

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P. M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), and it concerns a measure recently taken in the most recent Budget. In that Budget there were a number of tax measures, and one of those tax measures was an increase in the royalty or the tax paid to the government by wood contractors or paper companies who cut various types of wood on Crown lands, that is lands and forest controlled by the government, in other words, stumpage, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister tell the House what the rates were before and after the Budget for various types of wood - cutting, that is, for lumber, pulp wood, construction timber, fuel wood and so on?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the stumpage rates increased in the recent Budget basically have two categories, a category where we supply the roads, supplied by the government, at government expense, and also the stumpage rate that is affected directly by whether they are harvesting to salvage the spruce budworm-killed stands or whether it is basically healthy stands. The rates before the Budget were \$2.00 and \$3.00 respectively depending on whether the government supplied roads or not, and they are now \$5.16 and \$8.12, I think it is.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the minister pointed out one large increase, and that was the increase in the royalty or stumpage for pulpwood. As the minister is well aware, pulpwood cutting largely helps keep our sawmillers in business, and the increase has been, as he said, from \$2.00 to \$8.10 to \$9.18.

MR. LUSH: A four hundred per cent increase.

MR. TULK: In other words, that is a 400 per cent increase, Mr. Speaker.

Would the minister now inform the House what the impact on the pulpwood industry, and in particular the export pulpwood industry, has been as a result of that increase in tax? Did he consult his officials or any officials of the paper companies, and what was their advice to him?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the pulp and paper industry and the sawmilling industry and the increased stumpage fees, as of course all persons in the Province know there is no stumpage collected on the company licenced or held limits. These stumpage rates only apply to Crown lands. The affect that they will have both on the sawmilling industry and the industry generally itself, and certainly the rates have not increased 400 per cent, the rates are up 260 per cent from 1974, which was the last time stumpage rates were increased in the Province. During that time, from 1974 to the Budget of 1982, the cost of newsprint being sold from this Province is up over 300 per cent - the value of newsprint. The cost of supplying roads to these persons who have either partial sawmilling licences or sawmilling licences is up over 200 per cent for the cost of

MR. POWER:

supplying roads. Our increase is one which is certainly in line with the stumpage rate, and less than the stumpage rates in all other parts of Atlantic Canada; in line with not only the stumpage increases in the Budget but the fact that sawmilling licences have not increased. And the fact that this government took the bold initiative of not having any sales tax charged on any sawmilling equipment, we think are ways of stimulating the already depressed sawmilling market as it relates to the export of pulp in this Province. There is one contractor who has a fairly extensive contract for the export of pulpwood and because that is being harvested mainly from salvage lots that we have identified, where most of it is bud-killed, and where we certainly do not wish to jeopardize the export contract he has. I have talked to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and government will be negotiating with that person. The stumpage rates certainly will be allowed him to continue to export wood and keep persons employed in the Province, and certainly at the same time, Mr. Speaker, to allow for a reasonable, fair return to the people of this Province in the form of stumpage for a resource which it is being used.

MR. TULK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: I do not know whether the minister is aware of it or not, but today, and starting last weekend, we are witnessing perhaps the shutdown of the export pulpwood industry in this Province, and in particular in the districts of Lewisporte, Twillingate and Fogo. Those are the areas that I am particularly aware of. According to the people in that area, the increase has been from \$2.00 to \$9.00. He says that he has spoken to the Minister of Finance and if this situation is not cleared up we

MR. TULK: are going to see 200 to 300 - perhaps 500-people out of work in that area. The shutdown has begun. Now would the minister tell the House just exactly what that stumpage rate is going to be, that royalty rate for those people?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the stumpage rate has gone from in that given area of bud-killed salvage harvesting from \$2.00 to \$5.16, that, Mr. Speaker, is if we are supplying the road to that resource?

I have talked to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). We will certainly do all that is necessary to accommodate the exporter who has the contract for exporting the bud-killed timber. And I am glad to say, Mr. Speaker, that maybe it is a good time to take notice that the policies of this government as it relates to harvesting of bud-killed timber, both for local industry in this Province and for export, has been successful and, according to the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), is employing as much as 300 to 500 people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TULK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister has still not answered the question. Now in a telex that was sent to some of his directors in regional offices in this Province, he indicated that on access roads where - or his deputy minister indicated - the price was from \$2.00 to \$3.00 per cord for salvaged timber, it has

MR. TULK: now gone from \$8 to \$10 per cord. Now the minister is saying \$5.16. But I tell him that where he provides an access road, the budgetary measures say that they will pay \$8.10 to \$9.18, I believe it, is per cord. Now what is the new rate that he is indeed going to charge if he is indeed going to change the rate?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered three times already that we have initiated new stumpage rates in this Province as a budgetary measure and also as a way of getting a fair return on a resource being utilized in this Province by persons in the Province itself. As it relates to the companies, we are certainly hoping that the new stumpage rates that we have for Crown limits will be ones that will form a basis for discussion with the paper companies, especially Abitibi-Price in the next week or two as it relates to their land tenure, where they now pay no stumpage rates, and, under the new forest management agreements being initiated by this government with the companies, stumpage will be charged and certainly we would like to get close to the new stumpage rates of \$8.00 rather than the old stumpage rate of \$2.00 or \$3.00.

As it relates to the exporter, as I say, I cannot give the member exactly what the stumpage rate is going to be for this one particular contract of who has an export contract. I will say that we will be discussing it with the Department of Finance and certainly everything will be done to keep Newfoundlanders working in the export of pulpwood as we have done in the last twelve months.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. When the hon. gentleman refers to "our roads", is the hon. minister referring to roads that are 90 per cent funded -

MR. TULK: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - paid for by the Government of Canada? Is that "our roads" the hon. gentleman is talking about?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about "our roads" being built in and for the Province of Newfoundland and for the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the answers given to my colleague, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who is asking some very good questions on this particular matter which seems to be developing into a bit of a crisis, that he has made recommendations to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in connection with one large operator. Would the hon. gentleman care to tell the House what these recommendations involved -

MR. TULK: And who the operator is.

MR. NEARY: - and who the operator is?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I do not care at this time to release the name of the operator. Obviously there is a matter of some negotiating between the persons in Europe that he has a contract with to supply pulpwood at a certain given price. I will say that because it relates to the Department of Forestry, and because it is also a budgetary matter, I have talked to the Minister of Finance, we will be accommodating this person to keep Newfoundlanders employed.

MR. POWER: And I just wish the same could be said for other governments which have some control and direct effect on the sawmilling industry particularly as it relates to high interest rates, which have pretty well everyone in the sawmilling industry in Newfoundland, if not in a state of bankruptcy then certainly near bankruptcy.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman telling the House that he made a recommendation to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to accommodate one operator only? Would not all the operators be in the same boat? And while the hon. gentleman is on his feet, would he also indicate that this retail sales tax exemption that they are giving on the purchase of new equipment and so forth, they are giving it in



MR. NEARY: one hand and taking it away  
on the other- is that not the way it works out?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Hon. minister of Forest Resources  
and Lands.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be  
a lack of understanding in the ranks opposite as it  
relates to how the forest industry is working and functioning  
in Newfoundland in 1982. There is certainly a very large  
and significant difference as it relates to the  
management of the resource today than it has been at  
any time in the last seventy-five or eighty years. Our  
government, certainly since 1974, has made bold initiatives,  
in 1974 with The Forest Land (Management Taxation) Act,  
in 1982, for instance right now, in taking away the sales  
tax on capital equipment for sawmills. This year we  
have changed the stumpage rates. One of the unfortunate  
side effects of changing the stumpage is that certain  
local, independent pulpwood harvesters may feel that  
they are now in jeopardy, or their business is in jeopardy,  
because the stumpage rates are increased. The stumpage  
rates are basically paid by the first purchases of  
wood in the Province which oftentimes is either the two  
large paper companies themselves, or the person who is  
doing the brokerage for export. In this case there is  
one person who has come to my department as it relates  
to export wood, and we will certainly accommodate  
the exporting of wood in this Province to a stumpage  
rate which is fair and just and returns to the people  
of the Province a fair amount of money for the uses of  
the resources that we control.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Pogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, yes. I must tell the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) that there is a lack of understanding in this House. It is beyond me how a minister would make a recommendation for a budgetary change and then a few days afterwards come back and fiddle around with what he is going to revert back to. I want to ask the minister a question: Did the minister have any input in deciding these rates or are they solely the result of the work of the Minister of Finance ( Dr. Collins ) and the Premier?

MR. WARREN: No answer.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Port Au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I too have a question for the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power). Mr. Speaker, the Stephenville mill, the Abitibi-Price mill, that mill, Mr. Speaker, eighty-five per cent of its wood supply comes from Crown land, eighty-five per cent of its wood supply, which is now subject to the new rate. Would the minister tell me what the effect of the raise in the stumpage fee will be on the Abitibi-Price mill in Stephenville?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the opening of the Abitibi newspaper mill in Newfoundland this year is a significant move by the people of Newfoundland. In order to get that mill reopened, a contract was negotiated and entered into between the Government of Newfoundland and Abitibi-Price Corporation. Basically, it allows for stumpage rates to be set for a certain period of time. Those stumpage rates are subject to review in eighteen months time, and we would hope at that time that they become subject to newer, higher and fairer returns on the resource for the people of Newfoundland.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying that in eighteen months time the new rates will come into effect?

MR. POWER: No.

MR. NEARY: Immediately? They will come into effect immediately?

MR. POWER: I say in eighteen months time the rates that Abitibi have for Stephenville are subject to review.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, on the -

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: Okay; I will let it go.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister another question. It is my understanding that those stumpage or royalty rates or taxes, whatever you want to call them, are already in effect. They have been in effect since April 1st. I would like to ask him again, in view of the fact that we are trying to salvage

MR. TULK: a great deal of budworm infested timber in this Province, will he go back to the original rates and will he see that they come off as of April 1st and that nobody is charged any more for stumpage rates than they were last year in trying to salvage what in four years is going to be lying on the ground rotten? Will he go back to that original rate?

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, there are two rates, one for the harvesting of bud-killed, salvaged timber from designated salvage areas, the other is a royalty rate, stumpage rate for healthy timber being taken from other areas of the Province. We do not intend, as a government, to go back to the stumpage rates which have been in effect since 1974. They are simply not fair, they are not reasonable nor practical in 1982 to expect the Government of Newfoundland on behalf of its citizens to not get a fair return on a resource that is being used. Our own rates now are still less than in any other part of Atlantic Canada. Roads are being supplied by the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada under an agreement between our governments. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that we intend to be fair and just to the exporters who are now exporting wood, Mr. Speaker, again on the initiative of this government, because we went out and sought markets for export of damaged bud-killed timber and it just shows that our policies in forestry are working.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon.  
the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask  
the minister another question on this whole thing, and  
that is, is he aware what the net profit of a local  
contractor, say, in the Northeast part of this Province  
in the districts of Lewisporte, Twillingate or Fogo  
was last year? And secondly, will he now send his  
officials out to consult with those people to see  
what type of royalty or how much of the royalty they  
can pay?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, if the question  
is whether I am aware of the net profit of any person  
involved in export, or company involved in export, or  
anybody

MR. C. POWER: involved in sawmilling, I do not really know. I know that this government is not bringing in policies which are going to handicap the industry any further than they have been handicapped. The real problem with the sawmilling industry in Newfoundland is exactly the same as the real problem with the sawmilling industry in British Columbia or any other province of Canada. They simply cannot produce a product and sell it in the market conditions that we presently have in Canada. And certainly the high interest rates are the most detrimental effect on sawmillers all across Canada in any given province. What we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is trying to relate stumpage rates in 1982 to what they should be. Simply because they have not been changed since 1974, simply shows that this government apparently understands what is happening in rural Newfoundland. The fact that we do not charge any more sales tax on capital equipment, the fact that we have not increased sawmilling licences shows that we are doing our part and we just wish that the other government in Canada who has some control over the sawmilling industry would do their part.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the loggers and the sawmillers are the only people that I know of in the country that have to pay a royalty for the harvesting of a renewable resource. To indicate how important it is, this royalty, this stumpage fee, to these loggers, I remind the minister of a brief that was presented to him about a year ago from the Unit 2 Forestry Association, which takes in the Bonavista Peninsula and that whole area. One of the measures they mentioned to the

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 988

MJ - 2

MR. T. LUSH: Minister, out of three measures which they thought were very important, one of the measures they mentioned and the way it was stated was an immediate relief to an ailing lumber industry, the removal of royalties on lumber production. Now I realize I have moved it from the pulpwood to the sawlogs, and the question I ask the minister was there never any consideration given to this urgent request from this large sawmill industrial group and showing the importance of the stumpage fee to them, was there

MR. LUSH: never any position taken on whether or not we should remove this stumpage fee with respect to lumber production for these people who are indeed struggling to stay in the business?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate what I have already said, that this Province, with its limited financial resources, took certain measures in a recent budget, a very well-prepared and well-delivered budget, well received by the people of Newfoundland, we had to take certain financial measures in that budget. We also took certain measures, Mr. Speaker, to make life a little easier for sawmillers, such as removing the sales tax on capital equipment. All I can say is that we cannot solve all the problems in the sawmilling industry in Newfoundland until somebody in Ottawa decides to change the high interest rate policy that they have.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister again what effect will the new stumpage rates have on the Grand Falls mill, the Bowaters mill in Corner Brook, and the Abitibi-Price in Stephenville? What effect will these new price increases have? And when will they come into effect? Would the minister tell us exactly how much extra these mills will have to pay?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as I said, most of the wood that goes to the Grand Falls mill, and to the Corner Brook mill, comes from company-held



MR. POWER: limits, so no stumpage is paid to the government of Newfoundland.

As it relates to the Stephenville mill, because of an agreement entered into with some foresight by this government, as opposed to the Linerboard mill which was there, we allowed in that agreement with the company for a stumpage rate which will be reviewed in eighteen months time. Hopefully the new stumpage rates negotiated between this government, as the ERCO power contract, as the Bowater power contract -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: - and all the other things that this government have done to get a fair return for the people of Newfoundland, will relate to the woods industry. The real effect of this agreement, these new stumpage rates may have on the companies in Newfoundland, is that when we get the land tenure negotiations done, when we get the two companies to enter into forest management agreements, when the resource will come back under the control of the people who rightfully own it, then the people of Newfoundland will get a better return on that very valuable resource.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister point-blank will the sub-contractors who are supplying the Stephenville mill be paying the new stumpage rates?

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear! A good question.

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 989, Page 3 -- apb

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the stumpage rate as it relates to a private contractor is covered by the new stumpage rates put into effect as of the recent budget. The company, Abitibi-Price, has agreed to pay the new stumpage rates-

MR. HODDER: For how long?

MR. POWER: - for wood produced up until June 15, upon which time they will be considering how much wood they require for this year, whether they will be getting it from company limits or Crown limits, and, if and when, they will obviously be using the union agreement on Crown limits,

MR. POWER: in which case the benefit to the people of Newfoundland, through higher taxes being paid by persons who earn a higher return for the work that they do in the union agreement on company limits, then the Province of Newfoundland will still get good returns from a resource which is rightfully ours.

MR. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the minister what Abitibi-Price says the cost is going to mean. They say it is going to mean from \$8.00 to \$10.00 a ton on their newsprint on the world market. Now the question I have for the minister -

MR. NEARY: That is down time.

MR. TULK: That is in Stephenville, you know.

MR. HODDER: That is in Stephenville.

MR. NEARY: That means down time.

MR. HODDER: That is in Stephenville - \$8.00 to \$10.00 a ton. Now I want to ask the minister another question. In light of the fact that the U.S. mills at the present time are dumping their pulp on the European market and that there is a price war going on, and in light of the fact that the President of MacMillan-Bloedel said recently that he felt that the industry was in a down-turn, and in light of the fact that the Europeans are now looking for the cheapest softwood possible, does the minister not think that by raising stumpage fees, which will affect the Stephenville mill, is that not the most detrimental act that this government has ever perpetrated on the town of Stephenville?

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, it seems that the basic principle never changes with the members opposite, all that changes is the topics and titles. It does not change when it comes to offshore and now in the case of MacMillan-Bloedel, if they were here, or Abitibi-Price or Bowaters, it now appears to be the ordinary taxpayer of the Province who has got to supplement a big corporation because you think there is going to be down time. Mr. Speaker, that is not going to happen. The companies in Newfoundland have made higher profits in the last four or five years than they ever have made. The stumpage rates will not materially affect down time in Stephenville. And as far as whether persons in Europe or anywhere else are buying the cheapest quality or the cheapest newsprint that they can get that is simply not true. What is happening in Europe, as it happens everywhere else, they want a quality product, the best newsprint in the world is being produced in a mill in Stephenville in Newfoundland, and down time for Stephenville will not be affected marginally by the stumpage rates implanted by this government only to get a fair return for a resource which is ours.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Final supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, the pulpwood industry, the competition between the Scandinavian countries and the Southern U.S. has thrown the European market in disarray. And I would just like to let the minister know, in case he does not know it, that the Abitibi-Price mill sells all of its pulp to the European market. And I would like to ask the minister again to truthfully tell the House whether he feels or not that an \$8.00 to \$10.00 a ton cost because of stumpage rates on the Abitibi mill will not affect the operations of that mill which, by the

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 990

SD - 3

MR. HODDER: way, has just started up and is just getting over its production problems and has not made a profit this year?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, this government, I would think, is reasonably well aware that there is a newsprint mill in Stephenville, reasonably well aware.

SOME CON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: We are also reasonably well aware of where that newsprint goes, what the cost is, and we are also reasonably well aware and reasonably determined to get a fair return in the form of stumpage for a wood resource that is being used in this Province to supply jobs in Newfoundland, on the one hand, and also to produce a product for export. If it comes down that someone says then it is always the Newfoundland Government who has got to give in, to subsidize the big operations or someone else, then I think that is wrong, it is unjust, it is unfair and it is something which this government does not see as being necessary in today, 1982.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, resulting from an answer he gave there a few moments ago; as everyone knows in this Province this administration because of their lack of plans and policies have thrown the fishery into chaos, the marketing industry is in shambles: Now is the hon. gentleman saying that the forest industry and the paper mills are going to have a good year, that there will be no down time at Stephenville? Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I can understand how eighteen got to be eight. I understand it more every day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: I have to say -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: - that anybody in this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: - who does not understand what is happening in the forest industry - last year we had a great discussion about the spray programme in this House, Mr. Speaker, a spray programme that was based upon recommendations of the royal commission. At least three or four of the eighteen who were there then - who have now become eight and may be less than that sometime - acknowledged during the debate that this royal commission report they had not read it, but they were willing to discuss the ramifications of it, they were willing to judge the recommendations, but they had not read from where the recommendations may have come.

What has happened in Newfoundland since 1972 as it relates to the forest industry? I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that I just wish that the Government of Canada, the big corporations of Canada, or anybody else in this world, would give to the Newfoundland Government as much control over its other resources as we have over the forestry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: What we have done in forest management since 1972 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: What we have done in 1974 with a Forest Management Taxation Act, which unfortunately hurts a few people who have large grants of land from some previous government for some reasons that nobody seems to know about -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: - and unfortunately we cannot collect taxes from those persons who own more than 300 acres

MR. POWER: of land in the Province,  
which happened sometime in that twenty-three  
year span from 1949 to 1973 or 1972, what we have done in 1979  
with a royal commission, what we have done with a spray  
programme, what we are about to do in the next couple of  
months in signing an agreement -

MR. NEAP: What is he talking about, Mr.  
Speaker?

MR. POWER: I will answer the question,  
Mr. Speaker, based on forest management and the control of  
our resources. What we are about to do with the Abitibi-  
Price, the largest producer of newsprint in the world, to make  
great big Abitibi-Price, the biggest, largest newsprint producer in  
the world, come to Newfoundland, conform to Newfoundland  
management, to sign land tenure agreements with the  
Newfoundland Government which puts them on twenty year  
conditional forest leases where they have to do silivcultural  
work, where they have to do reforestation, where they have  
to return to the people of Newfoundland a resource in



MR. POWER: some shape and form as they found it, those things we are doing, Mr. Speaker, and involved with all that, we happen to be increasing stumpage somewhat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I just wish that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) had the same control, the same degree of management over the resource that he is in charge of in some way for the Province of Newfoundland -

PREMIER PECKFORD: He would get a job done pretty fast if he did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: - I just wish he had. There would not be the St. Anthony problem, there would not be the quota problems, there would not be the Cubans and the Russians and the Poles going off with most of the resource as they are not going off with the resource that we have, for instance, right now in forestry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: It may hurt hon. members that we have a consistent, well-thought-out, well-reasoned policy for forest management in this Province. It is being done in a co-operative sense between the federal government and the provincial government, but done co-operatively by them because they know the resource is ours and they cannot take it away from us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the question I put to the hon. gentleman was this: Did I understand him correctly a few minutes ago when answering my

MR. NEARY:                               colleague, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), that this new stumpage fee would not be detrimental to the paper mill in Stephenville and that there would be no down time this year resulting from that sort of action on the part of the provincial government? Is that what the hon. gentleman said?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):       The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER:                               Mr. Speaker, what I said is what the big corporations always said to the eight, to the eighteen and to the, I guess, thirty-eight at one time, that we cannot -

MR. TOBIN:                               Thirty-nine. Thirty-nine.

MR. POWER:                               Alright, thirty-nine.

We cannot conform to the wishes of the Newfoundland Government because it is going to hurt our shareholders or hurt somebody else. The same kind of mentality was in place with the Upper Churchill, ERCO contracts, Bowater contracts and many others. What we are saying is that simply for Abitibi-Price to come back to us and say, 'My God, we are going to go out of business. Is it not terrible that we are going to have to close down Stephenville in Newfoundland,' because we have upped stumpage rates in Newfoundland by 260 per cent when the price of the newsprint is gone 300 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, this government does not swallow, lock, stock and barrel, the arguments of the big paper companies or any other big company. What we are going to do, Mr. Speaker, is get a fair return on stumpage rates for the people of this Province, which is fair and just and which still allows the forest to be managed properly which we are going to do, anyway.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Pogo.

MR. TULK: Let me take the minister back, clear of the big companies, Mr. Speaker, back to a local contractor on the Northeast Coast of this Province cutting export pulpwood.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: I asked the minister what was the net profit last year of a local contractor. Well, the three that I talked to yesterday, on the weekend, told me that now they are receiving \$50 per cord for export wood and without taking out Unemployment Insurance Commission benefits, Canada Pension benefits, or paying for any of their machinery, with the new royalties that he has put in place they will now spend \$48.38 per cord.

Now, in view of that, I will ask the minister again, will he go up and sit down with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), will he meet with those people, and will he put those stumpage rates back to what they were in 1980 - 1981

MR. TULK: so that we can have those 500 people who are now finding themselves unemployed back on the payrolls again?

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Spcaker, it is strange that I gave a commitment, in the very first answer to the initial question that was asked, by accomodating a wood exporter from Newfoundland who has certain persons employed. I said the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and I will be dealing and negotiating and straightening out that kind of a problem. But it is still strange, it is still amazing that we have to do that for a Newfoundland exporter of pulpwood, because the same person in Montreal who buys a big block of export wood all across Eastern Canada, in order to get a shipment of wood going to Europe he may buy 15,000 cords in Newfoundland, 15,000 or 20,000 cords from Nova Scotia, some in New Brunswick and some in Quebec, it is strange that we, as this government, are going to find persons going out of business because our stumpage rates are too high at the same time that all the other wood going to the export market in Europe pays a higher stumpage rate in Quebec, a higher stumpage rate in New Brunswick, a higher stumpage rate in Nova Scotia and we pay a lesser stumpage rate. But still I say the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and I will certainly sit down and accomodate them so that those persons will not become unemployed in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: I am afraid I cannot follow the hon. gentleman's logic. I have to ask the hon.

June 7, 1982

Tape 993

Ah - 2

MR. NEARY:

gentleman again -

MR. DINN:

You will have to put it in baby talk now.

MR. CALLAN:

You are a secretary now.

MR. NEARY:

NAPE and the Federation of Labour will deal with the hon. gentleman. I am dealing with the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) right now.

Is the hon. gentleman saying that he is going to negotiate with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who announced these new stumpage rates? Is he going to negotiate just for one contractor or is he going to negotiate the same deal for all the contractors who export wood or who sell wood off Crown land to the paper companies? Is there just going to be one deal for one contractor or is there going to be a universal formula for all the contractors?

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

The hon. Minister of Forests Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, we are going to accommodate the export of wood as it relates to this Province. There is one major exporter of wood in the Province, one major person, one major exporter of wood. We have to accommodate him because the new stumpage rates were not envisaged by him when he entered into a contract with a European buyer at last year's stumpage rates. And we will accommodate that person because we do not want persons unemployed in this Province if we can in any way, shape or form prevent it from happening. That is why we will be fair and just. But at the same time do not forget, Mr. Speaker, that the wood that is being cut is wood that is owned by the people of Newfoundland and they deserve a fair rate of return in the form of stumpage which we intend to do now and we intend to expand into the new land tenure agreements with Abitibi-Price

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 993

ah-3

MR. POWER:                                   and Bowaters. And we intend when those negotiations are concluded we will be able to come back to this House of Assembly and make a statement and say, "Look, here is what we do with the resource that we control, one which we intend to manage and here are the benefits in financial terms to the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:                   Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):           Order, please!

  The time for Question Period

has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question No. 43, by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Question: The cost of renovations to the minister's office, fiscal year '79, '80, '81? Answer; No renovations to the minister's office.

MR. YOUNG: Not getting along very well with the Minister of Public Works very good.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Order 2, Committee of Supply.  
On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! Head II - Legislature.  
Shall 201-01 carry?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, not quite, not yet -

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

MR. NEARY: - probably shortly, Mr. Speaker.  
One of the matters that we want to raise under this heading has to do with secretaries for MHAs. Now, Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen will remember in the Jamieson years negotiations took place between the present Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) or the - I am not sure if it was the Leader of the Opposition or my colleague, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), in connection with secretaries for MHAs. The government agreed at that time

MR. S. NEARY: that in return for co-operation of moving the estimates off the floor of this House, out into the boardrooms in various government buildings scattered around St. John's, and changing the rules of the House to suit the administration, to strip the authority and the responsibility from this House, in return for that the government undertook to look into the possibility of giving each MHA one secretary instead of one secretary for two MHA's. Now that was an honourable agreement that was made with my former colleague, the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson). Now, Mr. Chairman, these rule changes took place some three years ago and so far there is no sign of the other part of the deal being fulfilled, the other part of the deal being that the Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) would undertake to see to it that each MHA had his own secretary. One of the first things that this government did when they got their forty-four members, when they got their new mandate, was to throw us out of our offices down on the fifth floor and put us in these tiny cells down at the end of the corridor on the fifth floor. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is fine - I mean we have to live with that - but what about the other part of the deal that was made with Mr. Jamieson, to give the MHAs a secretary per MHA? Do they intend to honour that deal, Mr. Chairman? Or are they just going to ignore it now that they have their rule changes? And I might say, as far as the rule changes are concerned, they are not working. That is obvious by the way the Estimate Committees are functioning, Mr. Chairman. Somebody was conned at the time. Hon. members might recall that I



MR. NEARY: spoke and voted against these rule changes. I knew from the beginning they would not work. They are not working. They are working in favour of the administration because the people of this Province are not getting the information they are entitled to have. It is virtually impossible to scrutinize the estimates the way they should be scrutinized. And besides that, Mr. Chairman, the Committees are loaded in favour of the government; you have five government members on a Committee and two Opposition members. It is not like the Public Accounts Committee, Mr. Chairman, where the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee is an Opposition member. It does not work that way. They have the Chairman and they have the majority on the Committees. And, as my hon. colleague indicated this morning, they are there for one reason only, and that is to prop up the ministers, to protect the ministers. They are dumb-bells. They do not scrutinize the estimates.

MR. TOBIN: Not the dumb-bell you are.

MR. NEARY: It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, if the new member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), the new bushy-tailed member, wild-eyed and goggle-eyed and shiny-nosed, if he wants to help his constituents -

MR. CALLAN: He is only here for little bit.

MR. NEARY: - if the hon. member wants to help his constituents and the people of this Province, then he should see to it that the estimates are properly scrutinized. Mr. Chairman, I think I am making a very valid point.

Mr. Chairman, there are five government members on these Committees, and I would make a categorical statement now, that on a very rare occasion will you hear one of the five members ask the

MR. NEARY: minister an embarrassing question or try to probe and scrutinize the estimates of these departments.

So, Mr. Chairman, this Committee system is just not working. It never did work. The media cannot cover the meetings of the Committees, there are too many other activities going on. We were hoping in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, that the government would accommodate the Opposition and move the estimates back on the floor of the House of Assembly where they belong.

Once you remove the power of the purse from the House, you strip it of the only power and the only authority that it has. So you put the estimates out to a seven man Committee, five of whom are government members. The dice are loaded.

MR. CARTER: The Leader of the Opposition  
is loaded.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it is physically impossible to cover these committees, it is impossible for the media to cover these committees, they are not working. The rule change was made for one reason only, to give the government a free ride. And I remember when the present Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) was on this side of the house, he was so strong and firm then. He was so strong. I remember the hon. gentleman when he was over here that he was saying. He was very sensitive about removing the authority of this House down on the eighth floor, with an elite clique on the eighth floor, the hon. gentleman was very sensitive about that. And as soon as he got a position of authority where he could change the rules, he did it, to take the authority away from the House. And, Mr. Chairman, if this government wants to do the people of this Province a service, they should bring the estimates back to the floor of the House of Assembly. There are eight of us over here and at least some of us would be here all the time to scrutinize the estimates.

But anyway, that is not what I started out to say. That is just an aside, Mr. Chairman. What I started out to say was that the government did make a commitment and they have not honoured their commitment to give the MHAs once -

MR. J. HODDER: That was to Don Jamieson.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. HODDER: That was made to Mr. Jamieson.

MR. NEARY: - that was made to my former colleague, Mr. Jamieson, that they would give MHAs one secretary per MHA instead of one secretary for every two MHAs.

MR. S. NEARY: And I would like to get the hon. gentleman's reaction to that, because it was the hon. gentleman who made the commitment. We have the letter down in our office.

MR. MARSHALL: No other province in Canada has that.

MR. NEARY: No other province in Canada has it?

MR. HODDER: That is not so. No, Sir. That is not so.

MR. NEARY: I have a few other remarks to make, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to hear the hon. gentleman's reaction to that before I carry on.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I feel I have to reply to the scurrilous remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary). I have never heard - oh, yes I have heard such rubbish and I have heard such an attack before because every time he gets up he interlards his speech with an attack like that. I would just like to say that the committee system as far as I am concerned is working extremely well. As for the estimates not being on the floor of the House, the Concurrence Debates make sure that any items that were raised in the consideration of the estimates are raised again on the floor of this House. The time that is spent, although only fifteen hours is allowed is taken off the seventy-five hours for the consideration of the estimates. Nevertheless, considerably more than fifteen hours is spent on the consideration of the social

MR. CARTER:

Services estimates. Any other members of the House are certainly welcomed to attend. Now it so happens that the members of the Opposition who are on the Social Services Committee are real gentlemen and perhaps that Committee works a little better than other committees. And knowing the hon. gentleman opposite, I would be inclined to agree.

It seems for some reason or other our committee is blessed with the two best members on the Opposition. But there is no doubt about it that this system is the best thing since sliced bread. And furthermore the format that we have used is to allow any questions to be brought up at any time. Just because a subhead has been discussed, and you think put to bed, if a member of the Opposition or a member of the government side decides to bring up this question again we are more than happy to hear it and to go through it again. If someone comes in late and something has already been discussed, we have no quarrel with them bringing it up again. And we have bent over backwards to accommodate them.

The record shows that last year, I think, we spent - the exact figure escapes me - but I think it was twenty-seven and a half hours were spent on the Social Services Committee and that is far in excess of the amount of time that would have been spent had these estimates been brought into the House.

Now I have to cast my mind back at least four years to recall how the estimates were handled when they were done in the House but, as I recall it, the then Leader of the Opposition, because the spots have not changed that much, made it like pulling teeth. As each heading was raised everyone had to have a word to say on it, there was a ten minute harangue - or I think the allotment was fifteen minutes at a time - there was a fifteen minute harangue, and then the Chairman would try and get the item

MR. CARTER: through, and it would just about be carried and then someone else would get up and speak from the Opposition, and then the Leader of the Opposition, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)- I think he was the member for Bell Island then - would then get up and give his harangue again. So God bless whoever thought of bringing the estimates into the committee system. I am absolutely delighted that the member for LaPoile has decided to boycott these particular sessions because I know from past experience that you get nowhere, it is just a waste of time trying to make any headway with him,

MR. J. CARTER: and I very much appreciate the fact that he is staying away from it. I only wish he would carry through his threats completely and stay away from the House.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, a few words I will have in relation to what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said, supplementary to what the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) said in the first -

MR. NEARY: You do not associate with him here.

MR. MARSHALL: No, I always associate myself with the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). He always speaks very frankly and very cogently and says the truth at all times. He is right on when he speaks. As a matter of fact, we are very proud of the member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Not only is he the man who headed the committee on the flag, which the hon. members, with the exception of the member for Port au Port (Mr. Holder), condemned roundly and which is now accepted everywhere, and I would think that would be a feather - if not a feather certainly a flag in his cap for many years to come - but he has also been the Chairman of the Social Policy Committee and it is because of him, and the other chairmen to a large extent, that those committees have been successful.

Now as to the deal, Mr. Chairman, the alleged deal, and it is always said there were alleged deals, whatever deals this government has every made, this government has

MR. NEARY: kept, even with the Opposition. The rule changes that were made to put these estimates out to Committee were in conformity with the practice in just about every other parliamentary institution of this type. The then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) agreed with it. The present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) I think was the only one in the House who disagreed with it, and disagreed with it vigorously. Since then the hon. gentleman, particularly since he has gotten suzerainty over the other gentlemen, including the gentleman from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), and the other gentlemen in the House, he seems to be embarked on a policy of trying to demonstrate that the committees are not working, that they are not working properly. And that is an easy thing to do, Mr. Chairman, it is an easy thing to do. Because for the committees to operate, of course, you have Opposition members and you have government members on it and just say if the Opposition members do not turn up to the meetings or of the Opposition members there is only one there instead of two at the meeting, it is a very easy thing to say that the committees are not working. Well if they do not work because the Opposition do not turn up, Mr. Chairman, it is because of the Opposition and not of the government. And that is really what is happening.

If a member of the Opposition is unable to make a meeting at a particular time, there is a procedure in the rules, which has been used all the time, whereby a letter is signed, and I will be prepared to sign a letter at any time at the Opposition's request to substitute one Opposition member for another at that particular meeting.

Now surely it is not too much to ask two Opposition members to attend, because that is all they have to do, just two



MR. MARSHALL:

Opposition members have to attend a meeting. There are only two meetings that are held at any given time. This year we decided to do this because of the altered situation. So all we are doing is we are asking four Opposition members to attend and, surely, that is not asking too much.

We have this Committee system. One of the reforms in this House, legitimate reforms, was the establishment of the Committee system and by everybody's yardstick, except the Leader of the Opposition and some of the members now of the Opposition, under whose absolute and complete control we now find the Opposition, under the complete control now of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), some of them now parrot what he says and say that it is not working. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this is, as I say, we are implementing a system that has been in vogue in other areas and we are proud that we have done it. We are proud of what we have done to the House to increase the effectiveness of the House. It causes a more in-depth examination of the estimates; it involves a much more extensive look at the financial position of this Province, and it causes, despite what hon. members opposite may say, a greater publication of the situation.

The hon. member said that, in his view, the five government members do not ask embarrassing questions. From the reports of the Committees that I have seen, the five government members are asking incisive questions and questions geared to elicit information, which is the purpose of the Committee itself.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentleman does not like the type of questions that are asked by the government members, he will know that the government members are not under his control. Those who are under his complete control are the members of the Opposition, and all he has to do is to flick his finger and point his finger at whichever member is not going and police his people to see that they attend the meetings themselves.

As to the facilities available to the Opposition, here again we have striven to give to the Opposition, both last time, when they had larger numbers, and this time, adequate staff. At the present time I believe they have six secretaries down there. There are eight members of the Opposition. The government members themselves have much less proportionately than the Opposition members have. With respect to the space, the square footage available to the Opposition is considerably more than they had before per member, and it is considerably less than what the government has. The simple fact of the matter is they had to be moved from one quarter to another because their numbers, in the extreme wisdom of the electorate, were decimated and they were cut in half, so they cannot expect to have the same facilities. They cannot expect to have thirteen secretaries and they cannot expect - they would have

MR. MARSHALL:

enough space in their previous quarters, had they retained it, to set up a tennis court or a basketball court or something the way it is. So they just did not need it.

So we have co-operated.

As to the media, that it cannot cover them, I have not noticed that the media has suffered. I think the reports from the media have been excellent on these committees. It is not too much to have two reporters of any branch of the media attending two meetings at any given time. I agree, Mr. Chairman, with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member to the effect that the power of the purse should not be taken from the House. The power of the purse was put back in the House of Assembly by the successive administrations of this party.

Prior to 1972 it should be realized that the Cabinet of the day could borrow an unlimited amount of money without securing the approval of the House of Assembly. This is not there now. This is what you would call returning the power to the House.

As far as the Committees are concerned, we are now in a Committee, we are in a Committee of the Whole. This is what the hon. gentleman wants the estimates returned to. What we have done is we have made smaller committees in accordance with normal practices which allow for a greater examination and it is not taking the power of the purse from the House but in effect is making the power of the House over the public purse even greater because it gives an opportunity for more extensive inquiry into the expenditures.

Let us take a look at the proportions, for instance, in the Committees. The Committees are comprised of seven members. This time there are two Opposition members. The Committees usually reflect, the numbers

MR. MARSHALL:                    on the Committee usually reflect the complément in the House. But with two members in a seven man committee,they have 40 per cent representation on the committee. In the Committee of the Whole,to which the hon. gentleman wishes to return,they have eight members in fifty-two,which works out to 18 per cent.

So as a result of the way in which the Committees have been

MR. MARSHALL:

structured, we have a much better and much more effective, and give larger and much more possibility to the Opposition to make their points. I think it is much easier for two members, two active members, if they want to be active in a committee, to make their point in a small committee, than there would be for eight members in a fifty-two man committee. So all in all, Mr. Chairman, what we have done we make no apologies to anyone for. We have done what we consider to be a strengthening of the House and a strengthening of the main function of the House, which is an examination of the expenditures of the public purse and we have no intention of retrenching from it. And if the hon. gentleman wants to talk about there is a divergence, that there has been a break of any agreement, whatever agreement was allegedly made, that agreement was made when they had seventeen or eighteen members, and obviously, as I say, the electorate in its extreme wisdom cut them down to eight members. There are eight souls over on the other side of the House and before we had seventeen or eighteen of them. But if the electorate cut them down, so their number of secretaries should be cut down, so their space should be cut down. But even at that, proportionately they had more than they had before, which is the way this government operates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader did some fancy dancing around that one. The hon. gentleman did not address himself to the commitment that was made by him to Mr. Jamieson in return for our co-operation to change the rules of the House drastically-

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: -that each member would be given his own secretary. That was the deal, Mr. Chairman. It

MR. NEARY: does not make any difference if it is seventeen, eighteen or twenty members. If you had twenty members you would have twenty secretaries, if you had eighteen members you would have eighteen secretaries, if you have eight members you would have eight secretaries. Right now we have six secretaries for eight members and two executive assistants, ten people. You have six secretaries attending to the work of ten people. That is what you have, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman conveniently left out the executive assistants. He must expect them to do their own typing.

MR. MARSHALL: That is extra.

MR. NEARY: That is extra? I see. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, right now apart from that they are withholding a grant to the Opposition office. They are withholding that for the last three months. Commitments have already been made on that. And so, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman can get up all he wants and try to dance around it. The agreement was made. They have backed down on the agreement.

MR. MARSHALL: We never backed down on anything.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman says they never backed down. Well where is the one secretary per member?

MR. MARSHALL: We did not break an agreement.

MR. NEARY: You what?

MR. MARSHALL: You know that is not so.

MR. NEARY:

It is so.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman knows we did not  
back down on an agreement.

Mr. Chairman knows we did not

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Chairman, the  
hon. gentleman also spoke about the Committee system, I think,  
with tongue-in-cheek. This is the only Province in Canada -  
the hon. gentleman says it is done in every jurisdiction -  
this is the only Province in Canada where we have a system  
of Committees like we have here in this Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the

MR. WARREN:

It is not so, is it?

MR. NEARY:

The only Province in Canada.  
The CBC that the hon. the Premier hates so much, despises  
so much -

The only Province in Canada.

MR. WARREN:

But he walked out of the  
press conference.

But he walked out of the

MR. NEARY:

- and will not answer  
any questions for the CBC, they did a survey recently and they  
discovered much to their amazement that the system here is  
unique in Canada.

- and will not answer

MR. MARSHALL:

That is not right.

MR. NEARY:

The system here was designed  
in such a way as to silence the Opposition, as to bury the  
estimates. Mr. Chairman, the forum we have here now in this  
House is a forum for the Opposition, not the Committees. The  
Committee system can never work effectively when you have five  
government members, two Opposition members, and a government  
member Chairman. How can that system be effective, Mr. Chairman,  
with two meetings going on simultaneously with all the other  
duties that members have to perform home on weekends! This  
weekend I was down in Sop's Arm, Pollard's Point and Jackson's  
Arm. I left here on Saturday I got back last night.

The system here was designed

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And I had a good look at the road down there that the hon. gentleman is neglecting, that the administration is neglecting.

MR. MORGAN: You are looking for a new seat, You cannot go back to LaPoile again.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I had a good look at that road and I had a good look at the fish plant that the hon. gentleman will not open down there in Jackson's Arm -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: ... because travelling over the road is too expensive to transport fish. They have a million and a half cords of wood down there that Bowaters would like to get at and they cannot transport it because of the condition of the road.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is time for you to get to know Newfoundland, boy.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Chairman, it is time for me to get to know Newfoundland. I would say it is time for the hon. gentleman to get out from behind that chain link fence and have a look at this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: And his bodyguard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman will find me -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, could not keep water to me when I start travelling this Province. He would not make a good water boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier would not make a good nipper when I get started travelling this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And you know I keep telling -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - I keep telling the hon. gentleman that when I came into this job I certainly did not intend to stay here forever, but I am beginning to like it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I am beginning to like it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I am looking at that seat over there now, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Collins)?

PREMIER PECKFORD: "They also serve who only stand and wait."

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I was looking at this one a long while too.

MR. WARREN: Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman never thought that I would get into this one. And the hon. gentleman may not think that I will get into that one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NERRY: If the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman keeps making the blunders that he has been making, especially since the election, if he keeps abusing and misusing his mandate as he has in the last few weeks, I may be tempted to stay on and have a go at the hon. gentleman. I may be tempted to do it.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to belabour the point, but -

MR. MORGAN: Where is 'Ed Roberts'?  
He is resigning his seat soon.

MR. BARRETT: He is never here, so he must be resigning.

MR. MORGAN: He is going to offer his seat to Len Stirling.

MR. NEARY: I can wait, Mr. Chairman.  
I can wait.

MR. TULK: Three strikes and you are out in any other game.

MR. NEARY: That is right.  
It is one, two, three strikes you're out at the old ball game.

MR. MORGAN: I would get more than a twenty-one-vote majority in that election.

MR. WARREN: He does not talk to the judge, though.

MR. NEARY: We will just leave him alone, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to belabour the point, but I can only repeat what I have said before, what my colleagues have been saying publicly, that the Committee system as it is presently constituted will not work. It is not meant to be

MR. NEARY: effective, it is only meant and designed to hide the estimates, to stop the Opposition from scrutinizing the estimates. It is not done in any other jurisdiction. In Alberta, I am told, where there was only a small majority, the government worked out a procedure to accommodate the Opposition. In other jurisdictions the estimates are scrutinized on the floor of the House of Assembly. Mr. Chairman, that is tradition, that is the way the system works-except in Newfoundland. And there is no way the administration can justify what they did with the rule changes. They crucified the system that we had for analyzing and scrutinizing the budget.

Why, even the House Leader, who just spoke with tongue in cheek, I remember when he was on this side of the House, the number of times that he was on his feet when the estimates were being discussed. And ministers were allowed to bring their deputies and officials in on the floor of the House and have the officials seated beside them so that they could give ministers information on questions

MR. NEARY:

that they did not have in their heads. And the present Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) took a more active part in scrutinizing the estimates, I suppose, than any other member except the hon. W. J. Browne, who was an expert at it in this House. The estimates should be returned to the floor of this House, and there is no way they can justify what they are doing, Mr. Chairman. I do not care if we have twenty-two in Opposition, it still will not work. Where you have a larger number of government members on the Committee and the Committee Chairman a government member, how can that work? At least, in the Public Accounts Committee, the Chairman is an Opposition member - a different set-up altogether.

MR. YOUNG: It is by courtesy.

MR. NEARY: It is not by courtesy, it is by tradition.

MR. YOUNG: It is not traditional.

There is no such thing as tradition.

MR. NEARY: No. I know if the hon. gentleman had his way it would be a dictatorship. Why not just shut the House down and put the locks on the door? Close her down altogether! I mean, turn her into a dictatorship!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh'

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member wants to debate that I would be glad to debate it with him with what we saw happen in this Province on Friday past. I have never seen that happen before.

MR. WARREN: What was that, 'Steve'?

What was that?

MR. NEARY: When the Premier sulked and went storming out and called a six or seven minute

MR. NEARY: news conference and then refused to answer questions for the newsmen. At least we Liberals, if we call a news conference, we are prepared to face the music and answer questions after. That is the difference between Liberalism and Toryism.

MR. WARREN: You mean a dictator.

MR. NEARY: And that is the difference between a dictator and people who are free.

MR. WARREN: What happened? He would not answer any questions?

MR. NEARY: Would not answer any questions.

MR. WARREN: Would not answer any questions at all. Boy, oh, boy! And the Premier of the Province.

MR. NEARY: I would think, Mr. Chairman, that was the first time that ever happened in the history of this Province. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, pretty soon we will have the Reign of Terror in this Province.

MR. WARREN: Was he mad?

MR. NEARY: Was he mad? He was like a tyrant.

MR. WARREN: Is that right?

MR. NEARY: Went charging, stomping out like a little child, out of the news conference and refused to answer questions for the press. Well, we are not afraid to answer questions. If you ever see me having a news conference, I guarantee you, I will not be afraid to answer questions. And, Mr. Chairman, the vicious onslaught and attack that was made on the press was unprecedented in this Province, unprecedented. Mr. Chairman, we all have our disagreements occasionally with the media. We all have our disagreements, but none of us, I do not believe, have ever gone that far.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I thought it was pathetic. I thought it was distasteful, Mr. Chairman, the vicious attack that was made by the Premier of this Province on the press.

AN HON. MEMBER: I did not see anything wrong with it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman did not see anything wrong with it? The hon. gentleman should hang his head in shame for supporting that administration and the leader

MR. NEARY:

of that administration and his behaviour. I would think pretty soon if that keeps up it will not be long before we will see the butterfly nets out -

AN HON. MEMBER: Gill nets catching rats.

MR. NEARY: That is not all they will catch if they put nets out in this Province. White Coats and nets are not too far away, Mr. Chairman, with that kind of behaviour. And people in this Province are very concerned about it, Mr. Chairman. But anyway, that is an aside. I do not intend to belabour the point. We can probably get off this subhead now and get on to the Auditor General's Report. I understand that one or two of my colleagues would care to have a few words on this subhead.

MR. BAIRD: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Alyward): The hon. member for Humber West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BAIRD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments in relation to the former two speakers there. Number one, I guess if a lot of the members are the same as me they are getting very confused here because every two or three months we wind up with a new Leader of the Opposition, some inside the House and some outside the House, and it appears that every one of them have a different way of running things and neither one of them really seems to know what they want.

As far as the Estimates Committee are concerned, I have been on the Estimates Committees, this is my fourth year, the comments from everybody else with the exception of the existing Opposition House Leader (Mr. Neary) have been very favourable. I would think the fact that we have two members of the Opposition and five on government side would apparently give the Opposition a little more time to ask questions. But I think, as was apparent to the

MR. BAIRD: Social Services Committee this morning, I guess maybe the weather was half decent the weekend, and apparently our Opposition friends did not do their homework. They ran out of questions, they even ran out of comments after a little while -

MR. MORGAN: There you are now, is that not shameful?

MR. BAIRD: - then got up and attacked the government members for not asking questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BAIRD: I recall very well one year ago the same gentlemen were at the Estimate Committee that I attended, and then they had a different cry on their face even though they had double their numbers - twice eight is sixteen. The cry then was we were asking too many questions and they did not have a chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BAIRD: They have all the chances in the world. We listened to half an hour of Question Period today and what did we hear? It started off very poorly, finished up very poorly, with five out of the eight still asking questions and they did not really know what it was all about. I think it is time for some of the Opposition boys, including the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Neary) to get his act straight, make up his mind to which direction he is taking, he is after being in two or three parts of the Island now looking for a seat, I think the Premier's seat is going to be a long time there before he even gets a look at it let alone sit in it. When it comes to the secretaries down in the government members office I do not know why maybe you get a certain stigma to you when you get in Opposition - but I find that two of us, with one secretary in between, as all the other members and I do not see as much crying at our place as there is from the Opposition



MR. BAIRD: although they are always complaining what is the government doing with the money. So I think maybe the Opposition should do their homework a little more and rethink what their position is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Well done, 'Garfield'.

MR. WARREN: I guess first I should go back to the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), I was attending that committee meeting this morning and I believe that the member did not tell the whole truth. I think, if I remember him correctly, he said that we ran out of questions, which, Mr. Chairman, I do challenge him on.

MR. HODDER: The record will show.

MR. WARREN: The record will show that at all times this morning that the chairman of the committee, we said to the chairman time and time again this morning, "Now look, we will let the government members ask the questions if there are any questions, if not we will keep asking questions." So we gave the government members all the chances in the world this morning to ask their questions and I still have questions that I could not ask, Mr. Speaker.

However, we should remember,

Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman.

MR. WARREN: - we should remember, Mr. Chairman, that for two years now I have been saying the Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner, or the Ombudsman we call him, I figure that was a waste of government money. I figure it was a waste of government money, Mr. Chairman, but I have changed my mind. I changed my mind. I do not think it is a waste of

MR. WARREN: government money at all, Mr. Chairman, because of the fantastic report, this special report that the Ombudsman prepared showing that a Minister of the Crown did not follow the proper procedure, in particular concerning the appointments of individuals in the Civil Service. I think that the Ombudsman is worth much more money, is worth much more money than has been voted for him in the estimates.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if ever, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said - by the way I wish to advise you, as far as I am concerned there is only one Leader of the Opposition and that is the man who sits in this Chair right here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: I take my directions from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) right here in and out of the House. And I let you know, and the executive of the Liberal Party know, that I take my directions from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) in the House, as well as outside of the House. And, Mr. Chairman, I will also take my directions from him when the next election is called when he is sitting over there in the Premier's chair.

But I do not think, Mr. Chairman,

MR. G. WARREN:

that we should forget that this report that the Ombudsman prepared concerning an appointment in the Minister of Fisheries' (Mr. J. Morgan) office - I think we have taken this report too lightly. We know, the Ombudsman has proved it, and read the report here in black and white that the Minister of Fisheries intervened with the Public Service Act. And, Mr. Chairman, I really think that this in itself, Mr. Chairman, shows that. My only concern is I think the Ombudsman should have more on his staff because, if he did, just imagine how many more of those he would find? I would not doubt but the Minister of Public Works (Mr. H. Young), maybe, could be found with the same kind of a thing going on.

MR. H. YOUNG:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

A point of order. Point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Public Works on a point of Order.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, I think he has made an accusation there now and I think he should withdraw his remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I do not agree that it is a

point of order.

The hon. the member for Torqat

Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Ombudsman had more on his staff, I am just wondering about the Minister of Education (Ms. L. Verge), I wonder would he write a similar report about her. The Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) I am sure he would write probably many similar reports like this. So, Mr. Chairman, the only problem is that the Ombudsman has not got enough on his staff. In fact I would like to see three or four bodyguards dropped off from the Premier's staff

MR. G. WARREN: and some extra staff put on to the Ombudsman's where he can uncover more of this. Because, Mr. Chairman, what has he uncovered here is a minister interferring with the Public Service Commission. Now what is the point of having a Public Service Commission if number one person does not get the job? What is the good of being number one?

I remember a few years ago, Mr. Chairman, I sat in on an interview in 1978. I sat in on an interview interviewing somebody with the Department of Rural Development. At that time there were two members from the Public Service Commission and myself. We did an interview and, in fact, I think it was eleven or twelve were interviewed for a position, and, Mr. Chairman, when the recommendations came back from the Public Service Commission, number one did not get the job. Number one recommendation did not get the job. Now why? I would venture to say it could have been the same reason, if everything was found out.

MR. WARREN: It could have been the same reason as what happened with the Minister of Fisheries ( Mr. Morgan ) position. The Minister of Fisheries intervened. And it could not have necessarily been the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie ).It could have been his deputy minister or some other high official within his department. So, Mr. Chairman, we are not treating the Public Service Commission serious enough. If they make a recommendation, and the recommendation coincides with the members in the department that the person has applied for-like in this last one that the Ombudsman reported. The individual that this person was going to be responsible for, the individual that this person was going to be responsible for recommended that the number one person would get the job, but the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan ) said no, he said the number two position. And the Minister of Fisheries ( Mr. Morgan) did not even know the number two position, he never met the number two position. He did not even know who he was. All he knew was that he was painted blue.That was the only reason.

MR. TULK: What colour was that?

MR. WARREN: Blue. So now, Mr. Chairman, is that reason enough to put a person in such a position ? "The director said, ' look, I know number one. I have had a number one working with me for the past two or three years, so let us give number one the position.' And the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said, ' no, we will take two.' And going back and finding out two's credentials, number two's credentials are that there is an association there with the government in power. There is the association. Now what does that have to do with the man's intelligence or his ability to do a day's work? Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have to give more emphasis to what the Ombudsam reports. I knew he was a political appointment, but let us give him

MR. WARREN: credit that with only a staff of three, I think, he came up with this report on a particular minister. And I suppose it is like my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said, 'Strike three and you are out! But for some reason in baseball in Newfoundland you need more than three strikes. You know, in every baseball game right across Canada and in the United States, anywhere at all, after three strikes you are out. But if you play a baseball game in Newfoundland, like the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has been playing, you can get more than three strikes and you are not out. So how many strikes are needed? I guess we must have a new type of game connected up and you need more than three strikes to get out.

MR. CALLAN: Tiddly Winks.

MR. WARREN: You know, I do not have to go down and name the three strikes that the minister got. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition has named them before. But his latest strike, naturally - in fact, he almost had two simultaneously the last time, was it not?

MR. CALLAN: Almost at the same time.

MR. WARREN: Almost at the same time, right.

One with the judge

MR. WARREN: and one with the Ombudsman. So, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we should increase the budget for the Parliamentary Commissioner. I think we should increase his budget from \$128,000 - now I think it should be increased much more. I think the Ombudsman should be given more staff.

MR. NEARY: And given more authority.

MR. WARREN: Given more authority and more staff. And I would think next year this time, give the Ombudsman two more people on his staff and we will see a lot of red faces on that side. And I would venture to say there has been interference with the Civil Service Commission. In fact, I could tell you about a deputy minister who called up the Civil Service Commission and said, 'Look, number one I do not want, I want number two.' This has happened. So, Mr. Chairman, let us not think that we are naive enough to know that the message is not getting through to the Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, because they are beginning to see, and all we need to do is get a couple of more reports from the Ombudsman, get a couple of more reports concerning interferences with the judicial system, a couple of those reports, Mr. Chairman, then all of a sudden it is going to get out to the people. And they are saying, 'Well, that Premier we have is not as honest as I thought he was.' That is what they are going to say. 'I really thought he was an honest man, but we are beginning to believe he is not really that honest after all.'

MR. TULK: They are saying it now-

MR. WARREN: They are even saying it now.

MR. TULK: - about his house.

MR. WARREN: Yes, about his house. You know, you can have all

MR. WARREN: the bodyguards you want, you can have all the chain link fences, but one thing you cannot keep in with bodyguards and chain link fences is honesty. You cannot keep that in.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!  
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, how quickly the time goes!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a couple of words in response to what the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) said a few minutes ago here in the House of Assembly.

MR. TULK: It is not very often he speaks but when he does he puts his foot in his mouth.

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is not very often he speaks, either here in the House of Assembly or in Committee.

MR. NEARY: He has 'foot in mouth' disease.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I want to put something right. Because the member said this morning, and he said again here in the House this afternoon, that I had complained this morning about the lack of participation of government members in the Committee. He went on to say that last year I had been complaining otherwise - and I think he said this publicly as well,



MR. HODDER: that I had been complaining otherwise because there was not enough time for Opposition members to get their questions in.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to tell the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) categorically that I was not a member of the Social Services Committee last year.

MR. NEARY: So he lied.

MR. WARREN: He lied to the House.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, when the member for Humber West says that I speak out of both sides of my mouth, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put that right because, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have sat on the Committee for two years. And I would say to the member for Humber West, even though he sort of slunk out of the House after he made his comments, that I have never, never complained about the lack of opportunity for the Opposition to speak on that particular Committee or any other Committee. But, Mr. Chairman, I have certainly seen that hon. member sitting on the Committee, for years and years and years he has been sitting there and has said nothing. And I think the records will show, and there are transcripts made of those proceedings as there are made here in the House, and the Opposition members are the only ones - now I will admit, Mr. Chairman, that this morning, after I had made my comments out of disgust that there were more comments that came from members on the other side, which I think is quite good, Mr. Chairman. We are all Newfoundlanders. Whether we sit on either side of this House, if these estimates are coming before the Committees, I think it is more than incumbent upon any member in this House to make sure that the public funds

MR. HODDER: of this Province are spent correctly. And when the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) makes a public statement that I said one thing last year and another thing this year, Mr. Chairman, the truth speaks for itself because I did not sit on that Committee last year and I have never made such statements. But I will reiterate the statement I made this morning, and I will say it for all Committees, that the government members, if they think they are serving the Province well by sitting there and praising the minister, or interjecting when the Opposition has a line of questioning going to protect the minister, that they are serving the best interest of the people of this Province, Mr. Chairman, then I would say that we are in sad shape indeed. But when the member for Humber West names me personally as having spoken both ways, and he said 'last year', Mr. Chairman, the truth and the records will speak for itself..

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for St. Mary's-  
the Capes.

MR. HEARN: Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Social Services Committee I take exception to some of the remarks made by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).  
You know, we on

MR. HEARN: this side of the House feel rather generous when we look across the House at the lowly Opposition. And in committee, where they are complaining about five of us and two of them, we give them every courtesy and we let them ask the questions to a certain degree. However, after listening to the last two speakers, both of whom are on the same committee that I am on, and when you listen to the roundabout way that they have of bringing out a point and you realize how long it takes, number one, for them to ask a question and, number two, for the Chairman to understand or the minister to understand what they mean, you realize how frustrating it is to get a question in. I would also suggest that the transcript will show that the government members ask questions, and that if you look at the quantity of questions asked we may be outnumbered a little bit by the Opposition, but if you look at the quality of the questions, the government side would certainly win the day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to take exception to the comment made a few minutes ago by the in-House Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), I think it was, who referred to some of us here as dumb-bells - I think was the word. I guess we could somewhat pardon him with his limited vocabulary. However, I had the privilege and pleasure of attending three of those such committee meetings, one with Health, one with Labour and Manpower, and one with Municipal Affairs this morning, and in all three cases, Mr. Chairman, I did participate in discussion and, as my hon. colleague just noted, we outnumbered the Opposition members present. In each case at the meetings I attended there was only one from the Opposition in attendance, so we did have to give them the courtesy of having

MR. PEACH:

five questions to our one, I guess.

Therefore, I do not think it is right to say that we do not ask questions and do not participate in debate. Also, Mr. Chairman, I have heard the hon. member comment in the last few days here in the House when he referred to many of us, the newly elected members, as shiny nosed and bright eyed, I am glad to see that he recognizes our potential and that we are so bright eyed and are very much alert and probably when he looks across he can see such a glow and a mirror over here that when he looks at it it thinks he is

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 1013

MJ - 1

MR. M. PEACH: looking in a mirror and probably calling himself by the word he used to refer to us as dumb-bells. So again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that from the meetings that I have attended, that members of this side of the House have participated and participated well and have asked questions that did not take ten minutes to come forth with the question but stated the question at the beginning and then the minister could answer it.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Ayiward): The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments regarding the committee system without using any derogatory adjectives to describe members on either side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: What I want to do though is defend myself. And I make no apologies, Mr. Chairman. Last Thursday the Resource Committee met right here in this Assembly with the Minister of Development (Mr. N. Winsor). It was his department that we were dealing with on that particular morning. Now the one o'clock news, as I was eating my lunch at my desk because I did not have time to go down stairs and stay down there, I was eating my lunch at my desk with the radio on and the number one story on the station that I was listening to--and I am not condemning the press; far be it from me because I think the Premier will probably live to regret condemning the press because, as all hon. members are aware, I am sure, that you do not win when you attack the press. So I am not condemning - but anyway the number one story was mentioned that the member for Bellevue (Mr. W. Callan), who was the only member present on the Committee, came in twenty-five minutes late and did not have any questions. Now, Mr. Chairman,

MR. W. CALLAN: I want to explain. I want to explain, and I want to agree with what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) said in his remarks earlier, that it is unfair, and the member for Humber West (Mr. R. Baird) is being unfair when he compares the work load of a dozen backbenchers on the government side with eight Opposition members. I mean, the member is aware, I am sure, that the things that we are called on to do and to investigate and so on as Opposition members in no way compares with what a dozen, say, or even twenty backbenchers on the government side have to deal with. Because let us face it, it is the Cabinet and the people surrounding the Cabinet and the Premier who have the work load on the government side. So I do believe, as I have said, I do agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it would not be considered unfair or a waste of the taxpayers' dollars if the Premier had decided to give each Opposition member a secretary per member. Because as I said, the reason on Thursday morning past when we were into that Department of Development, the reason that I did not have any questions and the reason

MR. CALLAN: I got up several times to leave is because I had - What is it the Bible says? - "I was about my Father's business."

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. CALLAN: I was about my father's business. I got up to leave the Committee on two or three occasions to make phone calls, very important phone calls. Let me just mention one of the phone calls. I think everybody is aware, Mr. Chairman, that all last week there was a big hullabaloo, a big controversy regarding the future of the Markland hospital. It has not died down yet. Obviously it will continue this week and next week. But especially last week, when the thing surfaced for the first time, I was receiving phone calls from everybody. I had certain phone calls to make, to make my contacts and so on and so on. So, Mr. Chairman, that was just one of the things that I had on my plate.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that all members will agree that it has been traditional, the reason why the House of Assembly, for example, traditionally has not met in the morning but has met in the afternoon, is to give the government at least half the day to do the routine work. I mean, that has been tradition. But when you expect eight Opposition members to give up their morning and their afternoon, what time is left for constituency work? That is the only excuse. That is the only excuse - and it is not an excuse, Mr. Chairman, it is a reason - that is the reason why I disagree with the Committee system.

Now, let me react to the member of the press who suggested in the report that

MR. CALLAN: was given - in a couple of the press, I saw it; I read one and I heard one - that, you know, the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) did not have any questions. Let me just go through briefly, Mr. Chairman, some questions that are here on the Order Paper for the Minister of Development (Mr. Winsor). I could have asked these questions that same morning but, as I said, I had to get up and leave on several occasions. I arrived late for the same reason.

By the way, I mentioned the Markland Hospital, Mr. Chairman, I think I should mention something else. The Premier, a couple of times last week, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) on another occasion, at least three times last week, I heard the Premier twice and the Minister of Fisheries once, gloating over the government guarantees and the grants and the loans that were given to fish plants around this Province. They talked about it in the context of 'let us compare St. Anthony with the others' and so on. But, Mr. Chairman, some of the work that I had to do last week was, and perhaps the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) can verify that what I am saying is true, that a lot of these grants and loans, even though they were announced publicly probably a month ago or longer, that these fish plant operators do not have that money. They do not have that working capital.



MR. CALLAN:

in their hands. And I spent a fair amount of time last week trying to look after one of my constituents so that he could meet his payroll in the fish plant that he was operating. And the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), as I have said knows full well that, you know, it has to go from Finance to Justice and so on, and by the time the actual cheque arrives in the hands of the fish plant operator, a lot of time has expired.

But let me refer, Mr. Chairman, to some questions that I asked the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) ; they are on the Order Paper. I could have asked them last Thursday but I did not. Now then, " the member for Bellevue to ask the hon. Minister of Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information: the number of trips taken by the minister during the fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981; the reason for the trip; places visited" and so on and so on. That is just one. On another Order Paper, "The member for Bellevue to ask the Minister of Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information: the amount of housing in Labrador which was constructed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation." And another one right here, "To ask the hon. Minister of Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information: what legal firms and what fees were paid for legal work for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation." And if I can just take one final example, Mr. Chairman, " The member for Bellevue to ask the Minister of Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information: a list showing the loans by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation to industries that failed and assets of companies sold by public auction or some other means to recover part of the funding of such companies." And, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Development, of course, in

MR. CALLAN: his opening fifteen minute remark-  
which I heard, by the way, so I was not twenty-five minutes  
late, contrary to the report that was on the radio; I was  
not twenty-five minutes late - but the minister in his  
remarks and in answer to several questions wrongly condemned  
the federal government for the non-signing of a new tourist  
agreement. But that, Mr. Chairman, is typical of the  
other committee meeting that I attended. It is traditional,  
especially in the Resources Committee, to hear the ministers  
condemn Ottawa right, left and center, as of course they  
do here practically on a daily basis during the Oral  
Question Period, and even in the questions that were asked  
today regarding the stumpage fees and so on, the Minister  
of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) could not help  
but bring in and try to blame in some way the federal  
government for that as well, even though, Mr. Chairman,  
the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands knows when he  
said we charge stumpage where we build roads and the  
Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, Mr. Chairman,  
knows full well, and perhaps the federal

MR. CALLAN:

Liberal Government in Ottawa is very negligent, very negligent in blowing their own horn in this Province because in the boon docks and all over this Province I think there are an awful lot of people, an awful lot of people who work on projects and who travel over roads and enter buildings not realizing that 90 per cent of it came from the federal Liberal Government in Ottawa - in many cases 100 per cent, and in many cases - well in all cases 50 per cent. If a water and a sewer project is approved, for example, for Norman's Cove this year, fifty cents out of every dollar that will go into that project, even though it is approved by the Provincial Government, everybody knows that fifty cents out of every dollar that is spent in this Province is federal money anyway. And of course the forest access roads, the minister tried to make a suggestion here that we are providing those roads, so therefore it is fine, and you cannot blame us for charging a stumpage, a royalty, when he knows full well that these forest access roads are 90 per cent funded by the federal government.

Then the minister also talked about his infestation of the forest and the fine job that his department is doing in cleaning it up. We had a programme in my district, if the Trans-Canada Highway can be classified as being in somebody's district, it can when the list of road works comes down. Last year, for example, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush)-remember? - that in the list of road works for his district, \$3.5 million for Terra Nova. And there was not one copper spent in Terra Nova, not one copper. All of that had to do with the Overpass at the Glovertown intersection on the Trans-Canada Highway. But they put it in with Terra Nova, as they did in my district, of course, in Bellevue, the couple of million dollars that was spent on the Trans-Canada between the Chance Cove Road and the Welcome Inn at Goobies, all of that was lumped in as

MR. CALLAN: money being spent in Bellevue.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: And my time is up, Mr. Chairman.

So I will continue at some other time.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize the hon.

member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), I would like to make a ruling on a point of order which was raised by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) on Friday concerning such words as 'lucky' and 'stooge' which were used in this House by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). I have done some research on this and I cannot find in any of the Parliamentary reference books or any debate that these words have been ruled unparliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): So my ruling is that there was no point of order. But I would like to remind members on both sides of the House that depending on the tone in which certain words are used, they could in some future time be ruled unparliamentary language.

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Chairman, like many other of my colleagues, I too take exception to the remarks directed towards us by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and certainly by the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder). I have attended every meeting of the Resource Committee and I have asked questions at every meeting. Last Thursday, Mr. Chairman, we were in meetings from nine-thirty until twelve-thirty without the Opposition asking one single question. The questions were directed to the minister by the government members. I believe that I asked my fair share of questions at that meeting as well.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore do not feel that the remarks that were made by these two honourable gentlemen were directed at me because I asked questions. However, I believe that the word 'dummies' or 'dumb-bells' are certainly part of the vocabulary of the two people, and these two people must be very familiar with the words. I feel a little disappointed, Sir, that they have referred to people who do not ask questions as 'dummies' and have put their own colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), in a situation where he is basically referred to as a 'dummy' because he did not ask questions, and have put him in the situation where he just had to stand up and explain to this House why he did not ask questions.

Well, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I enjoyed working on the Committee with the hon. member for Bellevue, and I do not think he deserves to

MR. TOBIN: be fitted in that category, that people who did not ask questions he called 'dummies'. I believe that, as he said, that morning he had other questions to ask and he will ask them at other times, that he did not want to ask questions. And I do not believe for one minute that he should be referred to as a dummy by the two gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the greatest problem, the thing that agitates the two gentlemen, is the fact that most of the Committees are made up by new members and it is the quality of questions that are asked by the new members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: It is the quality of questions that are asked by the new members, Mr. Chairman, that upsets the people opposite. They know that we can ask questions and that we get direct and honest responses from the ministers involved. And they should also realize that quality is what counts and not the quantity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am proud to work on the Committee. I look forward to working for the rest of this year and other years to come, and any time that

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 1018

MLP-1

MR. G. TOBIN: I do not feel it is fit to ask a question, I do not think that I should be referred to as the dummy or a dumb-bell by the two gentlemen opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Before we carry it I have to respond. I am under heavy attack from these bushy-tailed, bright-eyed members. I really feel bad I am under such heavy attack. Mr. Chairman, how naive can you be? How naive can you get? Hon. gentleman go in and ask the ministers to tell them what nice fellows they are.

MR. WARREN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: " Tell me, Mr. Minister, tell me what a nice fellow you are today." First, before they go to the committee meeting, they have to go and kiss the Premier's picture.

MR. TOBIN: Twice.

MR. HODDER: Worse than twice, ten times.

MR. NEARY: And then, go into a committee meeting and say, " Mr. Minister, tell me what a nice fellow you are."

MR. TOBIN: That is what you had to do when you were a backbencher.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, let nobody be under any illusions of who asks the embarrassing questions of government. And it is not by privilege, by the way, and the hon. gentleman from St. Mary's- The Capes ( Mr. Hearn) should bear this in mind, that the majority of time is the Opposition's time. It is the Opposition who carries the ball, not the government, not the members who are trying to prop up the administration and try to make the administration look good. It is not a privilege- you do not give the Opposition a privilege- that is a tradition. The hon. gentleman may learn that as time goes on. I am not going to give the hon. gentleman a lecture on the tradition of Parliament, but I just want to say this, that no member on this side of the House asks a question as a matter of privilege because somebody on the government's side was trying to

MR. NEARY: That is our right and our privilege. It is the Opposition which is responsible for scrutinizing the estimates. So, Mr. Chairman, I thought I would have to put these few remarks in response to the heavy attack that I have been under, the stinging, stinging attack, the vicious attack I have been under from these bright-eyed, bushy-tailed members, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN( Dr. McNicholas): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I just want to draw to their attention, because I know the hon. gentlemen there opposite do not know the rules, they have not read the rules, and every time they get up on a point of order they do not quote any authorities either the Standing Orders of the House, which govern the conduct of the House, or Beauchesne or Erskine May or whatever it may be. Now I have heard a lot made by the Opposition about the fact that there were not questions asked by the members on the government side. The government side, you know, has asked questions, and I will not go into that again, but as far as the Opposition is concerned, and they do not know the rules of the House, poor fellows, Mr. Chairman - but I quote to you standing order 86(b) which says as follows:



MR. MARSHALL: "Any member of the House who is not a member of a Standing Committee" - now, 'not a member of a Standing Committee', the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) understands what 'not' means - "Not a member of a Standing Committee, may, unless the House or the committee concerned otherwise orders" - the House has not ordered, and the committee will not order - "may take part in the public proceedings of the committee, but he may not vote or move any motion nor shall he be part of any quorum."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to, they could, all eight of them could, attend the committee, they could outnumber the government members eight to five if they wish to. Now, they cannot vote because that is the way.

MR. NEARY: That is the catch.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, well that is fine. Now the complaint was not that they could not vote, the complaint was that there were not enough questions being asked. If two of them, if the two standard members can not ask enough questions, Mr. Speaker, they can add one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, or eight - but they can not add anymore than eight, of course. But they can add eight. It is regrettable, Mr. Chairman, that such a fine system, a democratic system that has been set up, has not been utilized by the Opposition. And it is even more regrettable, Mr. Chairman, that the Opposition - I do not believe that the Opposition is completely stunned; I believe the Opposition is stunned but I do not believe it is completely stunned - but what is regrettable is the Standing Orders of this House precisely give the hon. members the opportunity to do. And I will make an undertaking on behalf of the government

MR. MARSHALL: too, Mr. Chairman, that five members of the government always turn up; if all eight members turn up, only two may vote, but we will not send another three or another sixteen or anything like that, so they can ask all the questions they want to if they have the interest. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Chairman knows, they have not got the interest.

MR. TOBIN: That is right.

MR. MARSHALL: All they want to do is try to paint this government as being all-powerful, as being arrogant because it has all these numbers, is running over the poor, defenseless opposition. Now here is something, Mr. Chairman, that we are assisting the Opposition in; we are telling them the rules, the rules had of been there for two, three or four years that they had not read, and if they wish they can avail of it which would cancel out any complaints, spurious as they are, that they make. As it presently stands, the government members allow the Opposition to ask as many questions that they want too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried, carried!

On motion 201-01 through 201-07  
carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNICHOLAS): Shall 202-01 carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman,

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

MR. NEARY: 202-01, we are doing the Auditor's General report. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is the first opportunity that I have had to express publicly my appreciation to the Auditor General for the co-operation that he gave the Public Accounts Committee, while I was Chairman of that Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

As hon. members know the committee could not function effectively without the co-operation the Auditor General. And, as a matter of fact, the research assistant to the Public Accounts Committee is a member of the Auditor General's staff. A gentleman, an auditor who is familiar with the government accounts, is seconded from the Auditor General's department, to do the research for the Public Accounts Committee. And this is a very valuable assistance to the committee.

And so, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I want to extend a word of appreciation to the Auditor General for all the help that he gave the committee during the short time that I was chairman of that committee. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that there are a number of my colleagues that would like to raise some items in the Auditor General's report.

One thing I would like to raise, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the government now has - again this is something new - they have developed a new technique of trying to neutralize the Auditor General's report before it is tabled in the House of Assembly. The departments make their comments and so the government tables the Auditor General's report and tables along with it the comments of the ministers.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is tradition.

MR. NEARY:

That is not a tradition, that is something new.

MR. MARSHALL:

Your buddy, Mr. Jones, did that many years ago.

MR. NEARY:

No, he did not do it, Mr.

MR. NEARY: Chairman. No, Mr. Jones did not do it. They sort of try to take the harm out of the Auditor General's report.

DR. COLLINS: That is because we are efficient, that is all.

MR. NEARY: Oh, efficient! No, Mr. Chairman. The whole purpose of that exercise is to try to neutralize the report and take the harm out of it so it will not look as bad in the public eye. I do not think that is fair to the Auditor General, unless all the information is tabled. The letters between the Auditor General and the ministers should be tabled. What is it they call these letters?

DR. COLLINS: They have changed that rule.

MR. NEARY: The what? No, there is a name on them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Interdepartmental memos.

MR. NEARY: No, no. Not interdepartmental. I forget what they call it. But anyway, letters, all the back-up information, Mr. Chairman. The only fair way to do it, if you are going to table all these documents, is to put all the documentation on the table. The correspondence between the Auditor General and the ministers, the letters that go back and forth when the Auditor General is trying to get explanations from the various ministers and trying to resolve matters that concern the Auditor General very much, all the back-up information should be tabled in

MR. S. NEARY: this hon. House. Now, I do not think there is anything else that I want to say about this, Mr. Chairman, except that most of us are very concerned over that fact that sometimes the Auditor General's remarks are treated rather lightly by this administration. The Auditor General on occasions has had to raise matters two or three different occasions before the message got through to the ministers and to the administration. And let me give you an example, Mr. Chairman, of that, in case hon. gentlemen think that I am exaggerating. There were a couple of occasions in the last few years when it appeared as if money was spent illegally, money was spent from the public treasury on political polls and on political films, the Tory convention in Gander. And these items were followed up by the Public Accounts Committee. Witnesses were called before the Public Accounts Committee and hard testimony was taken from witnesses and an awful lot of effort and research went into these two particular items. And I am not referring here to the Public Works Department scandal, Mr. Chairman, I am talking about the Devine political poll and the films that were done on the Tory convention in Gander that were used on Provincial Affairs on CBC, a free political telecast. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Public Accounts Committee made unanimous recommendations to this House as a result of these matters being raised by the Auditor General. And the unanimous recommendation of the Committee was that the government take steps to recover the funds that were spent illegally and also look at the possibility of laying criminal charges against those who authorized the spending of these funds. And then there was the matter of the Public Works scandal, when the Public Accounts Committee recommended that the possibility be looked into of recovering funds resulting from the loss of money from the consolidated revenue as a result of things that were done illegally in the Public Works Department. To my knowledge,

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 1021

RA - 2

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, no action has been taken on these recommendations. I understand that one of the matters is before Cabinet and has been before Cabinet for some time, the matter of the Devine poll and the film that was done in the Tory convention in Gander.

AN HON. MEMBER: The previous administration.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? Previous administration. The hon. gentleman says it is the previous administration.

MR. WARREN: Yes. That is all he is talking about.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is irresponsible, in my opinion. There is a recommendation that these funds be recovered, that civil action be taken

MR. NEARY: to recover the money that was spent on these political polls and the money that was spent on the film, and the money that was lost in the breaking of the law with regard to the Public Works spending. In all three cases, Mr. Chairman, no apparent action has been taken, and as a result the Auditor General has had to raise two of these matters again, in his latest report, for the third time. How many more times, Mr. Chairman, will the Auditor General have to bring these matters to the attention of this Honourable House? How many different ways will he have to bring it to the attention of the House? It has been proven beyond any doubt that the political poll was paid for out of taxpayers' money and that money should be recovered. The shoot, the Gander shoot, the five minute film clips that were done at the Tory convention in Gander, that money should be recovered. I do not know what recommendations the Justice Department made to the Cabinet, but the Cabinet has been sitting on it now long enough. It is just about time, Mr. Chairman, we should not have to wait for the Auditor General to raise these matters again this time next year, the Auditor General has already raised the matters three times. I mean, the next thing, Mr. Chairman, the Auditor General is going to get so discouraged and so disillusioned over the lack of action on the very serious matters that are raised in his report that he is going to think that his report is just being treated as a joke in this hon. House. That would be a shame. As hon. members know the Auditor General is the watchdog of the public treasury, a servant of this House,

MR. NEARY: and anything he says should be taken very seriously, Mr. Chairman. Your Honour was on that committee and Your Honour was one who endorsed the recommendation of the committee that the funds be recovered, that civil action be taken to recover the funds, and the possibility of criminal action be looked into by the Justice Department. So far, Mr. Chairman, there is no apparent action on the part of the Justice Department or on the part of the Cabinet. I think before we pass the estimates of the department of the Auditor General that we should have an explanation from some spokesman in the Administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Alyward): Shall 202-01 carry?

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Just a brief word on that last point. There has been ongoing communications discussions by officials in the various



DR. COLLINS:

affected departments of government over this matter that the hon. member just brought out. It is far from the truth to say that no action has been taken. There have been many, many requests and receipt of information in regard to certain aspects of the expenses that were billed for those activities, and there has been clarification of many of the accounts. The Department of Justice was consulted as to whether actionable cause was present and we have not received from Justice any indication that there was. There have not been monies paid out that were not properly due. We are holding back on paying certain invoices that we received for that very reason. And the whole matter will presumably be cleared up in the very near future so that the whole account will be wiped clean. But there will not be any expenditures by this government for activities that were not incurred for strictly government purposes. I can assure the House of that.

MR. NEARY: So you are going to let bygones be bygones.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, I want to, under this Head, refer to the Auditor General's report and connect that up with some of the statements made by the Minister of Forests, Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) in this House this afternoon, and perhaps show the attitude of this government as well in trying to gain revenue for this Province. Mr. Chairman, in the Auditor General's report just tabled in the House, we saw under Section 39 that there was a serious mismanagement of the Forest Land (Management and Taxation) Act. That Act, Mr. Chairman, as we know was enacted, brought into being, to bring certain forest lands in this Province under proper management and to impose varying degrees of taxation in respect thereof. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if you manage the forest lands of this Province, if you own a section of forest lands in this Province and you manage it well, then you get a decrease in

MR. TURK:                    your taxes. If you do not manage it well, then you obviously get an increase in the land tax that you own.

Mr. Chairman, this is not something that the government picks up after the fact either. The landholders in the Province, regardless of whether they are big paper companies or not, are required under the legislation to submit long term management plans to the government and the annual operating plans using certain forest management criteria set out in the act.

MR. TULK: Rubbish! Mr. Chairman, the Auditor General in the latest report pointed out that the Province has not collected any significant amount of unmanaged land tax since the act came into force in 1975. In other words, there is a piece of legislation sitting on the Province's books, on the books of this Province, that has not brought in any significant funds to the Province and has not been used in the way that it should be. He goes on to point out that this is so even though there is significant evidence in the department's files that proper forest management procedures are not being practiced by certain landlords. In committee the other day I asked the minister some questions on this. We got some vague answers about, well, it was the minister's discretion whether he implemented the Forest Land (Management Taxation) Act or not, but that it would be in the future.

Mr. Chairman, now we have had eight years in this Province since 1974 to implement this Land Tax Act and yet there has been nothing done. This was in spite of the fact that one of the large paper companies, I believe it is Abitibi-Price - I think the minister told us that it was Abitibi-Price - that under that Land Management Certificate Act twenty - eight areas were approved for cutting in 1979. Cutting occurred in only thirteen of those and the company was allowed to go outside and cut in fifteen others. And they also cut, Mr. Speaker, in those fifteen other areas significant volumes of undamaged balsam fir when we got perhaps the worst forest, in Canada in Newfoundland with spruce budworm infested timber.

The Auditor General goes on to point out that the cutting of such areas is unacceptable and that the minister should have either done one thing or the

MR. TULK: other, or both, that is, to revoke the certificate of managed land and assess the tax for unmanaged land.

And we get the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) this afternoon in Question Period standing up and, in spite of the fact that he did not enforce an act to get revenue for this Province, saying well we have to raise our stumpage fee and our royalty fee we have to raise a tax because that is what stumpage and royalty fees are, we have to raise a tax 400 per cent. Now he says it is not 400 per cent. If you divide two into eight - mathematics has to be - familiar to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and if you take two - and divide it into eight and say that is not 400 per cent increase, then, Mr. Chairman, we should take the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Forestry, both of them, and send them back to I would say elementary school, about Grade VI or VII. Because, Mr. Chairman, it is a 400 per cent increase; from \$2 to \$8 or \$9.18 is a 400 per cent increase. And he has to do that, he says,

MR. TULK: the minister says, he has got to do that, he has got to raise royalty rates. He has got to raise the tax on wood so that there are some revenues accruing to this Province. And then he stands up in Question Period and says, 'Oh, the Opposition is on the side of big business, the big companies'. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me ask him a question, let me point out something to him, that he allowed, according to the Auditor General, he allowed one of the largest companies in this Province, Abitibi-Price, to do what they wanted to do with the woods, with the forests of this Province, and yet he is going out to a small, local contractor on the Northeast Coast of this Province and saying, 'Now, boy, how about six dollars more for every cord of wood that you cut?' Now, Mr. Chairman, if that is not picking on the little guy, then I would like to know what is. It is a prime example, Mr. Chairman, of the mismanagement of this government and it is a prime example of socking it to those people who are least able to pay. And you ask him where is he trying to get the revenue from and for what. The federal government in this Province, Mr. Chairman, built the very access roads that this wood is being cut on, as the member for Belleuve (Mr. Callan) pointed out, ninety-ten. Ninety per cent of the funds expended by the minister last year in capital works came from the coffers of the federal government. He has been the happiest minister over there because - I will grant him this - he had the good sense, unlike many of his colleagues on that side, to sit down and negotiate an agreement. But that is about the only thing that he has done.

Seventy-five per cent of his capital budget this year, Mr. Chairman, is funded by the federal government. So what do we have? We let Abitibi-Price off scot-free, we get the federal government to put in

MR. TULK: some access roads in this Province and then go out and sock it to the little guy who is trying to pick up some of the decayed wood in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, I really do not believe that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) even knew this was happening. I really do not believe he did. I think perhaps the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this Province said, 'We have got to have more money'. So he says, 'All right, let us up the stumpage fees, let us up them'. Just takes his pen and very easily drives it from two dollars to eight dollars and fifteen cents, or nine dollars and eighteen cents, depending on where you are cutting. And then sends down to the minister and says, 'Charlie, boy, that is it. That is what you have got, nothing else'. That is it, Mr. Chairman, And I think the minister, when I approached him on Friday afternoon, I think it was the first time that he was aware that he was really creating a problem in this Province. Yet every official in his department from the Deputy Minister down knew that to put in that royalty on pulpwood, on export pulpwood in particular, to put in that royalty on pulpwood was in effect saying to the small sawmill pulpwood, local contractor in this Province, 'You are out of business'. That was the result of that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the one hand we have got the Auditor General saying, 'Go collect taxes that you should collect. Enforce the Land Management Act in this Province

MR. B. TULK: and collect your revenues, Go do that and collect some revenues.'And on the other hand we have the minister saying, 'No, I will not go to the big Abitibi-Price, I will go to the little guy and get my revenues.' Now, Mr. Chairman, that is mismanagement. And I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is the total attitude that is prevalent with this government.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Shall 202-01 carry.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I noticed that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has left the chamber, but when he replied to the questions on the political poll, the political convention expenses charged against public funds, I did not really get any sense of satisfaction. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Auditor General's report, Section 41, said that the political ads had been referred to Cabinet. Now, Mr. Chairman, these ads go back to 1978 or '79. Perhaps I could get the Premier to answer for me in the absence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). Speaking about the Auditor General's report, considering the charge for political ads which had been referred to Cabinet, the Auditor General had asked the Minister of Justice about trying to get back the expenses on those ads. The Auditor General's report on page 32, says that " On 31 December 1981, I wrote the Deputy Minister of Justice and requested that he inform me of any action taken or to be taken by his Department to implement the aforementioned recommendations. In his reply, the Deputy Minister informed me that, following a detailed analysis, officials of his Department concluded there was not sufficient evidence to succeed in an action to recover funds paid out under the Devine Contract. Therefore,

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 1026

RA - 2

MR. HODDER: no such action had been commenced.  
With respect to recommendation No. 6 "and these are the political ads, Mr. Chairman-"I am informed by the Deputy Minister that officials of his Department have reviewed the matter and have advised the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), and that the matter will be referred to Cabinet for its decision as to the appropriate course of action." Mr. Chairman, this goes back to the 1978-79



MR. HODDER: Auditor General's report. The question I have for the Premier is how long has the Cabinet had those recommendations and what were the recommendations of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer)? I would have asked the Minister of Justice had he been here, but what recommendations did the Minister of Justice make to Cabinet? A third question I would have for the Premier, is why is it taking so long, since this has been going on since 1978-79? It has been a misuse of public funds. These were ads which were used by the P.C. Party, not under the hon. gentleman's administration, but certainly, it seems to me, that certainly the administration was part of it and the Premier was part of that administration. Mr. Chairman, since the Premier has been the Premier, this has been referred to Cabinet, but we have not heard what Cabinet has done about it or what the decision is. So the question is simple, what were the recommendations made to Cabinet by the Minister of Justice. Why is it taking so long, and what does the Premier intend to do about this particular item?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: As the hon. member knows, it has been ongoing, Mr. Chairman, for some time. As the correspondance with the Auditor General indicates on the Devine advertising one, there were insufficient grounds to take legal action. We have been trying to move through the system, Mr. Chairman. On the other one, we have been, I think the Department of Finance with Justice have been negotiating and trying to recover the funds and the matter is in the hands of Cabinet. On the hon member's question, let me just say that the recommendations of the Minister of

PREMIER PECKFORD: Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) are recommendations that have been made to Cabinet, I do not intend to release those recommendations here at the present moment, but within the next couple of weeks we will be in a position to indicate to the hon. member just exactly where the government stands on it in relation to the recommendation that came forward from the Justice Department and what actions we are going to be taking. We have been pursuing the matter with a lot of diligence, but it is complex, and we had to isolate, first of all, all those legitimate expenses that were charged by the company and then those that we considered not to be legitimate. Then move it through - some negotiations went on in the early part of it, and then through the Justice Department to try and get some reading upon our legal position as a government in relation to those that were still outstanding. So, all I can say to the hon. member right now is that we will be informing him or anybody else of our action very shortly. It should be another week or two, that is all, at the most.

On motion 202-01 through  
202-04 carried.

On motion Head II. Legislative,  
carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Head 111 - Executive Council.

On motion 301-01 through 301-02-04 carried.

"Shall 302-01 carry?"

MR. NEARY: What head are we on now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 302-01. Office of the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the hon. gentleman would make some introductory remarks in the connection with the office of the Executive Council. The Premier's Office. So in light of his vicious attacks on the media for accusing him of being the most expensive premier in the whole of Canada -

AN HON. MEMBER: In your opinion.

MR. NEARY: - I thought he would rise and make some introductory remarks in connection with the Premier's Office.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this at the outset. The Premier can squirm all he wants, and he can do all the fancy footwork and all the fancy dancing that he wants, the hon. gentleman is still the most expensive premier in the whole of Canada.

MR. BAIRD: And the best!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And whether or not, Mr. Chairman, the CBC spliced in something that was done for the Journal, whether they spliced that in with another story or not, does not excuse the fact that we have here, in this Province the most expensive Premier in the whole of Canada. There is no doubt about that. And, Mr. Chairman, I might say, I saw the CBC Here and Now story, and I thought they left an awful lot out, because if you look at the estimates, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MORGAN: Yes, you are both being paid well.

MR. NEARY: - and I am not talking about the hon. gentleman's salary, I am talking about the perks, - if you look at the estimates you will see the Cabinet Secretariat,

MR. NEARY: that was not mentioned in the Here and  
Now report, the Treasury Board Secretariat, which seems to be  
growing in leaps and bounds. Then you have Intergovernmental  
Affairs, which really should be wiped out, it does not mean anything  
does not serve any useful purpose. And then you have the Advisory  
Councils, and then you have consulting firms, and then  
you have a raft of support staff.

MR. NEARY: You have executive assistants, parliamentary assistants, press people working in that office, Mr. Chairman. And then we are the only Province in Canada who gives a Premier a rent-free house. And I know the hon. gentleman will get up now, vicious again. He will get up vicious, and he will accuse the Opposition of attacking him personally. Mr. Chairman, anybody who accepts a rent-free house from the people of this Province has every right to be criticized, and it is not a personal attack.

MR. CARTER: Do not be so low.

MR. NEARY: The only Premier in Canada who gets it, Well, maybe we are unique here in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TOBIN: Sure we are.

MR. NEARY: Maybe we should give our Premier a rent-free house.

MR. TOBIN: Sure we should.

MR. NEARY: Now the hon. member says 'sure we should.' Well, Mr. Chairman, we are the only Province in Canada, or maybe we may be one of two Provinces in Canada, who charges -

MR. CALLAN: That is the same crowd who criticized Joey.

MR. STEWART: Do not forget the one on Roaches Line, now.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. CHairman, if I may, I believe we are the only Province in Canada who charges for a hospital bed on a ward. I believe we are, Mr. Chairman. We are unique in that again. Maybe we should be first in everything, Maybe we should sock it to the sick, give the Premier everything he wants, a rent-free house.

MR. TOBIN: Now that we have two Liberal leaders -

MR. CALLAN: Alberta is the other one. You know how Tory he is.

MR. NEARY: I am not going to be intimidated by the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman. You yourself, Your Honour, you stooped pretty rather low in the debate earlier -

AN HON. MEMBER: What? What?

MR. NEARY: - when you condemned the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - for talking about the most expensive Premier in Canada. You said people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Well let me point out to Your Honour that I am not referring to the hon. gentleman's salary, I am not referring to his salary.

MR. HEARN: Of course not. Because you are getting \$65,000 a year.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman does not like that, I would be very glad, if he would do likewise, I would be very glad to turn it in and I would wear coveralls -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Turn it back, but not because I take it, I believe that I am earning mine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is earning his? I would be very glad to put on

MR. NEARY: coveralls and come in the House  
If the hon. gentleman wanted me to. So, Mr. Chairman,  
let us set that aside, let us set the sessional -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Do not ask for a trade off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, if the hon. gentleman wants  
me to talk about it, it is still the highest in Canada.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Sixty-five thousand dollars a  
year, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: So! Well, I would say the Leader  
of the Opposition -

PREMIER PECKFORD: A fantastic salary.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see, fantastic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Sixty-five thousand dollars a year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, okay, Mr. Chairman, in that  
case if we take everything in proportion, then the Leader  
of the Opposition would be entitled to a rent-free house,  
free telephones, free lights, a private dining room,  
chauffeur driven cars, chain link fences, bodyguards,  
chambermaids. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how much  
we are paying for this Premier, How much are we paying?  
Do we provide toilet paper too, Mr. Chairman?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I realize that  
the Premier is very sensitive about this matter, very  
sensitive about it. And somehow or other he thinks that  
he is such a great Premier and he works so hard that  
the people of Newfoundland should give him all these perks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: No other Premier in Canada. I  
would think, Mr. Chairman, somehow or other I have a feeling

MR. NEARY: that Premier Davis in Ontario works just as hard. I have that feeling. I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that Premier Bennett out in British Columbia works just as hard. And I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that Premier Devine in Manitoba works just as hard. I have a feeling they do. And I have a feeling that all the other Premiers of Canada work just as hard for their Province and, Mr. Chairman, they do not get these perks, they do not get a rent-free house. Only poor old Newfoundland! And this hon. gentleman tells us so often in this Province how poor we are -

MR. TULK: Have not shall be no more.

MR. NEARY: Have not shall-what?

MR. TULK: Shall be no more.

MR. NEARY: Have not shall be no more, that we want the same standard of living as other Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Have not shall be no more. Well have not shall be no more all right, for the hon. gentleman.

MR. MORGAN: He is the man who is drawing \$65,000.

MR. NEARY: I think that is wonderful, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the hon. gentlemen recognizes my value in this House.

MR. HODDER: You are getting the same as Cabinet, you know.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, do you mean to tell me, is the hon. gentleman telling me



June 7, 1982

Tape No. 1031

MleP - 1

MR. S. NEARY: that all I get is the equivalent of what the Minister of Fisheries ( Mr. Morgan), gets?

PREMIER PECKFORD: You get more in total than he gets.

MR. NEARY: Is that what the hon. gentleman is telling me?

MR. MORGAN: More than I get.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not true, I get the equivalent - can you imagine? I get the equivalent of what the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) gets -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, he should be getting as much as you are getting.

MR. NEARY: - and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), gets.

MR. TULK: He is getting to you, boy! He is getting to you.

MR. NEARY: Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, here I am with the responsibilities I have on my shoulder, and all - and Mr. Chairman, what about the Minister of Environment ( Mr . Andrews )? Do I only get what the Minister of the Environment gets - you get more and you are only half a Leader.

MR. NEARY: - who is on his last chance in the Cabinet?

MR. TULK: You got the same thing.

MR. NEARY: Is that all I get? And what about the Minister of Health ( Mr. House )? Do I only get what the Minister of Health gets?

MR. CHAIRMAN ( Dr. McNicholas ): Order, please! The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I will have another go , Mr. Chairman,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD : Mr. Chairman,well I am glad the Leader of the Opposition gave me an opportunity to stand in my place concerning my estimates. I think perhaps the first thing we should propose is that the \$65,000 that the Leader of the Opposition gets should be split,\$32,500 to the in-House Leader Liberal Party and \$32,500 to the out-House Leader of the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON MEMBER: And then they both would be over paid.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is the first thing we should do, I mean, it grossly unfair, Mr. Chairman, grossly unfair. I mean, you know, I have great deal of respect for the member of Bonavista North( Mr. Cross ), I really do. I have a great deal of respect, but I mean he really did the job on the Leader of the Liberal Party. I mean, I feel a little bit ashamed by it all. I mean, he could run faster than the outside Leader of the Liberal Party, he could relate more to the common man of Bonavista North, and by the same token I guess all the members who were in the House the last session, you know, still have a little bit of sympathy for the Leader of the Liberal Party outside the House. So I propose,Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Leader in the House of Assembly, that he give half his salary to the other half Leader of the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now is he going to accept that? Can we get him to agree? Can the Leader of the Opposition in the House agree to give half his salary to the Leader of the Opposition outside the House?Can we get that kind of proposition passed through here quickly this afternoon? I do not hear a sound, Mr. Chairman, I do not hear a sound from this hon. gentleman.

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 1031

MLeP - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: \$65,000 a year the  
Leader of the Opposition in Newfoundland gets. This Leader  
of the Opposition here, this is the gentleman who can stand  
in his place and criticize the Premier of the Province for  
getting \$75,000 a year in total, the Premier makes \$10,000  
or more a year than the Leader of the Opposition,

PREMIER PECKFORD: and then he is only half a leader, Mr. Chairman, half a leader.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not that really.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Half a leader. Half a leader or half a litre, which is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Half a litre.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now we are gone metric.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is down a quart.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Chairman, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland during the recent election tried a little trick, Mr. Chairman. They tried a little trick. The trick was that they would do this ad on television, they would do this expert ad from the crowd from Toronto and Montreal, to do this expert ad they were going to try to show the Leader of the P.C. Party and the Premier of the day, show him up for what he was, try to be a little tricky, try to be a little tricky and they put this ad on television during the election campaign to try to show up the Premier of Newfoundland and the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party. And, Mr. Chairman, did they get a surprise? Did they get a surprise! Twenty-four hours later, or thirty hours, later they were deluged with calls from people saying, "Take that off the air! Take that off the air! That is discourteous -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that is disrespectful. I submit to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) if he wants to, or the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) or the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), if they want to make a political issue out of me and the amount that I receive as Premier of this Province, go right ahead, Mr. Chairman, because I am ready to take on the Leader of the Opposition or any member of the Liberal Party -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - if they are going to suddenly get down in the ditches of trying to accuse me of being anything

PREMIER PECKFORD: but proper and decent about how I operate as Premier of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will take the Leader of the Opposition on. Yes, he will put on more than his coveralls when this one is over, Mr. Chairman. He will put on more than his coveralls. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition,

Please, I submit to him in all humility, please keep it up. Please keep attacking me on this whole business of how much the Premier gets in Newfoundland. Keep attacking me because I am prepared to respond to the Leader of the Opposition on that issue any day of the week, any hour of the day.

AN HON. MEMBER: In-House, out-House

PREMIER PECKFORD: And if the Leader of the Opposition wants to try to defend his \$65,000 a year, and at the same time attack the Premier for his \$75,000 a year, then we will see who the people of Newfoundland will go along with, Mr. Chairman, fast and furious.

MR. DINN: He will not even get 4 voted let alone win by that much.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We will see. We will see how much he will win LaPoile by the next time, whether he will win by forty-one votes again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Leader of the Opposition should take a little lesson from the last election if he wants to stay in power in LaPoile district. Or does he want to move to some other district?

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the Office of Executive Council. We are dealing with my office, on the Eighth Floor. We are dealing with the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Cabinet Secretariat, we are dealing with Treasury Board. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) says, Treasury Board is getting larger, or the staff down there are getting larger, and all the rest of it. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition know what Treasury Board does-besides managing the budget for the whole year, managing the account, the money, the subheads? Every collective bargaining unit in the Province, every single one that does business with the government- I do not know how many collective agreements are outstanding, Twenty-five, thirty, thirty-five or more?

MR. DINN: There are about eighty.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There are about eighty all told, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) tells me, negotiated by the Treasury Board group, all told, large and small.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There are twenty or thirty fairly large ones. And the Treasury Board secretariat is not, in my view, given what they have to do at all too large for this Province and the budget that it has to manage during the year. The Cabinet secretariat is the Cabinet committee system. We have in this Province - one man does not rule this Province, two people do not rule this Province, Mr. Chairman, it is done collectively - we have a Cabinet committee system, made up not only of the Treasury Board, which is ministers who sit down and try to manage each week the amount of money that is being spent by all of the departments. We have a Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet, we have a Social Policy Committee of Cabinet, which meets at least once a week and they have secretaries and individuals who do research for them as part of the ongoing business of trying to run a government and introduce new policies and programmes. Mr. Chairman, I am not defensive at all as it relates to the estimates both for my office, where we are into hundreds and hundreds of letters each week and into hundreds and hundreds of phone calls trying to respond to the people of Newfoundland. So I am proud of the job that the Cabinet secretariat is doing. I am proud of the job that the Treasury Board secretariat is doing, and I am proud of what my own staff is doing in the Premier's office to respond to things that come to it, and we do not back down on that at all. Intergovernmental Affairs, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) says, does nothing. They only negotiate every single agreement between ourselves and any other province or government, only negotiate all the agreements.

MR. NEARY: These are very few.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is not our fault, Mr. Chairman, the people of Newfoundland know that too. We are in the process now of negotiations with the federal authorities through

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 1033

RA - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Gray's department on the list of DREE proposals that have been put forward. So, Mr. Chairman, I am proud of what these estimates here mean and the delivery system that we have in this Province at the executive level, through Executive Council, our Cabinet secretariat, our Treasury Board and our Intergovernmental Affairs. And I think we do a good job when we keep things fairly well in line and try to ensure that the people that we have in place are the people who can do the jobs without allowing it to balloon and get too large. So the Cabinet secretariat deals with the Cabinet and the Cabinet Committees. Treasury Board secretariat manages each week



PREMIER PECKFORD: the material that comes from all the departments of government in the carrying out of the budget that year for all of those subheads in every one of those departments, and personnel and hiring new people. And the Treasury Board Secretariat bargains with all the units in the public service, and, as the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) said, they total over eighty, all told. The Intergovernmental Affairs group are only small but they are the ones who negotiate all the agreements on behalf of all the departments and in line with all the departments.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of work goes ahead in those three areas - in those four areas, all told, including the Premier's office itself. So we are trying to do a job and I think in large measure we are succeeding in doing that job. I would also agree with anybody on either side of the House that in all the departments - this is extremely important too, it is true for the Opposition or anybody else - that one of the great weakness or one of the great problems you have in government, as you do in all large corporations, you always have the tendency to say, 'If you had more people you can solve more of the problems'. So it balloons and you get this great bureaucracy coming up all the time and everybody has fallen into it, a lot of governments. I think we have tried, in the last three years, to really hold the line on new positions and so on and to try to do with what we have. But that is a tough row to hoe. And in some cases if you are introducing new programmes then you are going to need new people to deliver those programmes. But you have got to be real careful. One of the great dangers everybody in government everywhere faces is this business of just allowing the public service to get completely out of control and you are not getting the productivity and the

PREMIER PECKFORD: efficiency that you would otherwise get. But that is a difficult thing to put into practice.

Number one, on me, personally, Mr. Chairman, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wants to continue to attack how I operate he is free to do it. That is fine and dandy. On the Cabinet Secretariat, I would defend it to the death as doing a good job for the amount of money we are spending there in developing new programmes and servicing the Cabinet Committees. Treasury Board Secretariat needs very little comment. It works yoeman's service in putting together the budget, in operating the budget during the whole year through the Department of Finance.

Intergovernmental Affairs are

PREMIER PECKFORD: involved with all departments in the Federal Government and the other governments of Canada on a regular basis, and I think it is quite easy to defend the amount of money they spend in going about their business. So, as far as that goes, part of my office that comes under this heading as well are the advisory councils, the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women and their allotment of money this year is \$150,000; and the Offshore Petroleum Impact committees, which are committees from all over the Province who get together to feed into government and give us recommendations on impact for offshore oil and gas, if and when it comes about in the Province. So, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to answer any questions that the Opposition will have. I believe that these agencies that come under my control here are agencies which are kept in control as it relates to ballooning bureaucracies and that they are delivering a very valuable service on behalf of all the people of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman can try all he likes, Mr. Chairman, to turn around the argument, by trying to focus attention on the salary of the Leader of the Opposition. And the hon. gentleman apparently does not understand the make-up of that salary. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman says that the Leader of the Opposition earns \$65,000 a year. I am not trying to defend that, I am not the one that decided that that was the salary for the Leader of the Opposition that is not the salary for the Leader of the Opposition by the way.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is \$29,000.

MR. NEARY: \$29,000. Now the hon. gentleman is getting somewhere. The salary for the Leader of the Opposition is \$29,000.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And the Premier's is \$40,000.

MR. NEARY: Right, right on, okay. And if you put the two together, the sessional indemnity and the salary together, the total then -

PREMIER PECKFORD: The total then is \$65,000.

MR. NEARY: That is right. So, that is a big difference, Mr. Chairman. As an elected representative of this House I am entitled the same as every other member, to my sessional indemnity.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Squirm, my son!

MR. NEARY: I am not squirming, Mr. Chairman. I am not the one who decided how much the Premier would be paid, or how much the Leader of the Opposition would be paid. I just happened to fall into that, Mr. Chairman. I am not the one who determined what the amount is.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You are waltzing through those particular figures.

MR. NEARY: Let us dispose of that rather quickly, Mr. Chairman. Let us dispose of it rather quickly, and let us talk about the perks.

MR. YOUNG: You are going to give half to Len Stirling, are you?

MR. NEARY: The perks. Well, Mr. Chairman, can you imagine, I can hardly imagine, that the Leader of the Opposition, would only receive the same pay as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young).

MR. CALLAN: Boy, they do not listen to you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, can you imagine, or the same salary as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. TOBIN: You are only half a leader, do not forget.

MR. BAIRD: You only have half an Opposition.

MR. YOUNG: You only got eight people, and four of them are against you.

MR. NEARY: But anyways, Mr. Chairman, I am not the one who made the arrangements.

MR. TOBIN: Ask him how he got the job as Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: It is all in the public records, it is in the public accounts. But the things we are talking about, Mr. CHairman, are the perks, the free house. And how much else goes with that free house.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we hear days in and days out about being poor, the poorest Province in Canada.

MR. S. NEARY: How must Ontario feel, and how must British Columbia feel, and how must Manitoba or Alberta feel? They cannot afford, they do not give their Premier a house, a residence, and they are sending their money down here in equalization payments, in equalization grants to this Province because we are a have-not Province. And when they send it down to us, what do we do with it? we give the Premier a free house, free lights, free telephone, a private dining room that they cannot afford to give their Premier.

MR. TULK: Scandalous.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, there is the shame of it all. And we do not know how much else we are paying for. We do not know if we are paying for the groceries or for the toilet paper. What else are we paying for? And when this bodyguard thing developed, it was only supposed to be for a short time.

MR. TULK: Witch hunt.

MR. NEARY: Now, they have twenty-four hour bodyguard service who checks the breakfast table in the morning and turns down the sheets at night, Mr. Chairman, is all that necessary? Is it?

MR. TULK: The Prime Minister was sitting with a friend at a hockey game and the Premier was sitting with his bodyguard.

MR. MORGAN: The Opposition Leader gets \$65,000 a year. That we know.

MR. NEARY: Is all that necessary, Mr. Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not getting \$65,000, is he?

MR. NEARY: No, and I have my eye on the \$75,000 by the way. I had my eye on the \$75,000. That is all you will ever have on it will be your eye. Mr. Chairman, I will make a statement in the hon. House right now, that when I occupy that chair, that there will be no Mount Scio House-

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: -I can guarantee that there will be no Mount Scio House, I can guarantee you that,

PREMIER PECKFORD: You better be careful now. You are not going to get my job.

MR. NEARY: There will be no King Air for the hon. gentleman to fly around in. There will be an auction down at Torbay Airport, and the King Air -

PREMIER PECKFORD: You will not have anything to take the hospital patients around in.

MR. NEARY: - the King Air will be auctioned off. Mount Scio House will be turned into a home for disabled children. Mount Scio House will be a home for handicapped children. The private dining room downstairs, Mr. Chairman, will be put to a useful purpose,

PREMIER PECKFORD: There will be a lot of entertainment expenses then for all the restaurants.

MR. NEARY: The bodyguard's will be sent back to try to solve the

MR. NEARY: crime rate in this Province, to try to reduce the crime rate. The security, Mr. Chairman, the security will all be sent back to do more useful jobs. The gardner will be the Premier, will be me; my hands will go down in the soil, in the dirt. I do not need anybody to do my gardening for me. The chain link fence will be hauled down. The electronic gates, Mr. Chairman, will be sold off. What else do we have? In the process the taxpayers of this Province will save enough money, they will save enough, that they will be able to eliminate the cost of hospital beds on a ward to sick people in this Province.

MR. YOUNG: You did not ask what kind of toilet paper we will use.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who has turn the Premier's picture around to kiss it every day should know that.

Mount Scio house, the total,  
the total last year for Mount Scio house -

MR. TULK: Capital expenditure, Capital expenditure.

MR. NEARY: - capital expenditure in the Auditor General's Report, \$96,000-in the Public Accounts \$96,000. Mr. Chairman, rather than get up and try to intimidate the Opposition, and try to protect himself by trying to focus attention on something that I had no control over, the hon. gentleman would be better off if he stood in his place and told us what that \$96,000 was spent on.

MR. TOBIN: What do you mean, you had no control over it? Tell us how you got the job.



MR. NEARY: Should I ask for the protection  
of the Chair?

MR. TULK: I would say so. That is  
rough over there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they can make light  
of it all they want -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: -they can joke about it all they  
want, they can make light of it all they want. The fact of  
the matter is, the CBC was 110 per cent correct. The  
only thing is they did not go far enough, they did not  
reveal all the perks, Mr. Chairman. And so, Mr. Chairman,  
I do not mean to belabour the point and I do not mean to  
parrot what the CBC said, but we do have the most expensive  
Premier in the whole of Canada and he may as well  
admit it. He can attack me all he wants, he can attack  
the Leader of the Opposition's salary all he wants-

An hon. member; : Which Leader? Which Leader?

MR. NEARY: -but it is not going to excuse the hon. gentleman for trying to leave the impression on the one hand that he is for the ordinary person and then on the other hand he wants to live like an oil sheik.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, the way this is supposed to work - and it just shows you the depths to which we have come - is that the Opposition is supposed to ask questions about different things. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has not asked any questions, he has just tried to attack again. You know, if the Leader of the Opposition - just let me deal with a couple of points just for the record, not for anything else, Mr. Chairman, for the record - if the Leader of the Opposition wants to know anything about the security and what has happened at Mount Scio house over the last year, I would be only too happy to sit down with the Leader of the Opposition if he requested a meeting. To use the opportunity of the House, though, to try to then somehow say I am wasting money on security in deliberate ignorance because he has not asked to see me to go over what the story is on security, and he knows that I am only too willing to tell him about it, then that is not playing according to the rules, Mr. Chairman.

I could, because the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition want to pretend so that it can get out to the media again that somehow I am wasting money on security, if the Leader of the Opposition would like to have a full account of what has happened on security over the last while, I will be only too happy to provide it. And he will see the only problem -

MR. NEARY: Any time.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You can say any time all you like now. Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition can say, 'Any time' as long as he likes now. The Leader of the Opposition and the members of the Opposition -

MR. TULK: All right, do not do it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, I am not going to do it because you know it is not supposed to be for public consumption. Now, Mr. Chairman, the member for Pogo (Mr. Tulk) can worm all he likes. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is simply this, if the Leader of the Opposition had any decency about him at all and he wants to accuse me of being expensive and one of the components he wants to include in that allegation of affluence is security, I would ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to at least have the human decency and courtesy to ask me outside of this House so that I could provide him with that information.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Then he would not be able to come into this House and attack me as being expensive on the grounds of security.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: But no He would deliberately follow the track of ignorance so that he can ask the question and make the innuendos saying, 'Sure, I do not know the difference, Mr. Chairman. No, I do not know the difference'. But if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wants to be fair, decent -

AN HON. MEMBER: Impossible.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - man Fashion, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to be decent, if he wants to consider himself a full member of the human race, let the Leader of the Opposition come and ask me, and I told the former leader the same thing, just come and ask me what the story is on security. Ask me why the chain link fence was put up around Mount Scio house, what incidents lead to that fence having to be put up? What incidents occurred to my family to make that a necessity?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about his own house?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will ask the Leader of the Opposition to ponder that. That is the only reason why I was there and I objected to it strenuously.

So, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to talk about that, let him put his money where his mouth is and come and I will give him a full run down on the security -

MR. DINN: He do not want to know.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and what my personal position is on it, that is number one. So let us take that component out of there. As far as gardeners and all the rest of it, I have none. There are none. There are none at all. And then

PREMIER PECKFORD: the Leader of the Opposition, when we alleged his \$65,000 a year, what is his lame excuse? 'I had no control over it,' he says, 'Mr. Chairman, I have no - '. Well, give it over, Pass over the \$65,000 a year then if you are now a leader. Give some of it back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Is he guilty? Mr. Chairman, is the Leader of the Opposition guilty? 'I have no control over it'. Well, he has got control over it, He is the leader now, he is making a total, as member and Leader of the Opposition, of \$65,000 a year. If the Leader of the Opposition never had any control over it, he has now, stand up in his place and say, 'I do receive that total amount of \$65,000 . I now have control over it because I am the leader and therefore I am going to give some of this back to the taxpayers of Newfoundland to build his handicapped camp".

AN HON. MEMBER: Fat chance. Fat chance.

MR. DINN: Not a chance.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Pass back some of it for his handicapped camp now.

MR. NEARY: You have had your share.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, because -

MR. NEARY: You earned yours.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - I earned mine, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is what I do, Mr. Chairman. Not monkey see, monkey do, Mr. Chairman. Let him get up and defend his the same way as I am getting up and defending mine. I will say that I earned mine. I will not say I got no control over it, Mr. Chairman, I have got control over it and I could give back some of it if I wanted to,

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 1039

RA - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: but I earn it. And I am saying it straight out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And if the Leader of the Opposition earns his let him stand up and say it. But do not be a weasel, Mr. Chairman, Do not weasel

PREMIER PECKFORD:

around it and say I have got no control over it. What a sneaky way to do business. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the way to go about doing business in Newfoundland. The same way now that they had during the election. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has any questions on how Intergovernmental Affairs operates, I will answer it. If the Leader of the Opposition has any questions about how the Cabinet Secretariat operates, I will answer his questions. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to know how we operate the Premier's Office- how much work they do? How many hours they spend? How many letters we get? How many telephone calls we answer? What we do?-I will answer his questions. If he wants to know anything about the Treasury Board Secretariat I will answer his questions. I am available. Let us get on with it and let us ask some questions about how this government functions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there was a question put to the hon. gentleman, but before I repeat the question, let me say this, that the hon. gentleman sitting over there with forty-four seats-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - given a mandate by the people of this Province, a large mandate, and Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has it within his power, he has the authority if he wants to, to change anything in this House, including the rules. They do not even need a two-thirds majority. They have a two-thirds majority to change the rules. And anytime that the hon. gentleman does not like the salary of the Opposition Leader or members of the Opposition-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



*With the Compliments of*

**ANDREW CADDELL**  
Special Assistant  
to the Leader of the Opposition

House of Assembly  
Confederation Building  
St. John's, Newfoundland  
(709) 737-3818 (Office)  
753-9437 (Res.)

gentleman has it in

larger offices!

his hands to change it.

for it 'Haig' ?

a new carpet for his

re, a desk like Don

t. I can wait, Mr.

Chairman. I can wait. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER: An absolute lie!

MR. NEARY: Nothing. I have asked for nothing and I do not expect to get anything from this crowd.

MR. YOUNG: Point of order

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG The hon. Leader is misleading the House. I can produce letters, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked for paint, carpet, desks, chesterfields, furniture and everything in his office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. YOUNG: I withdraw it, but he is not telling a lie.

MR. NEARY: Is that a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are really getting down in the gutter now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!



MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Opposition Office, and I have the letters to prove it.

MR. MORGAN: Boy, it is shocking.

MR. NEARY: - on behalf of the Opposition Office I asked, because I had to sign the letter, to have -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, hold on now. Wait now - to have certain renovations made -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Hold on now!

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. TULK: You did not ask for anything for your house, did you?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I did not ask anybody to buy my groceries or pay for the toilet paper or pay for the lights or telephone in my house.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Or to feed me down in a private dining room.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, what I asked for -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they are really hurting on this one. They are really smarting on this one.

MR. TOBIN: Trying to get off the hook.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is not getting off the hook. He can get all the cat calls he wants and he can shout and wave his arms all he wants, and he can get as wild-eyed and as wooly as he wants. He is not going to intimidate us. We are just going to keep on ploughing ahead -

MR. MORGAN: Did you ask for a portable

MR. NEARY: We are just going to plough ahead, Mr. Chairman, and do our job.

MR. MORGAN: Did you ask for a portable bar?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should go out and look after the Income Tax Department. I recommend the Income Tax Department to the hon. gentleman.

MR. MORGAN: Portable bar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman,

AN HON. MEMBER: Portable bars.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know how long. Maybe Your Honour should rise the House until they restore a little order over there, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we asked to have the Opposition offices painted.

MR. MORGAN: He wants a desk like Don's.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Chairman, I was out for the weekend and I was speaking to a group of people, Tories and Liberals, by the way, and I gave them about six examples of how this administration since it has got its mandate is misusing and abusing its authority, and how arrogant they have become, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, here is another example today of the abuse of power -

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - and the arrogance of this administration, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN: Imagine what we would do if he had power.

MR. NEARY: As an Opposition, Mr. Chairman, we asked to have our offices painted. Anybody can go down and inspect the walls of the offices down there after the

MR. NEARY: government members were finished with them. They are in pretty bad shape and I think in the best interests-

MR. TULK: They are like a bunch of teenagers.

MR. NEARY: - of the taxpayers of this Province I think there should be -

MR. MORGAN: No, wants a desk like Don Jameson had.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if I were the hon. gentleman I would look after the Income Tax Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: I am as good as Don was. Give me a big desk like Don had. New carpet.

MR. NEARY: I hope the hon. gentleman got the same thing in the mail that I got last week.

MR. TULK: What was that? You got something in the mail?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I certainly did get something interesting in the mail that the hon. Premier got, I understand.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman,

AN HON. MEMBER: Little innuendos.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not an innuendo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be intimidated by hon. members.

MR. MORGAN: You got that little penalty fine for income tax.

June 7, 1982

Tape No. 1042

IB-1

MR. NEARY:

Because, Mr. -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Somebody sent me last week.

MR. NEARY:

I got the same thing.

MR. PECKFORD:

And it was not the member for Bonavista.

MR. NEARY:

signed, I disregard them.

I see. When these things are not

AN HON. MEMBER:

Then why did you mention it?

MR. NEARY:

the hon. gentleman received it.

I just wanted to find out if

AN HON. MEMBER:

The dirt, boy.

MR. NEARY:

up dirt there would be a little more dirt than that.

Mr. Chairman, if I wanted to dig

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that we are on a very serious matter here and the hon. gentleman can try to intimidate us all he wants. They can try to cover up for being the most expensive Premier in the whole of Canada. They can try all they want, Mr. Chairman, but the fact of the matter is that we are going to stay on this until we get some satisfactory answers from the hon. gentleman.

Now, let me repeat the question that I asked the hon. gentleman. There was \$96,000 spent last year in capital on Mount Scio house, \$96,000. Could the hon. gentleman give us a breakdown of that? Now that is a fair question. It is taxpayer money and the taxpayers have a right to an answer. What was that \$96,000 spent on?

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. MCNICHOLAS): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You know, Mr. Chairman, I am not against asking questions but I said to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) I want him to ask questions on the full Premier's office, I want him to ask questions on the Cabinet Secretariat. I think the majority of that

PREMIER PECKFORD: money - I think I can answer it off the top of my head - was for the chain link fence which the security people and the CID people wished to put there for some obvious reasons which I told the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) I am willing to release to him privately because I do not want it to become public knowledge. There were a number of things that occurred, which I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition I am prepared to tell him about, which led to that activity. I was personally against building that fence right up to the last minute when I was convinced from what instances occurred up around that area and in that house that made it necessary. There were doors that had to have new locks. And the windows in the basement of the House, you could use a penknife to get in. I will go into who got in or who did not get in with the Leader of the Opposition if he wants me to and I will tell him the full story. So the locks on the windows had to be changed. The locks on the doors, you could put a penknife in. I will tell him the full story. So the locks on the windows had to be changed. The locks on the doors, you could put a penknife in and walk on in. Then there were a number of other instances around which dictated that some kind of deterrent measure be established. I think that is where most of the cost comes in over this year. But I can give the hon. gentleman more background information on it. It was done through public tender and all the rest of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is really strange how the Leader of the Opposition can, like the old fellow said, squirm around the issue. The long and short of it is that everything that I do or this government does is public knowledge, it is open and free. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to keep alleging that I am the most expensive Premier in Canada go right ahead and do it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It makes no difference to me in the world. I know the difference of it and the majority of Newfoundlanders know the difference of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The long and short of it is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) cannot get up and say he is making \$65,000 a year and he got no control over it, and he cannot get up and write letters to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) and then say he was forced to do so by his colleagues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That does not wash. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not want to stay on that issue. You know, I do not want to stay on that issue. I want to deal with the Cabinet Secretariat. I want to deal with Intergovernmental Affairs, I want to deal with Treasury Board Secretariat, and all that money that we are spending on trying to operate the government, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to. If he does not that is fine with me.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman -

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all let me straighten out that having no -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to it referred and has made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if I may just before I move the adjournment of House, announce the two committee meetings tomorrow of the Estimate Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Tomorrow the Resource Committee at 9:30 in the Colonial Building with the Department of Fisheries, and the Social Services 9:30 here in the House of Assembly, the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth. And as I said in the debate, Mr. Speaker, four of the Opposition can, if they want to, appear here and the other four can appear at the other committee.

Mr. Speaker, I move -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Four and four makes eight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Four and four are eight.

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, at

June 7, 1982

Tape 1043

PK - 3

MR. MARSHALL: 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now  
adjourn.

On motion that this House do  
adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday, June 8, 1982.



I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 7, 1982

Answer to Question No. 43 by the Honourable the Member for Torngat Mountains to the Honourable the Minister of Social Services - Order Paper No. 3, dated May 13th, 1982.

The cost of renovations to Minister's offices in the fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981:

No renovations to Minister's offices.