

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the end of the Question Period I was questioning the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) re the fish plant at Charleston. And I had begun my question by reminding the minister that in a P.C. rally during the election that he had told the people attending that rally that the fish plant at Charleston would be re-opening. Yesterday I asked would the minister give a statement re the status of the fish plant at Charleston and I gathered that he was not as forthright in saying whether or not it was going to open then as he was on the night of that rally in the district of Terra Nova. Could the minister comment on that, just what is the status of the fish plant at Charleston, or whether he knows at this moment?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all may I say it is very pleasing to see since this new session of the House of Assembly so many questions on fisheries, because maybe they have learned the lesson the hard way. The last session there was hardly a question on fisheries.

MR. WOODROW: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: Now that they have learned the hard way by losing fishing districts to us in the recent election, they are going to try a different tactic but I appreciate the questions anyway, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

On the Charleston plant,
I said during the election, and in fact before the
election, and I have said since the election and I say
now that the Charleston plant is part of a proposal put
forward by the Nickerson firm,

MR. J. MORGAN: which owns outright that plant, a fairly modern plant that was acquired by Nickersons from the company Arctic Fisheries a few years ago and they carried out an expansion after they purchased it from Arctic Fisheries. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned yesterday I was meeting with the Nickerson firm today. I just came from a two or two and a half or three hour session with the Nickerson officials, in from Nova Scotia, and we are in the process of finalizing the proposal they put forward some months ago regarding a number of their fish plants in Newfoundland, the resource short inshore plants along the Northeast Coast owned by that company. It involves a proposal which, as I say, involves the Newfoundland government with a request for financial assistance, and, all I can say today, is new structuring of their operations so it will be strictly a Newfoundland operation separate from their operations in Nova Scotia. The meeting today just concluded, there are still meetings ongoing this afternoon involving the officials of the Department of Fisheries, the Deputy Minister (Mr. G. Slade) in particular, but I am hoping to be in a position by tomorrow afternoon, at the latest, to indicate a firm date when that plant in Charlestown in Bonavista Bay, in fact in the very historic district of Bonavista South, will be reopening, in other words giving a firm date, and also giving further information with regards to the reopening of a number of others connected with the Nickerson operation.

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
member for Terra Nova.

A supplementary the hon. the

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I still find that the minister's fudging a little. He is nearly being as forthright as he was during the rally in Terra Nova district when he said that the fish plant was going to open. Well, the minister is

MR. T. LUSH: not indicating that today. This is a very important issue, as the minister recognizes it to be. It employs a large number of people from three districts, the Terra Nova district, Trinity South and Bonavista South, it employs a lot of people. And well the minister knew that the night that he said that the fish plant was going to open. Well, I am asking the minister today is there any possibility, one, that that fish plant will not open or does he have information that the fish plant will open, that is just a matter of meeting tomorrow and giving the date? What is the actual status? What does the minister know at this point in time about the fish plant at Charlestown? Will it open or will it not open?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, maybe the reason why I am not so - how will I say it? - enthusiastic about the announcement on the Charlestown plant

MR. MORGAN: today in the House as I was the night at the rally is as I recall the hall was packed with about 500 people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - and they were very, very supportive of our Party and our Party's policies. In fact, I recall the vote increased substantially in that area of Lethbridge and Bloomfield and Bunyan's Cove and Cannings Cover and Musgravetown and Winter Brook and Jamestown and these places.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh oh!

MR. MORGAN: But, Mr. Speaker, what I said then is the same thing I said since the election and before the election; this government will leave no stone unturned in getting open any of the fish plants around this Province which we believe and the companies connected with the plants believe can be viable in the future. I said that yesterday and I maintain the position now. We will work with every company with regards to getting their operations open and getting the buying and processing of fish ongoing this Summer providing, of course as I indicated as well to the House yesterday, that they meet certain criteria and are willing to comply with the conditions we set down.

I do not know what the hon. gentleman wants more than I just told him. I said by tomorrow afternoon I will be able to announce a firm date when that plant will be re-opened. In other words, in the next twenty-four hours or so I will be making an announcement indicating when the plant will be re-opened. And I am sure that will be good news to the people of Bonavista South in particular.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: I agree with the minister there, there was a large number of people at that rally that night, Mr. Speaker, a large number. A lot of them told me they went to listen to Cory and Trina as opposed to listening to the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, the minister is still fudging, not being nearly as forthright as I found out the next day when I went around visiting when the people were all excited and telling me that Jim Morgan was going to open the fish plant at Charleston.

The final question to the minister; Can the minister indicate today whether the fish plant is going to be operating at full capacity in the way that it has been over the past couple of years or whether it is going to be in a reduced capacity? Can the minister indicate that today?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is obviously a very Doubting Thomas because I recall saying before the election and during the election that all of the seven plants that went into bankruptcy or into receivership - and the company wanted to move out of the Province-owned by Newfoundland Quick Freeze were going to open. I then heard comments come from-not the same hon. gentleman but from the same party saying, 'Oh, that was all nonsense, these plants would not be re-opened'. Well they are all re-opened now and are all going to operate now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: I also heard comments along the same lines about other plants, the plants that are now owned by the Lake Group Company. These plants were not going to re-open again. The Burgeo Seafoods Plant was never going to be sold, never re-open again under private enterprise, the government would always have to subsidize the operations down there -

MR. NEARY: Give-aways.

MR. MORGAN: - and these kinds of pessimistic viewpoints from the Opposition. It is time that you had some faith in what your provincial government is doing for this Province.

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

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, for the past three days we have been listening to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) answering questions. Mr. Speaker, the questions have been short and to the point. The answers, Mr. Speaker, have been rambling. Beauchesne, page 131 says, "Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate." Now the question asked to the Minister of Fisheries was a specific question on the Charleston fish plant, which is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Yes or no.

MR. HODDER: - to the people of the district of Terra Nova and the people of Charleston. But the minister, and other ministers on that side of the House, continually rise and then have many speeches and provoke debate and get on to every other type of topic.

Mr. Speaker, we have half an hour

MR. HODDER: for Question Period and if we have to ruin our own Question Period with points of order we do not care if we can get the ministers on the other side to please use their God-given intelligence, if they have any, to try and frame an answer in as short a time as possible.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order.

MR. NEARY: A simple yes or no.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, you know I find it really odd, As I listened to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) giving the answers to very important questions from the Opposition you could almost hear a pin drop when the Minister of Fisheries was speaking. Everybody was hanging on every word he was saying, were eager to find out the answer to the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The fantastic job that the Minister of Fisheries was doing on answering questions in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: A fantastic job. And I am absolutely astounded, appalled, as one member of this House, to hear the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder) get up and criticize the giving of information by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) about that resource. The member who asked the question was there hanging on every word, hanging on every comma that the Minister of Fisheries was making. And I submit to the hon. member he should know better and sit in his seat and listen to the golden words coming out of the mouth of the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 13, 1982

Tape No. 156

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I did not intend to comment on the point of order at all -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - until the Premier got into the discussion.

Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne states that questions, apart from a short preamble, should be short and the answers should be short. The question that was put to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

PREMIER PECKFORD: What section? What citation?

Get it from your House Leader.

MR. HODDER: Beauchesne, page 131.

MR. NEARY: Page 131, down at the bottom of the page, "Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate."

The answer given by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was rather long-winded, Mr. Speaker, and we saw a repetition today of what happened yesterday in this hon. House. My colleague, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) asked a question that only demands a simple yes or no answer and that is all, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman was being too long-winded, as he usually is in this House, saying nothing and I think he was completely out of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

It is true that Beauchesne does say that members when asking questions should make their question as brief as possible and hon. ministers when answering should be as brief as possible and I would request that hon. members on both sides adhere to that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is yes, the fish plant at Charleston will be re-opened. It will be re-opened with provincial government assistance only because the federal government turned down requests for assistance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier

MR. NEARY: with a short preamble, if Your Honour will permit me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no. Beauchesne.

MR. NEARY: A short preamble.

Mr. Speaker, the Parliament of Canada recently passed a piece of legislation making it mandatory for all the provinces of Canada, especially the province of Quebec, to allow a power corridor across the province of Quebec to transmit electrical energy from Newfoundland across the province of Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, this government, this administration and several previous administrations in this Province have been fighting tooth and nail for that for years and I would have expected that there would be celebrations in Newfoundland sponsored by the provincial government because the Parliament of Canada took this action really against the wishes of the province of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question, question!

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the legislature of Quebec is passing a bill objecting this or trying to outlaw or make it illegal for this corridor to go across -

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think that if the hon. the Opposition Leader and the Opposition House Leader is going to get up and start quoting subsections of Beauchesne about how long ministers are taking, that they are taking too long in answering questions and giving information, then what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander and they should have a very short preamble to their questions in the same

PREMIER PECKFORD: why as we have to give a short response to the questions they ask us.

MR. SIMMS: Tit for tat.

MR. NEARY: What is your citation?

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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): To that point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, when the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was asking his question he was trying to clarify. When the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was answering his question, he was dealing with subjects other than those for which the question was asked and was also straying into the realm of debate. There is quite a difference when you are trying to get a question across and you want to explain to the Premier what you are trying to say. That is quite a difference.

MR. DINN: The tit for tat rule.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The same rules of brevity should apply to the Opposition side as well as the government side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I have three or four specific questions to ask the hon. the Premier in connection with that piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. Number one, did the Tory party of Canada consult with the provincial government here in Newfoundland before they raised an objection to that piece of legislation granting a power corridor? Number two, did the two Tory MPs from Newfoundland, did they consult with the provincial government before they abstained -

PREMIER PECKFORD: You are making your questions too long.

MR. NEARY: That is two questions - before they abstained from voting on that piece of legislation? And, number three, is there anything that we can do in this Province now to show our support to the Parliament of Canada for having the courage to pass this piece of legislation against the wishes of the Province of Quebec?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, first of all I do not think the legislation is passed yet and I think the Leader of the Opposition indicated that it was passed.

MR. DINN: It is still in second reading.

PREMIER PECKFORD: My understanding is that I think it is still in second reading. So the Leader of the Opposition's facts are not clear and he does not understand that legislation is still legislation proposed by one side of the House. It has not passed. Secondly, it should be remembered that the only reason why that part of the energy bill now before the House of Commons contains a component which is to give a power corridor to the Province of Newfoundland for passage of electricity through Quebec is because we embarrassed the federal government into so doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let there be no mistake about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: We had private negotiations with the federal government. One would not think that you would have to make an argument, one would think that it would have been done automatically years ago, to allow Newfoundland to transmit its energy products in the same way as other Canadians have had the right to do for a long period of time. But we had to argue. And behind closed doors we negotiated with the federal government and embarrassed them. As a matter of fact, we even told them the wording to put into the legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now rather than, Mr. Speaker, rather than have one bill which had nothing in it except to give us the same rights of transmission of our electricity, like Alberta or Saskatchewan or BC has for its gas or oil, rather than do that, a clean bill with nothing else in

May 13, 1982

Tape No. 158

ah-3

PREMIER PECKFORD: there only to give us the same
rights as other Canadians now enjoy and have always
enjoyed since they were in Confederation, what did the
federal government do? They put that little component
to give us the same rights as other

PREMIER PECKFORD: Canadians now enjoy into a large, omnibus energy bill. The Progressive Conservative Party of Canada and the Opposition party in the Parliament are not objecting at all to the transmission corridor component of the energy bill, they are arguing against the great powers that the Minister of Energy will have on the other components in that bill. If the federal government were really serious about showing how concerned they are about the inequality that exists in Newfoundland as it relates to the transmission of energy, they would have put in a separate bill which would have gone to the House of Commons zoom-o in about two seconds, because there was no argument from the N.D.P. Party of Canada, there was no argument from the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada about the transmission rights which we should enjoy with electricity the same as other provinces on oil and gas. And the reason why our legislation, so-called, is held up is because it is part of a larger bill dealing with all energy matters in Canada in which the federal government is trying to get very, very large powers for the Cabinet and for the Minister of Energy. Nobody in the Parliament of Canada has argued one iota against the component which says that we should have a transmission corridor through the Province of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Premier missed the point completely, the point of my question, and he became rather argumentive there at the end. We are merely trying to indicate to the Premier and to the administration, Mr. Speaker, that we are concerned

MR. NEARY: about what is happening in the Province of Quebec, and we are offering a helping hand, if you wish, because the main question, the most important question I put to the Premier was about what is happening in the Legislature of Quebec. Is there anything that we can do in this House by way of Resolution, legislation or otherwise to show the Parliament of Canada and to show the Tory Party in Canada and the two Tory M.P.s from Newfoundland that we want this power corridor across Quebec and we will settle for nothing less? Because if we do not do anything then Quebec may get its own way and may block that piece of legislation. This is what I am concerned about.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is too late for the Liberal Party of Newfoundland to suddenly jump on the Conservative bandwagon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Two or three years ago when we were arguing with the federal government on this point was the time for the Liberal Opposition to ask what could they do to help Newfoundland. I will tell the Leader of the Opposition what he can do to help Newfoundland. I will tell him to foursquare come out and say he supports the January 25th proposal on the offshore -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that he is against this business of Northern cod being traded off in Europe and Russia, that he is against the squid allocations which are being stolen away from the people of Newfoundland to create employment elsewhere. It is too late. The barn door is closed and the horse is out, Mr. Speaker. For the Leader of the Opposition to suddenly get up in this House today and suddenly want to get on the bandwagon

PREMIER PECKFORD: of a great fight that we fought and won to persuade the federal government to bring in that legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling, I could be wrong -

PREMIER PECKFORD: More than likely.

MR. NEARY: - I have a feeling that the Government of Canada is Liberal. Somehow or other I have that feeling. I do not know if the Premier knows something that I do not know, but I believe there is a Liberal administration in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Only one. Only one.

MR. NEARY: Now as far as the Northern cod stock is concerned -

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You have already made one ruling, I have tried to keep my answers brief and I think I have done so, Mr. Speaker. And I would ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), we have all agreed that there is short preamble necessary for questions but obviously the Leader of the Opposition now in Question Period is trying to make a speech.

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

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

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, the Premier in answering the question was argumentative, he provoked debate and he was at fault in the beginning.

MR. WARREN: Right on. Right on.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To the point of order, the hon.
the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have a citation, Mr. Speaker,
which will clearly demonstrate what I am trying to talk about.
It is in Beauchesne, the rules and forms- everybody knows
Beauchesne- Chapter 9, page 132, we are on 359, subsection (2)
"The question must be brief". And it goes on to say, "A
preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence". Now
I know that might be difficult for the Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Neary), but Beauchesne overrules him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. HODDER: If I hear what the Premier read
it says, 'need not', it does not say 'must not'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: You are a teacher, you are a teacher.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Beauchesne has a lot to say about
questions both oral and written and maybe if the Chair stuck
strictly to the rule very few questions would be
permitted. Again I would ask hon. members to keep their
questions brief and the hon. members to my left, their
answers brief.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader
of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier not agree
that if we did not take a firm stand now, today, forget
what happened in the past -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DINN: You would love to, would you not?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I can go back to the mid-60's when the Premier of that day tried to get a

power corridor across Quebec -

MR. STAGG: Yes. He tried some hard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: - left here once to go to Ottawa to demand that it be done. But, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate to the House if it would not be in our best interest, at this moment, to show the Parliament of Canada that we are supportative of this clause, in whatever bill it is, but we are supportative of this clause just the same as we were supportative of a clause in the Constitution allowing the provincial government to tax

MR. NEARY: power being exported out of Newfoundland—and I will ask the hon. gentleman a few questions about that probably tomorrow sometime - but would it not be in our interest now, while Quebec is vehemently and strongly objecting to this power corridor, for this legislature, for this government to show the people of Canada that we are behind the Parliament and the Government of Canada in getting this power corridor legislation through the parliament of this nation?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is taken as given. Everybody in Newfoundland from Nain to St. Shotts, including now the latecomers, the members of the Opposition, that it is an embarrassment to the Canadian government, an embarrassment to everybody who lives in the confines of Canada to have this kind of inequity continue.

May I just as a sidelight, seeing the Leader of the Opposition brought it up: He mentioned that the former, former, former Premier, whatever, of this Province had gone to try to get a power corridor through Quebec. I cannot understand why the former, former, former Premier could not get a power corridor through the province of Quebec in the same way as this government, or the administration preceding us which was the same government, was able to do with the present federal government. And you cannot excuse an Upper Churchill contract which is losing us a half Billion dollars a year that way, in the way the Leader of the Opposition is now trying to do it. It is quite clear to all of the people of Canada and to the Parliament of Canada that this is sound, reasonable legislation. I am glad to have, belated though it is, the

PREMIER PECKFORD: support now of the Leader of the Opposition and the party that he represents in the arguments that we put forward a year and a half ago.

But I ask the question where was the Leader of the Opposition, where was the Liberal Party when we were negotiating that two years ago? There was not a peep from the other side. In the same way, one day when we will win on the offshore, one day when we will win on the offshore, the opposite side, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland will stand up and try to take credit for something that was fought for by the PC Party of Newfoundland, which they rejected. When they see the tide coming in, Mr. Speaker, they will be on it like they are right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman is not going to intimidate me - but let me ask the hon. gentleman some serious, serious questions. Is not the hon. gentleman concerned that there is a bill going through the legislature in the Province of Quebec to bar this corridor? Is not the hon. gentleman concerned that the national Tory party, the Tory party of Canada is against this bill? Is not the hon. gentleman concerned that the two Tories from Newfoundland abstained from voting on this bill? If we just lie down, Mr. Speaker, if we just lie down and do nothing, is not the hon. gentleman concerned that that power corridor may never become a reality even though it has gone through second reading of the House of Commons?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not so negative as the Leader of the Opposition. If Mr. LaLonde and the federal government, which is the national Government of Canada, introduce a law into the Parliament of Canada and it is passed then it overrides a resolution or a bill in any of the legislative assemblies of Canada concerning energy transmission. And I would say to the hon. gentleman, do not be so skeptical of his own government in Ottawa; do not be so skeptical of the National Energy Board. In the same way as there is now transmission allowed by oil and gas, it is going to be extended to energy products, and whether the National Assembly, so-called, of the Province of Quebec wants to pass a resolution or a bill, everybody in Canada, all the lawmakers in Canada know it is just another attempt by Quebec to demonstrate its ongoing objections to a very inequitable piece of law that is now on the books, or a contract that is now on the books. So I am not scared of Mr. Levesque, I am not scared of the National Assembly of Quebec. We have won the battle on the transmission of electricity because the Federal Government of Canada's law when it becomes law will be the overriding factor to be considered and everybody from coast to coast, lawmakers and everybody else know that it is unchallengable that this whole question of transmission of electric power is a very, very great embarrassment to all of Canada and these kinds of bills, laws or resolutions being introduced in the National Assembly are going nowhere fast, that Quebec is on its last legs as it relates to that and we are going to go through with the federal government, after we have persuaded them on this legislation, and get it in place.

So I am not at all afraid about the Province of Quebec. They have lost already on a number

PREMIER PECKFORD: of cases and are going to lose on this one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say to the little games that the hon. the Premier is playing right now, little political games, is that it is a good thing that we have a Liberal Government up in Ottawa. It is the only thing I can say to the hon. gentleman. But if I were the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker - and I want to again come back to a Resolution from this House, because I think it is necessary - I think, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman were to introduce a Resolution he would have no trouble to get unanimous consent of this House to endorse this piece of legislation granting a power corridor across Quebec by this great Liberal Government up there in Ottawa. But the hon. gentleman is aware just as well as I am that Quebec -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has, in the opinion of the Chair, taken a little too long to ask the question. I would suggest that he get on with the question.

MR. NEARY: Well, is the hon. gentleman aware that Quebec has the second highest number of members of Parliament in Ottawa? And is the hon. gentleman aware that sometimes,

MR. S. NEARY: the power of political persuasion can change things - the hon. gentleman should be aware of it if he is not, and with the pressure that is coming on from Quebec, would it not be in our best interest in this Province to pass a resolution in this House, unanimously, and send it off to the Parliament or the Prime Minister of Canada, to the Parliament of Canada to ask that they ignore the legislation in the Province of Quebec -

MR. J. HODDER: And ignore Mr. Crosbie.

MR. NEARY: - and ignore Mr. Crosbie and Mr. McGrath and the Tory party and put this piece of legislation through despite them?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I really find it amusing. Every time we talk about the federal government in this House we are accused of being confrontationists, we are accused of trying to attack Ottawa, we want to slough all the problems of Newfoundland off on to Ottawa, and here is the Liberal party of Newfoundland now suspect of their own senior party in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: No, Quebec.

MR. HODDER: You are darn right we are.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would know that his leader the Prime Minister, that the Energy Minister of Canada that great Liberal, Mr. Lalonde would not buckle down to a bit of pressure from his home province when he knows that fairness and equity across Canada is the overriding principle to be sustained here.

MR. NEARY: Well, if we lose it we will blame it on you.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am not nearly as nervous of Mr. Lalonde and of the Prime Minister as is the Leader of the

Opposition, number one. Number two, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it that what has been introduced into the National Assembly of Quebec -

MR. NEARY: I would not trust the hon.

Mr. Lalonde now as far as I could throw him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: What did he say?

MR. L. SIMMS: He said he would not trust him as far as he could throw him.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, did I hear properly? Did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) of the Liberal party in this Province say he would not trust Mr. Lalonde as far as he could throw him?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Wonderful, wonderful! Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I move, Mr. Speaker, the following resolution: That this House go on record as supporting the contention of the Leader of the Opposition that none of us would trust Mr. Lalonde any further than we would throw him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Do not run it into the ground now. Do not run it into the ground now.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it to this moment, what has been introduced into the National Assembly of Quebec is a resolution, not a bill. It is just an expression of sentiment by the National Assembly and has no basis in law at all. It is just a resolution and not a bill. But we welcome the support of the Leader of the Opposition we hope he speaks for the other seven on his side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He certainly does.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We welcome it. It is two years late. Better late than never.

May 13, 1982

Tape No. 163

MJ-3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Russell);

Order please! The time for

Oral Questions has expired. Before we proceed to other
business

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): it is a distinct pleasure for me to welcome to the galleries today exchange students from the George Elliott Secondary School of Winfield, British Columbia, with their chaperones Mr. Norm Malwinney, Mr. Bill Maire, and Mrs. Marilyn Bartell, along with their hosts, who are the Mount Pearl Central High, with their host teacher, Mr. Cal Button. I extend a sincere welcome to you all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to answer Question 27, from the hon. House Leader opposite (Mr. Hodder) who asked the hon. Minister of Finance to lay upon the table of the House the following information: a list of names and salaries of executive assistants, parliamentary assistants, and public relations specialists, appointed to the minister's staff for the fiscal years 1979, 1980, 1981. The answer is none.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Is that short enough?

MR. NEARY: That is only one minister.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of ninety residents in the community of Rigolet. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, before I start the petition I should indicate that it may fall into the federal government's hands, to a certain degree but it also will have some connection with this government as this government does have a Minister of Communications (Mr. Doyle) now.

It says, "Whereas the community of Rigolet is completely isolated from up-to-date news, weather and sports, and whereas it is of the utmost importance to be in communication with the rest of Canada and the world, and whereas the residents of the community of Rigolet, being Canadian citizens, have a legal and moral right to have access to a communications link in today's society, therefore we, the undersigned, in all sincerity urge the combined councils of Labrador, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, to resolve and encourage any and all possibilities of acquiring live television service to our community."

Mr. Speaker, one has to realize that from Goose Bay to Nain that in the community of Rigolet, and the community of Postville there is no radio, or television.

MR. WARREN: There before the election campaign there was what you call canned television in the community of Rigolet. That was provided by my opponent, but once he lost the election he went into Rigolet and took out the television set.

MR. NEARY: He was a sore looser.

MR. WARREN: He could have been a sore looser, Mr. Speaker, As of the present day the people of Rigolet do not have any television whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. Now there have been communications with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the town council of Rigolet and myself over the past two or three months and we have been advised by the CBC that they have no immediate plans in the next three or four years to have any kind of television or radio service in that community. It is also worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, that Rigolet is about ninety miles out the lake from Happy Valley-Goose Bay which has two radio stations and five or six TV channels. And also it is midway between the community of Makkovik and the community of Cartwright. And I would think, Mr. Speaker, that with the support of this government, and in particular now knowing that we have a new Minister of Communications (Mr. Doyle), that he would take every opportunity available to approach the CRTC and any other bodies associated with television and radio to have parts of Newfoundland and Labrador, that do not receive television or radio service to try and bring those towns and those communities in line with the civilization in which we presently live.

Thank you very much.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, Hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the

MR. NEARY: petition so ably presented by my hon. colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and I would like to tell the House that my colleague and the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) accompanied me last week to a hearing of the CRTC down here at the Holiday Inn and I thought we made a very strong presentation.

MR. WARREN: The Minister of Communication (Mr. Doyle) was not there though.

MR. NEARY: No, the Minister of Communication (Mr. Doyle) was not there. I did not see any representation from the provincial government at all at these hearings. But we made a very strong case to have television brought into the areas where they do not have not even one channel, and to bring the second channel into parts of Newfoundland where people are forced to watch the CBC. While I was listening to my colleague there presenting the petition, I was reminded, Mr. Speaker, that when I was Minister of Social Services one of the things that I did when I was the minister of that department was to get a projector, a movie projector for Rigolet. My hon. friend will remember that Rigolet

MR. NEARY: at the time was not included in the Norther Labrador agreement with Ottawa. I think one of the last things I did in that department was to bring Rigolet under that agreement. For some reason or other it went from North West River to Nain and they jumped over Rigolet. So when we did bring them in, I went down there and I asked the people what they wanted. Apart from housing and a few other things, they told me one of the things that wanted more than anything else was a movie projector, because all of the other communities could watch movies and they would not. So I arranged to get a few dollars and put a movie projector into Rigolet.

But that was a long time ago, Mr. Speaker. We have come a long way since then with satellites going up, and people now talking - and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) knows what I am talking about - people wanting to become millionaires on pay television. They want to become tycoons. But, Mr. Speaker, all the people of Rigolet, the Southwest coast of this Province, the Northeast coast, the Great Northern Peninsula, all they want, Mr. Speaker, in a few communities in Northern Labrador, Southern Labrador is one channel. In the rest of Newfoundland they would like to have an alternative to CBC, they would like to have the second channel. And they think they are entitled to that privilege just the same as the people in St. John's, Gander, Grand Falls, Corner Brook, and every other community in Newfoundland, where they get two channels, and, in addition to that, they can have cable television if they want to pay for it. And in addition to that, now we are going to have CanCom, we are going to have pay television and there will be a few more tycoons in Newfoundland. Because we

MR. NEARY: are told that a television station is like a licence to print your own money. I do not know if that is correct or not, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) could tell us.

But, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition. I think it is long overdue. I think the people in these communities are entitled to these services. I have a file down there, Mr. Speaker, on my own district that thick, telexes, a letter to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin), to the Minister of Communications, to the CRTC like you would not believe. It is a real nightmare. People are becoming frustrated. In some communities they do not even get radio, I believe, in Northern Labrador - do they?

MR. WARREN: In Davis Inlet and in Rigolet.

MR. NEARY: In Davis Inlet and Rigolet they do not even hear the -

MR. WARREN: And Makkovik.

MR. NEARY: And Makkovik, and in Charlottetown, in my hon. colleague's district, they do not even have a radio station from Newfoundland. And I think this is terrible, Mr. Speaker. And I hope, as a result of the petition that is presented in this House today, and the representation that we made to the CRTC the other day - my two colleagues from Labrador - that these people will get this long overdue service. So I support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for
Harbour Main - Bell Island.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, as the minister responsible for communications in this Province, I certainly want to support also the petition so ably presented by my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) on behalf of the ninety residents of Rigolet. I am sure, though, in presenting that petition, Your Honour, that the hon. gentleman is fully aware that the responsibility for that particular area lies within federal jurisdiction and, of course, as the minister responsible for communications, I will certainly make every effort on behalf of the ninety residents of Rigolet to contact the federal minister responsible for communications and to make these concerns known to the people in that particular area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, within the next week or so I will be meeting, as will all other nine provincial ministers responsible for communications - we will be meeting with Francis Fox in Calgary next week and I will certainly make the hon. gentleman's concerns known at that particular time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: I would also like to make a comment or two with respect to what the Opposition Leader mentioned with respect to Pay T.V. That also lies within federal jurisdiction and we are quite anxious as the provincial government to get jurisdiction over that particular part of the communications sector. As a matter of fact, six licences, Mr. Speaker, were granted

MR. DOYLE: for originating and distribution of Pay T.V. just today. None of these licences are for local exhibition of the service but are of a federal nature and a national nature. But, Mr. Speaker, I am very well aware of what residents of Rigolet are going through in this particular regard and I support the petition so ably presented by the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PREMIER PECKFORD: I suggest the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Committee of Supply?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

I would like to remind hon. members that we are in Committee of Supply now dealing with the granting of supply to Her Majesty.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am only going to speak briefly just to repeat some of the points we raised the other day in connection with this Interim Supply Bill.

First of all, it is a record Interim Supply Bill - \$675 million. I do not know what percentage of the Budget that is. I would assume it is more than one-third of this year's Budget. I do not think the Budget this year will be any more than \$1,500 million or \$1,600 million. So I would think the \$675 million would be more than one-third of the provincial Budget. \$129 million of the amount, Mr. Chairman, was spent unlawfully, was spent by the government without the authority of the Legislature. And according to all the research that we have done, this spending of public money without authority is unlawful. And the ministers should be prepared to admit man-fashion that it is unlawful to spend money without the authority of the provincial Legislature, of the House of Assembly.

Now the other day when I mentioned that well we may hang her down for a little while on this Interim Supply Bill, I went out to do an interview with a representative of the media and we had spent at that time, I think, less than two hours and probably between an hour and a half and two hours on Interim Supply - \$675 million. And you know the first question that was put to me said, 'Mr. Neary, is the Opposition filibustering?' Less

MR. NEARY: than two hours on \$675 million and this particular representative of the media wanted to know if the Opposition was filibustering.

MR. TULK: Did you say yes or what?

DR. COLLINS: What did you answer?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

DR. COLLINS: What was your answer?

MR. NEARY: Well I was very kind as a matter of fact, very kind, as I usually am to the media -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - knowing that the media can make or break you. And I said no, we were not filibustering, we were merely trying to get information for the people of this Province. Now that is what we are going to do. Here is our plan, Mr. Chairman, and it will depend on the co-operation that we get from the minister and from the government whether or not they will get Interim Supply by the deadline, which is tomorrow, I believe, The six weeks are up tomorrow, After tomorrow the government will not be able to spend another penny, although

MR. NEARY:

I have doubts about that. They have spent \$129 million illegally, but now the House is opened, I do not suppose they would be brazen enough to go and look for Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants -

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, and that they would.

MR. NEARY:

- and have the Comptroller of the Treasury overruled by Treasury Board -

MR. CALLAN:

Sure they would.

MR. NEARY:

- while the House is open to get money to pay their bills after tomorrow, But tomorrow is the deadline and we are, Mr. Chairman, as I said on opening day - and again I have to take a newsman to task. Not really to task, I thought it was a -

MR. WARREN:

A misunderstanding.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, probably he misunderstood what I said on opening day, when I said that we were going to support the government at least on three measures, On the offshore oil, on the power corridor across Quebec, and the re-opening of the Churchill Falls contract, we are in complete agreement and support of the government. Now, that does not necessarily mean that we agree with their tactics. Sometimes we may have to disagree with the approach or with their unnecessary confrontation attitude. Like today, when I was trying to pin the Premier down.

That is to help Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. That does not necessarily mean that we are just going to go overboard and everything is going to be sweetness and light and we are all going to get out and waltz around the floor of the legislature.

When the government needs to be taken to task, we will take the government to task. When they bring in a measure that we think is in the best interest of the Province, whether it be a piece of legislation

MR. NEARY: or whether it be a strategy in connection with the three projects I just mentioned, so be it. But we have to separate these three items from the other things in the economy, and the other matters that will be raised in this House, and the other statements and speeches made in this House, Mr. Speaker.

And that is what I meant on opening day. It does not mean that the government can now ride roughshod over everybody. I want to reassure the people of this Province that when the government needs to be criticized, we will criticize them. But we intend to co-operate for at least the first six months. And in this particular instance, I do not suppose any administration could violate the privileges of parliament, the traditions of parliament as much as they did in spending money without authority. That is about the worst thing that any administration can do. It is no-no, Mr. Chairman.

And that is why a couple of days

MR. NEARY: ago, the day before yesterday, that I was so strong in my condemnation of the administration, and so critical of the administration, who overruled the Comptroller of the Treasury, and who refused to table a legal opinion in the House, who refused to give us the Auditor General's Report, who refused to tell us why new capital projects were included in interim supply. That is never done. All interim supply is, in case the new members do not realize what we are talking about here, interim supply is money needed by the government, because they could not bring down a budget before the end of the fiscal year, to pay their bills. That is all it is. In this case it is \$675 million, with new projects, new capital works projects. I have never known that to happen before. And the minister, all he has done so far, is sneer at us, and jeer at us because we dare raise these important points, these important matters.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to -

MR. CALLAN: Typical arrogance.

MR. NEARY: - to repeat a few of these points because they are so important. Because, Mr. Chairman, as sure as I am standing here, and as sure as the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is sitting over there in his seat -

MR. CALLAN: He is, is he?

MR. STAGG: He is still here.

MR. NEARY: And he is here for a change today.

MR. CALLAN: I thought he was in Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And as sure as the new member -
MR. STAGG: Not fair.
MR. TULK: And who would protest?
MR. STAGG: Not fair. Not parliamentary.
MR. TULK: Maybe the member for
Carbonear (Mr. Peach).
MR. NEARY: - and as sure, Mr. Chairman -
MR. STAGG: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.
MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. member for Stephenville.
MR. STAGG: Now it was brought to my attention
very forcefully and correctly, I may add, last year by the
former member for Carbonear, when I was summing up in the
Committee, that he had not attended any of the Committee
meetings, and it was brought forward by him that it is
unparliamentary to refer to the absence of a member from
the House of Assembly.
MR. NEARY: He was not referring to your absence,
he was referring to your presence.
MR. STAGG: The hon. member may not say
indirectly what he cannot say directly. That is also a
rule that the hon. member honours in the breach.
Mr. Chairman, yesterday I was
in Stephenville attending the opening of building 360
of the Bay St. George Community College, a magnificent
event in the history of this Province, and in the history
of my district. I was there where all members should be.

MR. STAGG: And the hon. member, in an unparliamentary way, is indicating, or alluding, or insinuating that I do not attend the House, which it is my duty and every member's duty to do.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if it will make the hon. gentleman feel any better I am not insinuating anything. I just happened to look down, the hon. gentleman smiled at me and I thought I would give him a little bit of recognition for a change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Obviously, Mr. Chairman, he has no intention of speaking in the House. I do not know

MR. NEARY:

if all the members are muzzled over there or not. The hon. gentleman -

MR. CALLAN: The Premier has never given him any recognition.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Otherwise he would have been in the Cabinet.

MR. CALLAN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Just the same, Mr. Chairman, as I am glad to see the member for Burin (Mr. Tobin) in his seat today.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): This is to the point of order.

MR. NEARY: No, if I -

MR. SPEAKER: Well to that point of order, I rule that there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I am so glad to see the member for Burin-Palcentia West (Mr. Tobin) in his seat today. It was rumoured the hon. gentleman was going into the Cabinet. I do not know if the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) is here today.

MR. CALLAN: He was earlier.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if there is dissention in the ranks already, Mr. Chairman. It would appear that way.

MR. HODDER: Also the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr Stewart) there, he is starting to even look like a Cabinet minister.

MR. NEARY: That is right. And the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) moved up in the front seats. I thought for sure he was going into the Cabinet.

MR. HODDER: You notice he looks like one?

MR. NEARY: But I would say that rust now will start to set in rather early. The dissention has already set in. And, Mr. Chairman, we have lots of room on this side of the House. We can put a few seats down on that side, a few seats to my left and a few seats in here behind. So when they all get the message some of them will be welcome.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.HODDER: Not all of them. No, not all of them. Just some of them.

MR.WARREN: The member for Fortune- Hermitage is not welcome, by the way.

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Mr. Chairman, let me get back to the Interim Supply Bill. What I think we will do or, what I would like to do, what we would like to do, Mr. Chairman, we would like to get some specifics about this Interim Supply.

MR. WARREN: Yes.

MR.NEARY: And what we would like to do if the minister will co-operate and the administration will co-operate they may get their Interim Supply Bill by tomorrow and they may not. It depends on their attitude. If they continue to be arrogant and dictatorial and insulting and rude and nasty they will not get their Interim supply Bill. We would like to pass it. We would like their co-operation. So what we will do, I think, Mr. Chairman, is each shadow will ask the minister specific questions. The minister told us the other day he had two books on his desk with all kinds of information crammed in between the covers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to remind the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN: By leave.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked a few points there and I think it might be as well I answer them as time goes along. Actually he did not ask any new questions so I really am repeating what I have already said. He commented that the Interim Supply Bill, which is for a four month period actually, amounts to more than one third of the total Budget. Well, you know, he does not know what the total Budget is yet but I will let that go. But even if it does go more than one third,

DR. J. COLLINS:

I have already explained that. The Interim Supply Bill is perhaps larger than would ordinarily be expected because it includes in it funds for capital expenditures, but that is not something unique to this year. That has been done before. It was done last year. There was funding for new capital expenditures last year also. And it was done again this year for the very good reason that the economy is in a great deal of difficulty, not by our doing by and large - I do not suppose any government can say, you know, that they have no hand in how the economy is performing - but by and large it is not our doing. We do not have that much control from a monetary point of view over the economy, that is a federal responsibility. The economy is in trouble largely because of particular federal policies, and we have to try within the means available to us to counter these negative influences or these negative impacts in our part of the country from those federal policies. And the way we did was to pre-tender certain capital works. Now we could only pre-tender those works if the amount that was going to be expended on those capital works was included in the Interim Supply Bill. So that is why the Interim Supply Bill is rather larger than perhaps would ordinarily be expected.

Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) commented on the media - I just forget in what context now, but he said something about the media. I do not suppose again, you know, that we are all happy with the media, I know I had a little bit of a run-in with the media recently where I made a comment in response to one question and, lo and behold, it came out my comment was in relation to another question. The commentor posed another question and my comment to an entirely different question was added on to that and gave the whole thing a terribly wrong context. And I think the media, we in this

DR. J. COLLINS: House have a duty to bring our concerns about the media to their attention every once and a while when they do that. It is not so much that it is embarrassing to us, which it is to some extent, but it is misleading the people. And I think the media had a tremendous responsibility, by the very nature of the privileges they are given in this House, not to mislead the people. And I think sometimes the people are misled by doing things in the wrong context. Now another thing about the media that I might just mention, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) there said, you know, that we were illegal, that we did something illegal in regard to the Special Warrants that were brought in on March 31st, I must say that I think the media sort of asked him about that a little while ago and my view of things is that I thought the reporter came out much ahead of the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition was going on with his old, you know, really not

DR. COLLINS:

supportable arguments, that what was done was totally outside the precedents of what has been done in the past and totally outside what our Statutes say can be done, which is not so at all. And I think the reporter tackled him on that and pointed out the falacies in his arguments, and I think the whole thing about it, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) did not look too well at the end of the interview.

So I think that covers the points that have been raised so far.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

First of all, Sir, I regret now that I raised the matter about that interview when I was asked about whether we were carrying on a filibuster. I did not mean in any way, shape or form, Mr. Chairman, to give anybody a launching pad, especially the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collin), a launching pad to attack the media. That was not my reason for bringing it up. I regret very much now bringing it up, because it gave the Minister of Finance an opportunity, in a cowardly way, to attack the media, because they cannot defend themselves in this hon. House. The hon. gentleman had to sneak in his little snide remarks.

I heard one of the reporters the other day saying that - what was it he said about the minister? - 'He was sneering and jeering at the Opposition', I heard on radio the other day. Sneering and jeering.

DR. COLLINS: Misquoted. Misquoted.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman
was misquoted, was he?

DR. COLLINS: If you change your
expression you are misquoted again, obviously, in the
media. What daring.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon.
gentleman was certainly sneering. And this is becoming
now a landmark of this government. Their arrogance,
only after less than a week in the House, is starting
to come through to the people of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, with
regard to the other part of the hon. gentleman's
statement about how I was not right when I said that
things were done illegally, well, Mr. Crosbie, back in
1972, admitted that it was illegal.

MR. HODDER: And you cannot.

DR. COLLINS: You just said, 'Forget
the past'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman,
Mr. Bernard G. Carew, who happens to be a servant of
this House, who happens to be one of three servants of
this House in this Province, refused to give the
administration authority to spend \$129 million without
the authority of this House. What does the hon.
gentleman say about that? Mr. Carew, did he not know
what he was talking about?

DR. COLLINS: An excellent civil
servant.

MR. NEARY: An excellent civil
servant. Knew what he was talking about. Well, let us
see what he said: 'In accordance with the requirements
of the Financial Administration Act, I am writing to

MR. NEARY: inform you that I
must decline to issue money out of the Consolidated
Revenue Fund pursuant to the above noted warrant on
the grounds that there is no legislative authority
thereof'. Does that have a familiar ring? Is that

MR. NEARY:

what I said? That is precisely what I said, supported by the highest ranking public servant in the land, the Comptroller of the Public Treasury. And I say, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, again what I said the other day - it does not seem to get through to the hon. gentleman and he can sneer and jeer all he wants, and he can be as arrogant as he wants - once you remove the power of the purse from the floor of parliament you are taking away the only protection that the people out there have. The control of the purse strings rests with parliament, not with an elite clique down on the eighth floor of the Confederation Building. That is wrong.

And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) knows it is wrong and the Minister of Finance knows that he is asking this House to approve an unlawful act. Of course, they have the majority, and I am sure the new members over there think they will be doing the right thing because they will follow the Minister of Finance and they will vote, aye, for this bill, They will all vote in favour of it because the Minister of Finance can do no wrong. Well, he has been here for a few years. He is the Minister of Finance, they have the legal opinions of the Justice Department so therefore the Minister of Finance knows what he is doing and they will all follow him like a bunch of sheep.

MR. WARREN: But some of them will go astray eventually.

MR. NEARY: They will follow him over the cliff, over the cliff. These members who do not know the difference should realize that it is a no-no to spend, after a fiscal

MR. NEARY: year ends, without the authority of the legislature. Now you can do it by brute force, forty-four to eight. We can be outvoted, forty-four to eight. There is no way we can win. But I ask hon. gentlemen to remember this, that they when they vote in favour of that bill they are voting for an unlawful act committed by the administration.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is a pretty serious matter. And so there is nothing we can do about it, Mr. Chairman, nothing we can do about it. We can get down now to specifics and we can ask the minister a lot of questions about under the various sub-heads and how this money is going to be spent.

MR. NEARY:

Perhaps I could start off the questioning myself, and if the questions are short the answers should be equally as short, we may in the process be able to get some information. Because one of the big criticisms of the Opposition in the last few years has been that we have been making speeches and we have not been asking enough questions or getting enough information.

Now we are going to give the minister and his colleagues an opportunity to provide the people of this Province with the information.

I will start off with the Department of Energy. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what projects come under head of Expenditure VII - Mines and Energy, \$16,000,372? Can the hon. gentleman give us a breakdown and tell us how that \$16 million is made up? I will take my seat and I will give the hon. gentleman a chance to - he has his books there in front of him and I presume the civil servants have provided him with all the information - give us a breakdown of that \$16 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has asked a specific question and I will be glad to respond to that. But I will do it in just a moment because this question of the special warrants keeps coming up, and as long as it keeps coming up and the comments are put in such a way that it seems that this government has been acting illegally, I am going to respond and say that we did not act illegally, and I am going to point out why. Now we can go on with this forever, but I am not going to leave the last word with the Opposition that we acted illegally, that we acted outside authority. I am not

DR. COLLINS: going to leave it like that. So if we want to get on with this we will have to stop these comments because I insist I am going to correct any statements that I think are incorrect. I am not going to leave on the record an unanswered, incorrect statement in this regard because I think it is too serious. I think the people of the Province have a right to be assured that their government is not acting beyond its authority.

Now the impression is being left that if there is expenditure without the authority of this House that it is illegal. That is incorrect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: If that were so, there would be no such thing as warrants. Warrants are for the very purpose of making needed expenditures for which this House has not given the authority. If that were totally illegal, our Financial Administration Act should

DR. COLLINS: be amended to leave out all reference to warrants. So you can made expenditures without this House giving the authority. But having done that you then have to go through certain procedures to legitimize, shall we say, the issuance of the warrants and the expenditure of funds that flowed from that warrant. And that is exactly what this government did and they did it in the form that is laid out in the Financial Administration Act. And I do not wish to take up the time of the House unduly but I am going to read the section of the Financial Administration Act which lays out what has to be done in circumstances like that. It is Section 32, subsection (1) which reads as follows, and this section is given the title in the Financial Administration Act called 'Refusal to Make Payments'. So the Financial Administration Act has something in there where the Comptroller General- this particular act here speaks of the Comptroller but it is the same thing, we have changed the actual title of that very valuable public servant recently to that of Comptroller General, but the Comptroller in the act is the same person.

The act lays out procedures where it was anticipated, when the act came in, that the Comptroller or the Comptroller General may feel it incumbent to refuse to make payment, but the act then says what to do, what the government should do. And here is what Section 32, subsection (1) says: "If the Comptroller declines to cause an issue of public money out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund on the ground that the money is not justly due or that it is in excess of the authority granted by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council", that is Cabinet, "or that there is no legislative authority", that is special warrants, "or if he is in disagreement with a deputy head of a department charged with the administration of a particular service as

DR. COLLINS: to the state of the unencumbered balance of the appropriation authorized for such service, or if the Auditor General objects" - all these points, but you will notice that included in those points was 'lack of legislative authority' - "then upon a report of the case being submitted to the Board", and this means the Treasury Board, "the Board shall be the judge of the sufficiency of the objections and may sustain them or order payment to be made."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

DR. COLLINS: Now the act just lays out exactly what should be done. And that is what was done in this case.

MR. NEARY: That is within the fiscal year.

DR. COLLINS: The government followed precisely Section 32 of the Financial Administration Act. So there is absolutely no question that the government acted fully within its authority, and as it happened the

DR. COLLINS: Treasury Board, in this instance, in its judgement said that if these funds were not expended, there would be serious harm done to the public good. The public servants would not be paid, social services would not be paid, there would be environment and control measures that would not be taken, health measures would not be taken, educational services would have had to stop and so on, right down the line. All these things would have come to a dead halt. Now it would be totally and utterly irresponsible of government to allow that to happen.

The Act says, how to prevent it from happening and that is what the government did.

Now, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked for a breakdown of the expenditures under the allocations in the Interim Supply Bill for Mines and Energy. I do not know exactly now how we should handle this, because there are a lot of expenditures under that head.

Minister's Office: The total there is \$50,700. That will include salaries, supplies, transportation and communications, employee benefits and so on. Executive Support: That will be DM's, ADM's and so on and so forth. That amounts to \$89,900. Administrative Support; That is for the purchase of services and similar things, and it also includes a certain amount voted in other departments that Mines and Energy requires and that comes to - I am sorry, I am a bit slow on this because I have to add two columns here. It comes to \$87,900. So the total - this might be a more useful figure - the total, therefore, for that part, for the executive and support services for that four month period, comes to just over \$200,000.

May 13, 1982

Tape NO. 177

EL - 2

DR. COLLINS: In mineral development the total -
well, I will have to go through the whole thing I guess -
mineral development, administration is \$75,000; regional
mapping was \$550,000;

May 13, 1982

Tape No. 178

MJ - 1

DR. J. COLLINS: geo-chemistry, the total amount there was \$262,000; mineral deposits, that was \$227,000; environmental geology, that was \$188,000; publications and information, there was a certain amount of revenue there so I will give you the net figure \$213,400; core storage - this is where drilling is done and materials are obtained and these had to be stored somewhere - was \$180,000; so the total therefore for mineral development, that part of the Mines and Energy Department, came to \$1,791,200. Then Mineral Lands Administration, the total there was \$7,600; mineral rights was \$46,700; quarry materials, \$31,800; mines management; That is broken under several headings. Administration, \$26,100; engineering analysis, \$43,800; mineral policy and project analysis, \$58,000. So the total, therefore, for mineral resources management came out to be \$2,270,400. The next section then is Energy Resources Management. My time is running out so perhaps I could give the total for Energy Resources Management. The total for Energy Resources Management came to just over \$200,000. It is \$133,700 plus \$68,900 - I cannot add quick enough. Then the next section was Conservation and Renewable Energy Resource Development. Could I -

MR. NEARY: I will tell you, I will just respond to the early part of your remarks and then you can come back and finish answering the question.

DR. COLLINS: Right.

MR. NEARY: I want to get back to the Financial Administration Act, Mr. Chairman, and I want to say that I was shocked and amazed to hear the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for this Province get up and show his complete ignorance of the Financial Administration Act. His complete ignorance. And the hon. gentleman tried to twist it by saying that the authority for doing something

MR. NEARY: unlawful was Section 32 of the Financial Administration Act. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman and anybody who is experienced in this House knows that that is not the purpose of this section of the act. The purpose of this section of the Financial Administration Act is to issue Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants in a fiscal year, within a fiscal year from the 1st of April to March 31st. Once the fiscal year ends, no more money. And the Lieutenant-Governor would have been perfectly within his rights to refuse to sign these warrants - no reflection on His Honour - which he should have done, because warrants were signed without the authority of this Legislature. And the minister would not table the legal opinion. It was not an independent legal opinion. But even the one they had from their own servants, the hon. gentleman refused to table it. There is no way that you can twist this section of the act, Mr. Chairman, to give the administration the authority to do something unlawful. Let me repeat again that Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants are not issued for spending after the fiscal year has ended. Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants are only issued within the fiscal year for unforeseen happenings, for unforeseen expenditure, extraordinary expenditure, and the only way that you can spend money without the authority of the Legislature is in case of an emergency, like a Third World War or something like that. That is the only reason. An earthquake or a flood or a Third World War, that is the only reason you can spend money without the authority of this Legislature. That is why we are here. That is why Parliament exists, Mr. Chairman. So I hope I never hear again from the Minister of Finance of this Province - the man who has

MR. NEARY: control over the public purse, the man who has it in his hands to collect revenue and spend money on behalf of the people of this Province, gets up and tells us that the government did nothing unlawful, that they did not need the authority of the Legislature to spend \$129 million. It is time, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman believes that, it is time either for the Premier to give him the Royal Order of the Boot or he should pass in his resignation. Because, obviously the gentleman is completely unfamiliar, deliberately or otherwise, with the tradition of Parliament,

MR. NEARY: with the functions of parliament, and with the real reason why parliament exists. And I hope that nobody in the media in this Province - look, Mr. Chairman, I am awfully discouraged and disillusioned. You can con-the minister with his straight face, and he is an honest looking fellow, and he soundssincere, and it is easy for him to con people. I remember the day I called a news conference to say that the administration had done something illegal. The first response was, "Oh," from a newsman, "Oh, they have not done anything illegal because the minister said they got a legal opinion from the Justice Department and under section 32 of the act they could have done it."

I called the gentleman up and I said to him, "What is your authority for saying that my statements are incorrect?" He said, "Because of the legal opinion they got." Because of the legal opinion. What legal opinion? Legal opinion from their own employees. The Comptroller of the Treasury should be the opinion. The editorial writers in this Province should be hopping mad, Mr. Chairman, they should be hopping mad. They should come down on this administration like a ton of brick for carrying out this unlawful act. And they are allowed to get away with it. They are allowed to get away with it.

Mr. Chairman, there is no need for this House to exist at all if that is the way we are going to run this poor, old Province of ours, with its colourful and historic background. Shut her down. Shut her down and let the clique down on the eighth floor run the Province.

DR. COLLINS: They should cut down on your time.

MR. NEARY: I am sure, Mr. Chairman, either the hon. gentleman made that statement with tongue in cheek, or he made it out of complete ignorance of the Financial Administration Act and how to run the finances of this Province, made it out of complete ignorance. And he is able to con a few old news reporters, he is able to con them into saying, "Well, sure it is all right." The fact of the matter is that the only thing that will make it right is this, the only thing that will make it right, Mr. Chairman, is this, that they have forty-four members and we have eight. If you were into a tight situation in this House, I guarantee you it would not be that way. Because with brute force they can ram this bill through the House. They could invoke closure if they wanted to. They can outvote us and that is the only reason

MR. NEARY:

that that unlawful act will be made lawful, because they will outvote us. That is the only reason, Mr. Chairman. And I hope that is clear in people's minds.

It is a no, no. It is not done in any part of the world. To spend \$129 million of taxpayer money without the elected representatives of the people approving it, authorizing it, it is just not done. It is a no, no. And the minister knows it is not done. And the minister knows he is twisting the Financial Administration Act. If the hon. gentleman was doing his job, he would table the legal opinion.

MR. CALLAN:

It is just as illegal

as (inaudible). Just as illegal.

MR. NEARY:

And the minister can squirm all he wants. The minister can squirm all he wants, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, after hearing the remarks from the lips of the hon. gentleman, I would suggest that it is time in this Province— unless we want to close down, put the sign on the door out there, saying, "Closed", "Gone out of Business", everything is going to be decided on the eighth floor, shut her down, no more double salaries, no more expense allowance, shut her down, decide everything on the eighth floor, go all the way and have a complete dictatorship in this Province, decide everything down on the eighth floor.

Mr. Chairman, did Your Honour ever ask yourself the question why is interim supply brought into the House in the first Place? Why is supplementary supply brought in? Why is a budget brought into the House, Mr. Chairman? Why? Why is it necessary to bring interim supply in? Why? Why, Mr. Chairman? Because the government, the administration have no authority after the fiscal year ends to spend money.

MR. NEARY: That is why. That is the principle of interim supply. And this foolish nonsense about the Premier's right to call an election overrides everything else, oh, Mr. Chairman, who is going to swallow that? Who is going to swallow that argument? The Premier's right to call an election overrides everthing else.

MR. DAWE: He is representing the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: There is the arrogance, boy. There is the arrogance again.

MR. NEARY: Listen to the arrogance. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make that point in the event that some of these shiny-nosed, innocent looking little new members of the House look up to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and to the administration and they say - wild-eyed and shiny-nosed - look at the Minister of Finance and say, "Well the Minister of Finance must know what he is doing,

MR. NEARY: He is Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), he must know what he is doing. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is doing. All he is doing is conning this House, members on that side of the House, and he is conning some members of the media into thinking that it is legal. It is an non-lawful act. And now I will take my seat, Mr. Chairman, and allow the hon. gentleman to give us the specific information. But I have to tell the hon. gentleman that if he keeps it up, if he wants to be here until the middle of next week on interim supply, that is perfectly okay with us.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. MORGAN: You are having great trouble there.

MR. WINDSOR: There is not much room on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, for somebody as big as me. I will tell you, we are really jammed in here. I wish we had as much room as hon. gentlemen over there.

MR. YOUNG: We have not got standing room.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR: I do not know about my belt, Mr. Chairman, but my shoes are much too big for hon. gentlemen opposite, I can guarantee you that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman, I find it really amazing, some of the comments coming from hon. gentlemen opposite and what they really find important. You know, it is a sad testimony when we stand here with seventy-five hours allocated for studying the Budget of this government, and the estimates of this Budget and hon. gentlemen are taking up a great deal of time with rhetoric, talking about things that are very generally related, I suppose. But I find it amazing, some of the questions and some of the criticism that is pointed at this government over

MR. WINDSOR: a year, that hon. gentlemen opposite would not be more interested in getting on with the business of this House and getting down to some of the details of the budget when it comes down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman, you know, as hon. gentlemen know, the time that is being spent here now on interim supply is coming from the time that is allocated to the budget. They will have their opportunity in committees to speak to the budget, they will have opportunities to deal with the issues and the new programmes and initiatives that will be announced by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in his budget. So I would suggest that that could be a much more useful, a much more valuable use of the House's time than some of the rhetoric that we are hearing from hon. gentlemen opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, wanted to talk about Mines and Energy and some of the energy developments that are being proposed by government. And he is talking about the interim supply, the tremendous amount of money here. This is obviously, Mr. Chairman - the hon. gentleman, I do not know if he has looked at the details of the Interim Supply Bill, but the Interim Supply Bill basically provides enough money for the ongoing programmes of the Department of Mines and Energy, and those programmes include a whole host of things, the control and management of the mineral resources of this Province and the hydro resources of this Province, which are absolutely essential. And some of the programmes that are here,

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. gentleman opposite probably has not heard about them. But there are numerous programmes in renewable energy, conservation of energy, mineral identification, mapping of mineral resources in this Province and identifying some of the resources that are available, something useful and productive, Mr. Chairman, in trying to identify opportunities for development of the resources of this Province which, of course, is in the Department of Development for which my main responsibility is one of the chief objects of that department. And I am very pleased to have the opportunity to have some input into the work of the Department of Mines and Energy.

Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen have talked about some of the power potentials of our Province, and all. Have they every stopped to think that the potential of the Lower Churchill, and we are talking about in here as well some of the money that we are spending in trying to - not identify it because we have already identified that potential - but some of the money that we are spending in trying to develop that particular potential. And they sit there and they criticize some of the smaller points. I would like to hear what their opinion is, Mr. Chairman, on the fact that the Lower Churchill is not yet under development. I would like to know how they can sit there opposite and support a Party in Ottawa that has not yet come forward with it, that has not given us an opportunity to develop that potential. And they talk about oil and gas. Well, I would like to talk about hydro power and the potential of the Lower Churchill. Do they know, Mr. Chairman, opposite, that the Lower Churchill has a potential to generate some 2,300 megawatts of power? 2,300 megawatts of power. And do you know what that is in terms of oil and gas, Mr. Chairman? Do you know what that is equivalent to? The energy equivalent of 75,000 barrels of oil per day, forever. A renewable resource

MR. WINDSOR: versus a non-renewable resource offshore - 75,000 barrels of oil per day, forever. That is a phenomenal resource, Mr. Chairman, which has not yet been developed. Well, what does that mean to Canada? And what does it mean to the Province? The fact of the matter is, if you realize that the Government of Canada subsidizes oil that is imported into Canada from mid-East countries or whatever, putting aside for a moment the fact that that therefore gives control over energy in this Province to a foreign nation, or the cost of energy, putting that aside, realizing that we are subsidizing every barrel of oil that comes into Canada to the amount of twenty dollars per barrel, that 75,000 barrels or the equivalent of 75,000 means that Canada is sending out of Canada \$1.5 million a day every day that the Lower Churchill is not developed. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a national disgrace. And that resource, in fact, should be developed not only for Newfoundland but for Canada. It is in the national interest. And if the federal government wants to talk about being energy self-sufficient, well let us talk about the Lower Churchill and let us talk about getting that developed. And in the short-term let us

MR. N. WINDSOR: create the 2,000 or 3,000 jobs that would be created there and let us spend the \$5 billion or \$6 billion that would need to be spent on construction activity in this Province and elsewhere in Canada in order to develop that particular resource potential and let us get moving with the job if they want to be energy self-sufficient by 1990 or 1995. Well let us move on with it, and let us have the opportunity to displace the thermal generated power at Holyrood. Let us stop buying oil and importing oil into Canada and into Newfoundland to generate electricity when we have the potential to generate it in Labrador. Let us displace those 450 megawatts and let us have the energy available -

MR. TULK; Well do it. Come on. Just do it.

MR. WINDSOR: I would love to.

MR. TULK: You would love to?

MR. WINDSOR: Yes.

MR. HISCOCK: Do it.

MR. WINDSOR: Grand.

MR. HISCOCK: The federal government gave \$200 million.

MR. WINDSOR: No problem, Mr. Chairman, no

problem. If the hon. gentleman opposite were sitting in Ottawa I can tell from their comments that they would gladly give us a power corridor through Quebec, they would gladly give us the opportunity to sell that power, they would gladly finance the CFLCo and the Lower Churchill Development so that we could move ahead. They would gladly help us with the aluminum smelter, Mr. Chairman, which will be one of the major energy intensive industries that we are trying to attract to this Province, having done an exhaustive study, Mr. Chairman, of the opportunities to utilize some of this energy potential in our Province. Because I, for one, do not believe that we should

May 13, 1982

Tape No. 184

MJ - 2

MR. N. WINDSOR: be exporting raw materials. When I see electricity going out of our Province, I see that as a raw material that is going out, I would like to see some of the energy potential used in the Province. If you want to use it - you want to export some of it in the short term so that you have the recall rights to meet domestic load growth as it becomes necessary. In the short term you want to be able to export some of that power and, as I said, you want to be able to use some of that energy for energy intensive industries. Our exhaustive studies showed very clearly that the aluminum industry has the greatest potential in this Province for developing energy intensive industry. And we have been actively pursuing that. We put together in conjunction with the Department of Development and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro a marketing brochure and a marketing effort worldwide and talked to all of the aluminum companies worldwide that we thought may have some interest in establishing a smelter in our Province. The result of that was that no less than some eighteen companies, I think it was, had showed some interest to varying degrees in establishing an industry here in our Province and, in fact, many of them have done a great deal of investigation, including detailed engineering work. The ultimate result of that, of course, was that at the moment the Anaconda Aluminum Company in conjunction with the government are undertaking and are now carrying out a \$500,000 study of the aluminum industry potential in Labrador and on the Western side of the Province to decide, first of all, if it is feasible technically and economically and, secondly, just exactly where such an industry should best be located.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. R. Aylward): One minute left.

MR. WINDSOR: One minute. It is amazing

MR. HODDER: I have questions for the Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Get him back in his seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is trying to get a rise out of me because it is my first afternoon in the Chair, but I am sure if the hon. minister wants to come back he will do so.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to get a rise out of Your Honour. As a matter of fact, I welcome Your Honour to the Chair for the first time, and I -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - know that Your Honour is going to do a good job, but, Mr. Chairman, we want to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) questions. The hon. gentleman has these two books on his desk with the information inside the covers. Why do we not just rise the Committee for ten or fifteen minutes so that we can find the Minister of Finance?

MR. WINDSOR: If the hon. gentleman will not ask his questions, he should sit down.

MR. NEARY: We have all kinds of questions for the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR: Well, put them forward and wait for us to answer them.

MR. HODDER: Well, ask him some questions. See if he can answer the question on the environment here: Where is the one million-and-something for the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me ask the hon. gentleman a question, he is so cocky over there. Could he tell us what the amount - there is

MR. NEARY: an amount here for the Justice Department of \$20 million, Could the hon. gentleman give us a breakdown of that?

MR. WINDSOR: Sit down and we will attempt it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, okay. Give us a breakdown.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman wants to make his speech, then we will take our opportunity to -

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, that is ridiculous.

MR. NEARY: Well, could the hon. gentleman give us a breakdown of Culture, Recreation and Youth?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Yes, give us a breakdown of what this - \$14 million, could we have a breakdown of that?

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Oh, well, we have the minister back in his seat. Okay.

MR. LUSH: It is a total breakdown by the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

I am waiting for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). It was the day before yesterday I asked the Minister of Finance specific questions, and the questions were directed towards the Department of Education, which was spending \$165 million. There were also questions geared towards the Department of Public Works, \$25 million. I asked the minister at that time if he could provide me with a detailed breakdown of what was happening in those departments, how much capital construction was going on in those departments.

The minister said at that time to go through the sub-heads of the budget and I would basically get them and ongoing programmes for each year. This is quite true. But as the minister has pointed out, this is one-third of our actual budget and one of the reasons why it is one-third of our actual budget is because of the Capital Works projects in it. And I was specifically asking the minister, with regards to Public Works and the Department of Education and the Department of Municipal Affairs, how much of this was actually going into Capital Works projects - particularly in Municipal Affairs and Public Works.

But to get into a little more specific details, and I would like for the minister to provide me with them, I told him he could provide them in writing. I also said that I was quite ready to wait three or four days for them. But with regard to that, I have some specific questions. Could the Minister of Finance tell us how much the government is going to be spending on buying cars and trucks and other vehicles for the government this year? Could the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) also tell us how much

MR. HISCOCK: is going to be spent on snow-clearing equipment, etc., and, also, with regard to the part of Public Works where they buy their government supplies? Could the minister inform this House how much it is costing this government for revovation of the military museum in the Murray Premises? How much is it actually costing to renovate the military museum in the Murray Premises? Also, how much rent are we paying there? This has been ongoing since 1979. We have had the 11th Floor vacated because of the museum moving and it is going to be turned into a conference centre. Could the minister inform us when we can expect this conference centre to be finished?

MR. HISCOCK: How much is it costing?
Also, what is it going to be used for? Who is going to be using that conference centre? With regards to the Department of Public Works, would the minister inform us how much is being allocated for the construction of the new Confederation Building that was brought up during last year's estimates, if there is any money allocated for planning, if there is any money allocated for engineering for the new Confederation Building?

MR. HODDER: Agreed. . Agreed.

MR. HISCOCK: Also, if the minister could provide us with information, are there any other new buildings being constructed around this Province under the Department of Public Works, and, if so , which ones? With regard to other things, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister of Finance also tell us how much the Department of Public Works spent on the framing and buying of pictures by Rostotski, one of the leading photographers in this Province, buying pictures of the Premier to put in the Department of Fisheries, for example, the Department of Labour and various others. With regard to Municipal Affairs, could the minister inform this House how much is being spent on new sixty/forty cost sharing programmes between the Department of Municipal Affairs and other councils?

MR. LUSH: I am going up to the conference centre now to check it out.

MR. HISCOCK: And, also, with regard to Municipal Affairs, could he inform us how many guaranteed

MR. HISCOCK: loans are going to be supplied in this interim supply? Of something like \$28 million, how much of this is going to be guaranteed loans to Municipal Affairs, councils? Also, with regard to Municipal Affairs, could the minister inform this House of any money that is going to be spent with regard to engineering, in co-operation with the City Council? With the construction of a new Convention Centre, the possibility of having this, is the Department of Municipal Affairs going to share in this cost sharing programme?

With regard to this department, I think it would be a little easier and it would save my time and save the House's time and save the minister's time if we would just go through the various departments, Public Works and Municipal Affairs, and give

MR. HISCOCK: the general breakdown.
That way, I think, it would save time, unless it is top secret. If it is top secret, then obviously it is not going to be provided at all.

I am concerned about the debt, how much debt the Province has with regard to debts of our town councils and our community councils. How much of that is outstanding? How much of that is missing?

The Department of Municipal Affairs has charged a surcharge of 15 per cent on outstanding debts. Could the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) inform us how much of this \$28 million is expected to be spent on the administration of this, to try to recover the 15 per cent surcharge that has been put on? I believe, Mr. Chairman, these are a few of the questions, and if we get the answers to these questions, I, for myself, will approve the interim supply, being the critic for those two departments.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, many of the questions that the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) has asked, I put it to him that they are really not appropriate for the matter before the Committee at the present time. The matter before the -

MR. NEARY: Then why did you not say so?

DR. COLLINS: No, let me explain now.

MR. NEARY: Six hundred and seventy five million dollars in Interim Supplies.

DR. COLLINS: Just let me explain now.

DR. COLLINS: What is before the Committee now are the expenditures for the four month period from the beginning of April to the end of July, that are included under the Interim Supply Bill.

Now, the hon. member, for instance, asked how much was spent on photography. He mentioned the firm, I believe. That really is information that is in the public accounts. It is not in the Interim Supply Bill. There is no expenditure for photography in the Interim Supply Bill. We are not going to spend, to my knowledge anyway, unless I can, perhaps, dig through and I might find out someone who is going to get a picture of Signal Hill or something to put in his office. That might be in there somewhere, or something like that. But the expenditures on photography that the hon. member is asking for is going to be in the public accounts which will be tabled in this House at some point in time. It is not going to be in the Interim Supply Bill.

Similarly he asked what is going to be the expenditure, say, on the new Confederation Building. In the Interim Supply Bill there is going to be no expenditure. Now when the main estimates are come down, there will be an amount in there that will have to do with planning and probably some engineering studies and that sort of thing. But they will not be during the interim supply period, they will be after the end of July and they will be in the main estimates.

MR. NEARY: What have you got in those books you have there?

DR. COLLINS: The hon. the member did ask me though what are the

DR. COLLINS: details in Public Works and Municipal Affairs. You know, I have all of that information here. And I have already given it to the hon. Leader of the Opposition in regard to Mines and Energy. I had not quite completed it -

MR. NEARY: How about Housing?

DR. COLLINS: - I got about two-thirds of the way through. I am quite willing to go back to that. The hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Windsor), I think, did carry on and perhaps gave out some information.

MR. NEARY: All he did was just get up and scoff at us.

DR. COLLINS: But perhaps before going back to that I should answer the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) who was the last one to speak. And in Public Works, for instance, in the minister's office for this interim supply period, a four month period, there is an expenditure allocated of \$36,200; that includes salaries, transportation and communications, supplies and so on. And it is just the amounts that would ordinarily be expended during such period.

MR. YOUNG: Money well spent.

DR. COLLINS: In general administration -

MR. YOUNG: Money to pay light bills and telephone bills.

DR. COLLINS: - executive support, a part of general administration, there will be a total expenditure of \$82,000 which again will cover salaries for the deputy minister, for instance, the assistant deputy minister and so on; for purchase of services for executive offices and for transportation and communications, such payment of telephones, and necessary travel by the executive officers of the department.

Then for administrative support there is a total there of \$371,700. Again that is for salaries,

DR. COLLINS: for supplies, for professional services, for purchase of services, and for communication and transportation. So the total for general administration - I am sorry, the total for executive and support services comes out to be \$424,500.

Then the next one is technical service for building and supplies. Under planning and support we have an expenditure for design purposes of just over \$84,000; for tendering and contracts, which is an ongoing activity in the Department of Public Works, we have an expenditure there of \$29,500.

Then the next heading is building operation. That is quite a large one, obviously.

MR. YOUNG:

That is all the buildings.

DR. COLLINS:

I will see if I can get a total figure on that one.

MR. YOUNG: Yes, 522 Buildings.

DR. COLLINS: I will come across a total figure so I will have to go through it. Under administration in that section there is \$132,000 for cleaning services, for salaries and purchase of services, contracts and so on. The total there will be \$1,825,000 for a four month period. Water supplies - you use an awful lot of water in the department of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG: Yes, to keep the place clean.

DR. COLLINS: Water supplies will be \$48,000. Electrical utilities will be \$800,000. That is electrical utilities cost for all government buildings. Heating supplies, the total amount there is another \$800,000 for that four month period. Telephones will be -

MR. YOUNG: That is shocking.

DR. COLLINS: Yes. Telephones will be \$1,500,000 for four months. Snow removal for the four month period in the Public Works and Services Department, \$100,000. Garbage removal - garbage removal?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, that is right, Sir, they took that out of the Opposition members' offices.

DR. COLLINS: \$150,000 worth of garbage was removed in the four month period.

Security, there is \$825,000. Elevator control; \$90,000 spent on elevator control. Fire protection; \$15,000 spent on fire protection. Mechanical and electrical control, \$100,000. So here is the total I was looking for earlier. The total for building operations for a four month period, the operating of all government buildings, is \$6,402,000. Over \$6 million to operate government buildings for a four month period. That is the operation of the buildings.

DR. COLLINS:

Now we get on to the maintenance, this is repairs and so on. In the administration section - there is a large number of employees there of course - there is \$1.5 million approximately. Programme maintenance, the amount there is over \$2 million. So the total for building maintenance, all government buildings, comes to over \$6 million.

Then leased accommodations, in leases - I must see if I got a total figure on that - yes, total for leased accommodations is \$5,492,500. These are buildings and offices leased in buildings outside those buildings owned by government.

Construction, this is administration and project management,

May 13, 1982

Tape No. 191

MJ - 1

DR. J. COLLINS: \$225,000; improvements to land and property, the total there is \$410,000; so the total for provincial buildings and grounds - the figure I cannot make out there, but it is about \$17 million, the total for Provincial buildings and grounds. Government purchasing agency, the total amount there is \$854,800. So I can go on if I wish, I do not know if this information -

MR. HISCOCK: The Military Museum, how much are you paying there?

DR. COLLINS: Pardon.

MR. HODDER: The Military Museum, how much are you paying there?

DR. COLLINS: The Military Museum is in a rented premises so that will be included in the rental I gave you. I do not have that identified here, but I certainly can get it for the hon. member. I can ask someone in my department.

MR. HODDER: Can you get it now?

DR. COLLINS: I can get it now.

MR. HODDER: Where is the Military Museum now, is it in the Murray Premises?

DR. COLLINS: It is in the Murray Premises.

MR. HODDER: It is there? People can go down and see it? I can go down and see it if I want to see it now?

DR. COLLINS: I have never been in there, I must admit. I presume you can. I am sorry I have never been there myself, but I do not see any reason why you cannot.

MR. HODDER: I would hope that you would.

DR. COLLINS: But perhaps it is not open, I do not know.

MR. HODDER: Can the Minister of Public Works (Mr. H. Young) tell us whether we can go down and see it this

MR. J. HODDER: evening?

MR. H. YOUNG: We will have to close the House now and take you down.

DR. COLLINS: I think my time has expired.

MR. HODDER: When was it placed there?

MR. YOUNG: We relocated it on Water Street a long time ago.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Military Museum - I hope the Minister of Finance does not run away.

DR. COLLINS: No, I can hear you from here.

MR. NEARY: In connection with the Military Museum, my understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that the Military Museum which used to occupy the tenth floor of Confederation Building -

MR. HODDER: The eleventh. The eleventh.

MR. NEARY: - the eleventh floor of Confederation Building was shut down in 1979, over three years ago, and the historic objects and the artifacts were put in storage. Is that correct? Who is responsible for museums, by the way? They were put in storage and space was rented in the Murray Premises, down on the Waterfront, is that correct?

MR. SIMMS: I will just have to take note of it.

MR. TULK: You could add something there, Mr. Minister.

MR. NEARY: Well, space was rented in the Murray Premises down on the Waterfront in 1979, and the taxpayers

May 13, 1982

Tape No. 192

RA - 1

MR. S. NEARY: of this Province have been paying rent for that space ever since. Is that correct?

MR. SIMMS: I am sorry.

MR. S. NEARY: I presume we are paying our rent down there, are we?

MR. H. YOUNG: We pay every cent I can guarantee you that.

MR. S. NEARY: And the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) just confirmed that we are paying every cent. Every cent rent due to the Murray Premises has been paid.

MR. H. YOUNG: We are just paying what rent we owe.

MR. S. NEARY: And so, Mr. Chairman, it has now been established that we are paying rent and we have been paying rent since 1979 to the owners of the Murray Premises for housing the Military Museum.

MR. HODDER: But the museum has not been there, it was in storage as you just confirmed 'Haig'.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, the question my colleague asked the minister is to tell us if it is now possible to visit that Military Museum. Can students from schools around Newfoundland, can people visiting from other provinces, can the people out there in the outside world, can members of this House now go down and visit that Military Museum? We have been paying rent since 1979, and I would think it is pretty good rent-

MR. WARREN: Who owns that? Who runs that?

MR. S. NEARY: -down at the Murray Premises, so I would like to know if it is open now to the public. Before we pass this are we going to get the answers?

MR. HODDER: Is it open to the public? To start questioning.

MR. S. NEARY: Is it open to the public? Is there anybody on that side of the House who can tell us if the Military Museum is open to the public, down in the Murray Premises?

MR. YOUNG: No, no. It is not open yet.

MR. NEARY: It is not open yet. Well, why is it not open?

AN HON. MEMBER: 'Steve' sit down and let somebody help you.

MR. NEARY: Well, is there anybody on that side of the House who can answer the question? The government is asking for \$675 million in interim supply and they cannot answer a simple question as to whether the Military Museum, which was moved almost four years ago from the 11th floor of Confederation Building down to the Murray Premises, they cannot even tell us if it is open yet.

MR. YOUNG: It is not open.

MR. NEARY: It is not open? Alright I will take the Minister of Public Works' (Mr. Young) word.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): If I could interrupt the hon. member for one moment. It being 5 o'clock, I have to inform the House that there are no items for debate at 5:30. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Now I take the Minister of Public Works' word for it that the museum is not open. Now, can the minister tell us why it is not open?

MR. YOUNG: The contract is not finished.

MR. HODDER: You mean the contractor - but this has been four years.

MR. NEARY: Can anybody tell us why it

MR. NEARY: is not open? Can anybody over on that side tell us if public tenders were called?

MR. HODDER: Were you tied up in that too?

MR. NEARY: Were public tenders called for that spacedown in the Murray Premises? And can anybody tell us if the Premier personally intervened on behalf of his buddy, his friend who owns the Murray Premises?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. NEARY: No?

MR. HODDER: No?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Clark asked the same question of the Prime Minister in Ottawa yesterday about an architect who was hired by the Government of Canada to build a building in Washington, so if it is all right for Mr. Joe Clark to ask the question, who is the Tory Leader in Canada, I guess it is all right for me to ask it.

MR. WARREN: Sure. Sure.

MR. BAIRD: You are not half the man Joe Clark is.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. BAIRD: You are not half the man Joe Clark is.

MR. WARREN: Thank God for that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, are we going to be able to get any information on this -

MR. CALLAN: He is not half the man, he is twice the man.

MR. NEARY: - on this military museum? How much has it cost for renovations on it so far? And why is it not open? Can the hon. gentleman tell us?

MR. CALLAN: Joe who?

MR. NEARY: I will take my seat if the hon. gentleman will give us the information. Somebody over there give us some information.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and others have asked a large number of questions about Murray Premises. I have to state that we - for the purpose of this Committee, we are on the Interim Supply Bill. So the information that I am getting in terms of dollars is, how much is in this Interim Supply Bill in regard to the Murray Premises? It would be largely in terms of rental and so on. I have one of my officials now going to get the exact dollars.

There are a large number of other questions which are not appropriate to the Interim Supply Bill. They are asking, you know, who did what and so on and so forth. That has got nothing to do with the Interim Supply Bill. But I will say this about the Murray Premises, that is one of the best restored buildings in Eastern Canada -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: - and it is a credit to this city, it is a credit to this Province, it is something that all the visitors to St. John's visit. All the people who come to this part of the Province on tours, on visitations, on visits to their relatives and so on, they will go to Cabot Tower, they will possibly go out to Bowring Park or whatever, and then they will go down to the Murray Premises. And I think that if there were awards given, and I hope that at some stage awards will be given for restoration of heritage buildings in this Province, I think if awards were given the Murray Premises would either win the first or would certainly be high up on the list. And I think it was only right that the Province itself

DR. COLLINS: should contribute. It should not all be left just to private firms to take space in that restored building. But I think it is quite appropriate that government itself should, if it needs accommodation outside buildings that it owns itself, should also look to taking up space in that premises. And that is what government did. And it decided that it would be very appropriate to have our Military Museum down there. Now if anyone knows anything about museums you just do not take your exhibits and put them down into a building that was constructed - what? - ninety years ago, a hundred years ago or whatever, not for that purpose but constructed as a storage shed, you do not take your exhibits and put them in there without taking the appropriate measures to make sure that those exhibits will not deteriorate. So there had to be renovations done to the space down there that was appropriate for museum purposes. And that is why it is taking so long to do the renovations down there. And I am sure that when the renovations are completed not only will the exhibits be secure, not just for this generation but for generations to come, not only will they be secure but they will be displayed in a tasteful and instructive manner that will do well for all the citizens of this Province and for all the visitors who come to this Province.

Now I am going to get the dollar figures either today, if my official can come up with them today, or if not, by tomorrow. I will come up with the dollar figures, as in the Interim Supply Bill in relation to the museum at the Murray Premises. The figures obviously are not here yet or someone would be giving me an indication. But I will find out the dollars that are in the Interim Supply Bill for the purposes of the Military Museum.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the question about the Murray Premises, when I asked the question I asked from the point of view that we in the Opposition have been asking for office space, as well as government backbenchers have been asking for office space, and we were told that when the museum was moved out we would get some space. I also know that it has not been open since -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: I also know that the Province has been paying rent since 1979. I also realize that when you are developing a museum you need to take a certain amount of time. When the minister tables how much is going to be spent on it, I want to know how much has been spent on it, who has the contract, what were the terms of the contract, when were the tenders called, were they open tenders, how many other companies submitted tenders and, with regard to it, how much has it

MR. HISCOCK: over exceeded the original cost? Has it gone over? Because it has been four years now, due to inflation, due to other rising costs, is there a built in escalating clause in that contract? Because a four year contract is a long time to do a small museum. It really is not that large.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the other one, where are the artifacts being stored? Are we paying rent for storing these artifacts? I am sure a lot of people would like to know. As the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) asked, where is the Newfoundland dog? But with regard to the other things, how much is actually being spent in renovating this? How much is being spent on the conference centre on the 11th. Floor? When can we expect the museum to be opened? Why is it not open after four years? When can we expect to have the conference centre on the 11th. Floor opened? Who has the tender to do that? Is Public Works doing that itself?

MR. YOUNG: No, it went to public tender.

MR. HISCOCK: Public tender. When was that called? What were the terms of reference of these public tenders? And how much will it cost the taxpayers to do these?

These are the things, Mr. Chairman -I am directing my questions to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), because I think they are important. I think there are a lot of questions that have to be asked and the government has to be accountable. Here is a building that has not been used in four years. We are still waiting , and it is a good possibility that it will not be ready for this year. And I think what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said is quite right.

MR. HISCOCK: Was there any influence used in Cabinet by any Cabinet ministers, by the Premier, or by any friends of political persuasion, the Progressive Conservative Party, in awarding this tender? Because, if so, then I think this should be brought up to the Auditor General and looked into. I think that after four years, Mr. Chairman, there should be some progress. I would like also for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to tell us at what stage both these projects are. Are they finished? Are they near finished? Are they three-quarters finished? How much more will we have to spend on finishing these projects and when could we expect a completion date to both of these projects.

These are some of the things that I think are important. I would like to have the papers that the public tenders were printed in, The Daily News and The Evening Telegram, and what companies were rejected and for what reason? And were they given any artistic reason for setting up the Museum? Because not everybody,

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said, not every company can actually build a building that will be up to national standards for preserving artifacts. We have only the originals of many of these things and these are the last objects. They should be in good environmental conditions so we should follow the national standards. And I would like to know if those standards were followed, if those were in the terms of the tenders when they were called. Or did we actually just go and give a tender to renovate the building, put a few glass cases down there and then call it the museum, thereby allowing the manager or the owner of that building to get a substantial return.

In regard to the rental space in the Murray Premises is it in proportion to other rental space that has been rented by some of the commercial businesses? Is the amount of money that we are paying per square foot comparable to commercial space that is being rented down in those areas? Those are some of the questions, Mr Chairman, I direct to the Minister of Finance and hopefully he will be able to table the answers.

I would also like to have some information in detail about the Department of Municipal Affairs.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have a few questions I wish to ask the minister, in particular pertaining to the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. I notice there is \$15 million allotted in the Interim Supply Bill. I am just wondering if the minister can outline some of the expenditures this \$15 million is comprised of. And also, Mr. Chairman, under the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth - I think the minister probably has been trying to get some

MR. WARREN: facts and figures - but of this \$11 million can the minister advise how much of this \$11 million has been paid to Mr. Ryan at the Murray Premises, the exact number of dollars that has been paid to Mr. Ryan at the Murray Premises?

And, Mr. Chairman, under the Department of Social Services, \$57,890,000, I am just wondering, Mr. Chairman, has any of this money been used for programmes or has it just gone out to social assistance recipients? So, Mr. Chairman, those are three of the departments that I am attempting to shadow. However, I would like for the minister to be as co-operative

May 13, 1982

Tape No. 197

NM - 1

MR. WARREN: with me as possible, and give me a run-down on those three departments, as precisely and closely as possible.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, as I have already indicated, I am going to get the dollar figures that are in the Interim Supply Bill in regard to Murray Premises, and I will give those to the Committee as soon as they come into my hands.

Now, the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) asked questions such as: Was there tendering for the renovations. Yes, there was tendering. All contracts of that nature are tendered, are subject to public tendering and that was done in this case. When contracts were let, there was a public announcement on it, it was indicated who got the contracts. So that is all public knowledge.

In regard to the Murray Premises for the Military Museum, it was Marco Limited or Incorporated. The amount I will get precisely, but it was something of the order of \$390,000, something of that order. That is not, I do not think, the precise figure. But it was something of that order.

MR. NEARY: Not your outfit, is it?
Old, conflict of interest is back.
We are going to find out anyway so you may as well admit it.

DR. COLLINS: I have some figures here. I presume these - now again I would have to check these out - but I presume these are the figures that come in in regard to the Interim Supply Bill. For the Murray Premises Military Museum, the rental \$113,500.

MR. HISCOCK: A year?

DR. COLLINS: I presume, as I say, this is for the Interim Supply Bill, for the four month period.

MR. YOUNG: That is for one year.

DR. COLLINS: That is the total for the year, is it?

MR. WARREN: For the year or for the last three months? How much?

DR. COLLINS: Well, this does not - you have to divide this by approximately three, \$113,500.

MR. NEARY: Well, we paid out \$500,000 and we still have not got a museum.

DR. COLLINS: Services, that would be for light, cleaning and similar services, \$50,000.

MR. NEARY: How much for renovations?

DR. COLLINS: So on current account - there is \$163,500 in current account. \$163,500.

MR. TULK: For a year?

DR. COLLINS: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) says that is for a year. But again I will check on that.

Yes, it is rental for a full year.

MR. NEARY: Let us get a royal commission on this.

DR. COLLINS: \$163,500 for a full year.

MR. NEARY: And we have been paying for almost four years.

DR. COLLINS: For renovations -

MR. NEARY: What about for renovations?

DR. COLLINS: The total for renovations, the total contract for renovations is \$516,000.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. NEARY: My, I am going to have a stroke.

DR. COLLINS: So those are the figures that I have at the present time. If I get any further breakdown on those -

MR. HODDER: Did the minister say - I did not quite get that - did the minister say a half million for renovations and \$600,000 for rent?

DR. COLLINS: Yes. For the total capital expenditures, roughly a half million dollars.

MR. HODDER: So that is over \$1 million dollars to move it from here to there?

MR. NEARY: And we still have not got a museum.

DR. COLLINS: The fitting up costs, in other words, were a half a million dollars, yes.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. WARREN: What?

DR. COLLINS: The fitting up costs will be a half million dollars?

MR. NEARY: What about the total renovations?

DR. COLLINS: If you want to fit up a museum you are going to pay for it.

MR. NEARY: How much is the total rent to date?

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes. It is a bit ridiculous.

DR. COLLINS: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: How much is the total rent to date, since 1979?

DR. COLLINS: I do not have that figure. But for a year it is \$163,500.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is over three years, eh?
Three and a half years?

DR. COLLINS: If the hon.member says it is three
and a half years, he must multiply it by three and a half.

MR. HODDER: \$163,000 a year for rent.

DR. COLLINS: Now the hon. member for
Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) wanted information in
regard to Rural Agricultural and Northern Development
Department and for Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. HODDER: Do you want to rent some stuff from
me?

DR. COLLINS: I can again go through these various
ones I have here if he so wishes. But so as not to
take up too much time in the Committee, if he wishes, the other
way I could do it, because he is interested in these departments,
would be to make a copy of those departments and let him have
them in due course.

MR. WARREN: Okay. I will have questions on them tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS: Hopefully tomorrow.

MR. WARREN: I want to ask you questions on it
tomorrow, all right?

DR. COLLINS: All right. I will get them by tomorrow,
sure.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to
that Military Museum again.

MR. HISCOCK: Yes.

MR. NEARY: I mean, I think I sniff, I sniff
a scandal of very great proportions here.

MR. HISCOCK: Yes.

MR. HODDER: It smells.

MR. NEARY: Apart now from who owns the premises,
and apart from the relationship with the Premier -

MR. HODDER: That fact that it is his bag man.

MR. NEARY: - and apart from the fact that we
are not sure yet - nobody can tell us whether public tenders
were called or not.

DR. COLLINS: Yes, they were called.

MR. NEARY: They were called.

DR. COLLINS: Yes, I told you that.

MR. NEARY: Well, would the hon. gentleman
get the tenders, bring the tenders into the House, lay them
on the table of the House so we can take a look at the tender
call and the tenders? Only then will we be able to find
out if the Museum went to the lowest bidder.

MR. WARREN: The lowest bidder.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, we might have
the Premier back in his seat to find out if he intervened
on behalf of his personal friend?

MR. BAIRD: No, he did not.

MR. WARREN: Oh!

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. Well, Mr. Trudeau said
the same thing up in Ottawa yesterday and Mr. Clark did
not appear to be satisfied with that.

MR. BAIRD: Trudeau never said anything.

MR. NEARY: He did not?

MR. BAIRD: Mr. Trudeau said he did not interfere.

MR. NEARY: He certainly did not say he did
interfere.

MR. BAIRD: Yes he did.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, that is all beside
the point.

MR. BAIRD: He was given the contract.

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is,
Mr. Chairman, according to the calculations, the figures
provided by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), in the
contract to renovate the Murray Premises -

MR. TULK: What is that per square foot?

MR. NEARY: - there is a total of \$516,000.

Now we are not sure, the minister is not sure yet -

MR. WARREN: He is not finished yet.

MR. NEARY: - he is going to find out for
us tomorrow,

MR. S. NEARY: if that \$516,000 renovations is the total for renovating that premises for the museum, or if there are other amounts that have been spent on renovations. Is that right? Can the minister say for sure that that is the total amount to be spent on renovations, \$516,000, in that contract.

MR. HODDER: Were there other contracts?

MR. S. NEARY: Now, that is a half a million dollars. And we are not sure if that is the final figure or not. We are not sure if there were any amounts before that. And he says one year's rent \$163,500. Now, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) says that is one year. And they are not denying it, neither one of the ministers are denying it. I will wait for a second just to make sure.

MR. WARREN: No denial. No, no denial.

MR. NEARY: That is the year's rent.

MR. WARREN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Now, is that what we pay every year \$163,500?

DR. COLLINS: It might be subject to escalation as time goes on like all rents escalate as time goes on. But that is the current rental.

MR. NEARY: Well, let us assume that we have paid out so far, since 1979, in rent close to a half million dollars.

MR. TULK: No, more than that, \$650,000.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am being very generous, I am being very kind.

DR. COLLINS: Make it around \$700,000.

MR. NEARY: How much?

DR. COLLINS: I was just helping out the hon. member over there.

MR. NEARY: Say a half a million but I realize -

DR. COLLINS: Why stop at a half for gosh sakes.

MR. HODDER: It is closer to three-quarters.

MR. NEARY: -it is much more. Three years is \$480,000. I think it is much longer than three years, but in the meantime I will settle at the moment, to use round figures, a half a million dollars, and a half a million dollars for renovations. \$1 million of taxpayer money, \$1 million. And, Mr. Chairman, any member of this House can go down there now, take a camera and go down and they will see for themselves that there is nothing in there.

MR. HODDER: Is there anything in there?

MR. DOYLE: The museum?

MR. NEARY: There is no museum down there. The hon. gentleman should have better sense than to ask a silly question like that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I hope the people on Bell Island have faith in the hon. gentlemen in getting them a second ferry than he has in getting them a museum. \$1 million, Mr. Chairman, \$1 million of taxpayer money and no museum. Now, that is really funny, is it not?

MR. HODDER: Now, who is the man that owns the building?

MR. NEARY: We know who owns the building and we know why the museum is down there, and we know why it is not open yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Why? why? Why?

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

MR. NEARY: by an old member let alone a new one, a rookie.

MR. DOYLE: Tell us why.

MR. HODDER: And not a very good one at that.

MR. DOYLE: Tell us, tell us why.

MR. NEARY: Conflict of interest down there knows why. He could tell us.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who? Who?

MR. HODDER: Who is this conflict of interest?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it would not be the provincial co-ordinator for the Tory campaign, for the Tory election, that would not be who owns it would it?

MR. DOYLE: No, not at all.

MR. NEARY: It would not be the campaign manager for the Tory Party in the last election? That would not be who owns it, would it?

MR. HODDER: No, never! Shocking! A shame!

MR. HEARN: Is that what this House is about, getting on like that?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. HEARN: Is that what this House is about, getting on like that?

MR. NEARY: Is that what what is about? We are talking about \$1 million of taxpayer money. That is what this House is about. I hope the hon. gentleman spent the money more wisely when he was working for the Department of Social Services than the minister has done -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: -and more prudently.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: I spent it better than you did when you were working for them.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, had many a request -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Mr. Mifflin?

MR. NEARY: - for a wheel chair or for crutches or for false teeth or for eye glasses when he could not issue the order. There are the priorities. And the administration spending \$1 million on a museum that is not even there yet. Now, how is that? Is that what this House is all about?

Mr. Chairman, there should be a Commission of Enquiry into this scandal.

MR. HODDER: Linked directly to the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there should be a Commission of Enquiry. I am only assuming that the amount is \$1 million. It could be much higher. It could be much greater than that, Mr. Chairman, it could be much greater. And the hon. gentleman has not told us yet what square footage we are paying for down there. Can the hon. gentleman tell us that now? How much per square foot is that? How many square feet are we talking about?

MR. HODDER: The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) should know how many square feet are down there. How many square feet are down there?

MR. NEARY: Does anybody know?

MR. DOYLE: Let them put it down on their notice.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this administration comes into the House, they ask us for \$675 million and they refuse to give us information.

MR. WARREN: The man has just thrown away \$1 million to Pat Ryan.

DR. COLLINS: We support the Arts and Culture Centre but I do not know the square footage over there.

MR. NEARY: And do you know what the hon. gentleman said when he got up?

MR. NEARY: He said, 'It is one of the'-
what was it he said? Here is what he said, 'It was one of the
best restored buildings in Canada'. That is what the hon.
gentleman said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: So that, Mr. Chairman, is
justification then, because this is the best restored building in
Canada owned by the co-ordinator, the campaign manager for
the Tory party, that is justification then for spending a
million dollars of taxpayer money to relocate a museum, that
was housed on the eleventh floor, in 1979, that is not yet open
to the public and will not be open for some time. And if
anybody does not believe me let them take their cameras -
I do not know how much work old conflict of interest has done
down there since he got the contract.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: Who is old conflict of interest?

MR. NEARY: Is there any work going ahead?

MR. SIMMS: You are supposed to refer to members by their district.

MR. NEARY: Is there any work going ahead down
there yet? Perhaps if I want to get some information I should
ask my hon. friend. Perhaps my hon. friend can tell me. Would
the hon. gentleman care to volunteer, because we cannot get it
from the ministers, volunteer to give us some information on the
Murray Premises renovations.

MR. BAIRD: That will not be easy.

MR. NEARY: What have you done?

MR. REID: Not this afternoon, some other day.

MR. NEARY: Well, will you give it to us
now? Because we are asked to pass this bill for Interim Supply.

MR. REID: I have not got it right now.

MR. NEARY: But you have done work there.

MR. REID: No.

MR. NEARY: You are doing work there?

MR. REID: No.

MR. NEARY: You will do work there?

MR. J. REID: No.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman -

MR. J. HODDER: Forget the point of order, sit down and shut up.

MR. MORGAN: You cannot be questioning a contractor as a member of the House, can you?

MR. NEARY: I am just trying to find out if he is in conflict of interest.

MR. YOUNG: Get Joey with his conflict-over in Sweden somewhere.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I am just going to make one comment.

MR. YOUNG: I am talking about Joey.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a large amount of money here in the Interim Supply Bill, the total being \$674 million plus dollars. Now the amount we are considering in regard to, not just the amount spent on the Murray Premises for four months, which is what the Interim Supply Bill is all about, but for a twelve month period, comes to \$163,000 out of current account. Now that proportion of this Interim Supply Bill is minuscule and that is what the Opposition is concentrating on. There are many other aspects of the Interim Supply Bill which they are totally ignoring. Now in terms of capital account, again they are bringing up points about the capital cost. Well, I can tell hon. members opposite that we have many cultural activities in this Province that cost us an arm and a leg.

DR. COLLINS: If we put together the capital costs of the Arts and Culture Centres, they would amount to many, many millions of dollars. If the hon. members opposite are saying that we should not have any concern, that we should not have any expenditures in regard to the cultural and heritage aspects of this Province, well that is their saying, it is not what we are saying. We know these things are costly. We know that we have to expend taxpayers' money for them. But we feel that these are things that the people of this Province want preserved and as long as this administration is in power, which will be probably for the next quarter of a century anyway, we will expend monies to preserve the cultural heritage of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I will bring further details as seem appropriate to this on tomorrow, but in the meantime, as it is Thursday, I move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Chairman of Committees.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: I do now leave the Chair until ten o'clock tomorrow, Friday.