

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
Thursday, May 7, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Windsor -
Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to welcome the
Premier back, Mr. Speaker, and in the process, direct this
question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: In the process, Mr. Speaker, I would
like to direct this question to the Premier. Would the Premier
inform the House what action he plans to take in view of the
latest initiative taken by the Prime Minister of Canada
whereby the resolution of the offshore ownership be set aside
and that a joint provincial-federal agreement be reached for
the purpose of future offshore development and production,
under which agreement, for the purpose of revenue sharing and
control, the resource will be treated the same as if that
resource were located on land?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, last night and this
morning I have been going over the comments made by the
Prime Minister on a visit to our Province, some of the
statements that he made on television and some of the
statements he made before a meeting that he addressed down
here. I have not had the benefit of going through these in
detail; I have the paper, the written statements now from
the television station and his recorded speech to the group
which was recorded and now have it all typed up to see
exactly what the Prime Minister said.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I guess my initial reaction would be it is unfortunate that the Canadian federal government apparently changes its position on issues so important to Newfoundland and to Nova Scotia and to British Columbia as this is, that he chooses to do it this way rather than at the discussion table during the Constitution discussions all last year and during the discussions that Nova Scotia has held with the Canadian federal government. That is number one. I mean, he should deal with the governments on these matters.

Secondly, it is not clear in my own mind, because I have not gone through the statements in detail, whether in fact the impression that is left in the minds of a lot of people is really valid, that there has been a change in the Canadian Government's position on the offshore. If, in fact, however, there is a change in the way the Canadian federal government wishes to deal with the whole question of the offshore, then we have said repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, that we are willing to sit down and discuss that. We have discussed it all last year. Nova Scotia discussed it after the constitutional discussions were over. We are willing to sit down today, this evening,

PREMIER PECKFORD: sit down today, this evening, tomorrow morning to pursue what seems on the surface to be some change in the Canadian government's position. We have never taken the position that we should not sit down and discuss these matters. Whether in fact there is an appreciable, substantive change in the way the Canadian government wants to proceed on the whole question of the offshore jurisdiction and the dispute that is there remains to be seen. For our part as a government, we are ready to sit down at any time and discuss these matters with the Prime Minister or his designates to see whether in fact there is that kind of appreciable change which seems to be in the minds of some Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would confirm that in staking out the provincial ground in the first instance, his original demand was that the offshore be treated the same as if the resource were located on land, treated the same as forests or mines. Those were his words verbatim and it is documented that that is what he wanted, and that is what the Prime Minister had offered. Now it would seem to me, Mr. Premier, that the Prime Minister has held out a possibility of breaking this stalemate, he is interested in breaking the stalemate. What I want the Premier to tell me if he will now initiate—because I think the ball is now in his court—will he initiate a meeting whereby he can discuss the various initiatives or the various proposals outlined by the Prime Minister with regard to breaking the stalemate and giving Newfoundland what they want, the offshore in the sense that it were situated on land, that the Premier originally requested?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the information that backs up the question that the hon. member asks is not as clear as the hon. member makes it seem. First of all, as I have said, and I have gone on record already in the last few minutes, that I am willing to sit down and discuss what seems to be, what superficially seems to be-and perhaps substantively, I do not know- a new initiative and a change of direction by the Canadian federal government as espoused by its leader, the Prime Minister, in Newfoundland over the last number of days. We are willing to do it immediately, just suspend the House and stop everything and sit down and discuss what seems to be a change. No problem there at all. That is number one, Mr. Speaker.

Number two, when the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) says that what the Province has been saying is that we want the offshore oil and gas resources to be treated the same as if they were on land, I hope the hon. member knows what he means by that because there are other qualifications in the Prime Minister's statements which talk about 'until you are a 'have' province' then it is no longer treated as if they were on land.

I hope the hon. member understands its effect upon the fishery, The rate of development, the role of Petro-Canada, the role of the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation are all facets of the issue which are not solved by saying that it be treated the same as on land until you are a 'have' province, which must be dealt with concomitantly with any other kind of agreement outside of a legal one.

MR. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. R. MOORES: He is getting away with his junk.

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1335

SD - 3

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, would the Premier agree-now the Prime Minister went out of his way, not at the meeting but in front of all Canadians, I suppose, because some of the programme was carried nationally, and certainly for all of Newfoundland, to talk about the revenue sharing

MR. FLIGHT:

split the same as if it were located on land and he said, Mr. Speaker, that today in Alberta 45 per cent of the revenue goes to the government of Alberta, 45 per cent. And the hundred per cent we are talking about is that 45 per cent. We would get 100 per cent of the 45 per cent. So, in other words, what he was saying was that the resource would be treated the same as if it were on land. In other words, the same for revenue sharing purposes as the resource is treated in Alberta.

Now, I would want to know if the Premier would confirm that that is his interpretation of what the Prime Minister said?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: First of all, I am very, very happy that the Prime Minister has clarified his statements at Memorial University where he talked about 100 per cent of the revenue and people all over the Province during that time were saying 100 per cent of all the revenues. Now he has come back to the position that we had taken after his speech at Memorial and said, '100 per cent of what is available to a Province', which is really 40 or 45 per cent. So, I am happy to see that the Prime Minister has clarified that.

Secondly, let me go on to say, seeing the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (G. Flight) wants to get into detail, that the Prime Minister did not answer that question when he talked about comparing it with Alberta. Apparently the member for Windsor-Buchans does not realize that the offshore Newfoundland under federal law, proposed and in existence, is different than oil and gas on land in Alberta. Is the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans aware that the Canadian Federal Government is treating, under law, under legislation, under regulations, the frontier areas differently than they are

PREMIER PECKFORD: treating Alberta? So it is not apples and apples, it is apples and oranges. So when asked the question, and I have it here before me on page four of the written transcript, about Petro-Canada's involvement, the Prime Minister's response came back and dealt with Alberta and the 45 per cent. The unfortunate part about it was that his answer is not applicable in this case because the offshore, under his own government's law, under his own government's regulations, is being treated differently today in existing law than Alberta's oil and gas is being treated. So therefore the answer -

MR. LUSH: You are being arrogant and a smart aleck.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, no.
Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the member for Terra Nova (T. Lush) takes that as being smart-alecky. I am sorry. The legislation is that Petro-Canada's interest would be increased from 25 to 43 per cent on frontier areas, not in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: I yield for a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I will simply say to the Premier that his interpretation of what the Prime Minister is saying and other people's interpretation is not the same, it cannot be reconciled. So now I would ask a very simple question: will the Premier, for the purpose of breaking the stalemate, give the House a commitment that he will take the initiative and request a meeting with Mr. Trudeau and his federal counterparts to see if whether or not an agreement, under the conditions laid out by the Prime Minister, can be reached, yes or no.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am prepared to sit down with the Prime Minister of Canada - or any members of the government are - to sit down with the Government of Canada tomorrow morning to see whether, in fact, what the Prime Minister has been saying verbally will translate into a change in position by that government so that we can get some kind of an agreement on the offshore as quickly as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member for LaPoile.

X
MR. S. NEARY: I, too, would like to welcome the Premier back and I admire his beautiful colour today. But the problems are still here; even though the Premier may have been away, the problems are still with us. And one of the big problems in Newfoundland today in certain communities, certain municipalities is the implementation of the property tax. Now would the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) tell the House how many municipalities are having assessments done at the present time with a view to implementing the property taxes?

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

X
MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, we have requests for assessments in excess of sixty for this year, sixty-odd. And I really cannot say just how many of these will be assessed this year or how long it will take, but we are working on those sixty-odd requests.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Out of the sixty requests, and a number are going ahead at the present time, I presume, a number of municipalities are actually in the process of doing the assessment on the property, would the hon. minister tell the House how many violent objections have come in to the department where residents of municipalities are violently objecting to the property tax and the way it is being forced on them, the way it is being implemented, the undemocratic manner in which the property tax is being implemented?

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

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1337

DW - 3

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, we have not had any at all, not one violent objection. The town of Bonavista has expressed their concern and what they are asking for is more information on it. And we have just completed a circular on property tax which will be mailed to every householder in Bonavista.

MR. S. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1338

AH-1

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

X
MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister raised the problems that have developed in the old and historic town of Bonavista. Would the hon. minister tell the House why she has refused to accede to the wishes of a committee that wished to meet with the minister in Bonavista, why she refused - and the information communicated through the member for the district - why she has refused so far to go down to Bonavista and sit down with the committee or with the people or hold a public meeting to explain the matter of the property tax to the people in that town?

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

X
MRS NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, the request for a meeting in Bonavista came to my department and was for officials to go down. My officials have visited Bonavista and there was a meeting and I think about possibly 100 people attended. So we feel now that the distribution of this circular will get into every household in Bonavista and this is a better way to get the information across.

MR.NEARY: A supplementary.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR.NEARY: Does the hon. minister realize that the government is sitting on a powder keg in Bonavista, that the implementation of the property tax in that community, without allowing the people to vote whether or not they wish to have the property tax and how much it should be, the non-democratic way in which it is being implemented, is the minister aware that she is sitting on a powder keg

MR. NEARY: as far as Bonavista is concerned?
And that the people did look forward to the minister coming out. It was not the officials that they wanted. They wanted the member and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Newhook) to attend the meeting in that community. Will the minister indicate whether she will be going to Bonavista in the very near future to discuss this matter before it get out of hand?

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

MRS NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I visit as many communities as I can and no doubt I will be in Bonavista, but I would like to wait to see the results of the circular that we are forwarding and I do feel that when they get the right information and when they are all aware of the information contained in that circular that there will be no more problems in Bonavista.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER : A final, final supplementary. The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister inform the House whether or not information is included in that circular to give the residents of Bonavista and the other communities that the property tax is being forced on, will they be given the right to decide for themselves and not have the property tax hoisted on them from St. John's, will they be given the right to a secret ballot to vote whether or not they wish to have the property tax?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, under our legislation, the new Municipalities Act, it is mandatory that there be

MRS. NEWHOOK: property tax if the town is serviced 50 per cent with water and sewer or water or sewer. And the residents of Bonavista, now, are asking for an expansion of their water services and what we have said to them is that it is mandatory that there be property tax if you wish a continuation or an expansion of these services to your community.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook). I can assure the minister that if Bonavista is not a powder keg, then Frenchman's Cove in the district of Grand Bank is. Because you are going to have troubles, and I give you fair warning to that. But there was water put into the community of Frenchman's Cove, there are eighty-seven homeowners, thirty-seven of them connected to the water. There are fifty homes in the community of Frenchman's Cove some of which can not afford to put the services in to receive the water even if they wanted to, they just do not have the money. They are now being charged -

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

The hon. member must ask his question.

MR. THOMS: I will get to the question.

They are now being charged \$120 a year, which is - what? - three times what I am being charged in St. John's and my question to the minister is this, is there any way that these people can get relief from this tremendous burden to them? The community council simply says, 'Look, we are being forced into charging you \$120 a year by the Department of Municipal Affairs'. But is there any way

MR. THOMS: that these people can get relief from this overtaxing burden?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I am looking into the problem in Frenchman's Cove. I do not think it is quite as serious as my hon. colleague there has pointed out. But it is a practice that if the council provides water services or sewer services to a community and it brings it to the property line of a householder, then that householder then is deemed to be available to be hooked up to the service. And if the cost for service has been put across the property, then that owner is supposed to pay for the services regardless of whether he feels he should hook onto it or not.

And in the cases where people cannot afford to hook on to the services, and if these are welfare recipients, then the Department of Social Services will pay for them to be hooked on

MRS. NEWHOOK: to it. But I am looking into that problem in Frenchmen's Cove just to see how serious it is.

MR. NEARY: How about the other problems?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port.

X
MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs as well. The waste disposal committees across the Province have been transferred from the Department of the Environment to the minister's department, and I understand - well, the question I have for the minister is I understand that the waste disposal committees that now exist will remain in existence, but has the programme been abolished? Will new waste disposal committees be put in place in areas where there are none?

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

+
MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, this is the first year that Municipal Affairs will have full control over waste disposal all across the Province for incorporated and unincorporated areas. And right now we are working on a new policy and it is not completed yet but as soon as it is I can surely say to the member that I will acquaint him with regard to that policy.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister says it is a new policy and she cannot give me the answer. But I have run into the experience whereby an unincorporated community has applied for a waste disposal site and has been told that they cannot have one because the programme

MR. HODDER: is abolished. Now I would ask the minister if she can tell me - I would ask again if she can tell me whether a community must be incorporated into a local service district in order to get a waste disposal service?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, not if there is already a service area. The services that are there will be continued the same as is.

MR. HODDER: What about the new ones?

MRS. NEWHOOK: With the new ones we have not formulated the policy yet, it is not completed so I cannot give you all the details on it. But I do not see any serious problems for unincorporated areas. Certainly that service will be available to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If I may, I notice some people leaving from the galleries and I did not get an opportunity earlier to welcome to the galleries. I do not usually do it during Question Period, but I will do it now because we do have some special guests in attendance. We have with us today twelve special education students and two teachers from Grand Prairie, Alberta; and forty students and three teachers from Fort Langley Junior Secondary School in British Columbia. We hope that they enjoy their visit with us today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), And the question I have for the Minister of Education, being in charge of school tax authorities, under the Department of Municipal Affairs

MR. HISCOCK: agricultural land is not taxed. Now that the Minister of Education (Ms Verge), in charge of School Tax Authorities has more tax authorities being set up in this Province and are going throughout the Province assessing not only businesses and private homes but they are also assessing agricultural land. And particularly on the West Coast, this is becoming an extremely grave problem because its taxes go up to \$2,000 or \$3,000. The community councils or the towns in those parts of our Province are not taxing them at all, but here we have another department in government as a contradiction because this -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Question Period, again, is to ask questions and not to make speeches. I think the hon. gentleman was -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - giving certain introductory remarks but they have now come into the area of a speech.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a legitimate point of order. The hon. member is aware of that as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is a legitimate point of order and, obviously, there are other members who wish to ask questions so I would ask members to keep their preambles as brief as they can. I would ask the hon. member to direct his question.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, My question to the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) is, now that this is becoming

MR. HISCOCK: a serious problem in the Province of agricultural land being taxed by the School Tax Authority, will the Minister of Education (Ms Verge), who is in charge of that, exercise her authority and do away with this tax as Municipal Affairs had, by not taxing it in the first place?

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, most school tax authorities at the moment impose simply a poll tax. There are some authorities, those in areas where property assessments have been carried out - and my own area of Corner Brook is one of them - have imposed, based on property assessments, school taxes on farms. There is a provision which is being used by the Corner Brook School Tax Authority, to give one example, whereby the authority requests of the Minister of Education an exemption or a partial exemption for agricultural land because of the special nature of farm land. As I say, that provision has been used. We are sensitive to the special aspects of farm land and, you know, I can say that this really has not been a problem so far. Most of the farming areas of the Province - Cormack, Pasadena area, Codroy Valley - are not within school tax authorities which impose any tax on that farm land.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. HISCOCK: As the minister informed this House, with regard to her own riding there is a special provision. I do not see why there should be a special provision just for one area of the Province. Will the Minister of Education ensure that since Municipal Affairs is not allowed to tax agricultural land, that she will instruct new tax authorities, as well as the ones already in existence, that they are not allowed, or will not be allowed to charge a tax on those lands?

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

MRS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I did not say, nor is it the case, that there is any special arrangement for the Corner Brook area. I merely gave one example of an authority which has requested of the Minister of Education an exemption or partial exemption for farm land where assessments have been carried out and where there is a commercial tax. Now, most authorities or many authorities do not have a commercial tax, they simply have a poll tax, so the issue does not arise.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Deputy House Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: That could be considered partisan, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, when my colleagues are through with their chuckles here, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Inasmuch as the one of the prime responsibilities of the minister must be look after the welfare and the interests of teachers, I wonder if the minister is aware of the fact that her government unilaterally interfered with the teachers' collective bargaining act within the last twelve to fifteen months?

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

MR. FLIGHT: A good question. Now let us have a short answer. A short question, a short answer.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am really not sure what the member for Terra Nova (T. Lush) is alluding to. One of the issues which is outstanding in the present dispute between government, the Federation of School Boards and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association has to do with co-ordinating

MS. VERGE: principals and I suspect that what he is getting at. The position of co-ordinating principal was introduced in a different era in education in the Province after reorganization, and in recent years it has been generally acknowledged in most areas of the Province that the functions which co-ordinating principals originally had were no longer needed because of the changes that had occurred in the years since.

Over the past couple of years, with recommendations that came to us, and after and long with discussions with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association executive, it was decided that the position would be phased out at the end of the term of the collective agreement which is still outstanding, which was the end of August, 1980.

Now, there were problems which developed after that. The Newfoundland Teachers' Association expressed displeasure after the event and the matter was referred to an arbitration board. The arbitration board has ruled, has given a decision, indicating that there has to be some compensation paid to the people affected. The amount of compensation is to be negotiated among the parties. Failing an agreement of the amount of compensation, the matter is to be referred back -

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - to the arbitration board and I am satisfied that a fair resolution of

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1343

SD - 1

MS. VERGE: that a fair resolution of that issue will be accomplished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

We have about thirty seconds left for a question and answer.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I can certainly ask the question, I only wish the minister could make her answers as precise and as much to the point as I can make the questions precise and to the point.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I will want to follow that point a little later, but on to a new point. In so much as that the strike vote takes a day and it looks like we are going to be faced with a teachers' strike, that is the word that is getting out, again in view of the fact that the minister is looking after the interest of the teachers and in so much as the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), when there was a strike at the College of Trades and Technology, he signed a card supporting these workers -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - can the minister indicate what she is doing to support the teachers? Would she indicate where her interests lie?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, are we not permitted to give the minister opportunity to answer the question, if

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1343

SD - 2

MR. THOMS: she so desires, with the leave of
the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The Standing Orders are quite
clear; thirty minutes are allowed for Question Period. The
thirty minutes have expired.

Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
I have heard a 'no', there has
not been leave granted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

We have to proceed.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. Minister of Culture,
Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a
question yesterday by the hon. the member for Bellevue
(Mr. Callan). The number of applications for big game licences
in 1980 were 36,444. There were 14,354 party applications
and 7,736 individual applications. In total there were 13,085
licences issued consisting of 10,453 party licences, 2,632
individual licences. In total, there were 36,444 people who
applied for big game licences in Newfoundland. Of that, 23,538
people were successful and were issued licences last year.
And there were 7,000 moose and caribou killed.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: I think this question was alluded to: The hunter safety test - in 1978, the first year of the hunter safety test, there were 35,630 who took and passed the test. In 1979, 6,200 - a large drop considering that 1978 was the first one, 6,294. In 1980, 2,842 and this year it is anticipated, because of the new programme, that 7,700 people will take the test - and that is an estimate - bringing the total since 1978 to 52,469 Newfoundlanders who will have taken the hunter safety course by this year. That is not necessarily the number in the Province now who are eligible to apply for a license because some of these people are deceased or have left the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further answers to questions?

MR. NEARY: A point of order Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now that the Premier is back in his seat, I wonder if he would issue instructions to the ministers to answer some of the written questions that are on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There is no point of order.

Further answers to questions. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to question number thirty-three presented by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. FLIGHT: She is not allowed to read it.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1344 AH-2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further answers to questions?

MRS NEWHOOK: It is requesting the number of trips I have made since I have been Minister of Municipal Affairs and I have not made any.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Order 15, Bill No. 41. Second reading of a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973." I believe that the last day the debate was adjourned by the hon. the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who has about twenty minutes remaining.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the last time I participated in this debate on this bill, we welcomed the reform as far as separating the responsibilities of the Comptroller of the Treasury and the Deputy Minister of Finance. And as I indicated at that time, this was a recommendation that was made by the Public Accounts Committee as the result of wrongdoing.

MR. NEARY:

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that government were more or less forced to separate these two positions because of wrongdoing. This bill would not have been before the House today if it were not for wrongdoing, the mismanagement and abuse of the taxpayers' money.

What brought it to a head was the improper spending of money in the Department of Public Works. And that is history now in this Province although the matter, I hope, is not closed, I hope the matter is still open. I hope that the government is making every attempt to recover the literally hundreds of thousands of dollars that were defrauded in the Department of Public Works.

And the other two items that brought it to a head were the McConnell Advertising spending in this Province, and the Devine Advertising scandal involving a political poll that was paid for out of the public treasury, paid for out of public funds. These are the three major items, Mr. Speaker, that brought this reform before this House. And, as I say, it is tragic, it is unfortunate that it took crimes against the public treasury, that it took a criminal action in order to bring about this reform.

We would not have had this bill before the House today if it were not for the crimes that were committed. And one individual, as we know, only one, out of all the skulduggery, the impropriety, the mismanagement, and abuse of public funds, of all the crimes that were committed only one individual, only one has paid the price, the others have walked away scot-free, and that one individual, I might say, has remained up to now very tight-lipped, very tight-lipped.

MR. NEARY: If that gentleman would only talk, Mr. Speaker, if he would only spill the beans, I am afraid that we would have more than one Cabinet minister get the shirt-tail run out of this House.

I have been paying very strict attention to these matters and I must say that I am rather disappointed that there has been no follow-up by the Justice Department, no follow-up by the Minister of Finance or the Comptroller of the Treasury. It is the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, it is the direct responsibility of the Comptroller of the Treasury to follow up on these matters. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should follow up on these matters to see what civil action can be taken to recover the funds that were defrauded. We know about hundreds of thousands of dollars- I would suspect it is in the millions myself - of

MR. NEARY:

money defrauded from the public treasury in connection with the Public Works spending. And prior to this, Mr. Speaker, prior to being caught and sentenced and probably still serving time - I am not sure if the gentleman is out yet or not - prior to that, the individual set up a trust company so he could put all his equipment and all his assets into a trust company, so he will come out of prison - serve a year or so in prison over at Westmoreland, on the farm over there - serve his sentence, come out and still be a wealthy man. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that fair? Is it fair? Are the government afraid or are they scared to follow up on this matter to recover the money? I think we are still within the statute of limitations as far as this matter is concerned. And I demand, Mr. Speaker, that further action be taken on this particular matter and that the government just not sit on it and just allow one individual to pay the price to society and then by serving a nine month or a one year jail sentence, and then that is all there is to it, the matter is over and done with it. And I am sure there are ministers on the government side of the House breathing a great sigh of relief, that they hope that the matter is closed, that the file is closed.

Well I hope it is not closed. I hope Mr. Mahoney in his report will open it up again. I understand one of the major recommendations of the Mahoney Royal Commission is to take whatever action necessary to recover the funds, take whatever action is necessary. That is one of the major recommendations of the Mahoney Royal Commission that so far the government has refused to table in this House. I do not know if they will give us a list of the recipients of the colour television sets or not.

There is no reason for the delay in tabling this report. Editorial writers have already started writing editorials about it. The longer the government keeps

MR. NEARY: it under wraps, the more air of mystery will be created about it.

MR. HISCOCK: It will probably appear with two or three pages gone.

MR. NEARY: That is right, and I hope none of the pages will be removed as we saw in the last report that was brought into this House.

But, Mr. Speaker, the government should take immediate action to recover the funds that rightfully belong to the Public Treasury and were defrauded from the Public Treasury, and I hope that because Mr. Mahoney identifies certain ministers as being too friendly with Mr. A.B. Walsh, and Walsh's companies that defrauded the Public Treasury, I hope it will not just die, be

MR. S. NEARY:

allowed to die. There have been violations of the Financial Administration Act just the same as there were violations of the Financial Administration Act in connection with McConnell's and in connection with Devine Advertising. And, again, Mr. Speaker, I have to say this, even though I was a member of the committee that made a unanimous report to this House in connection with the irregularities and the crimes that were committed there in connection with the spending for McConnell's and Devine Advertising, even though I was a member of the committee that endorsed the report, the unanimous report recommending that these funds be recovered and that certain action on the part of the Premier of that day was reprehensible, even though, Mr. Speaker, I was a member of that committee, I have to say this, that I hope that the blame for the crimes that were committed and the theft and the robbery and the fraud, I hope it will not just be pinned on one man, Mr. Speaker, namely, Mr. Frank Moores. If hon. members will take the trouble to read that report they will see that there are practically four or five paragraphs, almost a page and a half, that deals with collective responsibility. And I hope that Mr. Moores will not be the fall guy.

Mr. Speaker, we can only table a report in this House. We cannot initiate action, it is up to the government to initiate the action. Now in this particular instance of McConnell and Devine, who will they take action against? They cannot take action against the Tory Party. The Tory Party was actually innocent of the whole thing. They certainly cannot take action against one individual, namely, Frank Moores, the former Premier. Would that be fair, Mr. Speaker, when they were all in cahoots together, to lay the blame on one man, to make a fall guy out of one man, to use Mr. Moores as a scapegoat? Is that what they are attempting to do, Mr. Speaker? If it is, that would be very unfair and justice will not be done. Every minister in the

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1347

DW - 2

MR. S. NEARY: government at that time is responsible, every minister! There is no out, no excuses! They cannot say, 'Well, we have a loss of memory'. They cannot say that. They cannot say, 'Mr. Moores did not let us know what was going on'. That is a weak and a cowardly excuse and would only show the characteristics of somebody who had a yellow streak up and down his spine. They cannot say that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Moores can only accept his share of the blame the same as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who was in that Cabinet, has to accept his share of the blame. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is equally to blame. And the Premier at this moment, who was a senior minister in that government, has to accept his share of the blame. Eleven or twelve ministers in the present Cabinet cannot weasel their way out of this. They cannot skirt around it. They cannot shirk their responsibility. We happen to be working under a system, the British parliamentary system, that says - and this is the heart and soul of the system and how it works - that every member of the Cabinet was equally responsible. Collective responsibility it is called.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: And Frank Moores must not be used as the fall guy.

MR. MORGAN: Leave him alone, then, boy.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Mr. Speaker, I would say this, I would just as soon leave him alone if he is going to be the scapegoat and the fall guy.

The present Premier of this Province, a senior minister in the government, was one of the ones, one of the principals, who did one of these four and one-half minute films that were to be shown on Provincial Affairs and, Mr. Speaker, can he sit in this House and tell me that he did not know that that four and one-half film strip that he did for political purposes to be shown on Provincial Affairs, that he did not know that it was political?

MR. STAGG: I was on there too.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was not on like the Premier.

MR. STAGG: I had my picture taken in Gander (inaudible)

MR. THOMS: Yes, but the camera broke.

MR. NEARY: There were four film strips made and the Premier appeared on one of these films by himself.

MR. STAGG: It ended up on the cutting room floor.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, it did not end up on the cutting room floor, it ended up being seized by the RCMP.

MR. FLIGHT: That was where it ended.

MR. NEARY: That was where it ended up.

MR. FLIGHT: And there is a recommendation in now on it (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, can the Premier, who was a senior minister in the Moores administration now say, 'I did not know, I do not remember. I did not know what Mr. Moores was doing.' Because that is what they have been saying. They have been parading now before the Public Accounts Committee one after the other, and, like a crowd of cowards, they have been saying, 'We do not remember,' or 'We did not know what Mr. Moores was doing, he did not tell us what he was doing.' Mr. Speaker, they approved the money, the allocation for that spending,

MR. NEARY: and they knew that Mr. Moores, everyone of them knew that Mr. Moores and Mr. Maynard and Mr. Thomas and Mr. Bob Cole had been given authority to sign invoices in violation of the Financial Administration Act. Everyone of them knew it. And if they try to skunk their way out of it now, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that it would be the most cowardly and dastardly act that I have ever seen performed by a minister or a member of this House.

The money has to be recovered, Mr. Speaker, in the case of McConnell Advertising, and Devine Advertising, where the public treasury was defrauded of over \$100,000. We know of \$100,000, it is probably more because in McConnell's case the Auditor General tells us that it was impossible to verify the invoices. So we do not know if the spending was authentic or not. And I hope that matter has not been dropped.

And in the case of Mr. Walsh, who very cleverly set up a trust company, funnelled his assets into a trust company so that when he comes out of prison he can waltz into this Province a wealthy man and he can say, 'Ah, I served my sentence, I paid the price to society for what I did, for my wrongdoing.' And everybody else, including the ministers, can walk away scot-free. That will be some justice, Mr. Speaker. Not only must justice be done, but justice must appear to be done. So let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that these matters will be dealt with quickly by an administration that is trying to portray the image of being honest and open. That is what they have been telling is all along: 'We are honest and open, we are not going to tolerate any skulduggery or wrongdoing'. Well, here is the chance for

MR. NEARY: them to prove their sincerity. And if they do not take swift action, then we can only come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that this is all public relations, it is all PR, they have no intention of trying to recover the money or lay charges against those who are responsible.

Mr. Walsh has been the scapegoat and now they are trying to make the scapegoat out of Mr. Moores. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say about that is that poor old Mr. Moores, if he is foolish enough, and Mr. Walsh is foolish enough, to allow themselves to be the scapegoats, well, I would say there is not much hope for us.

Walsh could tell us more than he did, Mr. Speaker. He could tell us more than he did. And I am sure if Mr. Moores is pushed that he will tell us a few things, a thing or two about the present Premier and the ministers in the government. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that they will walk very gingerly, they will be like they are treading on egg shells, they will be like they are walking on glass in their bare feet, the way they will deal with this situation. We will soon find out how they are going to run a government of honesty and integrity and an open government. We will soon find out. They have had the Mahoney Royal Commission in their possession now for the last three weeks and the flimsy excuse the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) gave us the day before yesterday for not tabling it in the House, 'It is in the

MR. NEARY: final stages of being studied,'
whatever that means.

MR. THOMS: The Cabinet does not have it yet.

MR. NEARY: 'The final stages are being studied.'

Mr. Speaker, you can read the report in one evening when you go to bed; you take the report to bed with you, and before you go to sleep, you can read it, but, 'it is in the final stages of being studied.' All that is, Mr. Speaker, is a stall, The fact of the matter is that they do not want the people of this Province to have the report.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I welcome this division of authority in the Department of Finance where the Comptroller of the Treasury will now have the sole responsibility-and he is our agent, he is the agent of this House, Mr. Speaker; he is the only safety valve that we have in this House and the people of this Province have to see that there is no skulduggery or to see that there is no improper spending or abuse of taxpayers' money - the only safety valve we have.

There are a couple of clauses in this bill that are of some significance, I am sure my hon. colleague the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), our spokesman on Justice, when he speaks in this debate will refer to these other clauses that need further explanation, I might add. One clause there says that the provincial government can withhold all funds that are due people who have been convicted, not charged - I am not sure if it says charged or convicted in a court of law. I do not know what that means. Perhaps the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can tell us when he closes the debate exactly what that clause means. I do not understand it.

DR. COLLINS: What clause?

MR. NEARY: The clause that has to do with withholding funds of people who have been convicted - is that

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1350

SD - 2

MR. NEARY: What is it, convicted?

AN HON. MEMBER: Charged.

MR. NEARY: Oh, charged! Not convicted, Mr. Speaker, charged or in dispute with the government.

MR. THOMS: You are guilty until proven innocent.

MR. NEARY: Guilty until proven innocent, as my friend says. Charged, Does that mean that somebody could go to arbitration under a clause in a contract with the government and they could put the dispute to arbitration and then the government would withhold their funds? Is that what it means? If I could get the hon. gentleman's attention -

DR. COLLINS: I will explain.

MR. NEARY: But am I making a valid point?

DR. COLLINS: You are making a point and I will reply to it.

MR. NEARY: But if there is a situation that develops under a contract with the government where a company has exercised its rights under the arbitration clause of an agreement, can the government then, with this amendment, withhold funds? These are some of the questions I would like to see answered, Mr. Speaker, and I am looking forward to hearing further debate on this matter. X

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. member has spoken before in the debate.

X MR. THOMS: No, the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, has not spoken before in this debate. That I can assure the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

I had only planned to speak for two or three minutes to this bill but I will probably go to a half an hour now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD: A half hour for what you could say in two minutes.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, at least I get on my feet and I say what is on my mind, I am not like the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) who sits silently since he was elected back in June of 1979.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words in the debate on the amendment to the Financial Administration Act. I can honestly say I probably did not understand or realize the importance of the Financial Administration Act until this amendment came along. So I have learned something since this debate started. I wonder if my friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird) has learned anything since he has been elected. But I have learned something since this debate has started and that is that the Financial Administration Act could very well be the most important piece of legislation that we have in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, it did show me one thing, and the Public Accounts report showed me the same thing, and that is that we have sitting across from us in the Tory administration today some of the greatest - I think we see the greatest act of cowardism that I have ever seen in my life. I think we saw that before the PAC when minister after minister paraded before the PAC very conveniently suffering from selective amnesia, not being able to remember what went on in Cabinet or what was approved in Cabinet, very conveniently, Mr. Speaker, forgetting it.

MR. THOMS:

But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province, who was a member of that Cabinet; the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who is bringing in this amendment, who was a member of that Cabinet; the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), who was a member of that Cabinet. I do not know if the hon. member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) was a member of that Cabinet or not. Were you?

MR. POWER: I was not (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes. Yes. Yes.

MR. THOMS: You were not? You are very, very fortunate. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), whom I have said publicly is the one minister in the Tory Administration who treats the Opposition with any sort of decency when they go to him with a problem, and will give action even though you may or may not agree with him, or with the result.

The Minister of Health (Mr. House) was another member of the Cabinet who in 1978 and now has got to bear the responsibility for the decision made by the then administration.

MR. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Right on.

MR. THOMS: Now I can talk about the administration that was in existence in this Province in 1978, or 1975.

MR. NEARY: It is practically the same one now.

MR. THOMS: I was not a member of the previous, previous, previous administration. I am not tarred with any administration. I have not had that privilege yet. Call an election though, call an election and with the good graces of the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) I will probably get a chance to form a part of the administration of this Province.

MR. THOMS: But how many were there, Mr. Speaker?

How many of the present Cabinet? A goodly number -

MR. NEARY: Eleven or twelve.

MR. THOMS: - a goodly number, - eleven or twelve
my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tells me -

MR. NEARY: That is right. That is right.

MR. THOMS: - were members of the Cabinet who in
1978, on April 20th., approved a Minute of Cabinet 347-'78.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under the principle
of collective responsibility every member of the Cabinet at that
particular time was responsible for the decisions made in
Cabinet. And that is a basic principle to our way of government,
that every minister is responsible for the decisions of Cabinet,
if they sit in that Cabinet. Even, Mr. Speaker, even if a
Cabinet minister is vacationing in Nassau -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. THOMS: - if there is a decision made in
Cabinet while he is in Nassau, he is as responsible for the
decision made in Cabinet as if he were here right on the
spot.

The Public Accounts Committee says,
"The Cabinet's decisions are ultimately unanimous. If a
minister cannot support every decision of Cabinet he must
resign.

MR. NEARY: And nobody resigned so we can only
assume -

MR. THOMS: If he does not resign he is equally
responsible -

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. THOMS: - with other ministers for every
decision.'

MR. MOORES: It is a long-standing -

MR. THOMS: No wonder the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) never misses a Cabinet meeting. No wonder he never misses a Cabinet meeting, because he knows what can happen behind his back. He may not read the minutes -

MR. NEARY: But he is still responsible if it happens behind his back or not.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. gentleman permit -

MR. THOMS: You will get a chance to have your say after I am finished.

MR. MARSHALL: I just want to say (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: He is equally responsible with other ministers for every decision.

MR. R. MOORES: I knew he would record it.

MR. THOMS: Is that a question or a comment from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall)?

MR. NEARY: That is the cowardly way out. That is the usual smoke screen to distract from the real issue.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the Public Accounts Committee goes on to say, "It does not matter whether a minister is present at a Cabinet meeting when a decision is taken."

MR. STAGG: Dwell on the past.

MR. THOMS: Do not talk to me about the past! I can regurgitate every time the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) gets up or the member for Placentia East (Mr. Patterson) and all we know about is the Smallwood era.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. THOMS: They know more about the Smallwood era than they do about the Moores or the Peckford eras. That is all they know about. I would like to inform the member for Stephenville, I was not a member, neither a backbencher nor a member of the Cabinet of any Smallwood administration -

MR. NEARY: Or any Moores administration.

MR. THOMS: - or any Moores administration. And, Mr. Speaker, it is even less likely that I will ever be a member of a Peckford administration. But, Mr. Speaker, if I am ever a member, I will accept my responsibilities. I will not cower before the PAC and say, 'I cannot remember anything about that. I mean, I was signing papers, Mr. Speaker, all day - I cannot remember anything that went on that day, anything in Cabinet. I cannot remember any papers coming across my desk. What do you think I am?'

MR. NEARY: And besides, it happened three years ago. I mean, how do you expect me to remember back that far?

MR. THOMS: But if you take that attitude, as the ministers did who paraded before the PAC, Mr. Speaker, then you are shirking your responsibility. Now, that is nothing new for the members of the Peckford administration. The Minister of Education (Ms Verge) does it naturally. I mean, her shrug is as good as Pierre Trudeau's.

MR. THOMS: She does it naturally.

MR. STAGG: Let us have (inaudible)
on Pierre.

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the PAC report also goes on to say that 'a minister is provided with a copy of all decisions and he is expected to read them.'

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. THOMS: 'If he fails to do so he does so at his peril as ignorance is no excuse from the collective responsibility of Cabinet.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: So if the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) has any illusions about not being responsible for a decision taken at a Cabinet meeting he missed, yesterday, then he had better think again.

MR. WHITE: He had better read his material.

MR. THOMS: He had better read his material because he is responsible.

Mr. Speaker, another interesting comment in the PAC report - and, Mr. Speaker, you know, this is a report that just was filed by my friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White). My friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is a member, my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is a member.

AN HON. MEMBER: Kilbride.

MR. THOMS: My friend from Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) -

AN HON. MEMBER: Used to be a member.

MR. THOMS: - used to be a member. But there are four - what I am trying to get, there are four members, there are four backbenchers all trying to claw their way into the Cabinet on that side who are on the Public Accounts Committee. There are no minority reports or anything in here. As far as I know, this is a unanimous decision of the PAC.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. THOMS: So everything that is written right here, everything that is written about collective responsibility in a Cabinet is agreed to by the Tory members of the Public Accounts Committee. And the Tory members of this Committee say this: 'The collective responsibility of Cabinet extends beyond decisions taken at Cabinet meetings. Each Cabinet minister is responsible to the Legislature and to the people of the Province for matters within his department's responsibility.'

Now, recommendation number one of the Public Accounts Committee report says this: "The government should act to ensure that the protection of the Public Treasury provided by Section 31(a) of the Financial Administration Act remains effective."

The greatest act of cowardice that one could see - the ministers in this Tory administration

MR. THOMS: took the former Premier of this Province and threw him to the wolves. Everyone of them who came before the PAC, everyone of them who came before the PAC put all the blame on the Premier. They put all the blame on the Premier. They were not prepared, they were not prepared in 1978 to accept their responsibility as members of the Moores administration. They were not prepared to accept their responsibility. They should not be in the present administration.

They should not be there because, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to indicate to me that those eleven or twelve who were in the Moores' administration are any more prepared to accept their responsibility today anymore than they were when they came before the PAC. Nothing to indicate it, nothing.

Mr. Speaker, there is some very very interesting-and this PAC report should be required reading for every Cabinet Minister. As a matter of fact, those who are in the Cabinet should have to eat every page of it. They refer here to the Premier of the Province at the time, the Premier, to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the Minister of Public Works (H. Young) and the Minister of Health (W.House), Social Services (T.Hickey), Fisheries (J.Morgan) - do not mind Fisheries, he would throw anybody to the wolves, anyone. But this is what the PAC says, 'aside from Premier Moores' other actions, his treatment of Mr. Thomas was reprehensible.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: FONSE will look after you.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, if the actions of the Premier at that time were reprehensible, if his actions were reprehensible, and the PAC report says they were reprehensible,

MR. THOMS: then, Mr. Speaker, you have to carry this further because of the principle of collective responsibility. Because of the principle of collective responsibility, then the Minister of Health (W. House) is just as reprehensible, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is just as reprehensible, the Minister of Public Works (H. Young) is just as reprehensible, the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) is just as reprehensible, the Minister of Social Services (T. Hickey) is just as reprehensible -

MR. HODDER: What about the Minister of Health? Do not forget the Minister of Health.

MR. THOMS: Oh, I did not forget the Minister of Health. He is just as reprehensible. The Minister of Manpower (J. Dinn) is just as reprehensible.

MR. DINN: I had nothing to do with it.

MR. THOMS: There you go, you see the selective amnesia. He had nothing at all to do with it -

MR. DINN: Nothing to do with it.

MR. THOMS: He had nothing at all to do with it. Read the PAC report. It says in black and white, you had all to do with it.

MR. HODDER: He is like Pontius Pilate, he is washing his hands. They are collectively washing their hands.

MR. YOUNG: At that time (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: That is it. Maybe he does not understand, maybe he does not understand the theory, the principle of collective responsibility in Cabinet. Maybe you do not understand that. Maybe instead of French lessons, Mr. Speaker, we can have some lessons in government, for the Minister of Public Works, so he can learn something about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the fact that the Minister of Health, and the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Social Services, the Minister of Fisheries, the Minister of Finance, I have mentioned the fact that they were

May 7, 1981

Tape NO. 1353

EL - 3

MR. THOMS: reprehensible and they remain reprehensible because they have to accept the responsibility, their legal responsibility as members of the Cabinet of that infamous day, April 20, 1978.

Mr. Speaker, I have left one out. I have left a member of that Cabinet out. It just came to mind who I did not mention when I was going through the list of Cabinet Ministers. I missed one. Who did I miss, Mr. Speaker?

MR. THOMS: None other than the present Premier! He was a member of the Moores' administration in 1978 -

MR. NEARY: A senior minister.

MR. THOMS: Yes, a senior minister. He was a member of the Moores' administration which the PAC report says was reprehensible. So in addition to the Minister of Health(Mr. House), and the Minister of Public Works(Mr. Young), and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and Social Services(Mr. Hickey), and Fisheries(Mr. Morgan) etc. -

MR. NEARY: And Manpower(Mr. Dinn).

MR. THOMS: And Labour and Manpower.

MR. WHITE: The President of the Council(Mr. Marshall) was smart enough to get out.

MR. THOMS: - the Premier of this Province must accept his share of the blame. He was just as reprehensible as anybody else. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker? Somewhere in this report it says certain individuals did certain things - yes, they are referring to Mr. Thomas who says he was intimidated, in his testimony. He indicated he feared losing his job if he did not certify the invoices. I thought, Mr. Speaker, from listening to that crowd over there that the -

MR. R. MOORES: Honourable.

MR. THOMS: - this hon. crowd - I thought that the only time anybody ever feared losing a job was in the bad, bad twenty-three years of Smallwood administration in this Province.

MR. NEARY: We were told Moores brought freedom to Newfoundland.

MR. THOMS: That is the only time, I understood, that people were afraid of losing their jobs.

MR. THOMS: jobs was when we had twenty-three years of the Smallwood administration. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I was not a member, neither a backbencher nor a member of the Smallwood administration. I was not around then. But listening to this hon. crowd on the other side of the House, we had twenty-three years of dictatorship when everybody was afraid of losing their jobs.

MR. STAGG: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: And lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago, here we have a report, a unanimous report presumably signed somewhere by four Tory backbenchers which says that Mr. Thomas feared losing his job if he did not certify these invoices. Here we have the PAC Report saying that the treatment of Mr. Thomas was reprehensible and that treatment, Mr. Speaker, whether they want to accept it or not, whether they can lie in bed at night and not be concerned about it, that treatment is as much the responsibility of the present ten, or eleven, or twelve members of the Peckford administration as it was of the Moores administration. This Cabinet is not only reprehensible in that sense, of what they did to Mr. Thomas, but as far as I am concerned, they are reprehensible in what they did to Mr. Moores. Whether he deserved it or not, they threw him to the dogs.

MR. NEARY: He is the sucker.

MR. THOMS: He is the fall guy. Two years ago he was Premier of this Province. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) were walking the proper distance

MR. THOMS: behind the man, trying to touch the hem of his garment. He no sooner resigns as Premier of this Province than the Cabinet ministers parade before the Public Accounts Committee of this Province, on which sit four Tory backbenchers, and threw him to the wolves, threw him to the dogs, cut his throat, there was nothing good about him. And Mr. Clean, with the beautiful from tan from Nassau, as we saw this afternoon, he comes along, not responsible, not responsible, Mr. Speaker.

'We are starting off from scratch. I am going to forgive myself,' he says. I am going to forgive myself and in the process I will forgive the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), and Health (Mr. House), and Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and Social Services (Mr. Hickey), and Finance (Dr. Collins), and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), etc.-

MR. NEARY: Industrial Development.

MR. THOMS: -Industrial Development (Mr. Windsor).

I will forgive them all.' But he cannot, he cannot just come in here, he cannot come in here like a Pontius Pilate and wash his hands of the actions that he was a part of as a senior member of that administration.

MR. HODDER: And what did he do to the Minister of Fisheries who broke the Public Tendering Act?

MR. THOMS: When I see what they did to the former Premier of this Province, the one they served under, I have one piece of advice for the present Premier of this Province; for God's sake do not turn your back, do not turn your back because they will have the knives out just as quickly. They will cut him in half. They will chew him up and throw about the bits.

MR. HODDER: It is starting already.

MR. THOMS: And then they will come in lily white and claim no responsibility whatsoever. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. THOMS: just to conclude in the three or four minutes that are left to me, I am expecting action on this report. I am expecting action on the PAC report. Some people might say that I am overly optimistic but I have great faith in the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) of this Province. I assume he does not come under the collective responsibility I was talking about because he was the Speaker of the House at the time. But I have great faith in that man's ability and that man's honesty and integrity. Somebody should be sued, Mr. Speaker, there should be some charges brought under the PAC. Now who is going to be charged? Who is going to be sued? Who is going to be sued to get the money back? You cannot sue the PC party. Legally the PC party does not exist any more than the Liberal party. Legally it does not exist and cannot be sued. Are we going to really rub it in and sue Mr. Moores or are we going to sue the civil servants who are involved in this? My suggestion to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), Mr. Speaker, is that he sue the people who should be sued and the people who should be sued are sitting in this House today. At least ten or eleven of them are sitting in this House today. And I will say again that the people who should be sued, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Social Services (Mr. Hickey), Health (Dr. Collins) and the present Premier of this Province, he should be sued to get the money back that was illegally spent and found to be so. Somebody is responsible and that somebody, these somebodies are the Cabinet of the time. They have to accept their responsibility and I hope the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) shows us just what justice is all about in this Province and does exactly that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have the issue, there is no question about it. We have the topic that I believe most represents, of all the topics that this House has ever been confronted with, the tenor and the substance and the measure of this government. No question about it, Mr. Speaker.

But before we get into the issue, before we get into my thirty minute time allocation on this, I would like to take a brief moment or two to address my hon. colleague, the member for the district of Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) when he made perhaps one of the lowest references to me, to my personage, that has ever been made in this House in the six years that I have been here. Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker -

MR. F. STAGG: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: I think, Mr. Speaker, we are discussing the Financial Administration Act and an attack upon an hon. member has no relevancy here.

MR. T. LUSH: Sit down and take it like a man.

MR. G. FLIGHT: There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Under second reading there is usually broad-range discussion and with each member speaking, I think the Chair will be flexible enough to allow a brief preamble because we are discussing second reading. So I will allow the hon. member to continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, what but for what impartiality of the Chair, would all of us be? What would we be indeed, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: The remark - so that I can put the issue in perspective, the remark that the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) so unwisely made was when he was getting up to report on the findings of the Estimates Committee on Government Services, he very nobly and very gentlemanly and very honourably said, 'The member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) was on that committee but he did not attend any meetings'. And the truth was never plainer than the fact that the hon. member for Carbonear was not at the committee meetings, did not ever intend to go and does not ever intend to go. The hon. member for Carbonear, like a number of members on both sides of this House, has always felt that the scurrilous method by which this government has re-directed debate on the Estimates in this House to committees outside of the House is beyond, Mr. Speaker, reprehensibility. That is why the member for Carbonear does not attend Estimates Committees because the Estimates Committees should never have existed. It should be debated here in this House where all of us can have a go at it not under this -

MR. F. STAGG: That is where we were. We were in the House.

MR. R. MOORES: -supercilious, silly, stupid method of decreasing the significance of this House and the debate that goes on within it.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the crux of this matter is not it does not matter what the member for Carbonear says or where he was, the crux and the substance of this matter is that a beguiling member, a colleague in this House comes into this House

MR. R. MOORES: and so ignorantly tries to bring ignominy against another member. And it is not only the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) but it is some press members in this Province. Gillespie of CBC on television made note of my absence at committee meetings and did not even have the decency to phone me and ask me. Where were you? Why do you not come to committee meetings?" Well, I will tell you why. I will tell you why my record in this House as a member responsible to my constituents is above any man's here, and that is because I tend to the problems of my district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: And I am in my district - when this House of Assembly is not open

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1357

NM - 1

MR. MOORES: I am there every day that I can humanly possibly be there.

MR. STAGG: Why did you sneak away from -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!
I believe the hon. member has now prefaced his remarks -

MR. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: - regarding the Estimates Committee and would deal with the second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act".

MR. MOORES: The likes of the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to bring my representation of my district into question in this House.

MR. LUSH: Wait until that member scurries back to his law practice.

MR. MOORES: Yes, you had better be careful I do not get one of my university students to take the PC nomination from you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: You had better be careful. That is how weak you are.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member is in charge of the university now?

MR. MOORES: That is how weak you are and how insignificant your representation has been in your district.

MR. STAGG: Let us bring the hon. member out.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MOORES: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is no more significant, I might say, or less significant, than his colleagues in the government when it comes to corruption, when it comes to the misuse of public funds in this Province. The one thing that the public of this Province perceives us to be, perceives us to be equal, all of us, whichever side of the House we sit on, the public of Newfoundland perceives us to be equal in that we are all corrupt and for a long time I felt that that was an unnecessary feeling on the part of the public in this Province and generally on the part of the populations all over Canada and North America. I always felt that we merely, as human beings, mirror the people we serve, and if any of you ever go sometimes to a building materials dealer, or a supermarket, or a dry goods store, or anything else, you will know what corruption is. You will know the legal theft that goes on within this Province, how shopkeepers, how entrepreneurs how businessmen rob us and thieve from us every chance they get, and in many cases they are protected, they are protected in doing that by the principle of free enterprise, a principle of free enterprise, by the way, that has outworn its usefulness in a world that is encumbered by inflation, and encumbered by a middle-class that is overtaxed.

MR. STAGG: Is the hon. member leaning to the left?

MR. MOORES: I have always been leaning to the left. If I was Roman Catholic and residing in Northern Island, I would probably be a member of the IRA. If there was a decent NDP Party in this Province, I might just be a member of the NDP. But the fact of the matter is that the only

MR. MOORES: alternative to the present government in this Province is the Liberal Party. And the only alternative that has ever been to the PC Government in this Province has been the Liberal Party. And I think myself, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House are not as much appalled at the idea that government misuses money and is corrupt in itself, in its actions and the way it deals with the people in this Province, but we are appalled more at the fact that this government, this government presently in this Province, is getting away with corruption and misuse of public funds right under the noses of the people.

MR. THOMS: They sit there and take it without even debating, not even debating.

MR. MOORES: It is just incredible, Mr. Speaker, what the press in this Province is not doing to uncover the kind of rape of the public treasury that is going on. And time and time again we have brought it up in this House and there has been no significant publication given to it.

Do you know that the Report of the Public Accounts Committee got about 500 words of coverage in both daily newspapers in the City of St. John's, and a moment or two on most of the radio and television stations, a report that concluded unequivocally that the former Premier of this Province and his Cabinet abused the finances of this Province, bullied the officials that they had working

MR. MOORES:

for them, actually corruptly misused public funds? It was made very clear in this report, there was no question of it, it was an unanimous report, there was no dissension, no objection, even in the findings of it. And what happened? What action did this government take, what action has anyone taken to make these people accountable for what they did? A public inquiry, a select committee of the House, perhaps, judicial committee of some sort, what? Hunderds of thousands of dollars taken and wasted and squandered on political propaganda and party usage, brow beaten officials in government, misuse of public funds, no public tenders and what has been done? What will be done? The answer is nothing. We know that, I mean, we are not naïve enough on this side of the House to think that the Premier of this Province, the white knight of Newfoundland - no, not so white right now, he just got back from Nassau - but the white knight of this Province, a senior - one of the top three ministers in the Moores' administration, one of the top three Cabinet ministers responsible for formulation of policy and government decision in the Moores' Cabinet, who now says he cannot remember what went on, He did not know that these things were going on right beneath his nose, yet the decisions were made in Cabinet. And this same Premier - this same Cabinet minister now sits as Premier of this Province and denies any responsibility, any collective responsibility for the decisions that were made by a Cabinet in which he was a member.

MR. LUSH:

A senior member.

MR. MOORES:

Not only senior, never mind the senior part of it, the fact is the man was Minister of Mines and Energy. This was perhaps the most critical portfolio in the Moores' government in policy formulation. He of all the ministers in the Moores' administration had every reason to want to get re-elected, to want his government to get re-elected,

MR. MOORES: and to do that, to have his government get re-elected, to continue to soften his nest, to continue on his path towards the premiership of this Province, he allowed Frank Moores, who, by the way, was, without question, the most corrupt Premier in this Province's history, and that takes in Alderdice - well it takes in -

MR. THOMS: He was pretty corrupt.

MR. MOORES: - a dozen infamous premiers over a period of one hundred and some-odd years and Moores, without question, was the most corrupt. He makes Joey Smallwood look like the angel Gabriel. That is how bad he was and we kept saying it from 1972 - well, not quite 1972, it took a year or so for us to catch on.

MR. FLIGHT: And his ministry knew it.

MR. MOORES: But we kept on saying that from 1973 until 1978, we kept repeating it, we kept telling the people of this Province, we kept pointing out certain things. And I might point out to you that the Moores' administration started off with exactly the same pious goals as this government.

MR. FLIGHT: The Premier himself on one of the pages (inaudible).

MR. MOORES: No different! I recall Frank Moores so clearly, on television and on a tape recording in front of Memorial University students in 1972,

MR. MOORES: so clearly telling us that the time for the people of Newfoundland had come, that he was going to absolve the people of Newfoundland for twenty-three years of dictatorship and corruption etc., etc. And what did he unleash? A cloud of darkness and a curtain of doom, Mr. Speaker. For almost ten years he unleashed it on the people of this Province. He took away any vestige that the people of this Province had for good, clean politics. And more importantly, when the eleven former Cabinet members of the Moores' government, now sitting in this House, and the now Premier, were asked to become accountable, were asked to stand up like men with some courage, some sense of manhood, and say, 'Look, yes, boy, I was a part of it, I was a part of that Cabinet and I am sorry to say that there was nothing that I could do, I had to keep my mouth shut, I had to toe the line because I wanted to become Premier of Newfoundland someday, and I was not going to kick against Frank Moores when I was a senior Cabinet minister and get myself flicked, flung, kicked out of Cabinet. I was not going to do that, I was not going to do that at all. What I was going to do was to stay in the Moores' Cabinet, agree to whatever went on, agree to it, go along with it' - not only that, but encouraged it, encouraged all the corruption that they could encourage because the faster Moores went down hill the faster the present Premier would become Premier. And that happened, you know, that scenario is not theoretical, that is actual and factual when you look from hindsight. There is no theory there, that is a fact.

MR. NEARY: Power at any price.

MR. MOORES: Sure! I mean, this Premier saw what was happening to the Moores government. The Moores government was finished in 1978 and they knew

MR. MOORES: it. Every man in it was crawling under whatever rock he could find and hoping to hell that he would not get beaten in the next election. And what happened? They watched Moores fall. But Frankie baby - you know, I have known him, by the way gentlemen, for twenty years off and on. I do not know the man personally, that is to say intimately, but I do know him because I am from Carbonear and that is where Frankie baby was born too. He grew up in Carbonear and Carbonear being a small town you cannot get to the outhouse without people knowing you are doing it etc., like most small towns in Newfoundland. And there is one thing about Frank Moores, he was not on an ego trip. He saw the writing on the wall and the shrewd guy got out. He said, 'There is no way that I am going to give the people of Newfoundland the satisfaction of kicking me out of office, I am going to get out now and make it appear like I am retiring like a gentleman'.

MR. THOMS: He certainly got kicked after he got out.

MR. MOORES: I will guarantee you he got kicked and not by the people of Newfoundland.

MR. FLIGHT: Et tu Brutus!

MR. MOORES: The present Premier was not too slow in denying Frankie baby three times before the rooster crowed, not at all. And what then, if one looks at the behaviour of this government and its Premier when they were members of the Moores' Cabinet, does that tell you about how they are acting now and how they would react to certain issues?

Well, first of all they knew what corruption was. And anybody who knows what corruption is, or who has participated in some manner of wrongdoing, then they know how to conceal it that much

MR. MOORES: better. And that is what is happening right here with this government, they have learned how to conceal their corruption, their misuse of public funds, their browbeating of certain officials, how they appoint lackeys and cronies, political appointees to very important positions of government and agencies, how they aid and abet wrongdoing in this Province by not laying down

MR. MOORES: the law to certain officials who are running amuck with the people's money, and one example of that is Newfoundland Hydro. Dear God, Mr. Speaker, if there are no reins put on that agency of government, if somebody does not step on Vic Young pretty soon, man I am telling you that it will be another Quebec Hydro. The borrowing capacity of Newfoundland Hydro in this Province right now is \$200 million a year. Five years ago it was nothing and now it is placing upon the public debt of this Province and the taxpayers, \$200 million a year and that is parallel to Hydro Quebec and Ontario Hydro. These same corporations, government agencies, started off at virtually nothing, under direct government control, and now they have grown to be absolutely uncontrollable monsters that in the case of René Levesque in Quebec, he cannot stop this guy, Boyd - is it? - Robert Boyd. He is so powerful in Quebec now that he actually besmirks the government.

MR. HODDER: Quebec Hydro is more powerful than the Quebec Government, and the same thing is happening here.

MR. MOORES: That is correct.

MR. FLIGHT: And now, too, Vic Young is more powerful than the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Let me point out to members of the House, to prove my point that this is not all something that I contrived, fabricated, a couple of weeks ago, Parrizeau, the Finance Minister in Quebec, severely intervened in the operation of Quebec Hydro. A couple of years ago, Levesque appointed a Hydro Board. Prior to that it was operated by basically the chairman and two other members. Two years ago, Levesque changed that and set up a board of directors, most of whom were government appointees, to take back as much control of Quebec Hydro as he could. Now, two weeks ago,

MR. MOORES: Parrizeau went even further and has intervened and said, 'Quebec Hydro, you no longer can borrow any money. We are saying to you now that it is finished. You no longer run this government. You no longer further burden the taxpayer of Quebec.' And the same thing is happening in Newfoundland with Newfoundland Hydro.

MR. FLIGHT: Only the government cannot step in.

MR. MOORES: And the Premier of this Province knows what I am saying is right. He knows what I am saying. And this guy, Young, of Newfoundland Hydro, you know, if you let him go he will destroy this Province environmentally and he will destroy it from a point of view of its financial burden on the taxpayer.

MR. FLIGHT: What is the Premier's stand on the Cat Arm -

MR. MOORES: He does not care about how much money is needed to produce electricity.

MR. FLIGHT: - environmental?

MR. MOORES: Produce it anywhere. Divert whatever rivers we can divert -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the cost and sock it to the consumer.

MR. MOORES: - and give it to them, and then whenever we need the money to do it, go to the government lackeys on the Public Utilities Board and we will get it anyway. Now, there is the truth of it and I wish that some young investigative reporter with the People's Paper would sit down one of these days and say, 'I am going to research that. I am going to go to the libraries and go to the Quebec papers and see if I can determine some pattern of development of Newfoundland Hydro, something that would indicate to me their psychological intent in this Province,' and see if what I am talking about is not true, that we

MR. MOORES: have a young man at the helm of Newfoundland Hydro who wants to become titular head of the Government of Newfoundland. Just another example of the Government of this Province concealing its abuse of its authority by not using it.

MR. FLIGHT: Aided and abetted by the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry).

DR. COLLINS: If it is a Newfoundlander, tear him down, boy!

MR. MOORES: Do not talk so foolish, boy! Where do you think I am from, New York? I do not have the right to objectively assess somebody's

MR. MOORES:

performance in an agency, in a corporation that is spending hundreds of millions of dollars of public money? Do not talk so foolish then. And, you know, look here, a statement like that from the number two minister of government is just exactly what I am talking about.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: No more regard for the public of this Province than a cat. And that is the crux of it, Mr. Speaker, the very substance of this bill that we are bringing in, An Act To Amend the Financial Administration Act, The Financial Administration Act, for the benefit of those people who do not know, is that piece of legislation which governs the administration, the expenditure of public funds, how you do it, the proper procedure for which it is accounted. It encompasses the entire gambit of spending by the government. And because it does that, this amendment is a very wide-ranging debate, in fact, almost as wide-ranging as the Budget debate because of the significance of the piece of legislation.


And I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, so very difficult, after we have seen the financial administration Act circumvented so often. We have seen the financial administration act of this Province circumvented so often that the Auditor General is worn out informing this House in the Auditor General's report, annual reports, of circumvention of the Financial Administration Act, that it is a tragedy in this Province. The man is worn out telling us how often it is done, the seriousness of it and how this government has no regard whatever for the regulations therein. They could not care less that there is a Financial Administration Act. We are all the same as if we were in Bogota, Columbia or something, a banana republic, no accountability and do not care. Just as we have seen the Public Accounts Committee's report on government spending

MR. MOORES: corruption, misuse of funds, brow-beating, fraud, Just as we have seen - here it is, here is the report. It is a public document, available to anyone in this Province. And now the Premier of this Province, just back from Nassau, fresh and revitalized and re-energized, should stand up in this House and say, 'Mr. Speaker, yes we are the good, clean government that we said we were and say we still are, and we are going to take these people, Frank Moores, Frankie baby, and the few others involved here and we are going to place them right before Criminal Court where they should be, right before court where they should be, and let them pay back the money! And Frankie baby can afford it, according to Torngat Investments.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to speak on this, makes us all so equal. We are all one and the same, as far as the people are concerned, and they have a right to believe that. They have a right to suspect it particularly. I mean, what can you expect the people to believe when you see this kind of stuff going on and still going on? Do not forget, still going on this very day, it is going on in this government. But they have learned to conceal

MR. MOORES:

it, they have learned to cover it up and more importantly, Mr. Speaker, you cannot disclose it to the public because the Tory press in St. John's are just simply not interested in letting the people of this Province know just how corrupt and slimy and dirty this government is underneath. And there it is, Mr. Speaker, not the members of the Opposition, we are not responsible for concealing it, it is the government and in turn the Tory press. If you ever read some of the editorials on Chretien's visit and the letter in Bellevue district, the editorial - just because it went on in Smallwood's regime it is permitted here, just because Hitler exterminated six million Jews we can do it here, just because it went on in the past. They are bought and sold this Tory press, bought and sold in St. John's.

Thank you. 

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is the House ready for the question on the amendment? No. Well, before the hon. member speaks, and I do not wish to interrupt him when he speaks, I can tell hon. members now that pursuant to Standing Orders 31(h), it being 5 o'clock I can inform the House I have received notice of three motions for debate at 5:30 when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House. First a notice is given by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) arising out of a question asked the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Andrews) and the subject matter is the awarding of big game licenses. The second notice is given by the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook) and the subject matter is water taxes

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): in Frenchman's Cove. And the third notice is given by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook) and the subject matter is the introduction of the property tax.

On the amendment the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

X
MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would be only be too glad to take my seat if there is some member on the government side who would like to get up and say a few words. And I can understand, Mr. Speaker, if I were a member on that government side I would not have the gall either to get up. So, Mr. Speaker, I can understand why members on that side do not feel inclined today to get up and speak in defence of this bill. Mr. Speaker, if I were a member, and the Premier just came back from Nassau, I would hang my head in shame too to know that this bill is coming before this hon. House and no one on the other side has the intestinal fortitude, to get up and speak in response to the bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume that the general public will draw conclusions of why there are thirty-three members -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: - on the government side and no one will get up and speak in defence of this bill. It must be, Mr. Speaker, if I am reading it correctly, it must be because they are guilty, because that government is guilty. Mr. Speaker, if you are not guilty at least you are going to get up and try to defend yourself. So I would say the guilty stay quiet in this regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we can reflect

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1362

AH-3

MR. WARREN:

back -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

If we can reflect back.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The Chair cannot hear a word that is being said. The hon. member I am sure would want to be heard.

MR. WARREN:

If we can reflect back, Mr. Speaker, sometime back in March, around the end of March 1979, the Premier of this Province was campaigning to become leader of the Progressive Conservative party.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was successful too.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, hon. member. He was successful at that time. And in June 1979, he was campaigning then to become Premier of this Province. Again he was successful. So, Mr. Speaker, you can see the Premier has been successful on two occasions,

MR. G. WARREN: successful in winning the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party, successful in winning the last provincial election. However, Mr. Speaker, during the same period of time he was saying, 'Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow'. Now, Mr. Speaker, he was also saying that, 'Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow'. However, Mr. Speaker, he failed on that one. He failed on that one. The Premier of this Province failed. He won the first two but he failed on the third one because -

MR. R. MOORES: And he knows it.

MR. G. WARREN: And he knows it too, and his government knows it. 'Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow', Mr. Speaker, I think it is exactly the reverse. And this is where the Premier of this Province and his administration fall down into the hands of justice, Mr. Speaker. This is where the Premier falls down. He won the first two however, he did not win the third one. What he gave his soul to; he gave his soul to the people of Newfoundland, 'Look, give me a chance and I shall be whiter than snow'. That is what he gave the people. He said, 'Give me the chance'. Now, the people have given him his chance and two years have past, two years this coming June, and we can see today more corruption in this government than has been in Newfoundland since 1949.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. WARREN: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this bill was introduced for two reasons. And why was it introduced? It was introduced because of last year's findings of the Public Accounts Committee and confirmed by this year's findings of the Public Accounts Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know, I suppose the Public Accounts Committee is the biggest farce that this government condones. Because, Mr. Speaker, this government does not even believe in the Public Accounts

MR. G. WARREN: committée, this government does even believe
in the committee -

MR. MOORES: Not in the members.

MR. G. WARREN: Not in the members. Here is a
Public Accounts Committee and this government will not even
take seriously what it prints. They will not even take
seriously what it prints. And on this committee there are
four members from the government side. We can recall,
Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
If the hon. member would permit
me, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to our
galleries today, a Member of Parliament for New Westminster,
B.C., Mrs. Pauline Jewett. We hope she enjoys her visit.



SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sure
the hon. minister from the federal government will -

AN HON. MEMBER: Member.

MR. G. WARREN: - member from the federal govern-
ment will know that there is corruption in the Newfoundland
government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, this Public Accounts
Committee is made up of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I could see
why the lady left. It is because of the corruption in this
government, because she was ashamed to know that this govern-
ment is full of corruption. She never thought, right from
B.C. to Newfoundland, that she would have to come all the
way to Newfoundland to find out that there is corruption
in this government. That is why the lady left.

May 7, 1981

Tape No. 1363

DW - 3

MR. G. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Public
Accounts Committee last year -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. G. WARREN: Maw mouth over there is going off
again. Last year, I believe, the Public Accounts Committee
said something about maw mouth. The Public Accounts Committee
said something last year about maw mouth but the Premier
said nothing wrong -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: He is lily white.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. G. WARREN: Right, lily white. Nothing
wrong with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), nothing
wrong with him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this year
the Public Accounts Committee comes out with their recom-
mendations again. Now, I want to read recommendation number
four, 'The Minister of Justice

MR. WARREN:

(Mr. Ottenheimer) should direct his officials to immediately initiate law suits to recover the funds paid out under the Devine contract, immediately take steps -

MR. THOMS:

He has to sue his own

ministers.

MR. WARREN:

- immediately take

steps, Mr. Speaker. Now, I am ashamed to have to stand up in this hon. House and know that the Public Accounts Committee have recommended that the Minister of Justice take immediate steps. Now, there has to be something wrong.

MR. NEARY:

They tell us it is a

misunderstanding between two -

MR. WARREN:

Well, that is what the

Premier said last year about the Minister of Fisheries, about maw mouth from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), but, Mr. Speaker, the Premier cannot say the same thing now, can he? The Premier cannot say the same thing now about this report.

Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of the PAC? Mr. Speaker, it is of no purpose whatsoever because the Premier of this Province will not take anything worth its salt that is in there. That is why, the Premier does not care what is in the report, it is just passed over as the case of the Minister of Fisheries was passed over last year, and he was given a blessing. So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we are going to appoint committees in this House and those committees are going to make recommendations, in particular - Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries to close his gob.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Is the member for Torngat Mountains continuing his speech? If so, could we have a little silence so the Chair can hear?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult when you have the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) on the other side, and my colleagues on this side trying to keep the minister down.

Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to have a Public Accounts Committee that is for the interests of this Province and I believe it is only fair for this government and this Premier to realize that there are things going wrong within this administration, there are things going wrong that were carried over from the Moores' administration into this administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, there were some films shown to the Public Accounts Committee members and in those films that were going to be shown on Provincial Affairs on CBC was the Premier of the day.

MR. NEARY: Right. And paid for out of public funds.

MR. WARREN: They were to be shown on Provincial Affairs and they were paid for out of the people's money for the P.C. Party.

I want to read paragraph 2 on page 47, and this is what the Premier's press secretary, the secretary of the past Premier, Premier Moores, and the same press secretary that - here is what

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Petten said - when asked if everyone associated with the filming of the political ads, including the ministers, had known that the ads were being created for the P.C. Party and not for the government, what did Mr. Petten say, I wonder? He said that everyone had been told that the films were being produced for Provincial Affairs and that he assumed they would have thought the films were being produced for the P.C. Party. Now I believe, Mr. Speaker, that was a good assumption. And every minister who was in the Moores' administration, including the Premier of the day - because at that time he had his eye on the leadership and he said, 'Well, here is

MR. WARREN: , a great chance for the Newfoundland people to see me on television and see me in this film on Provincial Affairs and sure I know about it and so therefore-

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you (inaudible)

MR. WARREN: No, thank God. And here it is, it is from the Public Accounts Committee - I believe that the Public Accounts -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: - and here is a member on the Public Accounts Committee, so Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Bring the film into the House.

MR. WARREN: Yes-

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, look we are discussing a bill. Actually it is an amendment, I understand, a six month hoist posed by one of the members opposite, if memory serves me correct, by the member for Trinity- Bay de Verde (F. Rowe), and the nature of the motion is that this bill not be read now but it be read six months time. The matter that is before the House which is to be read six months time according to the motion, is the Financial Administration Act. And, Mr. Speaker, I know that certain items with respect to the Public Accounts Committee may be relevant to this, but I do think that perhaps is not the latitude, so that - the House, after all, Mr. Speaker, does have business to transact, does have important business to transact and I think that the member speaking at least have some modicum of relevance.

MR. HODDER: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is no order. The member is dealing with the Public Accounts Committee Report which comes under this particular act and, Mr. Speaker, if the member has strayed at times, it is perhaps because the government House Leader (W.Marshall) and the government opposite have arranged the public debate of this House in such a way that we can only get on the Budget Speech once a week, and in order for the Opposition to get anything out at all in this House now, we have to try to get it in on public bills.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To that point of order, the Chair has allowed a broad-ranging discussion during second reading. However, I think it is a fair observation by the President of the Council, and I would ask the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (G.Warren) to confine his remarks to the six month hoist moved by the hon. member.

The hon. member has thirteen minutes left.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I believe this Financial Administration Act, 1973, to amend the act, does leave much to be desired, and it is desired from this government that is in power at the present time, because this government in power, Mr. Speaker, is abusing the people of Newfoundland and is actually, according to the Public Accounts Report that was tabled only a few days ago, costing the people of Newfoundland. It has cost a lot of money. It has cost the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, why has not all of the information been given to the Newfoundland population concerning the political poll that the past Premier of this Province carried out? Why was not all the information given? Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Do you know why it was not given? Because the people of this Province would be so upset with this administration that they would be in here day after day with pickets asking this administration to call an election because this administration at the present time, with the skulduggery that is still going on, should not be allowed

MR. WARREN: to govern any longer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. HODDER: The same thing (inaudible) government.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, also, in speaking about the finances of this Province, the expenses incurred in this Province, why has not the Mahoney Inquiry been released yet? The minister announced in the Committee the other day that they have already read it but it has not been released yet. Why, I wonder? But, the Premier can come in today, the first day back from down South, and sign twenty-five year certificates

MR. WARREN: that he hopes to get out in the mail in a few days time to try to cover up, all those certificates are to try to cover up the bad doing.

AN HON. MEMBER: What certificates?

MR. WARREN: The twenty-five year certificates, fifty year certificates, thirty -five year certificates for employees in the civil service. And so he has a big bunch down on his desk now. By the way, have they been passed in the House yet?

MR. NEARY: I should get one of these, I have my (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: There it is and he is going to send those out now to cover up for all the bad feelings. That is what he is going to do -

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) civil servants.

MR. WARREN: - just try to cover up and tell those civil servants, "Look, we never did that bad after all here is a certificate for you, you know."

MR. TULK: A piece of paper.

MR. WARREN: A piece of paper with twenty-five years or thirty-five years marked on it.

MR. NEARY: Eight per cent on a certificate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Eight per cent on a certificate, yes.

MR. NEARY: And a medal at Christmastime. New Year's honour (inaudible) will be medals plus 8 per cent.

MR. WARREN: Recommendation number 6, Mr. Speaker, in the Public Accounts Committee says: 'It is the recommendation of the Committee that the full amount of those political expenses be determined and that an action be initiated on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland to recover the full amount that was expended on those political ads!'

MR. HODDER: Now, there is your certificate.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, here it is, money owed to the people of Newfoundland by the PC Party and instead of this government initiating action and getting this money back into the Treasury where it belongs, get it back to the people -

MR. TULK: Is (inaudible) going down to Bonavista?

MR. NEARY: No, he will not come down.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, what would \$50,000 do for the people in my district? I will tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, it would do, it would help to repair houses that people are living in that are unfit for human habitation. That is one thing it would do, Mr. Speaker. There are residents in my district living in homes that were built by this government that are unfit for human habitation, Mr. Speaker, That is what some of that money would do.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order raised by the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) deliberately wish to flaunt the ruling that Your Honour has made.

MR. HODDER: The hon. Speaker did not (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is debating the matter of a six month hoist of the bill and he is now getting into areas of what \$50,000 could do for his district. There is ample provision for him to speak on that in the Throne Speech in the budget debate.

The principle of this bill -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: You should be ashamed of yourself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, is this kind of conduct allowed to go on in this House or, you know, are we going to conduct this House as a parliamentary forum which it is intended to be?

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) for eight years.

MR. MARSHALL: Listen to this, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council

(Mr. Marshall) on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is drifting off into areas of irrelevancy, having been called to order by Your Honour before. I know he does not deliberately wish to flaunt Your Honour's ruling, but there is a certain order procedure in the House and it has to be followed, Mr. Speaker, if there is to be any progress.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants a threat - it is not for me to give a threat but if the hon. gentleman wishes to act, you know, the way he is acting now and usurp the order of this House the way he is doing, and acting in a manner that is non-parliamentary, there is an obvious way of doing - the hon. gentleman cannot presume to take the House on his back as he is attempting to do it.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) honestly do.

MR. MARSHALL: There is a remedy, Mr. Speaker, he can be named if he has to be named.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, I am making this point of order and I am also appealing for order in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

May 7, 1981.

Tape No. 1366

RA - 4

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please, it is every hon. member's right to be heard in silence. On this point of order I was about to call the hon. member to order, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), because he was straying away from the amendment before the floor right now.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have already ruled on it.

MR. J. HODDER: Muzzled.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains has about five minutes to conclude.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about is the honesty and integrity of this government which is way below par. Mr. Speaker, it is disgusting when you see a minister of the Crown getting up and trying to have another member stopped from saying what he should say about this irresponsible government, and this is the

MR. WARREN:

government that said two years they are going to be whiter than snow.

MR. FLIGHT:

They cannot take it.

MR. WARREN:

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the member who just spoke, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) -

MR. TULK:

No, not Privy Council.

MR. WARREN:

The President of the Council who just spoke, he is a man, Mr. Speaker, a man of this Cabinet that is a long ways from being whiter than snow. He got a guilty conscience by getting up on points of order, Mr. Speaker. And I would say that this financial bill that we are discussing today -

MR. TULK:

He got the Minister of Fisheries on his conscience.

MR. WARREN:

And it has come out in the last two years in the Public Accounts Committee concerning the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) contravening the Public Tendering Act, concerning the political poll, so, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. TULK:

Knowingly.

DR. COLLINS:

The reason for (inaudible) it is impossible to keep (inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is why the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) brought in the six months hoist, because we are so upset because we are getting calls day after day from our constituents saying, What is the corrupt government doing? They are going to corrupt this Province, so will you fellows, on behalf of us, help us try to find out some information? And all we are doing in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is trying to find out some information on why the PC Party of this

MR. WARREN: Province is allowed, is permitted to go and use the people's money to gather data for an election, and this is what is happening. And this is why, Mr. Speaker, we are asking for a six month hoist. We do not think that this bill should pass until we get enough information.

Mr. Speaker, if the Premier of this Province would take seriously some of the recommendations -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: - that have been presented in this hon. House -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) I have ever seen.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: - when the Public Accounts Committee Report was released -

MR. WARREN: - the Premier would do justice to the Province if he would honour those recommendations, and ask his Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) to take immediate steps to recover this money from the PC Party.

MR. NEARY: No, not from the PC Party (inaudible).

MR. MOORES: It is the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) who moved the six month hoist, not Trinity Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe). Correct that because everyone is under the impression -

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a correction that my hon. colleague for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) brought in. It was the member for Eagle River who moved the six month hoist, not the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time is getting short but, however, we want to say we are dissatisfied with the operation and the administration of this government.

MR. WARREN: We are completely dissatisfied with it, and subsequently, we believe it is a good idea to have both sections divided, both sections separated from each other. However, let us hope and pray that it will work better and let us not let the Premier try to forget that he was one of the keys in the Moores administration -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: - and it is not Mr. Moores who has to take the blame, it is the Premier, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and the Minister of Health (Mr. House), the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), Those are the ministers who were in the previous Moores administration, and those are the ministers who must take the credit for being part of this propaganda.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Thank you.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I just got a minute, Mr. Speaker, to observe how edifying it has been this afternoon. We had this bill brought on, there was a six month hoist proposed by the Opposition when the debate adjourned. They got up and they debated all afternoon, they did not even realize they proposed the six month hoist so that is how relevant they have been.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) your responsibility.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, you have got to -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: This act, Mr. Speaker, takes

MR. MARSHALL: in -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (MR. SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking
and I have the right to the protection of the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Boo! Boo!

MR. SPEAKER: I have to carry out
the responsibility that the members of the House of Assembly
have given me and that is to try to preserve order in the House
and to try to do what I can to enhance the dignity and the
decorum of the House, and that is certainly not enhanced
by members shouting across the floor. And I would ask
hon. members to please restrain themselves and let us try to keep
this as the forum which it is meant to be.

The hon. President of
the Council has a few seconds before adjourning the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I know, Mr. Speaker,
I will come back tomorrow and I make the appeal to the hon.
gentlemen there opposite to treat the House of Assembly
like the people's House not like a schoolhouse, Mr. Speaker,
We have fifty pieces of legislation on the Order Paper,
we are trying to discuss them in an orderly manner and we
invite the Opposition to try to represent the people of this
Province in the way in which the people should be able to be
represented in the people's House and not to continue to
derogate it as the hon. gentlemen continually do it with
nonsensical debate. They get up in this House and they do not
even realize the motions they pass. I adjourn the debate. X

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. President of the
Council adjourns the debate. It being 5:30 a motion to adjourn
is deemed to before the House. The first matter for

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): debate is raised by the hon.
the member for Bellevue, awarding of big game licences.
The hon. the member for Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Maiden speech.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take
approximately five minutes in the Late show.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: I know what I am allowed. I have
been on the Late Show before, and Peter Gzowski and the
whole bit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say much
or make too many points in five minutes. Actually, I want
to do two things this afternoon. Number one, of course,
I am a little bit rusty, I have not been in the House for
a couple of years, so I wanted to get used to having a few
words to say in the House and a five minute speech is a
good occasion for that.

I wanted to make one point in
particular regarding the big game hunting system and the
system that is used, of course, for granting these licences.
The point that I wanted to make this afternoon is that
I do not believe there should be any individual licences
issued at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: That is a good point.

MR. CALLAN: Neither do I believe, Mr. Speaker,
that there should be any non-resident licences issued at
all as long as there are hundreds and thousands of resident
hunters who cannot avail themselves of the opportunity of
obtaining a big game licence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: These are the two points I wanted to make this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

In this House of Assembly before, approximately three years ago, I believe, I talked about the hunter capability testing programme. I said at that time that it was wrong. There was just a testing programme with no instruction. That was introduced, as everybody knows, by the minister at the time, the member for Bonavista South. He botched that as the Minister of Tourism, or Forestry, or whatever it was at that time, just like he botched back in 1977 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: When he was Minister of Transportation and Communications back in 1977 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: - and changed the traffic signs on the Trans-Canada, he botched that. There are still hundreds and thousands of drivers on the Trans-Canada who do not know how to use the Trans-Canada Highway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: We just had a lecture from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) about behaviour in the House. Now the hon. gentleman is not in his seat and the members over there seem to be doing what they like. I know Your Honour is doing the best he can to try to restrain the hon. ministers, especially the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) but, Mr. Speaker, this does not do anything for the decorum of the House, it just lowers

MR. NEARY: the decorum of the House, if anything, and I believe that now that the Premier is back in his seat -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - he should attempt to discipline his members and get them under control, Mr. Speaker, because if not, I mean, they are going to turn the House into a bear pit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order. The hon. gentleman there opposite does not to lecture this side on decorum in the House, they can take a mirror themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding the question was addressed to the hon. the Minister of the Environment and Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Andrews) with respect -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - and the hon. gentleman is getting on another minister. Obviously that side is again confused because before they did not know what they were debating, now they have put in a notice of objection here this afternoon and they forget which minister that they are involved with.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, obviously, the words I said a few moments ago were meant for all members of the House of Assembly, not for any particular side, and I hope that they have some meaning, otherwise there

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): is not much point in having a Speaker in the Chair. And if members have conversations which they want to have, instead of shouting across the House to each other, may I suggest they go out in the common room and have a cup of coffee and do it there.

I have to, unfortunately, now advise the hon. member that his time is expired.

The hon. the Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A couple of points raised in the short time he had, by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) - I would like to congratulate him on his Maiden Speech of 2.3 minutes.

With regard to no individual licences, I would certainly have to disagree with that. There are a lot of people who like to hunt alone. They like the pleasure of getting in the woods alone. But you must remember, Mr. Speaker, that these people have the lowest priority in

MR. ANDREWS: the draw. They have the lowest priority in the draw and the applicants that are party applications, they have the highest priority and, generally speaking, I would believe that these applications would go to areas where there would be a surplus of animals.

Regarding no non-resident hunting, my own opinion on that is that I think at this point in our time we can still afford some non-resident hunting in the Province. And I would believe that there are a lot of people, even on the other side of the House, who would agree with that. There are only a few hundred animals that they bring into the Province, I think is significant and it provides a considerable amount of employment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Federal wages.

MR. ANDREWS: The hunter safety test: There have been - my figures show, I think, 52,400 people have taken that test. The test in itself has been modified. There is now a hunter safety program in place and no one will be permitted a licence to hunt big game in Newfoundland as of this year without licence to hunt big game in Newfoundland as of this year without taking a twelve hour hunter safety course.

MR. FLIGHT: When will this (inaudible)

M.R ANDREWS: That is for all new applications, for anybody who has not hunted before.

MR. MOORES: After this year, is it?

MR. ANDREWS: After this year.

MR. FLIGHT: After this year. For next Fall's hunting?

MR. ANDREWS: I doubt if it would be in place, it is still been considered. But this is a great improvement, Mr. Speaker. The hunter safety test alone was a very good move. This is a good move. Some of the members of the House, on both sides, did take this course, it is a twelve hour course, some had trouble passing it though I think most were successful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ANDREWS: The process of the draw, I think is probably one of the fairest systems that we

MR. ANDREWS: , have. The applications are determined by priorities and just to give the House a brief outline, the highest priority that any applicant would have would be in what is called pool number one. Those would be persons who are in the draw, in each of the years, the past three years '78,'79, and '80, but who did not receive a licence in either of those years, in either of the three years. That is the first priority. The second priority is persons who are in the draw, successfully or otherwise, in any of the two of the three years, but who did not receive a licence in the last two years. The third group, coming down in priorities, persons who are in the draw , in one of the three years, '78,'79, or '80, who did not receive a licence in 1980. Pool number four where persons who participated in the draw in the party licences in 1979, or 1980, including both members of any party, and all people who are applying for licences for the first time. And pool number five is persons who held individual licences in 1980 regardless of participation in the draw in any other year , So the lowest priority on the draw list, in responding once again to the hon. member from Bellevue, the lowest priority in the draw list out of a grouping of five and then these also reranked again into another ten draw cycle. It is a complicated thing which I cannot explain in five minutes. But the lowest priority is the individual hunter who did receive a hunting licence last year.

MR. FLIGHT: How about the V.I.P.'s ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The second matter for debate is raised
by the hon. member for Grand Bank. Water taxes in Frenchman's
Cove. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

X
MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, you know, just what kind of a society we live in, just what kind of government we are actually getting. Sometimes I think that a lot of us would be better off in Communist Russia than we would be in Newfoundland, and I say that with all sincerity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Go over there. Go over there.

MR. THOMS: I say that with all sincerity-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the community of Frenchman's Cove, it is just like the Municipalities Act, and the property taxes.

MR. CALLAN: I got two.

MR. THOMS: It is mandatory now that if you want grants, if you want money for water or sewer in this Province, then you are compelled, you are compelled to charge property taxes. In other words, no community, whether they can afford it or not, can have the minimal services that are required in this Province without being first charged property taxes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, in Frenchman's Cove in the district of Grand Bank, there are approximately eighty-seven homeowners. Thirty-seven of those have taken

MR. THOMS:

advantage of the system that was put in there, thirty-seven out of eighty-seven. That leaves fifty who, for one reason or another, have not taken advantage of the system that has been put in. Now, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) stands up in this House and she says, "Oh, that is all right. If there is anybody on welfare, and there are people there on welfare who are not connected to the water, if they are on welfare welfare will pay the cost of hooking it up". I am not so sure that is right. I have not had the opportunity to check that out. I do not know if they will put the system in the home or whether the minister when she says, 'We will pay for the installation' is referring to just the lateral into the House but the family itself must put the facilities in the home.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: And then, Mr. Speaker, supposing she is right, supposing the government, the Department of Social Services, will install the facilities in the home - and I would like to have an answer whether or not she is talking about the lateral to the house or to the actual installation of the water system in the house - but assuming that the Department of Social Services will do this, these people still have to pay a \$120 water tax a year. Now, Mr. Speaker, for my hon. friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird) who is a high roller, \$120 is no sweat, none whatsoever. But this past Saturday I was in a home where there is a mother and a father and nine children. Now, they cannot afford to put the necessary pipes into their home or in their home to obtain the water. But, Mr. Speaker, as I said, even if the Department of Social Services were to pay for that, they cannot afford to pay the \$120 a year. Mr. Speaker, that is three times what we in St. John's pay. In rich, oil boom country like St. John's, we pay forty dollars.

MR. THOMS: In Frenchman's Cove, where they are all fishermen with the odd one who works at the Marystown shipyards, with the odd one who works directly in the fish plant, they have to pay \$120 for water that is not as good as they have right now, \$120 a year. The community council says, 'Look we do not want to charge the \$120 a year. We do not want to charge Mrs. Jones who cannot afford it \$120 a year, but we have no choice because the Department of Municipal Affairs says we must charge it'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are people - they have not hooked up to it, they are not getting the service at all but still they have to pay a tax on something they are not getting. And, you know, I think it is utter tommyrot to talk about improvement to the property by having the water line go down the road in Frenchman's Cove. You are not talking about an oil boom economy like St. John's, rich, Tory blue St. John's, you are talking about a small, rural outport town in a community in this Province where you do not have your millionaires, a Water Street and your millionaires. And I want this government to take that into consideration. They deserve the services and they should not be forced to pay \$120 a year for a service they are not getting and the reason they are not getting it is because they cannot afford to put the installation in and if they had it in, they could not afford the tax. And this is a government, Mr. Speaker, that was not going to raise taxes or impose taxes in the first three years.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, if government allocates large amounts of dollars for services and when a council determines that a system is needed and if the people are utilizing a system that has been installed, then my department feels and I feel and council feels that those who are capable of being connected to that system should use it. Now, council has to bear the cost of maintaining and operating the complete system, and this applies to Frenchman's Cove. So, I think it is only fair and reasonable that all the people in Frenchman's Cove contribute to the maintenance of that system. The system costs \$225,000. The cost of pumping from three pumps is heavy and it cannot be borne by council unless all of the residents pay. The system was designed for the whole community and, therefore, you know, I feel and Council does, and rightly so, that all should contribute to the cost of the operation and the maintenance. I understand that there are thirty-eight families now connected and I also further understand that there will be - most of the remaining families not connected now will be by July or August of this year.

MR. THOMS: Either that or they will be in jail.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Well, I do not think that is going to happen. But I also understand that the water rate in Frenchman's Cove is \$8 a month.

MR. THOMS: Ten dollars a month - I can bring in a bill and show you.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Well, they must have increased it recently.

MR. THOMS: Big deal! (Inaudible) big deal. It is not a big deal for (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. minister.

MRS. NEWHOOK: The standard rates for water services all across the Province are anywhere from \$6 to \$10 to \$15 a month and that is standard all across, and I think you will only find maybe the City of St. John's that is charging about \$50 a month and that is not covering the cost of the services. You will find that you are paying for the cost of the water services in St. John's under your other taxes and it is probably like it in Gander, they have the mil rate, and the water services there are so many mils allocated for water. In other towns they have so many mils allocated for water plus the water rate. When the hon. member says -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - when the hon. member says it does not add to the value of the property, I really cannot agree with the hon. member because I am sure -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - I am sure that if there were two properties side by side and one was connected with water and the other was not, and you had the option of buying either of them, that you would be much more interested in the property that has water connections to it. So, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - I do believe that the problem in Frenchman's Cove is not nearly as serious as the hon. member feels it is, and that sometime during the year - we have had a Winter season in between where people have not been able to probably make their connections to the system

MRS. NEWHOOK: but by the end of this year I am sure that the problem will be resolved.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The final matter for debate raised by the hon. the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) is the introduction of property tax.

The hon. member for Lapoile.

X MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) wondered out loud if we were living in Russia. Well, I would submit, Sir, if we are not living in Russia we are living in Nazi Germany, the way the government is approaching the matter of the implementation of the property tax. I do not have to remind hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that last year the Opposition violently opposed this new Municipalities Act under which now the Department of Municipal Affairs is proceeding to implement a property tax in communities that have more than a 50 per cent water supply in their community. I would say, Mr. Speaker, trouble

MR. NEARY: is brewing and the hon. minister knows that trouble is brewing. Sixty communities have asked to have the assessment done on the properties in their municipalities. But they have done it, Mr. Speaker, grudgingly. They are doing it under duress. They are forced to do it. They are being blackmailed into doing it because if they do not do it, then the government will cut them off, the Minister in the Department of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) will cut off any further grants or loans or any further expansion of water and sewerage. They have already done it. They will cut them off. It is a form of blackmail.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have an example in Bonavista where 2,000 residents of Bonavista just signed a petition vehemently, strongly objecting to the implementation of the property tax. Now, I am not going to debate whether or not Bonavista should have a property tax. That is not the point I am trying to make at all. But it is the way they are doing it. They are doing it in a most undemocratic fashion. The people of Bonavista, a good many of them, did not know that the assessors were coming until they knocked on the door and said we are here to assess your property. And that is why the minister now has sent out this foolish pamphlet, or is in the process of sending out a foolish pamphlet, to the householders in Bonavista to try to put out the fire. The minister knows that she is sitting on a powder keg in that old historic town of Bonavista. There is likely to be a civil war in Bonavista if the present member will not be allowed back, not even to pick up his salt water birds. They will have to send them out to him in - they will have to send out his ducks by mail. He will not be allowed back in. And next Thursday night, Mr. Speaker, we will find out when a public meeting will be held in the community of Bonavista, we will see how many people turn out to that meeting. I have been invited to go as one of the speakers and I have accepted the invitation.

MR. NEARY: What I am objecting to is the undemocratic manner in which this is being done, the high-handed tactics that are being used. Mr. Speaker, the government is changing boundaries in this Province without giving the people -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: My friend is not - my God I did not do that to him. Mr. Speaker, they are changing boundaries without consulting with the people, the residents in these areas. They are trying to force people to come into the city of St. John's, to come inside the municipal boundary without giving the people the opportunity of the secret ballot to decide for themselves and that is the question. The people should have the right to decide for themselves. The people of Bonavista should have the right and it should not be mandatory. And I do not care what act we have, we voted against that act. It is undemocratic and unconstitutional. And now they are trying to force the people of Bonavista to accept a property tax and the minister gets up and says it is mandatory. Well, who made it mandatory? This government made it mandatory. And it should be made unmandatory because, Mr. Speaker, the people of Bonavista have common sense enough, are sensible enough to be able to decide for themselves whether or not they want the property tax and not have it foisted on the people down there by St. John's, by seven ministers in the Cabinet from St. John's. And that is why the property tax is being imposed on the people of Bonavista and the people in the other sixty municipalities, because St. John's says, 'Oh we pay it why should they not pay it in Bonavista?'. Seven members influencing that Cabinet in St. John's and forcing - the decision is forced on the people of Bonavista and in these

MR. NEARY: other communities by St. John's.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say -

AN HON. MEMBER: St. John's (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Watch your language now.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Bonavista, the people of Pouch Cove, the people of Torbay, the people in all the other municipalities where they have more than 50 per cent of the community serviced by water and sewerage, the people themselves by secret ballot should be able to decide whether or not they want the property tax, what kind of taxes they want and how much taxes they should pay. That is fundamental, Mr. Speaker, and I should not have to say it, but I am saying it but I know my remarks are falling on deaf ears, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member's time has expired.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

X
MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I am quite surprised by the hon. member who was once a councillor. I would have thought that he would understand it much better than this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. NEWHOOK: And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the hon. member that the residents of Bonavista are a very reasonable people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You will get the message next week.

MRS. NEWHOOK: The Council in Bonavista represents the people. They feel that the property tax is the only equitable way to get the revenues they require for the services that are needed. They have made the commitment that they will accept the property tax.

MR. NEARY: They were forced put.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Seventy per cent of the people in Bonavista are already serviced, there are another 30 per cent who wish to be connected to services and have the same services as the other 70. But it is the 70 per cent of the people now who say, Well, we have got our services and the heck with the other 30 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - we do not want to pay the property tax.

MR. NEARY: That is not true, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. NEWHOOK: This is what they are saying, Mr. Speaker. This is the attitude that they are taking.

MR. NEARY: That is an insult to the people of Bonavista. Take it back. I hope you are not quoted on that (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (MR. SIMMS): Order, please! Order, please! Order, please.

MR. MORGAN: Can we not get protection from the Chair when the lady is speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: I said order three times.

MR. MORGAN: They are not listening, obviously.

MR. SPEAKER: Obviously, on both sides.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order. The hon.

President of the Council.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Well, I am not saying that, they are saying that, but by their actions they are assuming -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - this.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I just want to inject, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour called order three times, but the remedy, if somebody does not comply with Your Honour's - there is an obvious remedy and that is to name people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: It is my understanding of the events that just transpired in the House that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was trying to protect the minister from her own statement.

MR. NEARY: That is a terrible thing.

MR. HODDER: And he suggested to her that she withdraw that statement because it could be politically damaging. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member for LaPoile, as he usually is, was being a gentleman and he was trying to protect the lady who represents the portfolio as the Minister

MR. HODDER: of Municipal Affairs and was trying to do her a favour, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Right. Take it back.

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. SIMMS): Well, to the point of order, obviously the Chair is aware what the procedures are and I have tried to be as calm as some members have tried to be calm in the House, today in particular. And I will continue to enforce the rules as I have been given a mandate to do by you, the members of the House.

With respect to what the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has said in the point of order, the point of the fact is that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did not have the floor and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) had the floor, and I suggest that she should be given the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has about a moment.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that there are maybe one hundred people or so in Bonavista who by their actions are more or less - I would assume that by their actions they are indicating that they are really not concerned about the other 30 per cent of the people who are looking for services. And I am not condemning the people for saying this, because I really do think it is lack of information and that when they get the information that they need, then there will be no more problem in Bonavista.

Just for the hon. member's information, I would like to say to him that property tax is the most equitable form of taxation available to communities. Property constitutes or determines the wealth of a community. And a poll tax is exactly what it says, its a head tax, and all pay the same poll tax regardless of their

MRS. NEWHOOK: capability or the ability to pay. And under the poll tax system a council cannot increase -

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. SIMMS): Order, please!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - these taxes equally throughout the community -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - because some people in that community -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - cannot afford to pay the increase. X

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have to advise the hon. minister that it is now six o'clock, her time is expired. The motion is that the House do now adjourn. Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: No, leave?

Leave has not been granted.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MAY 7, 1981

QUESTION NO. 33 BY MR. NEARY (LaPOILE) - ORDERS OF THE DAY DATED
MARCH 25, 1981

MR. NEARY (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Municipal
Affairs to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

QUESTION

What is the number of journeys involving public business
which she has made since 1979 to places outside
Canada, showing for each journey:

- (a) the names of the countries visited;
- (b) dates of the journey;
- (c) the total cost to the Government for hotel accommodations, meals, ground and air transportation and other expenses;
- (d) whether or not any member of her staff, or any other person, accompanied her for all or a portion of her journey, and if so
 - (i) what is the name of such person;
 - (ii) what is the title of the position each such person holds or held;
 - (iii) what was the total cost to Government for hotel accommodations, meals, ground and air transportation and other expenses for each such person;
- (e) the nature of the public business attended to on the journey.

ANSWER

Nil.