



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 24

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

5 June 1935

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Before any statements by ministers I would like to rule on the point of privilege raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). I do not believe he has established a prima facie case. Since revision of the Standing Orders of this House in 1979, Interim Supply has been dealt with by this House under Standing Orders 116 to 122, the Standing Orders respecting estimates procedures. On checking back through Hansard I see that Interim Supply was carried in 1979 on July 30 and the budget was read on July 19. In 1980 Interim Supply was passed on March 27 and the budget was read on March 28. In 1981 it was April 7 and the budget was read one week later on April 14. Again, in 1982, it was May 14 and the budget was read on May 27. In 1983 it was different; the Interim Supply was passed on March 21 and the budget was introduced on March 17. In 1984 it was carried on March 30 and the budget was introduced on March 20. It has been the practice in this House, then, to treat the time used in the debate on Interim Supply as forming part of the seventy-five hours available under Standing Orders 116 (1), whether or not Interim Supply has been granted before the budget itself has been introduced as it was this year.

I also refer hon. members to Hansard for March 26, 1981, pages 1924 to 1942, where the question of whether Standing Orders 116 to 122, the Standing Orders respecting estimates procedures applying to Interim Supply was debated and ruled on. The ruling at that time was that they did not

apply. So there is no prima facie case established.

I think it is as good a time as any now to review briefly a number of discords that have developed over the past few weeks since I occupied the Chair. I readily agree that it is my inexperience in the Chair that has largely participated them.

The first is in connection with points of order. It is, of course, the right of any member to stand on a point of order, but in numerous cases, hon. members have gotten up on a point of order when in fact the only position the hon. member had was that he disagreed with what the hon. member was saying. This, of course, is not a point of order and, if carried to excess, is really a breach of the privileges of the member who is attempting to speak without interruption. I have tended to encourage this by hearing out the member who raised the point of order instead of ruling out the point of order right at the beginning.

The second point is in connection with comments or interruptions or, if you like, catcalls, while an hon. member is speaking. No one expects complete silence and often the odd comment is welcomed and responded to, but, when a member asks for silence, his wishes should be respected, no matter how much another hon. member disagrees with what he is saying. There are two particular objections in this regard, number one, where there appears to be a concerted effort by a group of hon. members who drown out what the hon. member is saying. I am not suggesting that this is deliberate in any way. I have also found that there is a persistent continuation of

interruptions by an hon. member - this comes from both sides - in spite of calls of order from the Chair. Again, I can only comment that the fault lies with the Chair in allowing this to happen, and the remedy is obvious.

The final comment I would like to make is about Question time. I would remind hon. members that questions should be brief, that no argument or opinion is to be offered in a preamble, and that no preamble is necessary in a supplementary. I would remind all hon. members that answers should be as brief as possible, should deal only with the matter raised in the question and should not be argumentative or provoke debate. Again, I feel I have been lax in letting both the questions and the answers get off the accepted track.

There is a learning process for all of us, maybe, on occasion, even for the most experienced members. I would like to ask all hon. members for their help and co-operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I have an oral statement to make, not a prepared statement.

I would like to say that, coincidentally with the federal

government and British Petroleum Exploration Canada Limited, I am extremely pleased to announce that B.P. Resources Canada Limited is to drill its first offshore Newfoundland exploration well since 1979 on the B.P. group coverage. The well, known as Baie Verte J-57, will be spudded on June 15 of this year, depending on ice conditions. B.P., as the operator for the group, has contracted the Bow Drill I rig for use and, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize this because one of the major policies of this government is to spread the benefit from offshore as far as possible, will use Botwood as a supply and marine support base.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, this announcement is being made coincidentally, as I said, with B.P. and the federal government at 3:00 P.M. Newfoundland time. I would draw to the attention of the House and the public, it is another example of the co-operation that has permeated the relationships with respect to offshore and the positive way in which we can attack both development and exploration of the new climate that exists between Ottawa and the federal government arising out of the Atlantic Accord. I would also have to draw to the attention of the House, as well, that this is the same well which, but for the intervention of M. Jean Chretien some years ago, when he was trying to use this particular issue, as so many others, for the purpose of their own political gain to bring Newfoundland to their knees with the willing cooperation of the hon. gentlemen there opposite, the people of Botwood could not see

developed before.* I am very happy today to be able to announce that British Petroleum will be drilling this well now under the cooperation and the umbrella of the Atlantic Accord, which Newfoundland as well as Ottawa has agreed to and given sanction to. Botwood will be used as a supply base. It is an indication of cooperation, Mr. Speaker, and an indication of the determination of this government to spread the benefits of the offshore as widely as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we will assume that it is age and the pressures of his position rather than deliberate oversight, but surely even the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) can remember when, under the previous Liberal government, there was activity out of Botwood. Even the Minister responsible for Energy has not forgotten that surely. If so, she is all gone over there, Mr. Speaker, and no wonder!

MR. CALLAN:

Probably he fell off his bike.

MR. BARRY:

Methinks that the hon. minister laboured mightily to bring forth a mouse when he starts talking about the significance of the fact that there is an Atlantic Accord in relationship to this announcement. Naturally we are all pleased to see that there is a

well to be drilled by BP, and naturally we are pleased to see that the supply is going to be out of the port of Botwood. It is unfortunate that there have been a couple of year's delay, since this activity by BP had been expected for the last several years, Mr. Speaker. Had the minister been on the ball they would have been out there drilling last Summer. This, Mr. Speaker, had nothing to do with any dispute because they had permits from both the provincial government and the federal government. Mr. Speaker, while I am sure we all look forward to many benefits once the Atlantic Accord is properly amended, once it is brought before this House and Term 54 is modified, as the Premier indicated it would be, by Mrs. Carney, we will be delighted to see the benefits come from the Atlantic Accord. But, Mr. Speaker, the minister is really demeaning and diminishing the impact of the Atlantic Accord to try and falsify to that extent its significance with respect to this particular announcement. We are delighted to see that BP is finally drilling. I would assume that if they did not drill this year, or at least next year, they would be in risk of losing their permits, so they did not have very much choice. I am delighted to see that they are now moving. I understand that some of us have invitations to a reception that BP is providing next week when they will have some of their officials in, and we will all be down to benefit from the hospitality they will be providing at that time. It is good to see an important company like BP committing itself to do what its permits require it to do and, as I say, the minister is making much out of it. What surprises me is that there has only been one announcement with

respect to one well being drilled by a new company since the Atlantic Accord has been signed.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly sure, to be quite frank with you, whether I should not have risen on a point of privilege today, but I want to just make the Speaker aware of something and I have chosen to rise on a point of order.

I want to say, too, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe it is very often that you will find me rising to make the kind of request that I am now going to make. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that in the debate in the House establishing whether there was a prima facie case of a breach of privilege of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), the member for Bonavista South made a certain statement in this House and for the sake of Your Honour I will read that statement. Referring to the shredding of his files he made the statement, 'It is the most serious matter that I have come across in my years of politics. I know why the files are missing and the story will unfold as to why the files are missing. I know why suddenly three year's records of the Minister of the Department of Fisheries are wiped out. Do I ever know why! And I will tell the story to this hon. House one of these days at my appropriate time. Indeed I will.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for

Bonavista South was called before the Committee on Privileges and Elections as a witness. During questioning of that witness I asked him for the story, and I think a number of other members of the Committee did as well. In my opinion, and indeed I think I am safe in saying that in the opinion of the Committee itself, the member for Bonavista South did not answer that question.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that during the re-examination of the member for Bonavista South, on his second appearance in other words, he again, in my opinion, did not answer the question. I consequently requested the Chairman (Mr. J. Carter) to take the appropriate action, whatever that action was. And first off I must say the Chairman of the Committee agreed that he, being the Chairman of the Committee, was the appropriate person to take that action and he was going to take it obviously on the basis not of precedent but rulings of the House of Commons, the House of Commons Standing Orders 636, 637 (1) and 637 (2), which state that: 'A witness' - and we are talking about a witness who comes before a Standing Committee of the House - 'must answer all questions directed to him, even over his objection that an answer would incriminate him.' And 'if a witness should refuse to appear or if a witness refuses to answer questions, his conduct may be reported to the House.' Then, of course, the House takes the appropriate action whatever that might be.

It was, therefore, my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the report should come from the Committee and, as I said previously, the Chairman agreed that that was the case. In

subsequent conversations with the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, as to why an interim report of that Committee was not presented, it became obvious to me that for some reason or other there was a reluctance to do so. And that may have very well been the reluctance of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) rather than the Chairman of the Committee. I do not know.

Why is it important? Let me try to establish, Mr. Speaker, why it is important that the member answer the question. It is important, in my opinion, from two points of view. First of all, members who stand in this House making accusations or inuendoes, in any shape, that are unfounded, because those inuendoes and accusations are unfounded they cast a shadow over every member of this House, not only the member who is making them.

The other question was, for me as a Committee member, is it in any way connected to the destruction of the member for Bonavista South's (Mr. Morgan) files? And to believe what the member for Bonavista South said, 'Indeed it was.' And I have already quoted to Your Honour from Hansard.

The other real question is is it in any way connected to the present crisis in offshore fish stocks that prompted the member for Bonavista South to look for his files? And, of course, I am talking about the overfishing and the alleged bribing of fishery officials that has become so prominent in the last number of days. That is the very reason, as I understand it, that the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) went looking for his files in the

first place. Mr. Speaker, let it be plain to everyone concerned that this side of the House is not after the member for Bonavista South, it is not after the government in this particular case, but we do have to establish, in this House and in the Committee that is connected to this House, an arm of the House, that when members make charges, when witnesses make charges they should have to substantiate the charges or, if they were made in the heat of the moment, then withdraw them. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the final report of this Committee, which I believe is very important to this House and to the functioning of this House, will be left dangling for those reasons and there will still be a shadow hanging over that whole affair. The question will still be asked, did some person intentionally destroy the member for Bonavista South's files? If so, who and why? There has been enough of that. The question has to be asked, for the sake of some of the people, perhaps, who destroyed them, where they inadvertently destroyed? If so, the report of the Committee and the recommendations will be different than if they were destroyed intentionally.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that if he, in any way, blocked the Chairman from presenting that report, and only he can answer that, then I want to tell him that he is casting a shadow on the whole affair and on the government as well. It will foster this idea that is prevalent in some circles that, indeed, there was a cover-up in this affair. That has to be answered, whether indeed there was a cover-up. Those kind of

statements should not be allowed to stand, they should be proven or disproven. We must have an answer in that Committee or the whole series of events that I have outlined are likely to occur. The member must do one of two things: He must answer the question or he must withdraw, one thing or the other. The record will then be clear for all to see.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. J. Carter) about it on two occasions. On Friday morning I informed the Chairman of the Committee that I intended to raise this matter in the House today, unless he did it on Friday, that I would raise it myself today after notice of my intention. As I understand it, the whole Committee in session agreed that this question should be answered. As a matter of fact, I think the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), on the second appearance of the witness, questioned the witness extensively on the very question that I questioned him on in his first appearance as a witness. Mr. Speaker, since the Chairman has refused or neglected, whatever the case might be, to present that report, I am calling on you, Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous cost of time, and not only time but the number of people we have interviewed and the number of hours we have sat, and in view of the importance of it, I believe, to this House, I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, as the chief guardian of this House, to take whatever action you consider appropriate.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. member for St. John's North on a point of order.

MR. J. CARTER

Mr. Speaker, the Vice-Chairman, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), and I are not fundamentally in disagreement. However, this is a learning experience for, I think, the whole Committee because we are breaking new ground. The more authorities I read, the more I realize that, for instance, by bringing this matter back into the House, as it has come back into the House several times not of my choosing, once this matter is referred back to this House, even on a preliminary basis, control of this matter goes from the Committee back into the House and the House Leader (Mr. Marshall), of course, is the person who must take appropriate action.

It is not improper for the Vice-Chairman to bring up a matter like this because the authorities cite example after example where the Vice-Chairman may bring up such a matter. In fact, if the House wishes I have in my drawer a paper ready to complain to Your Honour not only about that particular matter but about another matter about the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). But I was going to hold it over and put it in the final report, and I think it is the more appropriate place to put it, and this is the fundamental disagreement that myself and the Vice-Chairman have. It is not a matter of a serious schism or split in the Committee, but more a disagreement as to where this particular objection should be entered. I myself feel, after consulting the authorities, that it would more properly be in the final report even though this would perhaps make the final report less conclusive than it otherwise should be. However, I would be interested in arguments

to the contrary. But this is the basis for it, this is the background for it, and I certainly understand and appreciate the Vice-Chairman's position and I agree with him that it is very frustrating to ask a witness a question and be refused an answer, especially when we have the undoubted right to ask it and to demand an answer.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, initially when I introduced the point of order, I made two points: The first point was, first of all, that the Chairman had agreed, as all Committee members, I do not believe, will deny I have not consulted with the other two members from the Government side, but I know that the other member on the Opposition side will not deny it - that if the Committee agrees that this thing has to come back to the House because a witness refused to answer that question and another question put by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) but I do not remember exactly that question, but if the Committee agrees, and we did agree that the member for Bonavista South should answer the question, nobody can deny that, and I do not believe that the other gentlemen will, and then the Chairman agrees that he is person who is going to put it forward and then refuses to do it I have to ask the question why he refuses to do it. And if the Government House Leader is blocking that in some way, once the report is put

to this House it is his responsibility to rise in his place and to suggest to this House at least what should be done. If that is refused by the Chairman, and I agree with him that the Committee's work should not be brought back into the House only under extreme circumstances, but if it is refused, then what choice do we have but to bring it back to this House? I have gone to the Chairman on at least two occasions and said, "Raise this question in the House," and my requests have been refused. As I said, as I understood from him it was at the request, I will not say at the insistence, of the Government House Leader that we forget the whole thing, that we not make any more fuss with it. Well, I am sorry, but it is not a matter of fuss; it is a matter of getting the information out or having the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) withdraw that statement from Hansard. He has two choices. And, if the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is blocking it, I say to him now to have to rise in his place and take the appropriate action which needs to be taken.

MR. MORGAN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Seeing that the point of order is revolving directly around me, I think it is appropriate that I comment on it. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Committee that has been referred to is the Committee which is looking at a possible breach of the privileges of this member, upon my putting forward a

prima facie case of breach of privilege to the House.

I want to say at the outset that I find it very disturbing that the Committee has diverted its attention from whether or not my privileges are being breached, are twisting it around, to some extent, to make me look like I am somewhat of a criminal.

MR. TULK:
No.

MR. MORGAN:
I am the individual who has his files lost.

MR. TULK:
That is right.

MR. MORGAN:
I am the individual who has found his documents are missing, and suddenly it seems that I am now the culprit. All I am asking for is some protection from the House.

MR. BARRY:
Are they trying to shoot the messenger?

MR. TULK:
Trying to shoot the messenger, yes.

MR. MORGAN:
Last week, for example, the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. J. Carter) made me look like a criminal in the eyes of the public. He was going to have me put in jail. I could not believe the CBC news reports when I heard them. The Chairman of the Committee was going to have me put in jail. For doing what? I answered every question that was put to me. They threatened me, if I did not give them the statement I gave the RCMP, a signed statement asking the authorities to look into any

possible intentional wrongdoing, intentional destruction of files. Because by that time, Mr. Speaker, it was clear from the evidence put forward to the Committee that the files were inadvertently destroyed.

MR. TULK:
Oh! Is that so?

MR. MORGAN:
Now, that is the evidence from witnesses who were involved in the actual sorting through -

MR. TULK:
Not until you withdraw the statement it is not clear.

MR. MORGAN:
- and shredding and burning of my documents, that it was inadvertently done.

MR. TULK:
Oh?

MR. MORGAN:
Now, unless I am going to make a charge of perjury against those individuals concerned, who gave testimony under oath, the evidence before the Committee now is quite conclusive that it all occurred inadvertently in the Department of Fisheries, that my files were sorted through and burned and shredded.

MR. BARRY:
Are you satisfied with that?

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, during the Committee proceedings I expressed reservations and concern about a number of things, and these are on record in the transcripts of the Committee -

MR. TULK:
No, it is not.

MR. MORGAN:

- that I was not really, in my own mind, believing that they were inadvertently destroyed, but at the same time I was saying that I had no choice -

MR. TULK:

That is right, but you must answer the charges.

MR. MORGAN:

- I had no choice, unless I said one or two of the witnesses came forward and perjured themselves under oath, that the evidence is quite conclusive, they were inadvertently destroyed. So for me to say no, this is all wrong, they were not inadvertently destroyed, that they were intentionally destroyed, I had to make that very serious allegation of perjury.

So, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I want to emphasize again that during the Committees questioning of me as a witness, I gave every bit of information I could possibly give to them. You see, Mr. Speaker, information which has been given to the Committee shows that my files were not really destroyed, they were copied. Some were shredded, some were burned, but questioning of the witnesses revealed that there are copies of the most important files now existing down in the Department of Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, until we know whether there exists today a Foreign Overfishing file, until we know there is Offshore Surveillance file, until we know these things the questions asked by the man who raised the point of order, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), remain unanswered. Because the Committee has to determine whether or not these files now exist, the Foreign Overfishing file, the

200-mile limit Surveillance file, the Observer Programme file, those three particular files, until the Committee gets down to the level of finding out whether or not these files exist, until the RCMP can find out whether these files exist, or are not now in the registry of the Department of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, how can I even comment on what I said in the House the day I put forward my case to the Assembly and to you, Your Honour?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Since the hon. gentleman mentioned me in the course of his point of order, he gives me a source of power and a position in this House that really I do not hold. One member is the same as every other member in this House and has the same rights. The hon. gentleman has shown that any member of this House has the right to rise on a point of order or a point of privilege which the hon. gentleman did. My only comment with respect to this, Mr. Speaker, is that this particular issue was originally referred to a Committee on Privileges and Elections pursuant to the prima facie case that Your Honour found. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that it having been delegated to the Committee, it is appropriate that the Committee do its enquiry completely and fully and then come back to this House and make a report to this House, of which the point of order raised by the hon. gentleman may or may not be a part of the Committee's deliberation, and the House will deal with it then. But I want to point out to Your Honour that this

particular issue, an emotional one for some people in the House, maybe, having been referred to a Committee, it is most appropriate that it be dealt with in Committee and I do not think that this House should, every single day, have its time occupied with ancillary points of privilege arising out of the Committee itself, otherwise the House should deal with it completely itself.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER
The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
If I could just speak briefly, Your Honour, realizing Your Honour has heard a lot on this, I just want to say, Your Honour, as I understand the situation from listening to my colleague and members opposite, the Committee finds itself in a bit of a difficult position in being able to complete its report if it does not have the information which is being sought. I can understand the difficulty that the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) finds himself in, in that if he feels that there is some underlying reason why there might be advertent destruction of his files. There are innocent people out there who could be harmed by statements made in this House and the member obviously cannot make rash statements and the member has to have some material with which to back up statements. But the member has already made a statement, unfortunately, which would indicate that there is some reason which might explain why files have been destroyed. Now, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, we would not be spending as much time on this issue on our side of the

House if we did not have this other very disturbing series of events which are occurring with respect to allegations of impropriety on the matter of fisheries observers. And apparently there are now certain allegations being made with respect to the lack of response by the federal Department of Fisheries when certain reports were brought in by fisheries observers. Now, I am being very careful in my choice of words because I do not want to make any imputations.

MR. BAIRD:
You had better be careful.

MR. BARRY:
Who is saying, I had better be? Who is the whisperer?

MR. TULK:
That is landslide Baird.

MR. BARRY:
Well, we will try and avoid creating unnecessary difficulty for people outside this House, Mr. Speaker, but we are talking, in the case of the West Germans alone, one incident, we understand, \$40 million worth of fish. We are talking about a situation where the total allowable catch may be affected because fish stocks are not regenerating at the rate it was originally thought, and that might be related to overfishing.

Now, if there is in any way any relationship between what has happened to the member's files and this other disturbing sequence of events, we have to try to establish that. We want to go very slowly, very carefully, so that nobody is put in a difficult position, but we owe it to the people of this Province to make

* sure that all the information comes out. And, what bothers me with the position taken by the Chairman of this Committee is that we are going to see a report, if that takes place, come in from that Committee and there is going to be work left undone. There is going to be information which the Committee will not be able to report upon because there is a refusal to deal with that by the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). Now, that is disturbing, Mr. Speaker, because it either means that there will have to be reference back to the Committee or another committee set up, or something that has to take place after that incomplete report comes in. What we are trying to do is expedite the process and deal with this issue which is of interest and importance to Newfoundlanders generally without being unfair to members of the Committee or the Chairman or members of the House or the general public. We have to do it in the most expeditious way possible because there are things happening off the coast of this Province with respect to overfishing that will have to be dealt with, Mr. Speaker, either here or in Ottawa, or, more likely, both.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

To that point of order, I have listened at length to the arguments on each side, because it is such an important matter. Again, I must say that, as far as the Chair is concerned, this is a matter that has been handed over to the Standing Committee and, if there any difficulties or irregularities or whatever, it is the Chairman of the Committee, in my view, who would report back to the House for the House to deal

with them at the time. But again, I do not believe that there is a point of order. This is a matter that is completely in the hands of the Chairman and his Committee at the present time.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
On a point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
I do not want to make it a spurious point of order, because this is a very important matter.

Sir, it is very simple to get to the bottom of all of this. One very simple request, and I will make it this afternoon: Let the Committee now determine whether or not there exist in Department of Fisheries files, three files, namely, number one, a Foreign Overfishing file, number two, a 200-mile limit Surveillance file and, number three, an Observer Programme file. And, Mr. Speaker, if those three files are no longer existing within government circles and within the Department of Fisheries, I will make my allegations after that.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, again I must rule there is no point of order. This is completely, at the present time, in the hands of the Chairman and the Committee, and when he reports back to this House there will, I am sure, be ample opportunity for all hon. members at that time to comment.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay matters but I have to say, in light of what has gone on here, I am extremely disturbed personally by the course of events and having this thing coming back again and again while the Committee is trying to deal with it. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) just mentioned it, therefore I feel, as leader of the government, I have to respond, just to say that if the member for Fogo or anybody believes that the government is trying to stonewall the Committee from bringing in a report of this kind then that is completely untrue. The first I heard of it was when it was raised in a point of order today. If the Committee, in the course of its deliberations, wishes to bring in something that they do not think they can deal with and they have to come back to the House, then I think that is what has to happen if a majority of the Committee voting so agree.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Everybody voted.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I just want to say, for my part, that I was not familiar with the course of events until the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) mentioned it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

If I could just briefly respond, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker,

the entire Committee decided that that was the appropriate course to take, to bring it back to the House, and the Chairman was directed to that effect, or requested, or whatever, and we have now waited four days. It could have been done on Wednesday. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) waited Wednesday, Thursday, then there was discussion with the Chairman of the Committee on Friday, waited Friday - gave these three days - for the Chairman, then gave him notice that if it was not done that he would be rising on this point. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that gives an indication that we are not trying to jump the gun or do anything other than see that the Committee operates. But for some reason, and there was some indication that it happened after discussion with the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), this report was not presented by the Chairman despite the Committee's voting or consensus, however they developed it, within itself that the report should be presented to the House. So we have a very serious problem here.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I understand all of that and I was not aware of it. Obviously the Chairman, after talking to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) thought that it was better to bring it in at the end for a final report, but that should in no way inhibit the Committee's majority decision that it had to be brought to the House. I agree with you wholeheartedly and I do not want

it being perceived, as a result of what has gone on here today, that there was some deliberate policy on behalf of government to stop interim reports from the Committee coming forward. If in fact there is a majority vote by the Committee then such an interim report should come back because that in no way is the case from where I sit.

MR. SPEAKER:

The only comment I would like to make is the Chair does not have any authority to deal with the matter, but if a report is brought to the House it can be considered at that time.

MR. TULK:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

In view of the Premier's statement - and let us not carry this on any longer - that he has agreed that anything that the Committee decides should be done, should be done, I wonder if the Chairman of the Committee can now agree to a time when he will make that interim report to the House? Is he just going to sit there?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

ooo

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, before the Question Period commences, I wonder if I could suggest that this House send an expression of sympathy to our neighbours in the Province of Ontario, and particularly send

condolences to the families of the victims of the recent tornado in that Province. There is tremendous destruction of homes and property as well as the loss of lives and personal injuries. It is more than normal storm damage, it is a disaster, and I think it would be appropriate if this House conveyed our sympathy and our concern and our condolences where appropriate to the Province of Ontario and to the people of Barrie and the other communities that were directly affected by this tornado.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Good idea, Mr. Speaker, and I think we should proceed to see that it is done.

MR. SPEAKER:

That will be done.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier, and it is a follow-up on a question that was asked last week. When the point was raised by members on this side that the federal budget by the De-indexing of federal taxes would see an automatic increase of taxes in this Province, the Premier indicated that he would review the possibility of reducing Provincial taxes.

Now the Premier, during the recent election, made a commitment that there would be no tax increases. And I would like to ask the Premier why is it necessary that he take it under review, under consideration? If he intends to live up to this commitment, why not the bald statement that the correction will be made so that this Province does not bring in tax increases on the back of actions taken under the federal budget?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, obviously I did not know what was in the federal budget until last week. It was tax increases over which we had explicit and specific authority as detailed in the budget that was just brought down in this House we can talk about that budget. By the way, I get the sneaky suspicious around the Province that the budget for Newfoundland has not been brought down yet. Obviously it must have been such a good Budget nobody wants to talk about it. I thought that this House was here to talk about the Provincial budget, not the federal budget. But be that as it may, obviously we are taking the matter now under advisement and we are doing a full review of the federal budget and its impact, specifically as it relates to income tax, and we will see what we can do about it at that point in time. But, obviously, the commitment that I made to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador has been kept in the budget that was brought down in this House. Now if we can do more as it relates to tax increases which come about indirectly because of an action by the

federal government, we will do that too. But we will wait and see just exactly what the amounts are and what we can do about it.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, on a supplementary.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to a comment on the Provincial budget, I have to tell the Premier we did have comment for a couple of days after the Budget was brought down. People did not completely ignore it and I think there was almost unanimous comment to the extent of 'Where are the jobs?' Then I think after that question was asked, and the obvious answer given that there are no jobs, they passed on to matters of some importance to the people of this Province.

But I would like to ask the Premier, along the same vein, whether he agrees with the comments of the Federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) that there are not enough rich people in Canada, and that is our real problem. Is that the real problem in this Province as well?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into commenting upon what the Federal Minister of Finance said or did not say, and whether I agree or disagree. I am sure there are far more appropriate questions to ask during question period which are more urgent for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador than whether a comment by

Mr. Michael Wilson finds agreement with the Premier of Newfoundland or finds disagreement. And I am not going to get into that kind of a debate. All I have been saying about the federal budget is that its total impact positive and negative, is being studied very extensively now by the people in Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs and Treasury Board, and we are going to have reports for Cabinet over the next couple of weeks on that and then we are going to take actions to mitigate any of the negative things that are there, and try to do it as reasonably and as sensibly as we can. As far as the comment that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) in Ottawa makes or the Minister of Trade (Mr. Kelleher) and whether I agree with those statements, I am not going to get into that kind of verbal gymnastics right here now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, a final supplementary.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this House would normally close around the middle or the third week in June, I would anticipate. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) breathes a sigh of relief there. I wonder if the Premier would give a commitment to the House that the review would be brought in before the House closes, within that time period?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

I cannot give a guarantee, Mr.

Speaker. I do not know how long it would take. It would be foolish and irresponsible of me to do so. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and a lot of his people are in Ottawa today talking to the Minister of Finance for Canada so therefore I would not be able to get an immediate schedule from the Minister of Finance today. But we will do our utmost to see that the studies are done before the House closes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Fishing - Fisheries, I am sorry. There is no fishing going on, or very little, and it concerns the overfishing or the alleged bribing of federal officials, again. There was a large amount of time, Mr. Speaker, spent in this House on this matter. There was a unanimous resolution sent to the federal government expressing our concern, and I understand that the minister at least has had meetings with federal officials and I would assume he has been in touch with his federal counterpart. I would like to ask the minister what feedback he has had from his federal counterpart, Mr. Fraser in Ottawa, as to actions being taken by the federal government to stop what we consider to be the rape and pirating of our fishery resource? Could he inform the House what the feedback is and what substantive actions are being taken on these matters?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The present or renewed or new

allegations that have been carried in the press over the weekend and today I myself have not personally seen, I just arrived back in the city about five minutes to three this evening. But I do know that the government today again, through the Premier, has been in discussion with Mr. Fraser on the new charges, if that is what they are, like I said, I have not seen it personally - expressing our concern and asking that it be highlighted and high profiled and some solution found to it. So the government has been very vigilant, then, Mr. Speaker, in making sure that we make our position know and make our position clear to the federal minister. As the member rightly said, there was a unanimous resolution of this Legislature submitted to Ottawa a few weeks ago on the matter as well.

Now at the officials level, Mr. Speaker, I can say to the hon. gentleman that we have gotten every indication from the federal government, from the Federal Department of Fisheries, that they share our concern and that they will be, through External Affairs and so on, trying to take whatever corrective action has to be taken to solve the problem. We will be meeting face to face with Mr. Fraser. I think the hon. gentleman might remember that I said it was going to be, I believe, last week, but it was cancelled or postponed on account of the federal budget, so the Atlantic ministers are meeting Mr. Fraser, I believe -

MR. TULK:

I did not know you were scheduled to meet Mr. Fraser.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Atlantic ministers will be

meeting with Mr. Fraser in Quebec City I believe on June 11 and 12, so at that time I will be following up further at the political level on this matter because it is a very, very serious matter and one that we are very concerned about.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, what a confession that we are getting out of the Minister of Fisheries. Is he telling this House that what he is really learning about the whole affair he is learning through the media? He has not had a chance to read the media today. Well, let me tell him that today's media are carrying reports of hundreds of violations, of fish stocks being depleted and millions of dollars in potential revenue lost because front line officials from the Federal Department of Fisheries have distorted data, that is the accusation. Now, I want to ask the minister, have there ever been any reports of over fishing or alleged bribery filed with the Provincial Department of Fisheries? The media reports that these reports went unrecognized by federal regional department officials in St. John's. I ask the minister is there any official in the provincial department who would have any connection with these federal officials? I also want to ask him is he now prepared to take action to see that the federal minister disciplines in some way those people, once they are proven to have taken bribes and allowed overfishing? What is the total score on the whole

matter? Just what connection has the Federal and Provincial Departments of Fisheries had, or is consultation dead?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I would like to answer the first part of that question and ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) to answer the second part of the question.

The first part of the question on the allegations, the Minister of Fisheries was out of town over the weekend and was on his way back, got fogged in on the South Coast, and because I could not get hold of him, I took it upon myself to call Mr. Fraser this morning as a result of the matters that were in the press this morning, in The Globe and Mail and The Evening Telegram. He was in the process, as a matter of fact, of calling me and our wires got crossed and we did not get on to one another until about twelve o'clock. He called to indicate to me that he knew Mr. Rideout was out of town and that he wanted the Government of Newfoundland to be aware that he, as Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, was immediately calling the manager or supervisor for enforcement, both from the Newfoundland region and the Gulf region, to Ottawa tomorrow morning for meetings, that there was an internal audit being done in the department as it related to enforcement to see if any of these allegations contained any substantiation or any validity.

The other part of it is that I have learned that some time ago,

and I forget the exact time but in the last couple of years, these allegations came to light before to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. There was either a federal inquiry or a federal court which ruled upon it and found no validity in the allegations at that point in time. Mr. Fraser indicated that he would keep the Department of Fisheries, provincially, completely informed on the matter of the new allegations and that he himself was getting involved in actively pursuing the matter within his department and with the enforcement people who are working for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

The second part of the hon. member's question, as it deals with has there been any information given to the provincial Department of Fisheries as it relates to this matter of these allegations of overfishing in the last while, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is in a much better position to answer than I am.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say to the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) it is not necessary to twist my words. They were very clear. I did not say that I was not aware of what was happening here. We spent hours and hours and hours over the last several weeks, Mr. Speaker, with officials and at the political level working on this very particular matter. Has there been any correspondence, I believe his question was, or any new information passed to the provincial Department of Fisheries?

MR. TULK:

Any files or records the provincial department did not know anything about?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I can say this to the hon. gentleman that it has been talked about, you know, overfishing and the problem with the observers, for several years as far as I know. Are there particular files available where there has been correspondence between us and the federal government, is that what the hon. gentleman is asking? If that is the case, yes, the answer is there are files available where we have made representation to the federal government. Is he asking me if there are files available where we have documented - I do not know what - proof from individuals that something went on out there? I do not know if those things exist, I have not seen any, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we now have a confession by the Premier that he learned about this things through the media as well. The minister says that he is not sure whether there is any information available or not. Let me ask him a far more important question in regards to this whole affair.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

(Inaudible) latest stuff this morning (inaudible).

MR. TULK:

The gentleman is scaring me.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am being honest about it.

MR. TULK:

Is the Premier finished?

Mr. Speaker, let me come back to the minister with another supplementary, a much more important one, perhaps the one that strikes at the very heart of this matter, and that is the amount of fish that is being taken out there. For example, the Kirby Task Force, as the minister is aware, predicted that the TAC of Northern cod would increase from 215,000 metric tons, I believe it was in 1982, to 380,000 metric tons in 1987. Let me ask the minister, in view of what has gone on out there - the rape, the pillage and piracy by foreign countries - can we now expect these TACs to be there for our own fishery, and in particular for inshore fishermen, or are they seriously depleted now? Does the minister know what is left? Is there anything left or is the 200 mile limit management zone only a figment of the imagination of the Newfoundland people and the Canadian people?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the 200 mile limit is not a figment of anybody's imagination. I think it is a reality. But the hon. gentleman is quite correct in his line of questioning. I mean, we are very concerned - and we have said so repeatedly on paper and off paper - about what is happening offshore with the overfishing. And I believe the hon. gentleman is correct, there could very well be a problem with the quotas, there could very well

be a problem with being able to take what the TAC says. I mean, obviously they are related. If there is overfishing going on and there are some people who would argue that the stocks are not rebuilding as fast as they should -

MR. TULK:

Is that the reason we have had a bad inshore fishery?

MR. RIDEOUT:

It could very well be so. We have said this repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, and we still share the same concern the hon. gentleman has in this matter.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I am astounded to hear the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) stand in this House and not in any way be able to give me the answers to that very, very essential question with respect to the Newfoundland fishery, particularly the inshore fishery.

Let me ask another question: Since it has been brought out today in this House that there has been very little inside contact between the federal minister and his officials and this government, has there been any consultation at all with the provincial minister's Tory friends in Ottawa? Is there any concern on the part of his federal counterpart and, if there is not, would he now ask the federal Minister of Fisheries for an internal investigation of the federal Department of Fisheries as to what is going on with his

observer programme, with a view to finding out how much fish is out there, how much fish has been taken, who is to blame, and whether it is top officials of the department or just people on the observer boats? Failing that, would he request the Prime Minister to either replace his Fisheries Minister so that we can get somebody up there who is competent to deal with it, or would he consider asking the Premier to move him to another department?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, somewhere in that political speech, I suppose there was a question.

MR. TULK:

No.

MR. RIDEOUT:

But it is rather difficult to find because all it was was political puffery, foolishness. The fact of the matter is the Premier just sat down, having told the hon. gentleman, and if he wants the truth, if he wants the facts, then it has already been told a dozen times during Question Period in this House today and on other days. The federal minister told the Premier this morning that he was embarking on an investigation within his department, that he was calling the people in Ottawa, bringing them in tomorrow and so on. All those questions have been answered, Mr. Speaker, the rest is just political puffery.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My question is to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

I, I think along with many of the other members of the House, have received representations from various groups that are opposing low-level flying in Labrador. I have received a lot of evidence of it as I am sure other members have. A lot of it is anecdotal, however, it is critical, I think, that somehow the genuine concerns that many people have about this low-level flying be addressed, and I think that it is important that it be addressed by a study that is reasonably credible. The former minister (Mr. Goudie) I had also asked the same question of, and I would ask the minister, what kinds of plans are you undertaking at this time to address these very real concerns?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, through the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth, there is money available now for a study on the effects of low-level flying on the caribou herds. In February, when I was in Labrador, a concern was put to me about the effects of low-level flying on human health. And there were rumours and there was talk that there are effects. I asked the seventy or eighty people at that meeting, concerned residents of the area, if they would get get me one specific instance of damage caused by low-level flying in the Labrador area, and to date I have not heard anything from any of these people. If there are any such

instances, surely everyone would be eager to have them looked at.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek, a supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:

One of the problems I think we have is that last Friday members of the Green Party from West Germany were meeting with people who are opposed to low-level flying in Labrador. We had our own demonstration on the lawn in front of the Confederation Building.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are socialists, are they not?

MR. FENWICK:

They are a little bit to the left of us, yes. What I see happening in the case of Goose Bay and its future is the same kind of thing that occurred in the seal fishery, that we had a small problem at the beginning that began to build and build and build. I can foresee in the next couple of months the Green party and the West German Reichstag getting involved with all sorts of things. I will get to my question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I was just going to remind the hon. member there is no need for a preamble.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes.

The question is quite simple. Instead of an internal study, it seems to me now that we need a study that has credibility in

Germany, in Canada, among all the people who really have serious questions. Are there any plans by the provincial government to set up an independent study with a broad range of references being turned into it, both the animal and the human situation, so that we can have some answers that the vast majority of people will find are credible? Are there plans afoot to put in that kind of an independent study?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member mentioned this Green Party group, that at least one person in the Green Party was in Labrador. I find it amazing that anyone in Labrador, particularly those involved with Native groups, would allow them to even enter Labrador because these were some of the people responsible for taking away a way of life, a livelihood of our Native people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

I know if I were involved with Labrador and was responsible and concerned about even the low-level flying, and there are concerns, no doubt, the last people in the world I would consult or ask to help me would be these people in the Green Party. As to the question about an international study that the hon. member asked, my department is investigating avenues of having studies done to make sure that there are no detrimental effects to the peoples of Labrador, caused by low-level flying.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Before recognizing the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) I would like to welcome to the gallery Mayor Lou Bailey, Deputy Mayor Gerry Appleby and Town Clerk Helena Fizzard of Burin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I wonder if the Premier would acknowledge to the House that his political patronage job creation policy is now extended and expanded upon, that in addition to awarding jobs to the official defeated Tory candidate in various districts throughout the Province, it now includes the defeated Tory candidate that ran for nomination in districts throughout the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know what the hon. member is talking about. He will have to be more specific.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

The question again, Mr. Speaker, is that I wonder if the Premier can tell the House whether or not

his government has extended or expanded upon his political patronage job creation programme, which has been clearly enunciated here in this House, by giving jobs to the official defeated Tory candidates that we have named, and now extended and expanded upon to include defeated candidates who ran for the Tory nomination in various districts throughout the Province?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know what the hon. member is trying to get at by giving a general question rather than a specific one. As the hon. member knows, there was a commitment made by the government to provide the people of Buchans with a development officer, and we have kept that commitment. Secondly, there is a policy of expanding the Department of Development around the Province. We began by having an office in Corner Brook a couple of years ago, and by phasing out the Gander Development Corporation and establishing an office of the Department of Development there. We also expanded it to Labrador West last year, and now we are expanding it to Labrador East. And we will continue to expand and regionalize various government departments around the Province as finances permit, and as we see that it is extremely important. This is a new department that we established a number of years ago and we want to get it off and running not only in St. John's, but to get it regionalized around the Province, and that is what we are about, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier wants the specifics. Would the Premier then confirm that the candidate whom the present member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) defeated for the PC nomination has been given a job on the Royal Commission for Employment and Unemployment, Sir, a commission which was established long before the election was called? Can the Premier confirm this appointment? And if so, by what process was this particular gentleman selected? What particular qualifications did he have to be appointed to this Royal Commission?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, now I remember reading in the paper, and somebody just reminded me -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I mean, there are lies, lies, and now there is foolishness. A policy of this government is that when we appoint a royal commission we make no effort whatsoever to influence who that royal commission hires. That is a firm and clear policy of this government and it has never been violated. I have not talked to the Chairman since he has been appointed, nor the other members of the Commission. They hire within their budgetary limits that they have been given. And I read

about the appointment - by the way, there were six or seven people who ran for the PC nomination in Humber Valley, and there were over 1,400 at the meeting, as a matter of fact. It was a great meeting and it resulted in the member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford), who is here now in the House, getting elected to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

He was foolish. He should have been defeated, he would have gotten a more lucrative job.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have no say whatsoever, the government has no say over who the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment hires or fires. They hire their staff as they see fit.

MR. TULK:

You approved their budget.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, we approved their budget and the number of positions that they are going to have. What person they actually hire for that is none of my business at all. They were given a mandate, they were given terms of reference, they were given a budget after they submitted what they wanted and they indicated they were going to hire this many people for these many jobs, or whatever. As to who the person was, I read it in the paper the same as the hon. member.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell) but, since he is not in the House this afternoon, I will direct it to the Premier. On the heels of the federal budget that just came down, and again we have to go back to the federal budget, where the onus for reducing the deficit is put on the backs of the poor and the low-income people, we now have word that CN are about to increase their rates again. Now this is the second time this year, 8 per cent and 9 per cent, which compounded comes out to around 20 per cent, and that is a considerable increase in the past couple of months. I would like to know if there was any consultation by CN about these increases, and could the Premier tell us if anything was done to protest against them?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. member just said CN generally. Is the hon. member referring to the bus fares?

MR. EFFORD:

The bus fares.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Transportation (Mr. Russell) have, over the last number of months, indicated the position of the Government of Newfoundland. We opposed any increases at that time, vigorously opposed them, to CN and the people in Ottawa.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

What was the result? We have not heard of any reply to that. What was the result or the answers back from that protest you put forward?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

MR. BARRY:

Was it ignored?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, obviously it was not ignored, obviously it was taken into account. If you remember, a number of weeks ago, when a number of things were going to happen in CN, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) made representation and got the matter stopped, the whole question stopped for a year or two. So, therefore, our representations have been working. I will have to consult with the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell) and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to see what the response was and I will get back to the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I would like to welcome to the gallery Mayor Everett Curtis of Cow Head.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by Standing
and Special Committees

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

It is not without regret, Mr. Speaker, that I deliver a preliminary report on our investigation into the disappearance of files. I did think, and I still do think, that it would be much better if it were incorporated into a final report. I am not entirely unwilling to do it. I am dismayed that the hon. gentleman would not answer two of our questions and here is the report.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) questioned the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) on his quotation from Hansard of May 15, which reads as follows: "It is the most serious matter that I have come across in my years of politics. I know why the files are missing and the story will unfold as to why the files are missing! I know why, suddenly, three years of records of the Minister of the Department of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) are wiped out! Do I ever know why! And I will tell the story to this hon. House one of these days at my appropriate time. Indeed I will!"

The Hansard of our Committee hearings of May 28, 1985 will show that the hon. the member for Bonavista South would not answer the questions pertaining to this, addressed to him by the Vice-Chairman, the hon. the member for Fogo. Therefore I have no choice but to report this matter to this House.

On the same date, as the Hansard of our hearings will show, I requested the member for Bonavista South to give us a complete copy of his statement to the RCMP, he subsequently supplied this Committee with a seven-page typewritten submission. On checking with the RCMP, I was informed that his submission to them amounted to some fifty-five pages, and therefore I must inform the House that the hon. the member for Bonavista South has failed to comply with the request of this Committee in this matter as well.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if it is in order, I would move that the member for Bonavista South be directed to answer these questions.

MR. MORGAN:

We are going to have some fun.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

It is moved and seconded that the hon. member for Bonavista South be directed to answer the questions raised by the Chairman of the Committee on Privileges.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely astounded that the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. J. Carter) appointed to look into a possible breach of my privileges has now come in with a preliminary report reporting that I am refusing to answer questions. When, Mr. Speaker, last Thursday morning I delivered to the Chairman of that same Committee and all Committee members a letter, and attached to the letter was a copy of the

signed statement that I agreed to give to the Committee the night before, given to the RCMP, and Mr. Speaker, the letter - I do not have it here right now but I will table it in the House - the letter clearly points out to the Chairman and Committee members that I was available to meet with them any time to pursue any further information they want to obtain from me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard back from that correspondence since last Thursday morning. I have not heard from, I have gotten no reply from the Chairman, I have gotten no phone call from the Chairman on the piece of correspondence. Mr. Speaker, why is this charade being carried on when I wrote to the Committee Chairman, after he threatened to have me held in contempt of the Committee because I would not answer the question, "Why were your files destroyed?" Mr. Speaker, apparently, evidence shows the files were not destroyed. If the files are not destroyed, Mr. Speaker, let the files be delivered to the House of Assembly, to me a member of this House and then I will get up in the House and I will say, "Well I have no idea why the files were destroyed." Because then I can say, "Well, look, it is all a sham. The files were not destroyed." If three certain files, and again I want to mention it, Mr. Speaker, for the record, a file on foreign overfishing, a file on the 200-mile limit surveillance, and a file on the observer programme, specifically headed and named accordingly. Now evidence shows that everything that was in my files of any importance pertaining to fisheries was copied and placed in the departmental registry.

So, Mr. Speaker, all the Committee has to do is to determine whether or not these files are presently in the Fisheries Department. If they are there, Mr. Speaker, they were not destroyed, at least those three files. These were the only files I was looking for when I made the comment in the House of Assembly at the time, when I rose to raise a point of privilege. The files I wanted the day before were those three files to deal with an ongoing investigation by the RCMP. Because I knew, Mr. Speaker, that the information in those files could be of substantial benefit to the RCMP in their ongoing investigation into alleged wrongdoing offshore.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the files exist, as the evidence given under oath to the committee shows, well, surely the Committee has the authority and the power to go down to the - surely anywhere in the government, in this case the Department of Fisheries - and to extract those three named files, which were my files, my personal files, and to have these files then passed over to the RCMP, which I wanted to have done. Now, if the Committee cannot determine that, why are they coming to the House saying I am refusing to answer questions? I answered every question that was put to me.

MR. J. CARTER:
Not fully.

MR. MORGAN:

The one question, to which the Chairman (Mr. J. Carter) is not relating, Mr. Speaker, is, 'Why were your files destroyed?' But the thing is the evidence now shows that my files were not destroyed. Let the Committee first of all determine whether or not those files are destroyed, or

if any part of my files were destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, that whole exercise, what was it for? Was it to get the story from Jim Morgan, the MHA for Bonavista South, as to why he thought his files were destroyed, or was it to determine whether or not there was a breach of my privileges?

Mr. Speaker, I contend it was the latter. The latter was the important issue, to determine whether or not my files had been destroyed. According to the interim report today, the Committee has not, to date, determined whether or not any of my files were destroyed.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the Committee to come into the House today and demand that one witness elaborate further and answer questions which arose from comments made in this House - as to why I thought the files were destroyed - when, at the same time, they have not determined whether or not the files have been destroyed, Mr. Speaker, that is superfluous. It is ridiculous to talk that way. Let the Committee determine, first of all, whether or not the three files I wanted on that Monday before I raised the issue in the House of Assembly exist. Those three files with the information contained in them, names, dates, etc., all pertinent to the ongoing allegations of wrongdoing in offshore surveillance. Let that Committee decide whether or not these files have been destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, if these files do not exist, indeed, I may have a very interesting story to tell this House of Assembly. That is a good possibility. But right now, evidence given under oath to this

Committee shows that nothing of any importance was destroyed. Cabinet documents were destroyed, yes, some files were copied, others shredded, but anything of any importance, according to the evidence given, and I quote, "Anything of any importance dealing with Fisheries was copied and filed in the departmental Registry." Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if it was copied and filed in the departmental Registry, a Committee of this House can clearly and quite quickly determine whether these files are there or not, or whether they have been destroyed.

Sure, Mr. Speaker, I have some very strong concerns about all of this. I find it extraordinarily strange that the files of a Minister who had been four years in the one portfolio were destroyed inadvertently, when the files for all the other departments he was involved with over the years have been kept. Naturally I find it rather strange, and I advised the Committee accordingly. But evidence shows they were destroyed inadvertently. And if the Committee is suggesting I make a charge that the witnesses perjured themselves, I am not going to do that. Evidence shows they were inadvertently destroyed. One witness said - in this case the secretary - she took sole responsibility for the destruction of the files. She assumed it was okay to do so. On the assumption they were sorted through, one file after the other, some were torn up, some were shredded, others were copied and put back in the registry.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee, first of all, has to determine the key question, are the files I am

referring in existence or not? Then, if they are in existence, the files I am talking about, with the information contained in same, I have no story to tell, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can stand in this House and state, as I stated under oath, I know these files existed, I know these files were there. They were active files. The most important issue I was dealing with for months in the Department of Fisheries was foreign overfishing. I was always an outspoken critic on that issue, too much fish going to foreign nations and foreign overfishing. There was an active file in the Department of Fisheries and in my files on foreign overfishing. And if that file is there now with all the information that was in my ministerial files, placed in that departmental Registry file on foreign overfishing, that is one file we can say was not destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept as a member in this House of Assembly, and I will stand on my credibility as a member of this House, that if all other files are there, and we do not know what is there yet - the RCMP informed me on Thursday or Friday that they have not gone down to have access to the Fisheries Registry to determine what is there and what is not there. They have not done that because they did not have access. There was no indication of criminal wrongdoing or intentional activity and, therefore, they had not gone down to seize any documents at the Department of Fisheries. So they did not know what was in the Department of Fisheries, as of Friday past.

I understand the Committee has not gone down to the Department of

Fisheries to determine what was taken from my filing cabinets and placed over in the Registry of the Department of Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, let the Committee get on with its work. Let them determine whether or not files were destroyed which belonged to me with some pertinent information I was going to extract from these files and give to the law enforcement agencies now still carrying on their investigation in two different avenues - one, the offshore surveillance activities and alleged wrongdoings, and the other tying into the loss and/or destruction of my files. Let one of the two, first of all, determine whether or not my files are gone and if files are gone let the Committee determine which files are gone, which files were destroyed and where they have gone. That is the key question.

Now the Chairman of the Committee has come back in this House, and before giving the House the report as to whether or not my files are destroyed or tampered with, whether or not there was a breach of my privileges, before determining that, they want to know why, if files were destroyed, why they were destroyed. Mr. Speaker, it is putting the cart before the horse. Let them, first of all, determine whether or not files are missing, files are destroyed, files were shredded and then determine which files were destroyed. And if the three files I wanted the day before I raised the whole matter in the House of Assembly, if those three files are, indeed, missing from my files that I kept active and current with regards to foreign overfishing, in particular, and the observer programme and the 200-mile limit surveillance, if

these files are missing, I have not hesitation in saying there, indeed, may be a major story to tell.

But right now it is clear that the Committee has not been able to determine whether or not these files are there or what files have been destroyed. And if there are any destroyed, the Committee has not reported whether or not they was inadvertently or advertently destroyed. So, Mr. Speaker, you cannot tell half a story when half the investigation is only completed.

I will repeat my earlier statement, if the RCMP investigation and if this Committee from this House investigation, side-by-side, determines that those three files no longer exist anywhere within the Department of Fisheries - I do not care what heading they are under now. It could be under international fisheries, it could be under conservation and protection as mentioned by the evidence given to the Committee - irrespective of where the evidence is now filed, the evidence in those three files which were in my personal possession over four years and a half years as minister, if they were, as evidence indicated, taken and copied and put over in the registry with the other files, that information is there now and they are readily available to any member of this House of Assembly or to myself who owns them or to the RCMP who will need them to carry on their investigation. I should not say will need them, in my opinion it would be helpful to them, I am still convinced of that.

So, Mr. Speaker, on the interim report that has been put forward,

let, first of all, the Committee address itself to the issue put forward to this House. Was there or was there not a breach of my privileges as a member of the House? Let them, first of all, answer that question. They can only answer that question by indicating whether or not files have been lost or destroyed. And, Mr. Speaker, I will only answer questions on the demand put forward by the Committee when the Committee answers its own questions regarding this investigation.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

It was proposed by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) that his report be adopted. According to our rules, notice of that that motion be concurred in should be given today. It will be put on the Order Paper for debate at a later time unless, of course, the House gives leave to debate it at the present time.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, you have cited precisely, in accordance with the Standing Rules, and I think that is the appropriate way to deal with the situation.

MR. MORGAN:
No, Mr. Speaker.

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
On a point of order, the hon. the

member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, I want to know now, Sir, because the Committee has made an interim report indicating that I will not give all information. I did not get a copy of the report, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have already ruled on that matter.

MR. MORGAN:
With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I want to raise another point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
A further point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
The point of order has to do with, now that we have an interim report filed in the House, which I have not seen, I understand it is demanding of me to answer certain questions regarding the comments I made in this House.

Sir, now I want to know, for my second point of order, when will the main report come in to give an indication to this House whether or not my privileges, as a member of the House, have been breached? That is the key issue I want answered by this Committee. So I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, by the Chairman tabling an interim report, not dealing with the main question, when will that Committee now address this House to give an indication of when the main report will be brought in, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:
I must rule there is no point of order. The Speaker does not know

when this report will be brought down.

MR. MORGAN:

Does the Chairman know?

MR. HICKEY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. HICKEY:

I thought I might have spoken to that point of order, Mr. Speaker, but I do not want to delay the House unduly.

About a week and a half ago, Your Honour, this issue came up by means of various points of order and one thing and another and I said then, Mr. Speaker, and it bears repeating what I said then, if we were not careful, this issue was going to get confused and muddled through parliamentary wrangling and points of order, and it seems to me that the main issue at hand here, in terms of the appointment of the Committee on Privileges, tends to be getting lost in the shuffle because of another issue which has been introduced. The fact that it is raised by a member from the Opposition on the Committee, or a member for this side is really academic to me.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the mandate given the Committee was to establish clearly and unequivocally whether or not the privileges of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) had been breached insofar as his files having been destroyed - burnt, shredded - one way or another, done away with. That was the mandate of the Committee. Mr. Speaker, I stand to be corrected,

but I have raised the matter a couple of times and I am not aware, nobody has told me, that the Committee was given any other mandate.

If that is the case, Your Honour, I have to ask the question, why is not that issue dealt with? And the issue brought forward today by the Chairman of the Committee or the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), or whoever raised it - it is academic who - that matter can be dealt with at another time. That matter can be dealt with by the same Committee, for that matter, if the House so decides to give them a mandate to do it. But my point, Mr. Speaker, is that the mandate given the Committee has nothing to do with why files were shredded, whether it was intentional or otherwise. The mandate was to establish were they shredded? Were the files done away with? Are they still intact? Was the member's privileges breached? Those is the question. That is the issue.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some other statements or suggestions or innuendo made affecting other members of the House. I suggest, Your Honour, that it is very unfortunate if this is going to drag on because of parliamentary wrangling or because of changing the mandate of the Committee by someone who does not have authority to change that mandate.

I suggest, Your Honour, that you direct the Committee to report forthwith, based on the mandate given that Committee. Are they able to stand in the House today and say whether the privileges of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) have been breached? Were they breached or where they not? Why they were breached is

another question. If you want to give the Committee an extension and a new mandate to look into that, by all means, we are in Your Honour's hands on that or in the government's hands on that insofar as calling Orders of the Day and with respect to what is going on in the House.

But certainly, the question at hand is the breach of privilege. Surely God, Mr. Speaker, the Committee is able to report now on whether or not the privileges of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) have been breached! That is the question. Let us have an answer to it now, today.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order. It is up to the Chairman and his Committee to bring in the report when they are ready to bring in that report. I have no power whatever to direct the Chairman or any member of the Committee to bring in that report now.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. HICKEY:

I am sorry, Your Honour, I hate to protest and to persist. If Your Honour cannot, will someone on the government side tell me, has the Committee gone beyond its mandate or not? I am saying it has. The member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) is saying it has.

MR. MORGAN:

That is right.

MR. HICKEY:

Now, Mr. Speaker; someone is

right, someone is wrong. Have we gone beyond the mandate given the Committee? If we have, I suggest my point of order is very much in order and very much should be dealt with, namely, come on with the report and say if the member's privileges have been breached.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I have already ruled on that point of order. We are awaiting the report from the Chairman and his Committee.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, are we going to withdraw what has been put on the table of the House today, which connects another issue to the mandate given the Committee? Can someone answer that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is a motion put by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and that can be put on the Order Paper for future debate or it can be debated now by leave of the House.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order at the present time. That has been ruled on.

MR. MORGAN:

Well, Sir, I want to raise a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Your Honour has now mentioned a

motion. What I have received, delivered to me and tabled in the House, is an interim report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections which points out that I had not given to the Committee, according to the last statement, all of the fifty-five pages I gave to the RCMP, whereas I did give the Committee my signed statement. So now, Mr. Speaker, what is the motion? My point of order is the motion itself is not addressed in this interim report. Where is the motion on the floor?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

When the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) brought in his interim report, he finished that report by proposing a motion that the matter be concurred with, and that will have to be put on the Order Paper and debated at a later time, unless the House agrees to debate it now.

MR. MORGAN:
Sir, what is the motion? Sir, with all due respect to the Chair, again I ask the question; a motion is being put, members of the House are now being told that it was read verbally or mentioned verbally, but there is no motion tabled in the House. There is only an interim report. There is no motion tabled, Mr. Speaker. I am asking now on a point of order, what is the motion that we are now putting before the House to be debated at some later date, Sir.?

MR. SPEAKER:
The motion was put by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) that his report be agreed on.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a document which is an outline of the government's position with respect to Regional and Economic Development Policy.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I have the Annual Report for 1984 of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:
A good job.

Answers to Questions for which
Notice has been Given

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I undertook, I think, the last day we were talking about the whole question of the Law of the Sea in question period, when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) brought up the question of the amount of money or taxes that a coastal state would have to pay to the international fund outside of the 200-mile limit.

Under the Law of the Sea, it is Article 82 (1, 2, 3, 4.) and Article 83 (1, 2, 3, 4.) There was some misinformation in the question asked by the, inadvertently no doubt, by the Leader of the Opposition, because the percentage of taxes outside the 200-mile limit -

MR. BARRY:

It was not me, it was the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The member for Menihek or whoever asked, I am sorry.

MR. MARSHALL:

That might have been a Freudian slip.

MR. BARRY:

It is one per cent a year.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is one per cent a year going to seven years.

MR. BARRY:

Twelfth year.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The twelfth in production.

Anyway so. I have a copy of the Law of the Sea -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am trying to give some information here and I am having great difficulty because some people are trying to show -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I want to table a copy of the Articles of the Law of the Sea,

Articles 82 and 83 which deals with this matter. It should be noted that any development beyond 200-miles, when made, would take around six years to put onstream. Then in accordance with Section 82 (2) there is a five year international tax holiday. Then the rates start, which will be 1996 from now, which will be at the earliest, increasing one per cent for each subsequent year to seven per cent in the twelfth year of production, which will be then 2003 from this date. And, of course, they have not discovered anything yet. So obviously it is going to be far, far beyond that. So it is a fairly long ways off and one reason why we wanted to deal with it later rather than sooner in the Atlantic Accord. The information that came out in the House the other day was that it started at seven per cent, the information that came out in the House said it was right away when production occurs. Both are wrong, it starts at 1 per cent and there is five years after production before it even kicks in, that 1 per cent, and then it goes until twelve years into production.

I am not saying that the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) does not know everything, all I am saying is that the wrong impression was left in the House the other day which obviously got out to the press that automatic 7 per cent right from day one of production. That is not true, it is 1 per cent after a five year tax holiday after production and the relevant Articles of the Law of the Sea are all here for hon. members to read.

I would also like to table a statement that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) also made on

Friday afternoon. The House was not open, and I took the earliest opportunity to ensure the hon. members are informed of it, it has to do with the business of beer distribution around the Province, which will be effective June 11 in the sense that imported beer from the United States and so on will be sufficient for the market by about June 11, and that it will be distributed through the various beer agents and whatever is in place now like the old distribution system when we had our breweries going. So I hereby table.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:
Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Committee of Supply.

MR. MARSHALL:
If I may, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I know the Opposition has no routine motion. I would like to propose that the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) replace the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) on the Social Services Committee - a permanent replacement.

MR. BARRY:
A permanent replacement?

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

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) gave us a schedule and now we have received notification that the Department of Education is meeting tonight, which is not on the schedule. There are now two committees meeting tonight.

MR. MARSHALL:
I will respond to that in a moment when I get the information from the Clerk.

MR. BARRY:
We just got a note. It is the first thing we heard about the Department of Education meeting tonight as far as I am aware of.

MR. MARSHALL:
Notice has to be given and if notice was not I will check into it.

The hon. gentleman advises me that he made a mistake, it is Justice tonight and notice was given on that.

MR. BARRY:
Justice? Did we get notice of Justice?

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TULK:
I think the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is the Chairman of the Social Services Committee. When did the member for St. John's North give notice that the Department of Justice would be on

tonight under the Social Services Committee? Could he answer that question?

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Th hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
I know I gave notice on Friday at 1:00 a.m. of the meetings that were to occur today.

MR. BARRY:
One tonight and one tomorrow night.

MR. MARSHALL:
Perhaps the record of the House can show which one it was.

MR. J. CARTER:
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Th hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
May I clarify. It was intended that the estimates of the Department of Education would be considered tonight, but certain difficulties arose and a last minute change had to be made. I am sorry but we are trying to make it convenient for every person and department concerned.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) stood in the House on Friday and gave notice that the Government Services Committee would meet, which is correct.

When we got this notice on our desk, this is the first we knew that the Department of Education was going to meet tonight, we just found out a few minutes ago. Now the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) suddenly stands up and says, 'There is some inconvenience there is a last minute change.' When are members on this side of the House supposed to prepare themselves to go into those estimates committees? This should be withdrawn.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Th hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
I agree that there is a problem and one of the biggest problems is that you cannot presume that any department's estimates will be passed in one sitting. That is the problem that faces all of us and that is fair enough, I concur, for once the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and myself agree wholeheartedly that that is the problem you cannot -

MR. BARRY:
It is not the problem, it is the practice.

MR. J. CARTER:
You cannot presume what the Committee will achieve in one particular sitting and, therefore, I was hoping to have a chance later on this afternoon to propose to the Leader of the Opposition that the way to go - and we could fix a very firm schedule - if the Opposition would agree that we would meet one Session per department and if there is a carry over that that would be carried over at the end. In other words,

every department would get a minimum of one Session and if there was any carry over then it would come at the end of the consideration of the estimates. It is the only way. I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is the only way that you will get a firm fixed agenda for the consideration of the estimates, otherwise it is very difficult.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Chairman, there is a member here who has been sitting in this House since 1972, I believe. The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) has been sitting in this House since 1972, but he still has no conception of what the role of the estimates committee or the role of the Opposition is in dealing with the estimates committee.

If the Opposition finds that a government department warrants, for whatever reason, matters of public interest, matters of malfeasance, whatever, we are entitled to spend the entire estimates committee on that department. Now, Mr. Chairman, I can only assume that the Chairman is just attempting to be mischievous. The point we are trying to make is that it is not that foolish philosophy that he has of the estimates committee that applies here because we were not informed the Social Services Committee was meeting at all tonight, whatever department, Education, whatever. I do not want to belabour it. The Government House Leader (Mr.

Marshall) did, I think, respond reasonably last week - and I want to make that clear - to our request to the estimates, I assume that there is a matter of a break down in communication or something, but really, we are supplied this today. We have members who are getting ready and are expecting to come up on a particular time.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman, I have the record now and I want to speak from the record. On Friday morning, at the end of the session, I gave motive of the Resource Committee meeting at 7:30 on Tuesday, etc. I also indicated that the Government Services Committee would meet on Monday at 7:30 here in the House. There was no notification with respect to Social Services. I have conferred with the Chairman and the procedure is that one is to be given notice of the meetings, so with the concurrence of the Chairman, in his usual affable way of dealing with things, there will be no meeting of Social Services tonight. The meetings will be as I give the notice at the end of the session. But, in the meantime, can I just make this clear, that we all have notice that the Resource Policy Committee and the Government Services Committee will consider certain departments, so we are all prepared within an ambit of the fifteen days. But everybody will get notice at the close of each session as to what is going to occur that night and what is going to occur the following morning.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

What an excellent solution.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

There seems to be a new disturbing trend developing which has to do with the fact of whether or not ministers are going to be available. With respect, the trend has been, and I know it is an inconvenience for departments, but I went through it as a minister and other members have, you wait, and when the Estimate Committee of this House is sitting, you know yours is coming on next. You do not know if it is that night or the next morning or late the next day, that is an inconvenience, granted, but we should not have the estimates procedure disrupted because of the attempt, now, to have ministerial convenience increased. We will not go along with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am glad that came up because I want to respond to it. As one of the architects of this system back a number of years ago, I still think it can work very well, but it is not working as well as it should work. And this morning, in anticipation of any problems along those lines I did contact, myself, the three Chairmans of the Estimates Committees to see how their committees were going and to ensure that departments and the ministers were responding and making themselves available. And as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) says, in his experience, I am not a bit concerned about the inconvenience caused to ministers or departments

as it relates to the Estimates Committees. Tough! They are paid to do a job, the ministers and the people under them, for this House and for the people of Newfoundland, and that is the way it has to be. The least inconvenience to the members of the House, and if it has to be that way, the most inconvenience for those whom the House is calling, and that is the ministers and the departments.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Its not working that way.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, I know it is not, and that is why I called this morning. I had an eerie feeling in my stomach this morning that the thing was not working right and I called the three Chairman. We will try to ensure that it is orderly, not overlapping, and so on as possible, because it is difficult, and the committee should be the last ones to be inconvenienced. The departments and the ministers are the ones who prepared the estimates, who should know them inside out and should be willing to respond, and it is the new members of the House who are not as well versed and, therefore, need some time to prepare so that they can ask intelligent questions so that democracy is not only working but seen to be working here.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

To that point also. When I was in our own Common Room answering a phone call I was using what I thought it was a piece of scrap

paper, but it happened to be the paper that was provided by the page into our Common Room, left on the table, and said, okay, now this is the notice that all the Opposition members got with regard to the Committees. I suggested to our Chairman that when we get notice each member be provided with a copy instead of just posting it or putting it on a desk or whatever. My question now to the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is, seeing the Chairman of the Social Services Committees says Education is not meeting, with regard to that Committee and being a member of it, would he inform the House when we can expect that Committee to be called? Tomorrow morning?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will give adequate notice. I just advised the House that I have to confer with the Social Services Committee and I will give notice, you will certainly get adequate notice.

MR. HISCOCK:

An hour?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to hear the Premier enlighten us because the Government Services Committee was supposed to meet with Municipal Affairs tonight. My colleague gave up another appointment and came in to meet with Municipal Affairs so I have been getting the feeling that we are, sort of, at their mercy. They are sort of doing us a favour to meet at those committees. And

now we end up meeting with Transportation, completely against our wish, I even agreed under protest to do it. It is as if we are the handmaidens and we have to wait at their convenience. It did seem unfair, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I am sorry that has happened and I apologize to the House and to the members opposite because it should not have happened. The only one I knew about that had any problems this morning when I called the three chairmen was that one that the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) is talking about. I was going to talk to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) this afternoon and find out why it was he could not keep the commitment to meet. That is what I was scared about and was anticipating problems in, so I just called the three chairmen this morning. That is where the problem was. That has to be ironed out and the departments have to meet, it is the departments and the minister - if there is going to be any inconvenience that is where the inconvenience has to be and not on the members of this Committee, or the various committees, and we will see that it does not happen any more and if it does and it comes to my attention we will iron it out pretty fast.

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible). A list of the guarantees that have been supplied by government during the year, now they are required to be tabled anyway eventually under the Financial Administration Act. Does the minister have the information on guarantees that

have been granted?

MR. MARSHALL:

I have information here on guarantees and this is the anticipated payouts, this is under 113.02 under the Fisheries Loan Board, following loans after the sale of respective vessels will approximate 50 per cent of the current loan balance. There is a list of names there if the hon. gentleman - I could table them.

MR. BARRY:

You could table those. Yes, but what about apart from the Fisheries Loan Board now? You have with respect to guarantees provided to the private sector, corporations, businesses.

MR. MARSHALL:

Issues under guarantee, yes, I have that here now. I have it here but I was not anticipating that the hon. gentleman was going to ask a question on the Consolidated Fund because I was under the impression that it had all been resolved, you know.

MR. BARRY:

I will tell you, if the minister could table the information and if we could have an understanding that we can come back to it briefly to ask the minister some questions on it.

MR. MARSHALL:

Can I get specifically that question again so I can be precise?

MR. BARRY:

I would like to have a list of the guarantees that have been supplied by government to enable private individuals or corporations to establish lines of credit or obtain loans.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will undertake to supply that.

MR. BARRY:

They have to be tabled eventually but it usually comes out during the Consolidated Fund estimates as well.

Now there is also some information with respect to CIDC shares being sold by the Government of Canada and I am wondering if the Province of Newfoundland is in the position to say whether Fishery Products International shares are held by CIDC now. They were intended to be, the last time it was raised they had not been formally transferred, but there is a commitment by Sinclair Stevens, the federal minister, to put the CIDC shares on the block, to sell them to private investors, what are the consequences of that for Fishery Products International?

Is Fishery Products International on the block or is it intended that the shares of Fishery Products International be taken out of CIDC and put somewhere else? Could the minister tell us?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, we were somewhat concerned with respect to the fact that they were put into CIDC in the first place because the restructuring agreement, quite clearly, had it that it was to be by the federal government. The previous federal administration saw fit to put it into CDIC. Our objection to it was that CDIC was one step removed from the federal government and, indeed, of course, it is going to be further removed if the intention is realized to sell it privately. But I can

state absolutely and categorically that we have received assurances with respect to this and of course the understanding is that Fishery Products International would be taken out of the CIDC portfolio when it is sold because those shares have to remain in the control, preferably directly, if not indirectly, by the federal government.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask a question with respect to Easteel and there is a guarantee and I am not sure whether it is combined with a grant or a loan from the Ocean Industries Fund, maybe the former Minister of Development might be aware of that. I have received information that that company is now bringing in containers for the oil industry which are fabricated in Nova Scotia and is acting as agent for a Nova Scotian company in bringing those containers in. Those containers compete directly with at least one local company, maybe others, where the containers are built here in this Province and provide employment and jobs in this Province.

Now there seems to be some incongruity, something wrong with the Government of the Province providing financing to a company which is then assisted in competing with a local company that can provide employment which has not received similar assistance from government. I am wondering whether the Minister Responsible for Energy, or the former Minister of Development, the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) might have any comment with respect to that?

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer that specifically. I am not aware that any people are bringing in containers. In relation to the funding that Easteel has been given, I stand to be corrected, but one I think is a straightforward government guarantee, and I think they also receive funding under the Ocean Industries Programme or some additional programme related to processing and working on pipes for offshore, as I recall. Again, I say, I stand to be corrected on that. It was quite some time ago.

Obviously, any time that we fund a company it would be our desire to ensure that that company, where possible, maximize local content and Easteel has been, to my knowledge, very good in that regard. I am not aware of any containers being brought in, or that they would be constructed locally by another company. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell me another company that might construct that type of container. If these are steel containers, Easteel is the only major fabricator really in the Province at the moment.

MR. BARRY:

I think it is AMO, I know the name of the individual, I know there is no question about it, they are building and they are in -

MR. WINDSOR:

I can undertake, on behalf of my colleague, who is not here today, to have that checked out and get that information for you. I am not aware that they are, indeed, importing anything from Nova Scotia, but they may well be.

MR. BARRY:

There is a local company that is

building and has twelve or thirteen people employed.

MR. WINDSOR:

I do not know, but if you want to send me a note with that name, it would be helpful in checking it out.

MR. BARRY:

Those are the questions I had.

MR. MARSHALL:

That question on the guarantees being secured, I hope to have it before the Committee rises; if not, we will have it for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) tomorrow.

MR. BARRY:

I beg your pardon?

MR. MARSHALL:

I said I hope to have that information before the Committee rises today; if not, we will have it tomorrow for you.

On motion, Consolidated Fund Services, all items, carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Executive Council, I guess, is the next one.

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

As is the tradition, unless members have some real questions, the vote to Government House usually carries without any great questions in the Assembly.

MR. BARRY:

There is one question.

MR. MARSHALL:

As the hon. gentleman can see, the vote is less than the actual budgeted amount last year, and slightly more than the revised

amount of 1984-85.

MR. BARRY:

There is one question. I have received one expression of concern about the Government House vehicle. I am not sure which one it is, but it has the Crown, the official emblem on it, which apparently is now being used for picking up and delivering mail. This may relate to the problem with respect to the disbanding of the motor pool, which we will be bringing up, and this may be as good a time as any to bring it up, under Executive Council.

There was a decision made to disband the motor pool and there were cars provided to various departments. The Opposition Office stated that it did not feel it necessary to take a car, we felt that that was an improper expenditure. We will be going into various departments to see what is happening with respect to the cars that have been supplied to the departments. The problem now is there is no provision, we have found, for a courier service or a messenger service. If you want to issue a press release, or if you want to have a document picked up from a government department, or sent to a government department, there is no messenger service any more. Apparently it is tied into the disbanding of the motor pool. Am I correct there?

MR. DAWE:

That is the reason why the Opposition Office was offered a vehicle.

MR. HISCOCK:

It was not. It was to take people home after parties, drunk.

MR. DAWE:

What your group would do with it was entirely up to yourself, you know.

MR. TULK:

Nasty! Nasty!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

The point here is disbanding the motor pool is one thing, but there should have been, and there still should be, a provision for a messenger service within government. Is the minister saying that we now have to take an automobile for the Opposition Office in order to have a messenger service? Is that the only way we get access to a messenger service?

MR. DAWE:

That was the intention. One of the reasons was the administration end of it, taking care of that aspect that the motor pool used to do.

MR. BARRY:

I would submit that is a waste of money. If we have to do it we have to do it, but I would submit to the minister that that is not a justification for allocating one car to each department of government. You could probably have one car to do that for the entire government.

MR. DAWE:

(Inaudible) the messenger service (inaudible) was just tremendous in the things it did for all departments and government agencies, and some agencies could use a car just about full time for that purpose. I mean, that is not the only reason, but it is certainly one.

MR. WINDSOR:

Take the car and then you will have no problem, you can do your own deliveries.

MR. BARRY:

We will have to have one for the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), I guess.

MR. DAWE:

By the way he was talking he will need a driver to go along with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

The context I am raising this in is that there has been an expression of concern with respect to Government House.

MR. HISCOCK:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. BARRY:

He took your words out of context.

MR. HISCOCK:

It does not matter about taking my words out of context. The former member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), has been one of the main champions of excessive expenditure, whether it be the government aircraft, the Premier's residence or the car pool.

One of the abuses of the car pool occurred in the past when the government or other parties had receptions and free transportation was provided to members who were a little bit under the weather. I would say that is one of the main reasons why it was disbanded. The former member for LaPoile was adamant about that and I think,

too, it was one of the main reasons. And for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to be making personal attacks or aspersions on one's character is completely unnecessary.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) says, and it is quite true, that we have thrown the baby out with the bath water. A courier service is needed and it is not necessary to have a car with the Crown's emblem on it carrying mail for Government House.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

On motion, 1.1.02, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall 2.1.01 carry?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I presumed we are on the Office of the Premier, are we?

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised, first of all, that the Premier is not in his seat to answer questions about his own office.

MR. MARSHALL:

The Premier is momentarily out.

MR. TULK:

The Premier is momentarily out, well, is that not wonderful!

MR. SIMMS:

He is not like the member for Fogo who is always out to lunch.

MR. TULK:

Will old Landslide Simms over there confine himself to getting back his forty-one votes up to an acceptable majority so that he can

come in here and act with the bravado that he is now putting on, the face that he is now putting on! He does not even know upside down from right side up. Be quiet!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, if you could refrain old Landslide, a former Speaker of this House, who should know that when somebody else is standing in the House he should be quiet. He has become a master of interruptions. He now has a record. So would the Chairman protect me from that onslaught from him that is coming over?

Mr. Chairman, one of the questions that we would obviously like to have the Premier answer is on the appointments that we have seen coming up in the last little while, the number of defeated Tory candidates, the number of defeated Tory MHAs, the number of would-be Tory candidates that we see being appointed to various positions in this Province. I suppose the President of the Council will answer this: Has it now become a rule of this government that if you run for that side and lose, then you find a very cushy job? Could we also have the President of the Council, (Mr. Marshall), since he is representing the Premier, as I suppose -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is the Premier.

MR. TULK:

He is the real Premier. After the mess he has made of the Estimate Committees and so on, I do not know why the Premier would leave anything in his hands. I cannot understand it. And I could see the grim look on his face this

evening when the Premier was so co-operative with the Opposition. He hated it. He could not stand it. He could not put up with it. He was over there squirming around in his seat, and I am sure that he will go home tonight -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is going to leave on his bike.

MR. TULK:

We would like to hear the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) now stand in this House and tell us if, indeed, it is the policy of the present government, of the administration of which he is so proud, the man who was responsible for the Public Accounts Committee, which we saw him sit there in his seat and get gutted last year - get the real guts torn out of him - I am talking about the Public Accounts of the Province. He built his whole career on that.

MR. SIMMS:

Public tendering.

MR. TULK:

Public tendering, that is right. I thank the member for Grand Falls. He has made one useful contribution to this House, the only one I have heard from him in six years.

MR. SIMMS:

One more than the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I would hope that he gets better advice than from the person from whom he is now getting it. I hope he is not seeking advice from the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

I would like for the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) to

stand in his place now and tell us what the policy of the government is with regard to patronage. I want to say to him that I suppose, Mr. Chairman, there would not be that much objection from members on this side of the House if, first of all, there were a public process of application and acceptance and screening of those former Tory candidates and the former nominees for the Tory Party. There would not be that much objection if indeed some good Tory got a job. As a matter of fact, I do not know that I can find too much objection, except for the way that he was appointed, to the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Goudie, being appointed to a very cosy position. I am not sure what their salaries are either. Their salaries are not clear. What are the salaries of some of those fat appointments that they have made? What are the salaries of some of those people? I know that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) would be very glad to tell us and I am sure that he will also stand in his place and tell us that the Premier, or somebody, was making those appointments over his objections, the man who basically said that Frank Moores' government and every other government before it had been - Did he not get flicked out of Cabinet for that?

AN HON. MEMBER:

He left.

MR. TULK:

He left. On his own volition he left the Cabinet because things were not, as he saw them, going right, so I know now that he will be very pleased to stand in his place in a few minutes when I sit down and tell us how many more patronage appointments we can

expect, how many more former Tory members, nominees, former Cabinet Ministers, former candidates, we can expect to see appointed, and I am sure that he will also stand and tell us, Mr. Chairman -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:
Look, Mr. Chairman, do not take any advice from him! Just do not take any advice from him! I would ask you to give whatever information you have to give to him and then request that he leave the table. Because, Mr. Chairman, you have been doing a very commendable job and if you take any advice from the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands, I will tell you that within a matter of weeks you will see us standing over here and questioning some of your rulings. He is probably one of the most bias people in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Who?

MR. TULK:
And to think that he carried on that facade -

MR. WINDSOR:
(Inaudible) not political bone in his body.

MR. SIMMS:
Are you talking about Mr. Chairman?

MR. TULK:
No, I am talking about you.

MR. SIMMS:
Oh, come on now. Now we know you are only kidding.

MR. TULK:
The member for Grand Falls, the

Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, I want the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Are you the new Premier?

MR. TULK:
I wish that glare would get out of the Premier's seat.

I want the President of the Council to stand and tell us how many more patronage appointments we can expect in this government? I want him to tell us if the former member for Bonavista North, now that he has been wiped out by my friend that used to be in Terra Nova, my friend, Mr. Lush, whether he is going to get an appointment? I want him to tell us whether the former member for Twillingate, who has been wiped out and adequately taken care of, is going to have a position, a cushy position in this government. What about -

MR. BAKER:
Gander.

MR. TULK:
The one for Gander probably deserves something. What about the former minister who was so ably wiped out by my friend from Grand Falls down there, is he going to get a good cushy job out of this too? As the member for St. Barbe was wiped out by the gentleman behind me? I would expect him -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tell us about Rex Murphy.

MR. TULK:
Who?

I would expect him to give something to the former member for Gander -

MR. BAKER:
Absolutely.

MR. TULK:
- because she has reached an age, and that is the reason why the people of Gander tossed here out, she has reached the age where she should.

The member for Stephenville, is he going to get an appointment? He again was wiped out by this young gentleman sitting back here. Is he going to get an appointment? Would he also tell us what the salaries of the people who have been appointed, how much they are contemplating on spending in their estimates this year for patronage appointments and just what the policy of the government is in regards to patronage appointments?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman, I mean, what is the point of this exercise. Here we have a budget that has been brought in by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with a \$70-odd million deficit on Current Account which should be of concern to all members of this House, as well as it is certainly a deep concern of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
Here you have the highest taxation rate that the government and all people in this Province are

concerned about, but do you hear the hon. gentlemen there opposite addressing that. Here, you have, Mr. Chairman, the seeds of the possibility of being able to overcome the fiscal problems that we have wrestled with for a long period of time through the offshore, through the fishery restructuring and that. Do they address that? No, Mr. Chairman, their lead off speaker, and traditionally when the Premier's estimates are called, of course, it is a field day for the hon. gentleman there opposite, but you would think they would ask if not sensible questions, for which they are incapable of, at least, incisive in question and inquiring questions.

All the hon. gentleman wanted to do is to speak for ten minutes about alleged policy with respect to defeated Tory candidates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:
All of which has been adequately answered. I would point out that I do not know how many employees there are in all of government, but every single one that is appointed in government that has been appointed by this administration has been appointed solely and simply on the criterion of ability. In many cases and in most cases 99 per cent of the time that goes before an independent commission of the Public Service Commission. I suppose, I could go into flight about people who had been appointed from time to time. I could go into flight about certain people who were defeated in 1982 and talk about the jobs that were provided for this person. I could talk about previous executive assistants to

MPs. I could talk about previous members from Lewisporte who got certain jobs. I could talk about another hon. member who was appointed in another regime from this same cruel group of people who dish out party patronage to a certain federal board.

MR. TOBIN:
Who is that?

MR. MARSHALL:
I could even talk, Mr. Chairman, about people now in the Opposition Office, such as the sage from Freshwater, and the job that the hon. gentleman got from the largess also of the public purse, but I am not going to because, the fact of the matter is, when you have certain people from time to time who get defeated, there is no reason at all, while their abilities were recognized while they were in Cabinet, if there is a position available that they apply for and they compete with and they turn out to be the best person possible, just because they happen to be Tory or they happen to be Liberal or they happen to be NDP or they happen to be Communist, or whatever they may or they may happen to be is certainly not going to disqualify them.

So I have responded now, I mean, if that is all, if -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman, now that the minister has gone that far would he - as long as they are

competent, would he now answer the part of the question which says, why did they not go through the public screening process?

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman wants to get up and interfere with debate, I mean that is the hon. gentleman's prerogative. The fact of the matter is that they were all appointed on the basis of merit.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Mere Tories!

MR. MARSHALL:
And they are people who can discharge the job. There were not positions created, I would indicate, as was the process that the hon. gentleman's party used. But the hon. gentleman is not going to trap me, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to get down in the mud and roll with the hon. gentleman. If the hon. gentleman, in the course of discourse on these estimates want to ask reasonable questions I will answer, but I will not get down in the grass with the snakes and crawl with the snakes. I will not, Mr. Chairman, get down in mud and roll with the swine. Mr. Chairman, what I will do is try to address sensible issues and questions that are asked and if the hon. gentlemen do not want to, that is fine. In connection with talking about sensible questions I can now table the answer to the question that was posed by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Barry) with respect to government guarantees over the past period of time. I can advise the hon. -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:
So you do not want the answer to that question, I understand?

MR. TULK:
Oh yes, come on and table it.

MR. MARSHALL:
You want it tabled. So you would rather table the substance and let the dirty mote from the hon. gentleman's mouth. Well, if that is the case then I will table it, Mr. Chairman. It goes to show the hon. gentlemen are not interested in sensible answers at all.

MR. SIMMS:
They just want to make a few political points.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to respond to some of the comments made by the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) in his cherubic visage. I am new in the House and one of the reasons that I would like to see this line of questioning pursued in a number of departments and in a number of estimates is simply this - and I would like edify - you are listening, are you?

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. BAKER:
Marvellous.

I would like to provide some edification for the Government House Leader. One of the reasons why this is such an interesting area and an area that I personally would like somebody to get into, and all of the other things that the hon. member mentioned. Certainly, there obviously are questions that are going to come but a lot of things, especially in other estimates committees, and may be in this one as well, but one of the things that has been repeatedly said over the last number of years is that this particular administration - and this is an impression that was given - that this particular administration was above all of those things, absolutely, totally, lily white clean.

MR. TULK:
Like a bar of Sunlight soap.

MR. BAKER:
This administration was above that kind of thing and appointments were not being made simply on the basis of whether someone was Tory or NDP or Liberal or whatever political stripe, but that all appointments would go through the civil service, the Public Service Commission would evaluate individuals and, on the rating system, provide to government individuals that were best qualified for a particular position. Now, then, when all of a sudden these things start showing up, Mr. Minister -

MR. SIMMS:
(Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER:
He said we did it like the Liberals.

MR. BAKER:

Yes, I know. This is my very point. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) makes the point well, is this government is just like the others. I mean, is this another case of what is happening in Ottawa where there were all kinds of recriminations to the previous government for patronage appointments and now we find the same thing is happening over again only greater.

I think it goes a little further than that. It goes into an attitude. This is really what I would like to get into. I am just explaining to the hon. gentleman why the patronage thing is an interesting avenue to pursue and, obviously, will be pursued. It is a matter of attitude. It was brought home within the last couple of Sessions, an uproar about members of the Opposition travelling to Montreal, I believe it was, to make a presentation before a hearing of some sort on sealing. The point is, is there something wrong with going somewhere else to make a presentation, is there something wrong with sort of getting outside the Island, outside the Province to go somewhere to make a point to a particular group or individual or whatever the case may be? This gives me the impression of an attitude over across the floor there. We are going to build a wall and people have to come here and so on. We do not like those people because they are foreigners, they are from up along and all this kind of thing and that attitude kind of bothers me. We should rather be going places and talking to people and we should be using whatever means at our disposal to make our points rather than building our little

wall around ourselves and not reaching out. So, it is this kind of a general attitude that I would like some comment from the minister on, the general attitude across the way going way back, the old time Tory attitude, the anti-Confederate kind of attitude that we are standing on our own and we will not even go somewhere to make a presentation to somebody.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Chairman):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, the quality, I have to say, on a score of one to ten, certainly has not gone up too much, although it is not as vindictive as the previous speaker. I know all hon. gentlemen would just love me to score them so from the point of zero to ten I will give the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) minus five, I give the hon. gentleman minus four and a half - a little bit better.

Mr. Chairman, he mentions the appointments. I wonder if he knows how many positions there are in the public service? There are in excess of 9,000 positions in the public service. Now the party that the hon. gentleman embraces was a party where each and every single appointment, just about bar none, was made, not through an independent Public Service Commission, but through a bogus commission. You talk about political appointees, and I do not want to name the hon. gentlemen, some of them have gone to their great reward, which are not the material type of rewards that the Liberal party can only concentrate

on. Now we established a Public Service Commission and, of those 9,000 positions, I would say about 98 per cent of those go through the Public Service Commission. The rest of them are contractual, certain ones, and they are done on a merit basis for various reasons. So this government had nothing whatever to apologize and to explain for the way in which it has conducted its affairs in government, not only this government, but this party since 1971.

Now the presentation, what is wrong? Now, the hon. gentleman there opposite, as I stood listening to him, there is an old saying, you know, 'To many cooks spoil the broth,' and, I think, there are probably too many cooks in Gander, too many bakers in Gander. I think it works in reverse for the representation now, instead of, 'To many cooks spoil the broth,' two bakers are half baked, and, Mr. Chairman, that is unfortunately what we have in Gander. The hon. gentleman asked, what is really wrong? Now, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman, one of the nicer fellows in the House, one of the more affable one who comes in with a smile on his face day to day and even though he is abysmally insulted by people on the other side, just as then, he can take it in good stead and smile. I wonder if the hon. gentleman can seriously ask, on a question like the seal fishery - now there is the former Minister of Fisheries down there sitting on the other side of the House - a question of the seal fishery so integrally entwined in the rural life of this Province, and he has to ask what is wrong with the Opposition Party going to Ottawa or to Montreal, or whatever it was to put their brief

for the seal fishery. Now the fact of the matter is not so much that the hon. gentleman went up there - I can understand because there is a certain psychology of the hon. gentlemen there opposite towards the Mainland. We saw their lap doggyish fashion with respect to the offshore, where they were prepared to sell the future of this Province forever and a day down because of the advice of Mainlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

And if they did everything that Mainlanders wanted them to do, Mr. Chairman, if we did everything that the hon. gentlemen did today because of their great love for Mainlanders - now I ask him really, how can he possibly, as a red-blooded Newfoundlander get up and ask the question as to what is wrong with a major party in this Province when a commission on the seal fishery comes into this Province and they do not even appear before it in this Province. They think somehow or other that representation is going to be a little bit better if they go up to the Mainland, go up to Ottawa or Toronto, or Montreal. They are in so much love with the place, Mr. Chairman, if they could take Newfoundland and Labrador up and put it into the middle of Central Canada, they would do it in a moment because they have no pride in the place at all.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, the Government House

Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the President of the Council would be reminded well that those who get in on the ground floor should perhaps be able to influence somebody more than those are tardy, who are behind.

MR. MARSHALL:

Are you speaking on a point of order?

MR. TULK:

I just want to correct the hon. gentleman. We got in on the ground floor and I think we had a greater influence possibly on the commission than the government did waiting for them to come down here, because, you see, we were got there first, we wanted to impress their minds with what was important to Newfoundland. That is the whole point of the situation. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) would learn well, we would have had an offshore agreement signed a number of years ago if the - but the Government House Leader was willing to travel to Toronto. He was in Toronto when the Premier pulled the rug out from under him and said, 'Back home, Bill, we are not signing anything with Chretien or Trudeau.'

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order there is no point of order.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, it is just another interruption. Now, the fact of the matter is I am going to tell the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) if he keeps on asking questions like this he will find, in the next election, that he is indeed over cooked or over baked and the people from Gander will

react accordingly. Imagine an hon. gentleman, particularly from that town which is so concerned about its own rights within the Province, and rightfully so, getting up and asking a question in this House as to what is wrong with the official opposition going to the Mainland only to put its point across.

The question that he should ask is why the official opposition did not appear before the committee when it was here in the Province of Newfoundland? What was the reason why? We have know that that party, through their stand on the offshore, is prepared to give in to the various points of the Mainland concerns and what have you. So what did the hon. gentlemen do up on the Mainland of Canada that they wanted to hide, that they did not want to repeat down here? As I say, the hon. gentleman gets up and he asks under this question as to what is wrong. What is wrong? There is plenty wrong with it. The hon. gentlemen should have the courage of their convictions, should have been prepared to represent the people that they represent in this Province and appear before the Royal Commission into the future of the seal fishery when it appeared in this Province. But the hon. gentlemen were too concerned, they wanted to get a trip to the Mainland again, as if that were Mecca or the panacea of life, and they went up to the Mainland to give their representations on behalf of the people of Twillingate. Imagine the member for Twillingate (W. Carter), the great defender of the seal fishery, now being a member of a party which feels it has got to go up to make representations with respect to the seal fishery to the Mainland. I say if the

hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, were still on the -

MR. W. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I should inform the hon. member that the member for Twillingate along with the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) did request permission to appear before the Royal Commission on seals and sealing. We did request permission to appear before that committee and make a presentation.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, they made that request because they had no power to influence their own caucus. The fact of the matter is what they wanted was representative groups and the hon. gentleman's Party let him down. What the hon. gentleman was trying to do was pull the coals out of the fire before they got too hot. So that is what the hon. gentleman, who very wise, politically did. But now the fact of the matter is I want to ask him once again, how can he sit on the other side of the House supporting a Party that refused to support Newfoundland's position on the seal fishery here in this Province?

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I would ask the hon. member how he can sit on that side of the House, support a Party and a government,

Mr. Chairman, that, this year, spent more money on a traffic survey for the Outer Ring Road for St. John's than what they were prepared to spend on keeping the seal fishery alive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I requested of the Premier that money be made available to help keep the seal fishery on the Northeast Coast alive. My request was refused. In fact, the Premier wrote me back a two-page letter talking about the \$75,000 that was being spent on the seal fishery. They spent \$110,000 two weeks before that time to Deleuw Cather and Company, an engineering consulting company. They spent \$110,000, Mr. Chairman, to a mainland engineering consulting company to provide a traffic study of the Outer Ring Road in St. John's - \$110,000 for the traffic study, \$75,000 for the great sealing fishery.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I thank the hon. gentleman. This hon. gentleman in answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, has no hesitation in supporting a government that has rescued the fishery of this Province from destruction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman

joined the wrong Party very much at the wrong time. Because, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman wants to look at it, where would Burin be today. Burin would be closed if you had the way of the hon. gentlemen there opposite particularly the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) who the hon. gentleman joined, they wanted to close Burin down.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman realized what they were trying to do with Burin. Today Burin is on its way to being a viable fishery. What happened to the plant in Grand Bank?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. MARSHALL:
My time is not up, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Yes, it is.

MR. MARSHALL:
I thought the hon. gentleman was speaking in the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No, no.

MR. MARSHALL:
Oh, I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To that point of order, there was no point of order.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Premier's office, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) ended up saying that over 9,000 people in the public service that the number of people who are appointed through political patronage does not really matter. Does he also realize that over 800 people were cut from the civil service last year blatantly and the positions not filled and another 800 this year, when we have over 60,000 people unemployed. The point that the Opposition wants to make is that if there are jobs there they should be listed with the Public Service Commission so that people can apply for them, and if they get them, well and good.

I remember the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) saying the former member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) got a job with the federal government. I would like to remind him, number one, that that person did not seek re-election and, number two, he applied for the job. Another thing I would like to remind the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) of with regard to jobs in this Province, is that we are debating the estimates of the Premier's Office and when we look at them we find that the Premier is one of the highest paid premiers in the country, \$65,400, and that is just the basic salary. Transportation and communications for the Premier's Office is estimated to be \$100,000, and that does not count the car and chauffeur provided, that does not count the rent free apartment, that does not count the dining room and chef provided, and, Mr. Speaker, that is not counting other fringe benefits, such as when the Premier goes on trips, the travel expense, the hotels, the meals, and

entertainment expense. The question I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, is how many people are in the Premier's Office and what are their salaries?

The other question I would like to ask is, and it was brought up in the Public Accounts Committee, although we have gotten rid of the government aircraft - we are using the government aircraft for air ambulance services - we are still spending just as much money in each individual department as we were spending when we had the government aircraft and the Deputy Minister is looking at the possibility of bringing the government aircraft back. I would like to ask the President of the Council is this going to be the case? Are we going to have the government aircraft brought back?

Another question I would like to ask the President of the Council to answer is, or the Premier, when the Atlantic Accord was signed there was a reception held at Holiday Inn, how much did that reception cost? When they had the reception at Holiday Inn for the media, how much did that reception cost, Mr. Chairman?

Another question I have is with regard to Mount Scio House. That is no longer being used by the Premier, we are providing him with a duplex, rent free, and the furniture which was in Mount Scio House is in storage. The question I would like to ask of the Premier or the President of the Council is, is it wise to have that furniture in storage? How long is it going to be in storage? Because this furniture can deteriorate, would it not be a good idea to sell it at a public auction, or donate it to Transition House, or donate it to

some of the 25,000 people who are on welfare? I do not think people realize that there are 25,000 welfare cases in this Province. The average rule of thumb is two and a half children per case, which means we are talking about 45,000 children on welfare, plus 25,000 parents. In all, we are talking about 70,000 people on welfare in the Province and we are not talking about, Mr. Chairman, the 60,000 people unemployed.

When we look at the fact that we provide a rent free apartment for the Premier, a chauffeur, a dining room, etc., plus the \$100,000 for transportation and the Premier's salary, which probably comes to \$120,000 altogether, and when we consider, Mr. Chairman, that there are 70,000 people on welfare and over 60,000 people unemployed and we only have a population of a little over 600,000 people, is it any wonder that the people of this Province look with envy at people in government?

But does the Premier take a generous attitude towards the representatives of the people in this Province who are duly elected, whether they be NDP, or Conservatives, or Liberals? Does he treat them with the same fairness that the people of the Province treat him by giving him the high salary, free rent, dining hall, chef and chauffeur, etc.? Does he do that? No, Mr. Chairman, the members of the Opposition are crowded into an office a little bit bigger than a telephone booth, and they have to share a secretary. In all honesty, Mr. Chairman, it became so bad, and I suppose when you look at people who do not have other incomes, it became such a crushing blow with regards to expenses that two of our members

on this side had to succumb to the pressure and want to have part of the good life and go over and have their own office, have their own secretary, be able to go into the dining room and have a decent meal, and also have \$13,000 provided for transportation. But does the Premier take the attitude of treating each elected representative in this House so that they can get up -

MR. WARREN:
(Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK:
If the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has any questions to ask, he can get up after this and ask as many questions as the member for Torngat wants to ask.

With regards to the other part, Mr. Chairman, the Premier does not treat the people, in actual fact, I think the Premier of this Province treats the people of this Province with utter contempt in the way he treats the representatives of this House, that each member of this House, Mr. Speaker, should have sufficient travelling expense, should have their own secretary -

MR. SIMMS:
(Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Chairman, if the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) would be silent for a moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:
If you look at other provinces you will find out that each of the duly elected representatives have their own secretary, have their

own office in their district, have their own executive assistants, in many cases, as well as space provided.

But we are still back in the dark ages in this Province and, that is, the Premier and the Leader of the House (Mr. Marshall) or the President of the Council takes the attitude, keep the Opposition in the dark, keep them down, do not give them their rights, do not give the people of this Province their rights so they can carry out their duly elected responsibilities, and let them grovel and let them continue to ask for things. And as a result of the attitude, if you want your own secretary, if you want your own office, if you want additional travel expense, then there is always room over on the government side, there is always room for a few more turncoats, a few more traitors to the beliefs of the people of this Province.

So, Mr. Chairman, in concluding I would like to ask the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) if he could provide us with, how many people are in the Premier's office? What their salaries are? How many executive assistants are there? I know there is one in Corner Brook, Grand Falls, I believe there is one in Goose Bay, and I believe he has a parliamentary assistant.

With regards to the government aircraft - is the government aircraft coming back? The Deputy Minister of Transportation said, we are spending more now on each individual chartered aircraft for each individual department than we did on the government aircraft. With regards to the other questions, with regards to the Premier's Office can the President

of the Council say to this House whether each duly elected representative of this House of Assembly, representing the people of this Province, whether they be Liberal or NDP or Conservative, will be treated fairly and with the same generosity that the people of this Province are providing the Premier. Will the member of the Opposition and government backbenchers be provided with their own secretaries, their own office, and adequate travel and other expenses.

I remember the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) in 1982 after the Liberals had eighteen members and we ended up going down to eight, and he came in, and very high and mighty after the election, and he started going around this, and this and this and that, I ended up saying, are we going to be getting individual offices, see there are eight of us now, and we had eighteen offices? The Minister of Public Works said that if I had it my way, he said, I would make sure that the Opposition will be given enough space as you would have in a phone booth.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can reply to all those body blows in the short period of time that is available to me, but

I want to say I think one of the first questions that I heard the hon. gentleman ask was How many people are employed in the Premier's office?

Now, the hon. gentleman has been in here - how long? - since 1979.

MR. HISCOCK:

I know how many there are, what are their salaries?

MR. MARSHALL:

No, you asked how many there were. Now, since 1979 he has participated in these committees and he must realize that there is always distributed with the Budget the Departmental Salary Details, with a listing of the employees. And if he looks there, how many employees are in the Office of the Premier? - two. There are just two in the Office of the Premier. Mr. Chairman, now is that not some Premier? Two people, himself and the secretary. He has Executive Support amounting to thirteen, and eight more in Administration for a total of twenty-three, the smallest in quantity but the greatest in quality in any province of Canada, Mr. Chairman. Now, imagine the hon. gentleman! Is he not embarrassed? - asking a question and speaking for two or three minutes with respect to a question such as that, when it was already before him! After all these years! The hon. gentleman sits here by grace of this government anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

In the first place, he sits here by grace, really, of this government!

MR. HISCOCK:

I sit here by the grace of the people of Eagle River.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, he sits here by grace of the government.

Now, there are some other questions that the hon. gentleman raised. He wanted to know certain costs. I can get him the various costs. He wanted to know how much was expended with respect to the meeting with the press awhile ago. Well, of course, Mr. Chairman, it is not in these estimates because that occurred awhile ago, but I will get that for the hon. gentleman. The same way with the Atlantic Accord, that is not in the estimates. How many were there? I do not know, Mr. Chairman, but I can tell the hon. gentleman the place was jam-packed with people of Newfoundland and Labrador, who were so glad to see that we had been able to rescue our offshore from the proposals that the hon. gentlemen wished us to accept through Mr. Chretien. What else did the hon. gentleman want to know? He wanted to know about the Premier's furniture. Imagine! He asked the question: If the Premier's furniture is stored, is it going to be in good repair? Is that what he asked?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Was it going to Deteriorate.

MR. MARSHALL:

Was it going to deteriorate? I assume that you store furniture, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of assuring that it does not deteriorate when it is not used.

I do not recall any other question that the hon. gentleman asked but I will look at the Hansard, Mr. Chairman, and see.

In the meantime, since it is 6:00 P.M., I move the Committee rise and report progress.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Before the House adjourns, I would like to advise the House that tonight at 7:30, pursuant to agreement, the Government Services Committee will be considering the estimates of the Department of Transportation.

Tomorrow morning at 9:30 in the Colonial Building, Social Services will be considering the estimates of the Department of Education.

Tomorrow at 7:30 P.M., in the House, Social Services will also be considering the Department of Education. So, tomorrow morning at Colonial Building and tomorrow night in the House, the Committee will be dealing with the Education

estimates.

Tomorrow night at 7:30, as I already announced on Friday, the Resource Committee, at the Colonial Building, will discuss Fisheries.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I know the time is just about gone, so the protest will not come this evening, but are we now to understand from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that we are going to have two committees meeting at once? Is that in line with what the Premier gave us this afternoon?

MR. MARSHALL:

The Premier did not say anything about -

MR. TULK:

Oh, now you are finagling again, are you not?

MR. MARSHALL:

No, we made it quite clear, Mr. Speaker. We made it quite clear that we would attempt, where possible, to have one meeting at a time, but we reserve the right to have two at a time. We do not feel that it is too onerous to have two at a time and we are continuing with that.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 4, 1985 at 3:00 P.M.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

June 3, 1985

Section 82 of the Law of the Sea Convention

Attached hereto is the final text of the Law of the Sea Convention. It should be noted that any development beyond 200 miles (when made) would take, say, 6 years to put on stream; then in accordance with S.82(2) there is a 5 year international tax holdiay; then the rate starts (in 1996 at the earliest) at 1%, increasing 1% for each subsequent year to 7% in the 12th year of production (ie. 2003 at the earliest).

This compromise was instrumental in getting a majority of countries to agree to give Canada (and thus Newfoundland) rights to our uniquely very wide continental margin extending up to 350 miles offshore.

Article 82

Payments and contributions with respect to the exploitation of the continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles.

1. The coastal State shall make payments or contributions in kind in respect of the exploitation of the non-living resources of the continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured.
2. The payments and contributions shall be made annually with respect to all production at a site after the first five years of production at that site. For the sixth year, the rate of payment or contribution shall be 1 per cent of the value or volume of production at the site. The rate shall increase by 1 per cent for each subsequent year until the twelfth year and shall remain at 7 per cent thereafter. Production does not include resources used in connection with exploitation.
3. A developing State which is a net importer of a mineral resource produced from its continental shelf is exempt from making such payments or contributions in respect of that mineral resource.
4. The payments or contributions shall be made through the Authority, which shall distribute them to States Parties to this Convention, on the basis of equitable sharing criteria, taking into account the interests and needs of developing States, particularly the least developed and the land-locked among them.

Article 83

Delimitation of the continental shelf between States with opposite or adjacent coasts

1. The delimitation of the continental shelf between States with opposite or adjacent coasts shall be effected by agreement on the basis of international law, as referred to in Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, in order to achieve an equitable solution.
2. If no agreement can be reached within a reasonable period of time, the States concerned shall resort to the procedures provided for in Part XV.
3. Pending agreement as provided for in paragraph 1, the States concerned, in a spirit of understanding and co-operation, shall make every effort to enter into provisional arrangements of a practical nature and, during this transitional period, not to jeopardize or hamper the reaching of the final agreement. Such arrangements shall be without prejudice to the final delimitation.
4. Where there is an agreement in force between the States concerned, questions relating to the delimitation of the continental shelf shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of that agreement.

*Tabled by the
the Premier,
3 June '85*

PRESS RELEASE

Issued by Honourable Dr. J. Collins, Minister of Finance,
concerning the sale of imported beer.

Finance Minister Dr. John Collins has announced that the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation has now developed a distribution system for imported beer which will enable distributors for local breweries to sell American beer to Brewers' Agents and Licenses.

In co-operation with the Newfoundland Liquor Licensing Board a temporary authorization will be issued to both Distributors and Brewers' Agents allowing them to sell the American beer under this system. Containers will be dropped off at various locations across the Province where distributors will pick up the beer and distribute it to their normal customers for sale to the general public.

The Liquor Corporation will absorb the costs of distributing the American beer so that Brewers' Agents will pay the same price for the imported beer as lounge owners have been paying up to now. The cost of agents' commissions and Retail Sales Tax will be added to this price so that the selling price in brewers agencies will be \$6.75 per six-pack.

The Corporation will be advising the distributors of the new system immediately and will provide information as to the procedures to be followed in order to procure beer.

It is expected that the new system will be fully operational by June 11, 1985 when sufficient beer supplies will be available in the Province.