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. R. Simmons) had to say about the continuing emphasis which this government, and I call it this government since 1972, whatever the transformations or the transitions may be it is still

MR. JAMIESON: this government that has been consistently in office during all of that time, and really I do wish - I would almost - if we were in a filibuster which is one of the things that I can assure the hon. House Leader I have no intention of getting into, I would like to begin with this sheaf of documents going back to 1972 and coming clear on through to the most recent Budget and the most recent Throne Speech and see how many times the same words have been used about "We are going to put our full effort behind fisheries development. We are going to maximize the income from our resources". It has been going on altogether too long. I can almost paraphrase them year after year, that we have been getting an inadequate return from our resources. Each one has parroted the other from 1972 right clean on through to the present day, and the end result, however, the end result of all of that in this particular set of interim supply measures which we have before us today is a series of expenditures which are fundamentally the same in terms of the resources that they are supporting as those of 1972. When I talked across the floor the other day in one of the debates to, I believe it was, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy and Industrial Development (Mr. L. Barry) and I put it to him fairly and bluntly that whatever the verbiage that is in the Budget, whatever is in the Throne Speech, the truth of the matter is that this year as in 1972, this government is staking the economic future of this Province for the next five years, by and large, on the fishery and on hydro developments in Labrador. Now, there will be peripheral activity. I could quote chapter and verse again from 1972 on on the very item which the gentleman, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. J. Morgan) I believe it is, talked about this afternoon - sawmilling. The first Throne Speech talked about sawmilling. This one talks about it. Today we are studying it. We are going to send another group out. So, from 1972 on, we have gambled; we had the whole business in Bay d'Espoir turning bottom up

July 30, 1979

Tape No. 415

GH-3

MR. JAMIESON:

and I realize there have been improvements, I am not saying that, I am saying, however, and the hon. the Premier will also know surely

MR. JAMIESON: that in terms of, for example, the Bay d'Espoir operation, it has gone through about three transformations and as recently as last weekend I heard that it is questionable once again. We have also had the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, about which I had some knowledge, which time after time said that it saw the future in the forest industry but it really has not emerged in anything like the dramatic way which was forecast in all of these. Now this is not to say, by the way, that I do not argue or do not support the idea of examining the forest industries to see whether they can be maximized, but I would invite hon. members opposite also to look at the number of occasions when, for example, the Throne Speech or a budget, or some DREE expenditure has been dedicated to harvesting - always, by the way, an adjective in it - harvesting the limitless resources, timber resources, or something of that sort, of Labrador. It is in again now.

So, therefore, while I realize that my time is up for this occasion, I emphasize once again that we should not delude ourselves. I suspect the Premier does not. And I am quite prepared myself to say that it makes some sense now to be hard-nosed and hard-headed in the next few months and say, 'Okay, will it work or will it not?' but what I think will be the real test of this government is when it has to get up and say, 'Look it here, we have examined this and it is a dog's breakfast; it is not going to work and we are going to turn it off.' And when we get to that point then I think we will start to put some reality into Newfoundlanders as to what to their real economic future is. But as long as one speech after the other keeps saying, 'boys just hang her down another few months and we will have Labrador on stream,' or with the greatest of respect to my friend, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that, 'We are going to have Come by Chance, you know, it may be next week, it may be next month, but it is coming.' It would be far better to be brutally, candidly frank, and say, 'We have done this study and this thing is not going to fly.' That is the kind of hard-nosed reality that I hope will be introduced and that is why I have not been, if you

MR. JAMIESON: like, as critical or as harsh in terms of all of these new studies which are now said to be underway. But, basically, let us hope that that is the approach which the government is going to take.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I feel it is necessary to react to a number of the things that have been said on the opposite side of the House this afternoon. First of all, I find the Leader of the Opposition's comments very, very comical indeed. He wants me to be frank. He wants this government to be frank and I have to be frank with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson).

I have watched the hon. the Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa for a number of years and if he wants me to be candidly frank, and he has motivated me to get to my feet on this, let me say to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, if he were as frank when he was Minister of External Affairs and the minister responsible for Newfoundland's affairs in the cabinet of Canada as he is asking this government to be now as it projects itself into the future, then he would have taken different steps and said different things at that time than he actually said. And I think most particularly of statements that the Leader of the Opposition made on many, many occasions both in St. Lawrence and out of St. Lawrence, on the Burin Peninsula and in Ottawa as it relates to the future of either St. Lawrence or any particular region in this province when it comes to resource development. The Leader of the Opposition knows only too well he can not have his cake and eat it too either when it comes to talking about resource development. He cannot on the one hand stand up here in this House or anywhere in this province and say, 'Well on the one hand we have to - you know there has been in the speeches from the Throne for the last seven or eight years there have been talks about hydro development, there have been talks about fishery, there have been talks about forestry -' and that somehow because this government or some

PREMIER PECKFORD: Newfoundlanders continue to repeat those things which are natural to them that there is something wrong with it. I just do not understand it; on the other hand, try to turn around and say that we have to tell it like it is. Well, Mr. Chairman, I for my part and from the Speech from the Throne and from things that we have said since May or whenever this government took office and got sworn in as a government, and now since the Provincial election, have tried to be candidly frank with the people of Newfoundland as it relates to our resource development potential. And if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) is going to take a - not a study, it is a practical experiment of sending two or three sawmill operators to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to look at not what needs to be necessarily done with the basic foundation of sawmilling in this province but rather, 'How do you increase the efficiency of the sawmill operation?' We are not studying the sawmill operation to see whether in fact we should establish a sawmill here, there or

PREMIER PECKFORD:

something else, but with the sawmills that have been created over the last six or seven years, how do you make them more efficient, how do you make them more productive, how do you make the quality better, how do you increase their marketing techniques. And that in no way diminishes what has to been done to date. We have increased the lumber production in this Province over the last four or five years a fantastic amount. This is an additional refinement to even make the sawmilling industry better tomorrow than it is today because today it is better than it was yesterday. And that is the kind of procedure.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it really.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh yes it is really a lot better. And I suggest to the hon. member that if he has time I can take him to a number of sawmill operations in this Province. We are doing more now in the sawmilling industry in the last two or three years that was ever done before. And as the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) can brag, that we are up around 40 million or 45 million, 46 million board feet a year which is a fantastic thing.

I remember in 1972 we were down around twenty or twenty-five board feet if we were that, 25 million board feet and now we are up to 46 million. Now we have got to do more in quality so we have got to become more refined in our approach. We have fundamentally solved the problem of establishing sawmills, of getting proper licensing procedure. But I mean the whole issue here is not only that, Mr. Chairman, but the fact that the future of Newfoundland - and I hope somebody rings it out a century from now - is the fishery and will continue to be the fishery. The question then after saying that is how do you develop the fishery in this Province? It is the how, it is the methodology to see that our input and our concerns are completely reflected in any national policy for fisheries on the East Coast of North America, are truly incorporated into what comes out on the other end so that the quotas and the licensing system and all of that - and I make no apologies at all for saying or for this administration saying that the fishery must continue to be the basic foundation of our

PREMIER PECKFORD:

economic strategies not only into the 1980's but into the next century because it is a renewable resource, it is natural, it is the reason why we were founded in the beginning. And I take great pride as a Newfoundlander -

MR. JAMIESON: (Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am speaking now, Mr. Chairman, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) will have his opportunity to respond. So that therefore I take great pride in that as a Newfoundlander. And you know, to say suddenly that a number of speeches a few years ago or now are still hollowing out the whole question of the fishery. That is important and that must continue to be our foundation and our clearest focus and the other things are on the periphery of it. But let us not forget that we also in talking about sawmilling - it is not just fishery and hydro development, important as they are, but there is and must always be a number of other areas like the forestry, like the mining, like rural development and areas where you can get involved in agriculture that are important and the tourist dollar. And we have signed or are in the process of signing additional agreements on that. But, you know, the question as to repeating over and over again the whole idea of fisheries and hydro development because these are - well, first of all the fishery is the foundation on which we must build other things and hydro power is a lever which we must use in the same way as we can use transportation as a lever for proper economic development. For the fishery, we need three phase power for fish plants around the Province. 'Give me three phase power' St. Barbe says. 'Give me three phase power' Arnold's Cove says. 'Give me three phase power' says Conche and so on. And so power is a direct level through which economic development can be pursued into the future and therefore must always be for now, for yesterday and for tomorrow one of the key elements in any economic strategy, not exclusively but one of them as is transportation. And forestry as a renewable resource must continue to be that.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So, you know, I do not fully understand the comments of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) when he talks about certain echoes of fishery development or certain echoes of hydro development which are still part of any government of Newfoundland's economic strategy because they must be the foundation on which other things happen. They are not exclusive but they are very, very key elements to it.

Secondly, let me just respond quickly to both the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as it relates to the questions. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) answered as the Minister of Public Works. It was no attempt on his part or the members of his staff in public works not to answer the question as it relates to Mount Scio house or anything else. I will undertake myself to get that information. The Department of Public Works did not have it. I do not suppose his Deputy Minister of Public Works or his Assistant Deputy Minister or whoever looked after it for him felt that they should call over to the University to get that information. If the House wishes information as it relates to rent on Mount Scio house over the six or seven years, the House shall have it and I shall get it. And the member

PREMIER PECKFORD: member for Lapoile (Mr. S. Neary) need not worry or any member on this side of the House or the other side of the House should need worry about information like that. I have up to now and will continue to provide all the information that it is possible to present without incurring any illegalities as the Leader of the Opposition said about the questions that the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) has been responding to. There will come times when certain answers cannot be given because it is out of the purview to give it, but in only a very small number of cases will that happen, but as it relates to that, and the other answers were not meant to be evasive, the question of the furnishings and the renovations to Mt. Scio House, a lot of it is furnishings, have not been purchased and the renovations have not been completed so that, therefore, a cost cannot be given. But as soon as the costs are given, as soon as the furniture is purchased and as soon as everything is done in Mt. Scio House, the hon. member for Lapoile, this House and the people of Newfoundland will have it laid on the table, "Here is what it cost to do those things".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, the member for Lapoile need not fear that whatever is done in Mt. Scio House or any other house the government owns or any other institution or agency that the government has any involvement in, is free information for the members of this House, not only because they ask for it but because it should be given in any case.

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

MR. JAMIESON: First of all, let me thank the -
I have no intention of resuming this debate, but just one or two points. First of all, let me thank the Premier for his frankness and tell him that I was not arguing with him. What I was talking

MR. JAMIESON: about in terms of the future is exactly what he himself has said, that it is basically on these natural resources, of course, that we must go. My complaint, which I think is perfectly valid, is that we have been saying the same things for seven or eight years, but we have in fact had a very, very heavy expenditure which has produced, for all practical purposes, nothing in terms of employment in Labrador going on since nationalization and all of the actual work that went underway. What I am saying is that it is the delay factor, it is the fact that nothing seems to really change all that much, and that was why I was commending him in this particular case for saying, "Okay, I take it, it is the last of the study periods and once we get through this kind of examination, we are going to know where we are going and there will be some movement". So I am not arguing with him as to what the basics are. I think I might have some qualification as to the degree to which the fishing industry can be relied upon as being the main generator, although he did not even say that, so therefore there is no basic argument with him on that point. But my argument now is, "For goodness' sake, let us get on with it so that the speech of 1980 and the one of 1981 will not be saying we are still looking for the great untapped resources of Labrador and the like and it will still be just so much rhetoric". That is all I was saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Butt) The hon. the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I quite frankly cannot understand why the Premier cannot understand the reasons why the Leader of the Opposition was echoing some substances of the past, particularly with respect to the fisheries development in this particular province. Sir, I have before me here the 169, and I have read some of them into the House before, 169 unkept promises, major policy statements made by the administration over the last number of years. Sir, 38 of these are directly related to fisheries development; 38 of the 169 major policy statements are directly related to

MR. F. ROWE: fisheries development. Now, Sir, we range from \$40 million trawler fleets to \$60 million trawler fleets, assistance to freezing plants, marina service stations, fish auctions, great industrial grants, assistance to small and medium sized companies, experimental programs in the fisheries, a great program to replace offshore vessels, another \$60 million trawler fleet, 20 new ships, many hundreds of new permanent jobs with the fish processing plants, and so you go down the line. Now, Mr. Chairman, what the Leader of the Opposition and he certainly does not need me to come to his defence but I would certainly like for the hon. the Premier to understand is that he is expressing deep concern and anxiety over the past performance of this administration in terms of the ad hockery

MR. F. ROWE: and the shotgun approach that this administration has with respect to some of its areas of development, particularly the fisheries. And I would not -

MR. STAGG: Shotgun marriages.

MR. F. ROWE: - Oh, there goes the member for Stephenville again, Mr. Chairman, trying to inject some comic relief into the situation. But I do not find it at all funny when over the past eight and a half years this administration has held up fisheries development as one of its major programmes for development of this Province in the setting up of a good economic base. It has come out with thirty-eight major proposals, none of which have been kept by this administration and the Leader of the Opposition reminded the hon. the Premier of that. And the reason why I have deep concern and anxiety about it, Sir, is last year, in November of 1978, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) with a great number of brochures, 'Fish is the Future' and a seminar and then another White Paper on 'Strategies and Programmes for Fisheries Development - 1985', then a special speech delivered by Walter Carter, Minister of Fisheries at a fisheries seminar on November 13, 1978, and a number of fishermen given less than twenty-four hours to study reports that cost \$680,000 by the Canadian Kellogg Corporation and some provincial authority - \$680,000 later the Minister of Fisheries comes out with this great new blueprint until 1985. Now, that programme, Mr. Chairman, was to cost in the order of \$500 million. The Minister of Fisheries - I am sorry he is not in his seat - has yet to indicate where that \$500 million is to come from, he suggests \$250 million from private enterprise and \$250 million from a combination of provincial and federal funding. But, Sir, what disturbs me greatly as I look in the Budget for this year and presumably there must not be hardly anything at all in this Interim Supply vote, is that when we look at the first year, one year later, of this five year programme costing in the order of \$500 million with \$61 million supposedly going for the primary landing and distribution centre - \$61 million, if one wants to divide 5 into \$61 million you can see what you would come out with; if one wants to divide 5 into \$500 million you see what you will

MR. F. ROWE: come out with, an expenditure of approximately \$100 million per year for the next five years to reach the goal as set down for 1985 - what do we see in the Budget this year, Sir? For the functioning of the Crown corporation, for the development of a primary landing and distribution centre for offshore landings to seasonal processors and to co-ordinate the lease and/or charter of foreign vessels for landings to under-utilized fish plants, what do we see? Not \$100 million, not \$3 million, we see \$100,000. So, Sir, one is led to legitimately ask out of deep anxiety, Is this great 'Strategies and Programmes for Fisheries Development' going to become number 39 of the great promises held out to the people of this Province for fisheries development? I am quite honestly, Sir, sick and tired of sitting back here and listening to hon. members opposite talk about the development of the fisheries and the importance of the fisheries to the future economic development of this Province, the importance of hydro development and that kind of thing. I confine myself strictly to the fisheries when in the first year of a \$500 million programme announced by the Minister of Fisheries - and, by the way, Mr. Chairman, I might add that this is the reason I put down this Private Members' bill because we have yet to have a full-fledged debate on

MR. F. ROWE:

anything having to do with the fisheries since this 'Strategies for Fisheries Development' came out last year, have yet to debate it. We have not yet had an opportunity although there was a seminar, a programme - I know what the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is whispering to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). We had an Interim Supply Bill there in March and curiously enough, Mr. Chairman, one is led to ask this question, why did we have a form of Interim Supply Bill brought down in the month of March and then an election and now we are back here for a second Interim Supply Bill.

I think Mr. Chairman is trying to get a message to me and there is nobody available to tell me that I have actually two minutes left. But the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) can inform the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) all he wishes about the opportunities for debate on this particular 'Strategies for Fisheries Development.' But the fact of the matter is that we have had very little if any opportunity to debate that particular point in this House of Assembly since -

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) unquestionable (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Well, I am not like the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), Mr. Chairman, as indicated by the Minister of Manpower and Labour (Mr. Dinn). I do not call a press conference every time I want to - you know the hon. Minister of Fisheries, as the Minister of Labour and Manpower knows - that the greatest artist of developing the use of the media for his own use with respect to press conferences has to be the Minister of Fisheries and I would commend the hon. Minister of Fisheries to all other hon. ministers.

But, Sir, just to sum up I would simply say this, that I sincerely hope that we will see something more than this \$100,000 towards the development of this great programme and that we do not see this 'Strategies for Fisheries Development' in 1985 being number thirty-nine on the list of great fisheries announcements that have come to nothing up to this point in the game.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there were a couple of points raised by speakers on both sides of the House here that I am afraid that I cannot let go unnoticed. Number one, I want to get back to that answer that was given to me today by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and I certainly concur with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) that the hon. gentleman so far has proven that he is a man of integrity and honesty in this House. But I cannot agree, Sir, that in all cases the information of who initiated an investigation should be kept confidential. Before the hon. gentleman turns thumbs down, 100 per cent, on what I am saying let me put this proposition, let me put my case to the House and it is this; that if somebody felt that there should be an investigation and they either called up the minister or wrote the minister or gave it to him orally and said, look we would like to have an investigation into this, somebody outside of government, well that would be fine, I would say, yes. The minister would be quite justified in keeping that information under wraps because half the cases in the world are solved because of informers, because of somebody providing information to either the police or to the minister or to some member of the House. But, Mr. Chairman, there is a vast difference in an informer and somebody doing something quite genuinely and quite sincerely than somebody doing it for strictly political reasons. And I suspect, Mr. Chairman, as a result of the information that the minister gave the House today, that the decision to investigate Societe Transshipping and raid the house of a former Premier of this Province two weeks before Christmas, that decision was taken in the Cabinet room and was nothing but a political vendetta. And that is why I say, if that is so, the person who did it, namely - I have my suspicions - the Minister of Finance now for Canada (Mr. Crosbie), I think, was the man who initiated that. Both he and the former Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) cooked it up between them, carrying out a personal and political vendetta against a former Premier of this Province and his friends. That is how it started, Sir, it was nothing only a personal vendetta.

MR. NEARY:

That is why I say, Mr. Chairman, that if it was, then that man should be exposed. If Mr. Crosbie was the culprit who initiated that investigation for strictly political, personal reasons then he should be exposed. It should not be covered up. And that is the difference between the type of question I put to the minister and what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) was referring to. And the

MR. NEARY: Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) confirmed for me today in this House that the initiative was not taken by the RCMP, it was taken by the Minister of Justice on complaints, and I shouted across the House and I said to the minister, "Who were the complainants?" and the minister said, "Well, I cannot divulge that because that is confidential". In 99 percent of the cases I would agree with the minister, that is the right position to take, but if Mr. Crosbie and Hickman and Mr. Moores were the culprits then they should be exposed in this House and in this Province. They should be exposed. If it was strictly a personal political vendetta, a decision taken on the eighth floor to launch an investigation into the former premier of this Province, that should be exposed and these people should be made to apologize.

MR. MORGAN: Why can you not investigate him?

MR. NEARY: Investigate who?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Smallwood. Why can you not, if you want to?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman does not seem to understand what it is I am saying. Why not investigate Mr. Moores? Why not investigate Mr. Moores?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) investigate the hon. gentleman if you want to.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, they cannot investigate the hon. gentleman. They have tried, they have tried but they failed and they cannot because there is nothing to investigate. That is right, there is nothing to investigate, no more than there is to investigate the hon. the Premier, the present Premier, but there are all kinds of reasons to investigate things about the former administration, the Moores administration, all sorts of things, and I say, Sir, now that in all fairness, in all fairness to the former Premier of this Province that if that was done, if that is what happened, and I suspect now from the answer the hon. gentleman

MR. NEARY: gave me, that that is what happened, that the decision was taken on the eighth floor to go out on a witch-hunt against the former Premier of this Province by Messrs. Crosbie, Hickman and Moores and they should be exposed for the phonies they are. They should be exposed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Call it six o'clock.

MR. NEARY: No, we will not call it six o'clock. The hon. gentleman may not like to hear what I am saying but, Sir, it is a matter that has to be cleared up. It is a black mark, a black mark on the administration of justice in this Province when you can manipulate Canada's national police force, Mr. Chairman. That is indeed a sad day for Canada and for Newfoundland and in this case, the RCMP were directed and told what to do and manipulated by the politicians of the day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: They were, Sir. The RCMP were manipulated. They were not told to investigate, they were directed. I would suspect they were called to the eighth floor or called to the Minister of Justice's office and told what to do, and that is a misuse and abuse of power and a misuse and abuse of the law enforcement officers, Canada's national police force being dictated to by a politician in this Province or a group of politicians. I think it is a scandal and a shame, Sir. No reflection on the present Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer), no reflection at all. The hon. gentleman, I do not think, would do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would he not?

MR. NEARY: I do not think he would. I am almost sure he would not, but it is a sad day. It is a perversion of justice, Mr. Chairman, and it is a matter that should not be treated lightly, it could happen to anybody. I always said for the last several years in this Province, Sir, that you could be framed in Newfoundland, not under this administration because we are not familiar with their actions yet, but the strategy of the old administration, you could be framed

MR. NEARY: and you would be in a senior citizens' home before the thing would ever come to court, and that is what they set out to do. They set out to frame, they set out to frame people, a political personal vendetta, and I have been saying that for years in this House as hon. gentlemen will recall and I am going to continue to say it because, Mr. Chairman, as long as that is allowed to remain on the record, Sir, as long as it is allowed to remain on the record, then I would say it is a sad, sad day for Newfoundland indeed. And that is not the only political personal vendetta that was started by Messrs. Crosbie, Hickman and Moores, not the only one. They have started a witch-hunt and a vendetta that has cost the taxpayers of this Province literally millions of dollars. I would suspect that that one investigation alone cost a couple of million dollars.

MR. MORGAN: Which one?

MR. NEARY: The one I am talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Societe Transshipping?

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the Liechtenstein one, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Could the minister not give you (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The minister said he could not give me - the hon.

gentleman does not obviously listen to what is going on in the House. The minister said it was impossible to get the cost. I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that it cost nothing under \$2 million to investigate that situation. The man hours by the RCMP that were used were absolutely unbelievable. And the trips they made all around the world are incredible. On directions, acting under orders from the Minister of Justice and his henchmen, Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Moores who set out to do a job, to do a hatchet job on the former Premier of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, that must be removed from the record, it must be. And I hope the MacDonald Royal Commission investigating the RCMP will pick it up. If I had the time I would lay the complaint myself. I already have a complaint before the MacDonald Commission about a raid on my office that was done under false pretenses, where a search warrant was obtained under false pretenses. Another part of the vendetta, the political persecution that we have seen in this Province for the last six or seven years. So, Sir, while I agree with the hon. gentleman in 99.9 per cent of the cases but where you have an example that could be detrimental to the Province, that could make Newfoundland the laughing stock of the free world, that is a black mark on our reputation and our record, where you have political persecution and a personal political vendetta carried on by Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Moores and Mr. Hickman, then Sir, that should be exposed and it will be exposed. We cannot allow it to remain on the record.

As I said the other day, for ten hours, Sir, sixteen RCMP officers over in Mr. Smallwood's residence, two weeks before Christmas, under siege, his wife with her suitcase packed ready to go away for Christmas, suitcase torn open, her personal belongings hauled out, letters from his grandchildren confiscated. I saw the inventory of all the stuff that was taken from his house. And, you know, Mr. Chairman, of all the things, all the documents and papers that were taken, I thought it was the funniest thing I have ever seen in my life

MR. NEARY:

if it was not so serious.

MR. MORGAN: Did they take his land grants.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman will get land grants one of these days.

MR. MORGAN: They did not take his land grants.

MR. NEARY: If there is anything wrong with the hon. gentleman's land grants then the hon. minister knows how to deal with them.

MR. MORGAN: That is right. They are already being dealt with.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is okay. Maybe they are being dealt with.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. the Premier heard that little snide remark and that little threat that just came across the House from the born-again administration. We are going to have no more personal attacks, no more snide remarks, no more innuendo, no more charges, no more insinuations. The hon. the Premier should get Hansard tomorrow and read what his minister just said.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to speak long on this matter but to reply briefly to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). The hon. gentleman said that he agreed with my position about 99.9 per cent. It was that one-tenth of 1 per cent, so it will be in that area. I think where the difference boils down is with respect to the question of the initiation of the RCMP investigation. My answer to that was that it was carried out by the RCMP under instructions from the Minister of Justice resulting from complaints received by him. I said at the time that it would not be proper for me to reveal the identity of the complainant or the complainants in that situation or in any situation. Now, the hon. gentleman accepts that, as I understand, as a general principle but suggests that there are exceptions

MR. OTTENHEIMER: when, in his opinion, such action would be politically motivated and he is suggesting that if it was a minister of the Crown who was a complainant then the name of such a person should be revealed or that suggestion, or hypothesis, confirmed or not.

Of course, when a complaint or complaints are made an area of judgment then comes into operation. Obviously, if any person, no matter who he is or what he is, comes in and says, 'I am making a complaint about something,' there has to be some form of substantiation; there has to be some judgmental factor. Also, then, if information is sworn out resulting in a search warrant the issuing of the search warrant is an act of a court. Now the hon. gentleman, I think, is suggesting that the information sworn to was wrong or suggesting that there may have been perjury there. But unless there is some evidence to suggest this, and if there is then obviously a person would have legal recourse.

But what I want to come back to is that suggestion that there should be some exceptions to the rule. I affirm the principle that any citizen be he a minister, a leader of the opposition, a member of the House, a member of the clergy, a member of the atheist congregation, all obviously have a right to make a complaint in this respect and they have a right to expect that their identity will not be revealed. Now, if one is to make exceptions then where do the exceptions start and where do they end? A person is a member of the House, would he be an exception? Or only a minister? If he were a leader of the opposition, or a speaker, or a bishop? I think one has to take that principle and stick with it, the principle being that a person making such a complaint has the right to expect that his or her identity will not be revealed. Once you start making exceptions then, in a sense, one is playing god. You are making these exceptions on what I think is a fundamental principle and I do not see how it can be done. Because then you are getting into the extremely dangerous area of not treating everybody alike and saying certain categories of people if they make a complaint

MR. OTTENHEIMER: their identity will be revealed, other categories of people make a complaint their identity will not be revealed. And as I say, the principle is no longer universally applicable then, its recognition is brought into question and anybody making a complaint will have to ask themselves, "Will this or a future minister of Justice regard me as one of those exceptions to the general rule?"

So I do have to affirm that we do have an honest difference of opinion here. Our opinion in this area between the hon. gentleman from Lapoile (Mr. Neary) and myself is a diametrically opposed one. It is fair enough that we would have difference of opinion, I do not quarrel with that, and I think it would be just as difficult for me to persuade him that he is wrong and I am right as it is for the hon. gentleman to persuade me that I am wrong and he is right. That is not a question of stubbornness either; it is just, I suppose, that we view it from different perspectives. But I do think, to make it quite clear, I have to stand unequivocally by the rule, by the principle that any citizen irrespective of his status who lodges a complaint has a right to expect that his or her identity will not be revealed.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is the principle I have operated on and will continue to so do.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. gentleman's point of view and I would not dare enter into any prolonged debates with the hon. gentleman because basically what he says is correct, but, Mr. Chairman, the unfortunate part of this whole unsavory affair is the fact that his predecessor was so weak-kneed, was such a weak Minister of Justice that he allowed himself to be bullied by Mr. Crosbie, and therein lies the problem, Sir, there is where the problem began. I am sure the hon. gentleman, as long as he occupies that seat as Minister of Justice, will not allow himself to be bullied into carrying out a personal and political vendetta. I believe that about the hon. gentleman who just took his seat. But I cannot say the same for his predecessor. And I said it before his face in this House that I thought he was one of the most weak-kneed Ministers of Justice that we ever had in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who was that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Hickman. And that is why, Mr. Chairman, we have this situation before us today that we have this black mark on our record. That is why it is there. It is there because Mr. Hickman was so weak-kneed and allowed himself to be bullied and pushed around by bully-boy Crosbie. That is the reason for it, Sir, and it is unfortunate but I can see the scenario now. I can see it now, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the hon. gentleman's point of view, and I can almost see it now, because as soon as Crosbie was sworn in up in Ottawa he immediately came out on the attack, on the offensive, and tried to launch a witch hunt and an investigation into the former Liberal administration, the Trudeau administration, the Government of Canada to the dismay and the shock of his own colleagues, and he was not long getting off that kick. But here in Newfoundland Crosbie is the big shot. And he bullied his way into it and bulldozed people around and kicked them around, including the Minister of Justice.

MR. YOUNG: A good man.

MR. NEARY: Yes, there is no doubt about that. A good man alright. He presided over the fishery gear scandal, he presided over the

- MR. NEARY: scandal, he presided over the closing of the Come By Chance oil refinery. What else did he preside over, 'Roger'?
- MR. SIMMONS: Well, the increasing debts that we had.
- MR. NEARY: He was Minister of Finance when our debt trebled in Newfoundland.
- MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) federal election (inaudible) Joe Clark.
- MR. STAGG: A very influential Newfoundlander.
- MR. NEARY: I will tell you one thing, that Mr. Clark will regret the day he ever made him Minister of Finance. He will be the most hated man in Canada in less than six months.
- MR. MORGAN: Now. You hope.
- MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I do not hope at all. He will be only getting what he deserves. He will only be getting his just deserts.
- MR. STAGG: We do not knight people anymore. He should be Sir John.
- MR. NEARY: Sir John, that is right. He should be Sir John. He should be canonized.
- MR. SIMMONS: He will become to Clark what he became to us, an albatross.
- MR. NEARY: That is right. He will be the albatross around Joe Clark's neck in short order. But anyway, he did his dirt in this Province. He managed to accomplish what he set out to do.
- MR. STAGG: Destroy the Liberal Party.
- MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, that is right. He destroyed the Liberal Party with his personal/political vendetta and his dirt and his venom and his skulduggery. When he was in charge of the Linerboard mill - my hon. friend should know the skulduggery that went on there. And the hon. the Premier told us a few moments ago he is going to be honest and he is going to level with us on Mount Scio House.
- MR. SIMMONS: He did not destroy the Liberal Party, he just purified it. He took the riffraff across the House.
- MR. NEARY: That is right. He destroyed it, Mr. Chairman. They built their foundation on a smear campaign. They started out in 1972

MR. NEARY: with a foundation built on smear tactics and personal attacks.

MR. STAGG: Who was that?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. STAGG: The hon. member is familiar with smears.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman means what I think he means, the hon. gentleman who is on his feet is not familiar with smears.

MR. SIMMONS: No, he is just reminding you that -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they have tried everything.

MR. SIMMONS: He is just reminding you that he was Deputy Speaker one time.

MR. NEARY: That is right, I remember when he was Deputy Speaker. I remember, and Your Honour should go back and check Hansard. One of the greatest tirades that I ever unleashed in this House, one of the most vicious attacks I have ever made on anybody

MR. NEARY: in this House I made it on the hon. gentleman when he was sitting in the Chair, and I believe I got kicked out of the House for one day or two days, I am not sure which -

MR. SIMMONS: On his conduct.

MR. NEARY: On his conduct, on his conduct when he was supposed to be sitting there impartial, but anyway, Sir, I am getting carried away now, getting carried away. I just want to come back to Mt. Scio House, now, I am finished with the other thing. I think I have made my point. I would say it is up to the news media in this Province, Mr. Chairman. It is up to the editorial writers and the press to clear up this matter of the Crosbie personal vendetta and his smear tactics that cost the taxpayers of this Province a couple of million dollars, in my opinion, with the RCMP travelling all over the globe. Well, I suppose more of them got to see the world than they ever dreamed of when they joined the RCMP, at public expense, acting under instructions and directions of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) who was being booted around by Crosbie and Moores. It is unfortunate but there it is, and I hope they give as much space and as much ink to it now as they did then when they were on the warpath. Some of the ministers are still sitting over on that side of the House, some of the critics of that particular situation, including the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) who raised the matter more than once in this hon. House, and I am talking about Societe Transshipping and the southern concessions. The hon. gentleman rode in on his white horse, the 'great white knight' rode into this House, the first speech he made that was one of the things he raised, the first speech, and then we find out there is nothing to it. It is all a farce, nothing to it, no justification at all.

Now, I want to come back to Mt. Scio House for a moment, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, let me have a few words. Let me have a few words.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman can have a few words whenever he wants to in this House. Very few people pay any attention to him.

We were told by the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. H. Young), told by the Minister of Public Works and Services and given a list of all the things that are needed in Mt. Scio House. They need carpet; they need drapes; they need furniture; they need main kitchen appliances; painting and wallcovering throughout; an office; furniture; in the kitchen they need new countertops, additional cupboards and flooring; cook's kitchen - construction and appliances, light fixtures and wiring; master dressing room - mirrors in it; dining room - remove cupboards; living room - install French doors; library - install bookshelves; main hall and library - resurface hardwood floors; small appliances; linens, dinnerware, etc. Mr. Chairman, after reading over the list and the answers and so forth that I got, I am beginning to wonder if the hon. former Premier, Mr. Frank Moores, who lived in that house was living in a pigsty or a henhouse.

MR. HICKEY: Are you going to give anybody else over there a chance.

MR. NEARY: What happened -

MR. MORGAN: No, no, he will keep on talking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentlemen know that I have a lot to say. I have been listening, I have been listening to the malarkey, Sir, from that hon. crowd now for 17 years in this House and I have finally got my chance to get it back at them. Finally got my chance to get it back and I am going to heave it back and I am going to keep reminding them and I am going to keep shoving it at them, because, Mr. Chairman, and hon. members will remember, somebody reminded me a few minutes ago, that that is how that crowd coasted into power. That is how they got there, on the foundation that they built of smear and character assassination.

MR. NEARY: What I would like to know, did Mr. Moores live in a henhouse? What happened to all these things?

AN HON. MEMBER: It was their own.

MR. NEARY: It was his own? They were his own? All we know is the colour television was his own and there was some doubt about that.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, was the carpet his own? Was the carpet his own? Did he take the carpet up when he left? Well, what about the drapes? Did he take the drapes when he left? The furniture, did he own all the furniture that was in there? What about the main kitchen appliances? Did he own all these? And the wallcovering and the countertops, did he take off the countertop because he owned it? Did he get an axe, Mr. Chairman? It looks to me like he must have gotten an axe and wrecked the place before he pulled out.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman said he could not determine the cost of maintenance. All the hon. gentleman has to do is to go back over his records for the last six or seven years to see how many security guards he had up there, to see how much it cost for snowclearing, to see how much it cost to mow the lawn and maintain the house. There is a seven year record, seven year experience, in the minister's department and the minister tells me that could not be determined. Well, Sir, my ten minutes is up. I will have to come back again and find out about all the costs of maintenance in Mount Scio house.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I would say to my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) that there is a reason why I would ask to be given the floor which I think will become obvious but my learned friend from Stephenville will certainly have an opportunity if he wishes. I gather, Mr. Chairman, a problem - I am sorry.

MR. STAGG: You fellows are hogging the debate.

MR. NEARY: Well, talk to your House Leader.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am quite willing to sit on but one more crack from the gentleman from Stephenville. I am doing something at the request of the government House Leader. Now, it is quite okay with me. The government House Leader came to me and to my colleague the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) to make a request. Now if the hon. gentleman from Stephenville wants me - I am quite happy. I happen to think that what my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is saying is information that ought to be answered.

MR. MORGAN: Over and over and over, he is saying it.

MR. ROBERTS: And the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) would do well to button his lip so that it matches his mind. And if he would keep his lip as closed as his mind we would get further in this House more quickly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. JAMIESON: — Just bear in mind what we are talking about

MR. ROBERTS: You know, we have a problem which we hope to deal with.

MR. STAGG: I understand.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not want to cut off the hon. gentleman for Stephenville. I enjoy listening to him. The hon. member for Bonavista South, the less said the better.

Mr. Chairman, we have a problem and the problem is this, that the government, I gather, have got to the point where unless this debate - this debate must conclude tonight or cheques have been issued which will bounce.

MR. FLIGHT: You are kidding.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I gather this. And my friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir - and I am not breaching any confidences - apparently predicted this in the Committee earlier this afternoon. I was not here at that point.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: But I gather that it is a serious problem. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has been incompetent. This Interim Supply Bill could have been brought on three or four days ago quite easily. Instead we are at the position now where -

AN HON. MEMBER: We had already been told at the start of debate.

MR. ROBERTS: - the gun has been put to our head and we have been told that the House must sit to deal with matter and it will sit this evening if need be. That is perfectly proper. The government are not attempting to close off debate, I am not saying that. They are certainly not attempting to do that. But because of their incompetence in bringing the matter before the Committee only this afternoon. It could have been done. The Minister of Finance knew a month ago he needed interim supply and I do submit that he could have brought this request before this Committee and the House two or three weeks ago.

Now, I understand that we on this side are willing to co-operate, that His Honour, the Governor has been asked. I have not had a chance to have a word with my friend from LaPoile

MR. ROBERTS:

(Mr. Neary) but, you know, we will co-operate. The only thing I would ask in return from the House Leader and I have not had an opportunity to raise it with him, this is the end of the supply procedure except for a little bit left to be done in Head 3, the executive council. Now, I have not kept score but there are a number of hours left from the seventy-five hour total. If we start with the seventy-five hour total, Mr. Chairman, and take off the number of hours required because of the heads referred to the committees and if we then take off the nine hours of concurrence report -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) to get trimmed.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, the Premier - then we take off the time we have used on Interim Supply, which comes off the seventy-five according to the rules, and the times we have used on the first three heads, there area number of hours left. All we would ask is that we would be allowed to add those to the concurrence reports debates.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have already talked about this to the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) a number of days ago.

MR. ROBERTS: Not to me, to your own colleague?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. Oh, to the House Leader, the House Leader. Sorry my definite article was indefinite. I agreed heartily at that time, because there was some lateness in the Interim Supply but also because I think it is proper and that the hours that are left must be distributed among the various debates that come in from the three Committees. and so that, therefore, the whole seventy-five years will be at the disposal of the House to use so that a full debate can be held and, therefore, that will add two hours, I think, to each of the three concurrent debates which in total will be about six hours that is left.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Premier. And while he may have spoken to his colleague who by the way, I think, is the Leader of the House. I think that is probably a correct - although we usually refer to him as the Government House Leader for obvious reasons - that meets our

MR. ROBERTS: point quite adequately. I think my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition wishes to say a word and he is recognized, of course he is. Perhaps we might stop the clock because we will have to report the Bill out from Committee, do the three readings, and then His Honour will attend upon us and I assume will assent. If not, we have a different sort of problem, do we not? Subject to that we will agree, but I do wish the Minister of Finance (Mr. Collins) next time would give a little more thought. If he had consulted his colleague, the House Leader (government) I am sure we would not have gotten into this unfortunate situation. But we do not want to see the government's cheques bounce. I think that is fair enough.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of prolonging the debate. I simply use this as an example in, I hope, as uncritical a way as I can, of the necessity for the kind of thing I said the other day in terms of experimenting with new rules.

Now, this was a case where we knew we had a certain amount of time at our disposal. We made a choice as to how that time was to be allocated. We were not looking for or seeking anything additional; we are trying to man the committees, we are doing all of the things to make this system work. Now, with the greatest of respect to the Minister of Finance or to the Government Leader, if we had known even at the beginning of this particular debate, that this was, in effect, a guillotine procedure albeit an abnormal one, then I assure the hon. members opposite that we would have accommodated to it and we would have made the kind of deal with regard to the time that we have now talked about. I just want to emphasize that. When people opposite start to sound off you have to understand that we are trying and we are seeking to work within the rules. We had no conception whatever that we were up against this particular deadline. Indeed, our whole plan was quite different from that in assuming that we would utilize the hours available to

MR. JAMIESON: us in a given kind of way. So I want to put that on the record so that we do not look to be obstructionists.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I only want to put on the record in response to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I appreciate his comments fully and we will try to participate and try to give the Opposition a lot more advance notice of things of this nature in the future than happened today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution and recommend a bill be introduced to give effect to the same, carried.

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. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered a certain resolution and a bill consequent thereto and recommend the said bill be introduced to give effect to the same and ask leave to sit again.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," carried. (Bill No. 32).

On motion, a Bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service", read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper (Bill No. 32).

MR. ROBERTS: Better stop the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the clock be stopped?
Agreed.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: His Honour is on his way. I do not know if it would be more comfortable for hon. members if we adjourn for just a few moments.

MR. SPEAKER: We will adjourn for a few moments.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Admit His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

Your Honour, it is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her faithful Commons in Newfoundland to present to Your Honour a bill for the appropriation of Interim Supply granted in the present session.

HON. GORDON A. WINTER (Lieutenant-Governor): In Her Majesty's Name, I thank Her Loyal Subjects, I accept their benevolence and I Assent to This Bill.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Just before giving the adjournment notice, I will indicate the Government Services Committee meets tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. in the Collective Bargaining Room, Resource Committee Tuesday at 9:30 a.m. in the Department of Health boardroom, Social Services Committee tomorrow in the Colonial Building at 9:30 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Could we have some indication of the business of the House for tomorrow?

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, tomorrow, the hon. Leader of the Opposition I do not believe was here last Friday when I gave an indication, but we will be getting back into Committee of the Whole on Supply, and when we are through with Committee of the Whole on Supply then we propose to go into the Budget debate which may or may not be tomorrow, I do not know, depending upon the length of time it takes.

Mr. Speaker, I move that House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3 o'clock, and that this House do now adjourn.

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

INDEX

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JULY 30, 1979

*Added by a Member of Public Works
Services July 30/79*
ANSWER TO QUESTION #17 (ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FROM LAPOILE)
ON ORDER PAPER 9/79. DATED: JULY 26, 1979

QUESTION (A) A LIST SHOWING PROPOSED RENOVATIONS TO MOUNT
SCIO HOUSE:

ANSWER (A) SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE A.

QUESTION (B) A LIST SHOWING FIXTURES, APPLIANCES, FURNITURE,
PAINTINGS, ETC. TO BE PURCHASED FOR MOUNT SCIO HOUSE:

ANSWER (B) NOT YET FULLY DETERMINED. THIS INFORMATION
WILL BE AVAILABLE AFTER THE FITTING UP
INCLUDING THE PURCHASE OF FURNITURE, APPLIANCES,
ETC. IS COMPLETED.

QUESTION (C) COST OF MAINTAINING MOUNT SCIO HOUSE AFTER IT
IS OCCUPIED BY THE PREMIER:

ANSWER (C) THE MAINTENANCE COST WILL BE THE ROUTINE OPERATION
AND MAINTENANCE OF THE PREMISES WHICH WILL
INCLUDE SECURITY, SNOW CLEARING, ETC. THIS
FIGURE HAS NOT YET BEEN DETERMINED.

2.

QUESTION (D) AMOUNT OWING THE UNIVERSITY IN RENT BY THE PREVIOUS PREMIER UP TO THE TIME MOUNT SCIO HOUSE WAS DECLARED THE OFFICIAL RESIDENCE OF THE PRESENT PREMIER:

ANSWER (D) MY DEPARTMENT DOES NOT HAVE ACCESS TO INTERNAL FINANCIAL INFORMATION CONCERNING MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY AND ITS TENANTS.

QUESTION (E) DID THE UNIVERSITY OR THE GOVERNMENT WRITE OFF THE ARREARS OWING IN RENT BY THE PREVIOUS PREMIER, MR. FRANK MOORES, PRIOR TO MOUNT SCIO HOUSE BEING DECLARED THE OFFICIAL RESIDENCE OF THE PREMIER?

ANSWER (E) MY DEPARTMENT DOES NOT HAVE ACCESS TO MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL DATA. MY DEPARTMENT DID NOT WRITE OFF ANY ARREARS THAT MAY HAVE BEEN OWED BY THE FORMER PREMIER, MR. FRANK MOORES.

3.

QUESTION (F) WHO AUTHORIZED METRO ENGINEERING (A.B. WALSH COMPANY) TO RENOVATE THE DOWNSTAIRS SECTION OF MOUNT SCIO HOUSE WHEN IT WAS OCCUPIED BY MR. FRANK D. MOORES AND WHO PAID FOR THESE RENOVATIONS?

ANSWER (F) MY DEPARTMENT DID NOT AUTHORIZE NOR PAY FOR THE RENOVATIONS.

SCHEDULE A
MOUNT SCIO HOUSE REDECORATIONS

CARPET

DRAPES

FURNITURE

MAIN KITCHEN APPLIANCES

PAINTING AND WALL COVERING THROUGHOUT

OFFICE

FURNITURE

KITCHEN - NEW COUNTER TOPS, ADDITIONAL
CUPBOARDS AND FLOORING

COOK'S KITCHEN - CONSTRUCTION AND
APPLIANCES

LIGHT FIXTURES AND WIRING

MASTER DRESSING ROOM - MIRRORS

DINING ROOM - REMOVE CUPBOARDS

LIVING ROOM - INSTALL FRENCH DOORS

LIBRARY - INSTALL BOOK SHELVES

MAIN HALL AND LIBRARY - RESURFACE HARDWOOD FLOORS

SMALL APPLIANCES, LINENS, DINNERWARE, ETC.

In answer to the question on the Order Paper of July 25, 1979,

No. 1 - There was a cost of \$4,860.77 to the Province paid to a firm of Chartered Accountants for the examination of accounts and records and a report thereon. It is impossible to indicate with any accuracy whatsoever what any indirect costs might have been. To the best of my knowledge no additional personnel were hired by the R.C.M.P. or by the Province in connection with this investigation. No record is kept to my knowledge of the amount of time spent by a specific person on a specific investigation.

No. 2 - The R.C.M.P. carried out this investigation under instructions from the Minister of Justice resulting from complaints received by him.