

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

Tuesday, March 29, 1977

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On behalf of all hon. members I am pleased to welcome to the Legislature twenty-nine students in the Secretarial Science Division of the College of Trades and Technology. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Hounsell and Mrs. Dean. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these people to the House of Assembly this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement relating to the recent press release by the Eastcan group of companies relating to their intention not to drill off the coast of this Province this forthcoming Summer.

In view of the fact that the reasons given for this suspension of drilling operations relate to a matter of vital importance to the Province, it is imperative that the position of this administration be placed on record so that the public may judge whether or not we are, in fact, acting responsibly in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, since this administration took office in 1972, all exploration conducted off the coast of this Province has been carried out pursuant to an interim permit issued with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council under the Petroleum and Natural Gas Act of 1965 as amended. These interim permits gave the interim permittee only exploration rights and did not convey any right or title to the oil resources of the permit area. Up to and including last year's drilling season, the interim permit mechanism was satisfactory to the companies.

By late last Spring it became obvious that a political settlement of the jurisdictional dispute with the Federal Government would not be forthcoming. Consequently, under

MR. PECKFORD: instructions from the government and the Premier, my officials started work on preparing regulations which would allow the Province to issue both exploration and production rights. It was obvious that as the jurisdictional dispute came to a final resolution, no company would be willing to undertake large investments where its title was, in fact, unclear because of the lack of provincial production rights. It was anticipated that the companies' perception of the need to obtain provincial production rights would change once the decision was made to go to court.

This prediction came true. In the early Fall of 1976 Eastcan and a number of other groups made strong representations to the Province that in view of the fact that the Province was proceeding to court on the jurisdictional dispute, they felt that they needed production rights from the Province before further major investments could be made.

Mr. Peckford:

It should be stressed that the rights which Eastcan and the other operators now wish to obtain from this Province are rights to produce and would include such matters as the level of royalties and the amount of acreage on which they can go to lease. Upon receiving the Eastcan request we thereupon accelerated our preparations of the draft regulations and have been working intensively on these since that time. In contrast the Federal Government has been working on their proposed regulations since 1971.

It must be stressed that the regulations under contemplation by this government will be the most important piece of legislation relating to offshore oil and gas rights as it will set out the essential bargain between operators such as Eastcan and the Province and will in fact determine the conditions upon which development can go forward and eventually the benefits which will accrue to this Province. Consequently, it is of great importance that the regulations be carefully and thoughtfully drafted and that input be received from, not only the oil companies, but also the general public. Because of this, it is our intention to publish a draft set of these regulations in a matter of weeks and receive public comments on them before we finally commit the Province as to the nature of the conditions we will attach to the development.

It is obvious that in a matter of such great importance to the Province that it will be necessary in this administration to negotiate a good bargain for the Province. This will naturally involve some very hard bargaining indeed. However, I am confident that we will be able to find the proper balance between ensuring that the people of the Province receive their fair share of

benefits from these developments while at the same time the oil companies, whose capital and expertise we need, will be able to accept our regulations as reasonable so that development can go forward on terms and conditions acceptable to both parties.

Mr. Peckford:

It is, however, of the utmost importance that we do not trade rather minor short-term benefits at the expense of our long term objectives. In this respect, the decision by Eastcan to suspend their operations this Summer must be placed squarely in the context of the overall struggle to ensure that these resources are developed for the overall benefit of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, our draft regulations have been described as being "more onerous" than those of the Federal Government. This fact is cited as one of the reasons why Eastcan does not wish to drill this Summer. On that I would make two comments:

First, the proposals sent to Eastcan are draft regulations only. They will be modified where it can be concretely demonstrated that their impact will make offshore developments uneconomic. I should stress in this respect that this is not a hit or miss process with us. My department has worked long and hard with the assistance of reputable consultants and at some expense to develop a computer programme to analyze the profitability of the oil companies' operations off our Province. That programme is we believe at least the equal of anything the oil companies have.

In addition, a special Interdepartmental Committee of senior officials has worked to ensure that our regulations meet the objectives of the Province generally.

I believe it is fair to say that our conversations with the oil companies have generally proceeded cordially and with mutual respect. Indeed the input of the oil companies particularly on the projected cost and timing of development has been helpful.

The second point follows from the first. While we are ready, Mr. Speaker, to make any necessary adjustments in, say our royalty structure, to accommodate what can be proved to us to be the true economics of the situation, there is an area which is not negotiable - that area can be broadly described as relating to the Province's control over offshore operations and to ensuring that the people of this Province derive maximum benefit from these developments.

AND NOW, MEMBERS:

Heard, heard!

Mr. Peckford:

Let me list a few of the guidelines which have governed our approach to the draft regulations:

- (1) that a company will only be granted that amount of land which it can effectively explore;
- (2) that on all lands granted, the company will undertake to conduct a high level of exploration;
- (3) that once oil or gas is found in commercial quantities, before any massive offshore development plan is approved, a full review of its economic, social and environmental consequences will take place with the provision for public input;
- (4) that where economically and technically feasible, all oil and gas found off the Province will be landed in the Province;
- (5) that this Province will have first call on any

MR. PECKFORD:

oil or gas found for industrial purposes; (6) that the oil companies make a proper contribution to the training of residents of this Province to ensure that they have the skills to get work offshore; (7) that the oil companies make a proper contribution to research and development programmes in this Province so that local businesses can be at the forefront of this new development; (8) that the oil companies guarantee to spend a significant proportion of their offshore expenditures within this Province; (9) that residents of the Province be given preference for any employment opportunities; (10) that local business be given a preference where competitive in price, quality and delivery and that they have a fair and equal chance to tender on all work; (11) Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Federal Government has short-sightedly issued rights to the whole continental margin. The oil companies now want to receive provincial rights to the same massive area, some 100 million acres. While we will not duplicate Ottawa's folly in this regard, in recognition of the oil companies past expenditures, we will probably end up granting more lands than we might in absence of those expenditures.

Consequently, this Government feels that it must reserve the right to control the timing and impact of offshore developments if discoveries made on permits issued in the first instance boom far beyond the capacity of our economy and society. No one should deny the reasonableness of this basic right of self defence.

Mr. Speaker, can these terms and conditions be termed as Mr. Gillespie claims "onerous" I say, Mr. Speaker, that if these minimum terms are "more onerous" than the Federal regulations, then it is Ottawa, not this Province, which is failing to develop sound offshore management principles.

MR. PECKFORD: My officials are working hard to get our Draft Regulations together with explanatory back-up material out to the people of this Province. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, they will endorse our stand in this matter when the full impact of our draft regulations is realized.

I have been asked on a number of occasions whether in fact Eastcan's decision is some sort of pressure play or economic blackmail. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that it is not in fact either of these but the decision of a prudent investor who wishes to see a basic uncertainty cleared up before making further commitments.

I would say, however, that if it is otherwise and if this move by Eastcan and the recent statements of Mr. Gillespie represents a challenge to the authority of this Government and to the rights of the people of this Province with respect to these resources, that it is a challenge that I, for my part, would most happily accept. The recent seal hunt controversy demonstrates that the people of this Province will no longer passively accept interference in our way of life by outside forces however well financed and however sophisticatedly organized. I am sure that if it would ever come to a confrontation with oil companies such as Eastcan that the people of this Province would stand foursquare behind us in our endeavours to ensure that these offshore resources are developed first and foremost for the benefit of the people of this Province. Thank You.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, in replying to the Ministerial Statement, and realizing that one cannot enter into the realm of debate, there are many many points in the statement which require further discussion and also clarification. But to take some of

MR. STRACHAN:

the points and, not necessarily in order, which the minister has stated here; the minister has stated that the decision of Eastcan is a decision of a prudent investor who wants to be careful in its dealings, especially in view of the fact that they have spent over the last number of years hundreds of millions of dollars in exploration for oil off this Province. At the same time we must be aware of the fact that Eastcan, or Total the conglomeration of companies which back it, are one of the few companies of many multi-national companies who are searching this world for a source of crude oil and therefore are putting this Province, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador right in the middle of an international consortium or international world of oil.

Mr. Strachan.

and, therefore, our position as the minister has stated, and I believe quite rightly, the position we must take as a position which is strong, firm and a position in which we cannot be bartered or blackmailed or bluffed by multi-national oil corporations, many of them who have budgets far greater than the budget of this Province, many of them who are greater than governments in this world, many of them who control governments in this world. Our position then is to deal with these multi-national companies, as the minister has stated, in a way in which it will benefit the people of this Province.

It should be noted that many of these companies, like the seven sisters, are companies which are involved from the womb to the tomb, that is from the crude oil right to selling the gas into your car. Any many of the companies outside of these are companies which have no source of crude oil and therefore need a source of crude oil. They are, therefore, prepared to go on to the less attractive places of the world in order to get a source of crude oil or to try to break into this tight closed circuit. And we must understand that, and we must, I feel, study that situation. In fact all of us here should study that situation, because that is a situation that these companies have put this Province in. We must become educated legislators if we are going to handle our resources correctly and wisely and not make the same mistakes that we have done with so many of our resources in previous years. So we must understand the reasons why these companies make the decisions they do. And I see the company making this decision on a threefold argument. First of all there is their own economic and technological argument, their own technological reasons why they would move elsewhere,

Mr. Strachan.

and we became familiar with that last year. And I think Eastcan's decision this year is just a further build up from last year's decision to go to Greenland. They are exploring in Greenland on the Western part of Greenland in relatively ice-free waters; that is waters free relatively so of icebergs compared to the Labrador Coast where we are talking about exploring in an iceberg alley. They are also exploring in an area which does not have the same wave activity as we have in Labrador. A much more gentle atmosphere in which to search for oil.

They are also caught in a situation in which there are only so many oil rigs in the world, and these oil rigs work on the basis of contracts. And as we witnessed last year, it is often difficult to get these companies to free the oil rigs to come from, for instance, Greenland or from the North Sea or from Spain or wherever else it is for a short two month or three month season in this Province. So these companies have difficulties in deciding exactly where to put their play, where to invest their money. I think they are also faced with a decision in this Province that even if they did find commercial finds of oil the technological problems that they face after that in getting it out give a long time span which would mean that the companies finding it could not be guaranteed of getting it out very quickly. So to lose one year now is really not that important at the moment although every year counts. But to lose that one year will possibly give them additional assistance to develop a technology to get the oil out. In comparison Greenland, if they did find oil in commercial quantities - I imagine in Greenland - and I am not being an expert on the matter - but I imagine in Greenland the method of

Mr. Strachan.

getting it out would be less hazardous than it is in this Province.

Furthermore Greenland, as was stated by the minister the other day in response to questions that I raised, Greenland has a far tighter regime, a far tighter regulation than this Province is imposing or stating it may impose. So why should companies move from the Labrador sea and move to an area off Greenland where they were very severely restricted in their drilling operations, and where they have to drill to 10,000 feet, I believe, for instance, that they have to drill down through different levels, whether the find gas and oil at the predicted level or not. If they only intend to drill to 4,000 thinking they will get oil there or 5,000 feet by seismic results, they must carry on drilling down, right down to 10,000. And there are many other restrictions which Greenland has put on them; the restriction that only Greenland Air for instance, can carry them by helicopter from their bases out to their drillships. So we are faced in a situation

MR. STRACHAN:

in which the companies then have to decide either here or there. I think that they have made the decision to move there. In fact I think they may have made the decision last year or in light of last year. What they were attempting to do - and I understand the minister when he states so cannot state the same as I can - but I believe what the companies were trying to do was trying to play us in the middle of a chess game in which they were moving the pieces and they were hoping to catch us in the center in which we had nowhere to go but to capitulate.

I support the position taken by this government, I think the only position that any administration in this Province could take, that we are not pawns in a game, we own it. And if we own the resource, we therefore control it. These companies therefore must come to us we do not go to the companies. On top of that I have some questions which would be asked based on that. And I am also interested in why a company would move to Greenland and also continue to support bases in Labrador at Saglek, Hopedale and Cartwright. I am also interested to know why the companies would move to Greenland and also build up some supplies at Hopedale. I am also interested to know why a company would move to Greenland and knowing it is moved to Greenland would institute an airstrip at Saglek, a co-plan system which is one of the most sophisticated landing devices in Canada. There are only two other such landing devices. There is a broad beam scatter rather than the directional flight path used by most airports, used in downtown Montreal and Ottawa for the STOL aircraft, the twin engine STOL aircraft. And in Saglek I understand that this was installed late last Fall and that is my understanding of hearing Department of Transportation people test it.

So it makes one wonder why they invest that kind of money - and I understand it is only a pittance compared to their major investments - they invest that kind of money and yet state they are pulling out and now are pulling out. So I wonder what the other term plan is? I wonder what next year's plan is and the year after's and whether as such we cannot therefore put our position together and try

MR. STPACHAN:

to negotiate with them and find out where they are.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I should call to the hon. gentleman's attention the requirement that the comment after a Ministerial Statement be brief. I realize the relativity of the term but presumably it must be related to the length of the Ministerial Statement. And we are dealing with one of approximately ten minutes. In saying that I am not saying that he may not complete his remarks, I am just pointing out the necessity of bringing them to completion.

MR. STRACHAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The real problem with it is that it is a very complex subject and a very complex topic and a very important topic for this Province and so it is very difficult in a very short few minutes to try and put ourselves in perspective and in the picture. I realize that one can only talk for a fairly brief period of time but I think it is important that we in this legislature understand exactly the play that we are forced to be in and I was hoping to try and do that.

I will very quickly then just draw up the couple of other points that I want to discuss. The minister raised the point of the jurisdictional dispute. In that we have no argument whatsoever. As far as we are concerned and the way I feel about it strongly, is that we own the resource and if we own the resource we must therefore fight for the resource. And I see in the Chamber Mr. Cabot Martin is here and I understand he has been doing a great deal of work on this and I agree with that totally. My main question is that after we get the resource we must be careful that we do not concede the resource away in a system of concessions.

Lastly the minister talked about oil and gas regulations. He talked about the necessity to discuss these and have input from both the oil companies and as well from the general public. That is where I take the greatest exception, in that the general public has not seen these regulations and I understand there are certain confidentialities in the oil industry but I think the first thing that should have been done

MR. STRACHAN:

in the form of a white paper as is done with the Mineral Acreage Act is to disclose to the public, to the people of this Province, the position the government is taking, not only disclose it to the companies and ask the companies for input and then to reject it on the basis that they do not want to have anything to do with it, but they should have been disclosed to the people so we could have had a look at it and seen what it was right from the start. That is the only point that I really feel strongly about as I have mentioned before in my questions in Question Period. And I think that should be done. We should not have to wait another two weeks or three weeks. It should have been done a month or six weeks ago. As soon as the oil companies got it in their hands then we should have had it in our hands to see exactly the position that we were placing this Province in.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, if I can get this sorted out now - I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of over 600 people in support of the workers from the Waterford Hospital. And in presenting this petition I am sure, as members would know, that I have never been party to negotiations and in many cases I represent a Labrador district and therefore have little knowledge of the discussions and the debate going on between the Treasury Board and the hospital workers. But nevertheless there are some points that we must become interested in because this is, as I see it, an ongoing part of the labour negotiations in this Province, labour strife in this Province.

The petition is for 600 people states, "That we the undersigned support the Waterford Hospital staff in their fight for a better pension plan, one comparable to the firemen, the constables and the warders, and for better working conditions and salaries."

I should indicate that I have become informed that the workers have, over the last few days, offered a temporary pension plan to the Treasury Board rather than a permanent plan to cover the workers presently there. That is just to cover the workers who are employed now and not the workers who may be employed at a later date. And this was to try and step back from their position in order that Treasury Board would therefore make also another step to try and come closer together.

This was rejected and rejected totally as I understand, and it was rejected on the basis—and I paraphrase here - but rejected on the basis that the Minister of Finance or the President of Treasury Board stated that it was not because was not justifiable and it was not because the money was not there, it was because the people feel that their case is a justifiable

MR. STRACHAN: case and if it is justifiable then the administration who do not want to deal with them, do not want to deal with them on the basis that this may snowball in the Province and that other institutions may also get onto this same thing. That does not lessen the case of the people in Waterford. If their case is justifiable then their case should be settled as a justifiable case.

The fact that money is not available, they feel very strongly that the people who are working there, and I am not going to question the virtue of the people who are working there in the hospital, maintaining the hospital at the moment, but they are termed "scabs" in industry by labour workers. The people working there are being paid a considerable amount of money in addition and that money if it had been invested in a pension plan could have probably financed the pension plan for the first five years of its term.

We also feel that many of the people working there will never see their full-term finished at work, that half of these people are women or men who may go on to other employment elsewhere so that really you are talking about a pension plan for 150 or so people and they feel therefore that their case is very justified and that they should come to terms and should negotiate this on that basis.

On a greater scene of the labour scene, I think it is a matter that we have adopted, an adversary system in our dealings with labour in that we do not regard labour as being an integral part of management and we therefore always force them into an adversary position and deal with them on that level. And I think that unless we change our attitude towards the labour of this Province, a fundamental change in attitude towards labour in this Province, to understand that resources and capital and labour are equal and labour is not degenerate or lower then we will continue to have strikes. So I support this petition, I would like to refer it to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of all of us, obviously, to support the petition and the one question that has been raised in the minds of many people, citizens who have participated through whatever form on this particular strike is this, that apparently if, if the situation is not as the employees in the Waterford Hospital have indicated, if they

Mr. Nolan.

are not in a position similar on occasion, perhaps many occasions, to a situation faced by either the policemen or the warders. Why is it that the administration found it necessary to man the hospital with the police? Why? Why not send the members of the House of Assembly in there and see what a mess they would make of it? It is as simple as that.

Now as for the grounds that we must be fearful that this pension situation may spread to other institutions is one that we cannot base it on. Because if you look at the whole pension scheme in Canada, there are those very wary, for example, about the Canada pension. Down the road someone is going to have to start to pay. It is also a well-known fact by those who have interested themselves enough to take a look at it that - and I am sure the minister would probably have more up-to-date figures on this than I do - but ten or fifteen years hence the money is going to be flowing out a heck of a lot faster than it is flowing in unless something substantial is being done.

Now we have also heard the situation discussed when we were into the teachers' situation on their pension. So I am afraid that it will not wash to say that, for example, the employees of another institution in this Province, they, too, when they see the hospital workers at the Waterford getting certain pension rights and so on that it is going to spread like wildfire. You have to deal with every situation as it comes. When the policemen had their pension rights and so on, well that is fine. There was no cry then that we must watch out for all the other institutions if they get it or the firemen get it or whatever. So now we have to judge the situation by those

Mr. Nolan.

that are presently in a very serious situation. They are now into the sixth week on this strike. Now, Mr. Speaker, the public generally are often times fed up with strikes, particularly the references, I am sure you have heard publicly, about the post office strike and so on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I wish to call to the hon. gentleman's attention, and in so doing I call to the attention of all hon. members that comments must be on the allegations of the petition which I understand to be a prayer for improved pension plan, working conditions and salaries, and not the overall labour situation or strikes or these matters.

The hon. member.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, well I was attempting, Mr. Speaker, to point out the pension things as I saw them, as I moved along, because I think they are very relevant. I certainly respect and will honour your ruling obviously. The only thing is I do not know if the Federation of Labour has taken a position publicly on this or not as yet, and if not we certainly ask the question, Why not? And the other thing is I am afraid, as in any strike, that the longer something goes on, tempers get up, people become firm in their positions on both sides, and we could very easily see other strike situations in sympathy throughout the public service if this is not brought to a head and very, very soon. We certainly support this petition, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who support this petition, and I support it in a general way. Certainly everyone would like to see - I think every member of this House would like to see - improved pension plans and

Mr. J. Carter.

working conditions for the workers at the Waterford Hospital. At the moment it is a Mexican stand-off, and it has been going on now for over six weeks, or entering its sixth week. I have to ask myself though why the workers will not experiment with arbitration? And I would hope - I am not suggesting compulsory arbitration - I am just suggesting ordinary arbitration. As I understand the process of arbitration the government appoints one member of the Arbitration Board, the union appoints another member - it has to be a member acceptable to the union - and then both of those members appoint a chairman who is acceptable to both sides. Now it may not work out. But I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that anything would be better than the present stand-off, and I would respectfully suggest that this be seriously considered by the union, as I know it has been considered by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the prayer of the petition presented by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), Sir. This strike now has been going on for about, oh, almost six weeks. It is a legal strike. The workers have every right to be doing what they are doing. They were given that right by this hon. House.

MR. NEARY: I do not understand the proposal that was just put forward by the previous speaker, Mr. Speaker, and I am not sure of the last proposal that was made by the Minister of Finance in connection with arbitration. The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) says that the government would appoint one member, the union would appoint one member and they would get together and pick a chairman. Now I am not quite sure if that was the procedure that was outlined or not.

MR. ROBERTS: What happens if they cannot pick a chairman?

MR. NEARY: If they cannot agree on a chairman, of course, then will the government just foist the chairman? My understanding, Mr. Speaker, of the last round of negotiations was that the minister offered an arbitrator, somebody outside the Province altogether.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not right.

MR. NEARY: Well that is what I heard on the radio.

MR. DOODY: That statement is wrong.

MR. NEARY: Well I would like to hear what was involved in the last negotiations. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that the union were very flexible, that they had made a counter-proposal to the minister, the minister had requested clarification of some of the points in writing, and the negotiations started up again then all of a sudden came to a sudden halt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope this is not a case of the government trying to starve the employees into submission as often happens in these negotiations. It would appear, Sir, that that is what is happening in this case because -

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order, please!

I have to point out the same stricture as I did previously, and that is the requirement that hon. members stick with the material allegation of the petition. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he had a few remarks on the arbitration. I realized the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) had mentioned it and I was waiting, expecting that

MR. SPEAKER: this to be related to the allegation but, of course, the hon. gentleman then took his seat. But certainly the hon. gentleman should confine his remarks to the allegations and prayers of the petition.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is that the 600 or 700 people that signed the petition support the workers at the Waterford in their fight to get improved pension plan conditions and better working conditions, Sir, and that - Mr. Speaker, the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) is not in his seat again today but I have to repeat what I said a couple of days ago when I presented a petition on behalf of 2,400 citizens of this Province, that the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) presented a petition that was supported by members on either side of the House asking for this very same thing. My hon. friend from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) even supported the petition and said that the night before he had seen One Flew Over The Cuckoo's Nest and therefore he had nothing but sympathy for the people who were looking for the improved pension plan.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is on record.

MR. NEARY: It is on record. I have it right down here under my desk, as a matter of fact. Then we had the letter. Sir, this is something that I fail to understand, why the government is not honouring their commitment they made to the workers in writing. Now the minister can try to weasel his way out of it all he wants to by shifting his ground and saying, Well we made a proposal, but the proposal was only half a proposal. It is not a full proposal at all, Sir, and the government are not honouring their commitment they made in writing.

So I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, and I hope that the minister will - both parties for that matter - will try to resolve this matter as quickly as possible. It is certainly a great lesson in how not to conduct management-employee relations in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to support the petition as indeed all hon. members of the House could not fail but support a petition that asks for improved working conditions and salary benefits and an improved pension plan for the people at Waterford, but I do so, Sir, with the knowledge that some of the points that have been raised from some of the other speakers, while undoubtedly well meaning, are not necessarily accurate. I do not know if I am straying from the prayer of the petition, Sir, as I comment on them but I am in your hands on the matter.

The offer that government made a day or so ago was to offer the union the option, if they wanted it, of submitting the pension issue to binding arbitration. Now many people have interpreted that as saying that there would be somebody from one side, from management side, somebody from union side and a jointly agreed on person and if we do not agree on it, what then?

Well first of all we have not tried that approach and so it would be premature to say that you cannot agree on some neutral outside observer. When I say outside observer, Sir, I do not necessarily mean outside the Province, I mean outside this particular dispute. If it has to be somebody from outside this Province or outside the country I could not care less where he comes from as long as it is somebody who can get this thing settled and this strike finished and get this - as many people have said, it has gone on far too long now.

MR. DOODY:

Government is willing to submit it to binding arbitration. If that central part, the Chairman of the Arbitration Board, if it is a board that is agreed to and not a single arbitrator, if both sides do not agree to him then it can be referred to the Supreme Court and the justice or the judge of the Supreme Court can pick the arbitrator. This is a plan that is outside the act. This is something that we are willing to go along with, any way that can be found to resolve the situation.

MR. ROBERTS: Is this part of the offer which the government made?

MR. DOODY: This was part of the plan that was put forward. Whether it was - as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says, this is a lesson in how not to conduct negotiations because nobody stays at the table long enough to get all the points out that are necessary to be gotten out.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. DOODY: Certainly.

MR. NEARY: This is a matter of clarification. Is the minister saying a one man arbitrator or a board of arbitrators?

MR. DOODY: We are easy.

MR. NEARY: It is optional. You are open on it.

MR. DOODY: That is right. That is right. It is open to discussion and open to, you know, whichever way both people want to feel is most reasonable and most sensible. Why these other problems have not been resolved or why we have not offered to put the rest of them to binding arbitration is because we are not even sure that there is a problem with them. We had been told some time ago, admittedly, that if we could get the pension plan resolved then the hospital plan that has been accepted by the other hospitals could pretty well fit into the Waterford situation. But we do not know if that is so or not because we have not had a chance to discuss it. We have got to get the pension plan resolved first, apparently, before we can get around to discussing anything else. That puts us in a rather awkward position obviously and it is not one that we enjoy.

MR. DOODY:

The most recent offer from the union in saying that they would be willing to accept a temporary plan which in effect takes into the plan all of the people who are requesting the pension, the maximum contact pay people - I want to be clear and fair on this and not try to mislead anybody - as of 1977, as of the day of the strike and then later on we would work on a permanent plan, down the road, next year's negotiations or whatever. Well that is not a temporary plan Your Honour. That is a permanent plan that comes in on a temporary nature today including everything that the union originally asked for and then next year we sit down at the bargaining table with that in front of us and try to exclude three or four or five or six people who have been hired since. It just does not seem reasonable. And the union itself says that they have a right - and I do not blame them - to try to negotiate an improved package next year. Of course they will.

So under these circumstances as hon. members of both sides of the House have said and as people in the general public are saying we are at an impasse, at a stalemate, we getting nowhere, the strike has gone on too long. It is hurting too many people, inside the hospital and outside the hospital, strikers, everybody is affected. It is a terrible situation. And in order to resolve it we have said, Look let us get somebody who is completely impartial and put it up to him and if he decides -

MR. NEARY: Or a board.

MR. DOODY: Or a board and if he decides or they decide, it decides that the case that the Waterford people are putting forward is a fair and reasonable case government will live with it. If they decide otherwise, then government will not live with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: Short of complete capitulation which is not negotiation at all, I do not know where to go beyond that Your Honour. I honestly do not. We are getting boxed into a corner here now where these people who are on a legal strike seem to be almost inviting us to legislate

MR. DOODY:

them back to work. And legislating people back to work in this day and age is retrogressive. It is not, I do not think in my own mind, going to really be the end solution to the problem. It may be a temporary solution to the problem but it certainly is not a permanent one.

If the patient care situation deteriorates or if there is a state of emergency which occurs, this government has no option but to do the legislative route. But it is not one that we want to go. We want to go through the negotiation route because that is what collective agreements, collective bargaining is all about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: I am informed that the five minutes has expired.

MR. ROBERTS: Extra time, agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. minister leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. DOODY: Thank you.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: A sad sounding thump.

MR. DOODY: Yes it is a sad situation.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not the government itself, it is the cheering section.

MR. DOODY: Oh, I am sorry.

MR. ROBERTS: The cheering section is not very good.

MR. DOODY: As I say, Mr. Speaker - and I have said it before - to say that government, or the minister in this case who wrote the letter on behalf of government last year, dated July 7, is not honouring its obligation that it made in that letter, it is just unfair

MR. DOODY: and untrue because I quoted from that letter before and it is on record and I will quote again. The operative clause in there that everybody agreed to, union, management, government and I say again, "In particular government recognizes the justification for revised pension benefits exists for those employees of Waterford Hospital for the record of lengthy service comprised of constant involvement in the supervising and care of patients." A commission were jointly appointed to look into that. They were not asked to come in unfortunately with a permanent decision, tell us that this is what it had to be and the report came back and it helped neither side and so we find ourselves now in this impasse.

There is no lack of good faith here. I have said and I say it again on behalf of this government, that an arbitration system at this point in time seems to me to be the only route to go, the only sensible and reasonable route to go and I sincerely ask the strikers, who I know are on a legal strike and I respect them for it and I respect the way they have been conducting themselves, and I sympathize with them. I honestly do. But I have got a duty also, Sir. My duty is to the taxpayers of the Province. And I am not going to make an arbitrary decision on the pension plan that may, and hon. members can say that you can take this one in isolation, that was all said back in the sixties under the contact pay thing. There is a letter on file signed by the then General Manager of NAPE undertaking that the contact pay situation would not spread. The letter is on file there. That gentleman's successor says that he is not bound by that letter. It has nothing to do with him at all. This is an entirely new set of circumstances, and that was years ago. And things have not changed since, Sir. People are still

MR. DOODY: going to fight for their rights and get the best deal that they possibly can. I cannot blame them. We all do that. But all I am saying is that in my responsibility in trying to protect the Treasury and the unit's responsibility in trying to get the best possible pension plan, there is obviously now an impasse and the way I look at that impasse, it would appear to be not one that we enjoy.

I do not enjoy passing over the responsibility of the Treasury to an outside agency. It is a major concession and it is a precedent and it is a terrible one. And I do not think that we particularly enjoy it. I do not think the union enjoys it either because they are taking away their bargaining rights and passing it over to an outside agency.

But both of us have got to give on this thing, Sir, you just cannot let the situation continue the way it is and to me at the present time, short of legislation, I quite honestly do not know what else to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word or two in support of the petition which my friend from Eagle River presented, let me begin by saying I have long been of the opinion, Sir, that the petition procedure is probably the most useful procedure that we have in this House and I think the events that have transpired this last half an hour or so since my friend from Eagle River presented the petition show that. I think the statement made by the Minister of Finance is a very helpful statement, as I understand it, and I think - I do not want to say whether it is a step forward or not because that would imply a judgement which I do not wish to make because I am not in a position to make it but I think it is a clarification which hopefully

MR. ROBERTS: will produce some positive results.

The situation, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the workers at the Waterford are on a lawful strike, whether that should or should not be a lawful strike is beside the point. It is and I think we all admire-as the Minister of Finance just said, and it is a point we have made on this side before, Sir, we all admire the way in which this strike has been carried out. It has been a very difficult strike on both sides. It is much more difficult than even the normal and usual strike. It has gone on for a very long time now, it is into the sixth week.

We are at a complete impasse. The government and the hospital ward on one side and the union local on the other are - daggers drawn. This phrase, which is a new one to me, of a Mexican standoff, which I assume means the same thing, that really nobody is going anywhere and what we foresaw at the start has now happened, it is very unfortunate, a complete loss of face is what one side or the other is threatened with and the trick is to try to avoid this and I think the statements made by the Minister of Finance may very well help to that end. There is no need for humiliation. There is no need for abject capitulation, that is not going to help anybody because of course, Sir, when the strike is over, as it will be, as the minister just said, you know the union and the management have to go on working together.

So I would

MR. ROBERTS.

I hope, Sir, that now that the minister has clarified the position - and I had understood that the offer had been made of a normal arbitration - in other words, each side naming a person and if the two could not agree on a third, then the Minister of Manpower in the normal course -

MR. DOODY: There is nothing wrong with this certainly

MR. ROBERTS: No, but I mean I had only understood what I had known. I was not privy to the negotiations. The House has not been told to this point and so I had no way to know. The minister has now made it clear that, you know, the ministry are open and that, in effect, they have now made a public offer here where it should be made, on the floor of the Legislature, that if the union are willing to accept any reasonable, workable form, not of compulsory or binding arbitration, I am not sure that that is what the minister had in mind, but it may be what he had in mind -

MR. DOODY: Compulsory arbitration.

MR. ROBERTS: - or binding arbitration even - I do not even know if I would go that far, because I have the minister's doubts, I have long had them, that the minister and his colleagues are responsible to this House and thus to the people of this Province to bring in even a three man committee, and to give them the power to sort of do as they would with the treasury of the Province is something that has never appealed to me as a concept. And I like the collective bargaining process and I regard a strike as being a normal part of the collective bargaining process. It might not be the nicest part, but it is certainly a normal and an acceptable part of the process.

As I understand it what the minister has said now is that if the union say, Look, let us agree, each of us will put up one member, and if the two members together cannot agree on a third person, we, the government, will undertake

Mr. Roberts.

to appoint, because we are under the Civil Service Collective Bargaining Act, and as I recall it that does not have the provision for reference to a court - but in any event we will undertake to ask the Chief Justice, who is a busy man these days, or a judge of the court, somebody neutral and impartial, to name the third member of that board. And whether the power appointment is with the judge or with the minister, it does not matter. If it is the minister he will appoint whomever is recommended. And presumably the terms of reference should include not only the pension issue, but all the other issues. If there is going to be little difficulty in settling them, then you might as well get them settled that way. If the two parties, a conciliation board or a -

MR. DOODY: We do not know yet.

MR. ROBERTS: No. The minister says he does not know or not, nor does anybody. But the fact remains that this board is an advisory proceeding by its very nature, and thus each side will have the opportunity to present its case, and the board will make a ruling upon it.

I think, Sir, that would be a considerable step forward. I would not suggest it be binding, because either side would have to reserve the right to say, No, if the recommendations - remotely, remotely possible, but it is possible - that the recommendations were that far out of line. But if either side turned down the recommendations without the very best of reasons then I think the force of public opinion would be very strong, and would make itself felt very effectively.

Well, Sir, it seems to me that the minister's offer, as I now understand it, which is a different one, I confess, than I understood from reading the newspapers two or three days ago

Mr. Roberts.

reporting on the weekend meeting, the minister's offer, Sir, I think, is a step in the right direction. I will say a step forward, but I say again I am not implying any judgement on any previous position. I think it is a step in the right direction, Sir. I think it is a positive step. I hope it will meet with positive response or a better response, a better suggestion if one can be made. Because, Sir, I am growing increasingly concerned, as I think all members of the House are, with the situation. It is just going from bad to badder, to baddest, and eventually will get to worst. And, Mr. Speaker, that is not a very pleasant thought. Any hospital is of vital importance to the people who must look to it. But, Sir, the Waterford Hospital is unique and cannot be replaced in this Province. It is the only institution that can cope with the type of medical disability that is present in the patients who are referred there. The pressures are beginning to build, I am told by my friends in the medical profession and my friends in the hospital, and so it is imperative, I think, that this strike be settled as quickly as possible on a fair and an equitable basis. So I, Sir, hope that this suggestion, as the minister has now explained it, which is a different one than I understood. - it may not be different than the minister had put forward, but certainly different than the public understood-with the third man, the third person being, you know, a neutral appointment as opposed to the appointment of even a man as estimable as the Minister of Manpower -

MR. DOODY: It may be a different plan.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. Well I mean, I do not know. But the fact remains that the ministry are open

Mr. Roberts:

remains that the ministry are open, and that is to me a considerable ray of light, and I hope it will produce a positive response, Sir, because while the union have a lawful right to strike, and the government have both the lawful right and the duty to ensure that their settlement, the settlement on this is, you know, proper taking into account a lot of factors, Sir, nobody, nobody has the right to make those patients suffer, and nobody should allow them to suffer, and we have to ensure, Sir, that in exercise, this is a very fundamental principle of democracy, and I will close on this note, Sir, that in exercising any right given to anyone that we do not have the right to hurt anybody else, As a very famous judge once said, Sir, I believe it was Mr. Justice Holmes of the American Supreme Court, "The right of free speech does not include the right to cry fire in a crowded theatre." Well, Mr. Speaker, that same thing could be applied here; the right to strike, or the right to resist a strike on the government's part, that, Sir, does not imply the right to have anybody suffer unduly or unnecessarily. We may be coming to that point, Sir, so I hope we can now get away out of this impasse and have the matter settled fairly and equitably.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. minister I would draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the Legislature this afternoon of some representatives of the Town Council of Bay de Verde, Mayor Blundon and Councillors Noonan, Doyle and Barter. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday in the House of Assembly, my deputy minister yesterday met with the NAPE unit presently on strike at the Waterford. He spent some time discussing the problems with them, as a matter of courtesy as I

Mr. Rousseau:

mentioned yesterday, consideration was given to various things, and I think we have a reaction from NAPE. And as I mentioned yesterday my colleague, the Minister of Finance, was out of the Province, We have been talking this morning and hopefully sometime this afternoon we hope to get together. And the only position we can maintain in the Department of Labour in its effort to try and maintain neutrality insofar as clearing away the underbrush is now, and that is really what is there now, underbrush to get the issues out of the way so actual face to face negotiations on something can take place. There has to be some way in which both sides sitting down can come up with some situation whereby the strike can be resolved.

I agree with all hon. members here that six weeks is a long while for a strike. Obviously both sides feel very strongly and believe in their position. I would certainly hope this afternoon later on as I said to meet with my colleague and discuss the reaction we had yesterday from the NAPE unit. I am certainly prepared in conjunction with my deputy minister to sit down and convene a face to face meeting, and if both sides are prepared to do that to clear away the underbrush so that we can at least come up with the broad terms of reference in which then some negotiations of some sort can proceed.

So we are certainly prepared to do that from a Department of Labour point of view, and I would certainly say that I look forward to, I hope, a situation whereby we can get to the table and hopefully, with the assistance of people from the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations, can come up with some final conclusion in respect to this very long strike that now seems to have solidified and crystalized on both sides.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from St. George's.

MRS. H. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make one point. The Minister of Finance when he spoke said that it appeared - I think I will quote him correctly - "That it appeared to him that possibly the strikers were inviting government to legislate them

Mrs. MacIsaac:

back to work." I think I understood him correctly. I would just like to say that I would not like to see it go that far, but I do feel from talking to the strikers that they have their own feelings on that situation, that they feel that government is just waiting for an incident, waiting for an opportunity to legislate them back to work. And I felt that I had to make this known to the minister because I have talked to quite a few of the strikers, and I am sure that is the general feeling. But I am sure from what the minister said that negotiations will be going on again, and this thing should be resolved quite soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Kilbride.

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in connection with this especially because a great many of those who are involved in this particular strike reside in the district which I represent, the district of Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: Now the strike has gone on for a long time and all of us who are concerned, and anybody in the Province who is concerned with the service provided by the Waterford on the one hand, and also with the rights and duties of those who work at the Waterford is concerned with it and regrets that negotiations have not gone on on a continuous basis. It is certainly not my position to apportion blame and I think it would be futile and stupid for anybody at this stage of the game to say, this one is at fault or, that one is at fault. I think what we have got to do is to look forward rather than backward and try to find a way out of the impasse. Now the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board has suggested various alternatives at various times to NAPE and these have been rejected for various reasons.

Now he has made another one, I understand this afternoon. The question of arbitration, binding arbitration has been raised, and that I understand is not satisfactory to the union. There is another approach which I would suggest for the consideration of both parties, and I raise it because experience, and experience of any of us who have had anything to do with labour-management relations, has shown that a conciliation board is sometimes a very useful tool. Now I think that conciliation did take place in the earlier stages, I believe with the minister of these negotiations. But I understand that that was a conciliation officer, and in my experience the quality of the members on a conciliation board sometimes and often determines what the value of the board is going to be. So if nothing else, if no other solution can be found now, in the next day or two, I would like to suggest for consideration of the minister, and consideration of NAPE also, that a conciliation board be appointed by mutual consent to try to help the parties reach agreement. The conciliation board would consist of a member appointed by the union, and a

MR. WELLS: member appointed by the government, and a member agreed to by both sides.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is before the -

MR. WELLS: I know that is before. I know that full well. I know the provisions in the labour relations act just as well as the hon. member. But what I am suggesting is - Sorry?

MR. MURPHY: How would that differ from what we are talking about now?

MR. WELLS: The arbitration board actually comes to a decision; it is like a court. But the conciliation board works with the parties to see if they can help them to reach an agreement. Now my suggestion is that although the normal time for conciliation is past, yet we are not now in a normal situation. And I would like to see, if the arbitration route is not acceptable, like to see a conciliation board set up by mutual agreement between the parties, even at this stage, and particularly I would like to see the chairman of such a board be not a resident of Newfoundland but a very, very, eminent person, and there are many such persons in Canada, familiar with labour relations and also familiar with hospitals, and particularly familiar with mental hospitals across this Province - across this country. And there are such persons and I would like to see such a person be nominated as chairman of this board, a man completely outside the Newfoundland scene with all the difficulties, you know, and the knowledge, the unfortunate knowledge of this particular strike. But a man fresh to it with impeccable credentials and with tremendous clout, and I think that a board set up in that fashion, that set to work with the parties to try and help them reach an agreement might find a way, at least I think it is an avenue of approach. Because we cannot go on this way indefinitely.

MR. WELLS:

the parties have got somehow to get together; somewhere, somehow this strike is going to be settled one way or another. Six months from now, a year from now the people are going to be back at the Waterford working. So it is only a question really, Mr. Speaker, difficult though it is, of how we get to that point, and I would suggest if the parties do not want to submit to arbitration and have it decided, as it were, by a court, or a court-like body, to have three eminent people familiar with this, selected by the parties and the chairman agreed to, and be a non-Newfoundlander, someone completely outside, with tremendous clout and knowledge to help the parties try and arrive at an agreement. Because I have seen many cases where conciliation boards worked with parties and the matter went on as high as three and four weeks and you never thought that an agreement was going to be reached. Yet by the officers of the board comprised of the right kind of people sometimes it can be done. And I think we all have an obligation, both the government and the union and all of us who are concerned about it, to use every effort to try and get something going which will result in the solution to this particular strike.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken in support of either one of the petitions that have been put forward on the Waterford Hospital, and I have never been a member of a union although I have a wife who, I believe, is supporting it, and tells me every night that I should make a statement on it. I must say that I appreciate the difficulties the workers have faced in this particular dispute, particularly since it is one of the strange circumstances where the people are on strike and yet other people are doing their work. And I do believe that the government must take steps, that this thing must be over with. We have sitting with it for six weeks, and there are only two points that I want to make. One is that I can say to the strikers that my colleagues on this side of the House - and this is the first time I have spoken - have taken this in a very responsible manner. And the members who represent the areas on this side of the House have certainly, ever since this strike started, have been asking questions, have been prodding and have followed the thing very closely, much more closely than I have been, having been from the West Coast.

The other thing I would like to say is that there must be a way in which - if it has to be an outside negotiator, if it has to be an impartial chairman or whatever it has to be - something must be done. I mean, we are in a situation now where we have the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations trying to negotiate with them. At the same time as Minister of Public Works, I suppose, he was the man who issued the order to put them out of Confederation Building. Now I could be wrong on those facts, but these are the sort of negotiations that are going on. And, you know, something has to be done to settle this strike, and I hope that something happens very, very quickly, and I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the record to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). I had hoped to speak previously on this topic but unfortunately I was not addressed enough in the particular sides of the argument. However, after reading all the pertinent information, I can find two things, one which I can understand and one which I cannot understand. The one which I can understand is that I know now the reason why the public opinion, the people of this Province, are in favour of the workers and are presently anti-government. In reading the presentation given by the union in The Evening Telegram this weekend, I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, why the government of this Province did not initiate a pension plan for these people. The pension plan as outlined in the paper must be one of the most ridiculous in this nation let alone in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must point out to the hon. gentleman that entering into the area of debate is prohibited even under present procedure where there is quite broad comment on the allegation.

The hon. member.

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

I will certainly abide by your ruling and perhaps was getting a little into the realm of debate.

I urge the government of this Province to get back to sensible negotiations. I do not believe in binding arbitration. If you place the idea of the warders' pension and the need for it for the workers, against the needs of maintaining Treasury Board regulations or public financing in this Province, they do not stand a chance. Binding arbitration invariably in most strikes comes out in favour of the employer, and

Mr. R. Moores.

not the employees. Get back to sensible negotiations and get this matter cleared up to the advantage of all the people involved, especially the patients. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition, an entirely different type of petition, on behalf of sixty-seven residents of the community of Paradise River on the Labrador Coast. The direct jurisdiction lies outside the present administration, the administration of this Province. It is recognized that the administration can have some affect on this issue. The petitioners are asking for a television reception at the community of Paradise River. As of February of this year Cartwright, the community of Cartwright, with a population of 1,000, received television for the first time.

MR. STRACHAN:

The community of Paradise River about twenty miles away understood that they were to receive television. But as it turned out, when the television signals came through the microwave, that the signal emitted by the transmitter at Cartwright was not powerful enough to receive the signal in Paradise River. They had at that point bought television sets in view of the signal being received in Paradise River. Fortunately the company who sold them the sets took the sets back. But they are asking that the transmitter at Cartwright be redirected and possibly the output increased.

We are asking that the Minister of Transportation and Communications under his jurisdiction will apply pressure on the CBC directly within this Province to ask the CBC to carry out field strength signals at the community of Paradise River in the Summer so they can test the strength of the signal at Paradise River and if possible the community are prepared - and I repeat this - the community are prepared to build a community antenna themselves which will receive the signal which will then be piped to their homes in Paradise River. So the community on one hand are asking for something, but on the other hand they are prepared to assist in the building of the community antenna.

We understand that the transmitter at Cartwright has not been set properly because of the Winter, the late finishing date in February. And this year has been an extremely mild year on the Labrador Coast with a great deal of ice-up of all antenna systems, and that the signal received by Cartwright is not up to the CRTC standards. But we are asking that as soon as the transmitter is set in its final position that the community of Paradise River be taken into consideration in the setting of the position so that the community may be able to receive the signal as tested by field strength signals and be therefore able to build a community antenna and therefore get television to the community of Paradise River.

I support the prayer of the petition. I think the community, although only less than 100 does have a right to communications.

MR. STRACHAN:

do have a right to see the same as all else in this Province. And I support their petition and refer it to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot add very much really in supporting the petition presented by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), just to add that I am quite familiar with the area of Paradise River and its proximity to the area of Cartwright, the lack of communications which have existed there traditionally apart from a radio signal which had been going into that area for a number of years. I think it all ties in to the lack of communications traditionally in particularly the Southern Coastal section of Labrador. And we in Labrador consider the Southern Coast to start more or less at Cartwright and go right down to the L'Anse-au-Clair area. But certainly with the television being installed at Cartwright, and a community being so near by, the community of Paradise River, I think it is incumbent around the CBC and anyone else in the Provincial Government who is concerned with communications to take action to see that certainly this community receive the same coverage that the nearby community and other communities in Labrador are receiving. I support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word or two on the petition which my friend from Eagle River presented. May I begin by saying I support it, Sir. Paradise River, as my friend has said, is quite a small community. Relatively isolated, there is no road to the community and it is located about fifteen miles from Cartwright, fifteen or twenty miles from Cartwright, and one has to go up Sandwich Bay by water in the summer and in the winter you can go back and forth by skidoo. It is obviously a very undesirable situation, Sir, that these people should have no access at all to television services. It is bad enough that most of the people who live in northern Newfoundland and in all of Labrador I say

MR. ROBERTS: most; there is the odd very unusual freak reception coming through. But almost all of the people who live in northern Newfoundland and in all parts of Labrador have no access at all, at any time, under any conditions, to the second television service. But, Sir, most of the people who live in Northern Newfoundland, in my district, for example, and Southern Labrador, part of which of course

MR. ROBERTS: is in the Straits of Belle Isle district, most of those people have access to at least one television channel, the CBC channel. It has done nothing for Peter Gzowski's popularity because people feel they should not have to watch him every night, as my friend from Menihék (Mr. Rousseau) pointed out the other night. But the fact remains that the people in Western Labrador or the people in St. Anthony or in Flowers Cove or in L'Anse-au-Clair can at least watch the CBC, they do have one television service. The people in Paradise River have none at all. That deprivation is made all the worse because of the fact that the people there understood, I do not know from whom and obviously they did not understand correctly or they were not informed correctly, but they understood that they were to get television reception at the same time as the CBC service was provided to the nearby community, the only nearby community of Cartwright itself.

Well, Sir, the request of the petition I think is reasonable. It possibly in part at least should be directed to Ottawa, but in part at least, Sir, it could be directed to the Government of this Province because, Sir, the government of this Province has helped in the past, has helped communities to get community antennas which as my understanding of the proposal in Cartwright has helped them to get these community antennas which are then licenced by CRTC and carry on in a normal way. I think that in the district represented by my friend from St. Mary's - The Capes there are a number of community associations that have been formed, banded together, to get a licence for an off air receiver and then I believe they have cable running into the homes, and these associations now, I only know of two or three of them, but I understand there are others, but I know of two or three at first hand which were given grants by the old Department of Community and Social Development. It is not a lot of money, \$5,000, \$10,000 maybe but it is a lot for people to raise. It is not a lot for government to give.

MR. ROBERTS: So I would suggest, Sir, very strongly that kind of suggestion be looked at with respect to the people in Paradise River. It is a permanent settlement. It has been there for a long time. It is obviously going to be there, and so it should be, for many years yet to come. We hear a great deal about Labrador in the House, Sir, much of it of a different order, if not a different nature, than the problem brought forth by my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), but it is a problem on which the government can help and I would very earnestly, Sir, hope that they do. The return they would get in providing an improved service for citizens of this Province would be a very great one in contrast to the expenditure which would be incurred.

I support the petition, Sir, and I do hope the government this year will make it possible to help these people in this way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few moments to support the prayer of the petition, Sir. This is a problem that is prevalent not only in Labrador but throughout the whole of the Province, Sir. Here on the Island of Newfoundland we have a similar problem along the Southwest Coast where people can only get one channel on television and that is full of snow. We cannot see it, down in LaPoile and Grand Bruit and Petites, they get one channel, Rose Blanche, Burnt Islands, Isle aux Morts.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is like you are in a blizzard.

MR. NEARY: And it is like you are in a blizzard when you are watching it, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion to make to the administration. The Minister of Transportation and Communications is not here. But I do not know if it is a practical idea or not, but it is certainly one that should be looked into and that

MR. NEARY: Is, Sir, that the Minister of Transportation and Communications look into the possibility of the government putting up the - what are they?

AN HON. MEMBER: Relays.

MR. NEARY: Relay stations, the government putting up the relay stations and leasing them back to the television media.

MR. H. COLLINS: It was in the Throne Speech in 1966.

MR. NEARY: It was in the Throne Speech in 1966?

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: You mean when the former Liberal Administration was there?

MR. H. COLLINS: Big promise.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I did not even know it was there. But if it was there it was certainly a good suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and one that should be reactivated. Let the government put up the satellite stations or the repeater stations or relay stations, whatever they are, and let them lease them to the television stations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: And that is the only way, Mr. Speaker, that you are going to get full coverage of television in my opinion in this Province, because the private station is not prepared to expand this year. I have gone into it with Mr. Geoff Sterling of the Newfoundland Broadcasting Company. I cannot find out what the other crowd are up to, the public media, the CBC. I have written them several times and I finally after several months managed to drag an answer of him. But I still do not know what it is they are going to do. But no matter what they do we are still not going to get full coverage, and I believe the Premier should take a look at that suggestion of mine of putting up - let the government put up the stations and then lease them to the - after all, if you can make a killing on cable television you should be able to make a few bucks of leasing these repeater stations to not only the cable television people but to

MR. NEARY: the Newfoundland Broadcasting Company and the C.B.C.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Just a few words, Mr. Speaker. I certainly would like to add my support to my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). With the long nights in Labrador, television is very important to the people up there. I think it is unfortunate, and I would think that probably the problem with the case and with the area is that the C.B.C.'s accelerated coverage plan is what they are going to follow.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not, above all, want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but, Sir, there is some sort of gabfest going on over here between my friend from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) and my friend from Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) and the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan). They are talking or laughing quite loudly and it does prevent us from hearing what the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) is saying. Surely, Sir, the gentleman from Menihek has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: I must direct hon. gentlemen to my left to keep their tones down.

The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: As I was saying there, Mr. Speaker, the CBC's accelerated coverage plan, of course, nor hell nor high water is going to make them move from the time table they have on that. And I would assume that that being the case there as I found in my year and a half in Communications but certainly I do support the prayer of the petition and I would hope that the people of Paradise as well as the other people in Labrador who do not have the luxury of television

MR. ROUSSEAU:

that everybody along the Coast would have it pretty soon. I think it is very important to them. It is very important to many people in the isolated communities of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, very briefly so I will not get my hon. friend opposite upset because I know we have gone on a bit long, but there are a couple of things that occur to me. Item one is the suggestion perhaps that maybe the Premier might be good enough to ask a small group in the House to take a look at the situation where there is or are problems with television reception.

PREMIER MOORES: A committee of one.

MR. NOLAN: Pardon?

PREMIER MOORES: A committee of one.

MR. NOLAN: Well if the Premier feels that I will be all right as a committee of one, I would certainly accept the commission. And I think the Premier knows me well enough to know that I would attempt to do a good job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Leaving for Paradise in the morning.

MR. NOLAN: Now I move to my sometimes referred to socialist ideas. And I have often wondered, Mr. Speaker, with the problems we have with communications here, I wonder if some of the more radical members of the Cabinet perhaps when it was discussed originally, particularly in view of all the publicity on cable television and the fortunes that are to be derived therefrom, I wonder if they ever looked at the possibility of having a public group, hopefully impartial, applying for these stations? The Minister of Justice is about to go through the walls because I am beginning to attack the capitalists.

MR. HICKMAN: (First part inaudible) get after you.

MR. NOLAN: I do not care who gets after me, Mr. Speaker. It does not bother me. All I am saying is -

MR. HICKMAN: There is no need to try, though.

MR. NOLAN: Just listen for one moment, Mr. Speaker. I know you are very attentive, but I wonder if it is possible for anyone to imagine what would have happened if, for example, if it is the gold mine that some people suggest with the great bind that the municipalities are into and I would think after the government continuously for more and more money for one service or another, why the funds could not - if it is, if in fact it is the gold mine that we have been told that it is - why, for example, it could not have been a great help to the city of St. John's, why the monies derived from the town of Mount Pearl could not have gone to the people of Mount Pearl and into that municipality, why the town of Conception Bay South, where money is derived therefrom, if it is the gold mine, could not go into Conception Bay South and eventually would spread throughout the Island? I mean, is that such a revolutionary idea? I mean, is that an attack on capitalism?

MR. ROBERTS: They are doing it in Saskatchewan.

MR. NOLAN: They are doing it in Saskatchewan. Well, I mean surely over there somewhere on the other side there must be some people who have given some consideration to that. And, you know, we are into a new era. I mean, if this is - I mean, we have had Lord Thompson saying that having a television license is like have a license to print money. Well, you may not want to go in. I am not suggesting that government, by the way, get involved in this, not one way. But I would think that you would have to have a very, very good group to operate it. And it would not be used obviously for political purposes by any group. But

Mr. Nolan:

I am thinking of the funds that could have been derived therefrom that could have gone to help offset some tremendous expenses that municipalities or the Province or whatever are faced with today. And I suggest to you that no one - maybe I would not be so bold as to suggest that maybe no one else in this House thought of it - I certainly did and discussed it with a number of people, but the thing is if you did you certainly did not express it, at least not in this House.

So I only mention it, Mr. Speaker, and if the Premier would like to set up the committee I suggested, we are prepared to meet, whoever we are, at anytime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! Well said.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from St. George's.

MRS. H. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to this petition for Labrador. I feel that Labrador is isolated enough as it is and certainly television is not today a luxury. I sympathize with them because in my district, and I think that just about every petition that is presented and every problem that comes up I can stand up and say, In my district the same thing exists. But in my district in the Coakroy Valley area I know what the situation is with respect to television coverage, two channels, and quite a few of the people in that area are not able to get the reception at all; some of them get one channel, some of them are getting pretty good coverage on both, and in other areas they do not have any television coverage at all.

So I certainly sympathize with the people in that area and I hope that something can be done to alleviate their problems. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Minister of Justice he promised to get some information for yesterday on the fishery scandal. The minister was going to give me the answer today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, answers to Question No. 7, the hon. member from Bellevue (Mr. Callan), Orders of the Day, February 3, 1977; the number and locations of artesian wells drilled during 1976.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry it is not going to be tabled? The hon. gentleman is going to table the list?

MR. DINN: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is lots of time.

MR. DOODY: No, no.

MR. DINN: Okay, I will just table them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: In the meantime I would like to hear them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I table the answer to Question No. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HICKMAN: ... the point.

MR. DINN: What?

MR. ROBERTS: I have a point of order, if the minister would grant me the leave to make the point of order. I think he would agree with it, I am trying to help him from his own rapacious colleague there, I hope really - Sir, I mean I know they are anxious to give us answers on the other side for a change, but surely the Minister of Municipal Affairs should be allowed to finish tabling whatever answers he has tabled before the Minister of Justice attempts to cut him off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order is well taken.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The point has already been ruled on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DENN: Answer to Question No. 93 from the hon. member from LaPoile, Orders of the Day, February 10, 1977, with respect to the Easley Report.

AN HON. MEMBER: Only raising a -

MR. ROBERTS: Well said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear, hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Thank you very much.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Responsible for, not for. Mr. Speaker, I table the answer to Question No. 182, that is 1, 2 and 3, the answer to No. 4 is all but one. The answer to No. 5 is that -

MR. NEARY: Who asked the question what date?

MR. HICKMAN: Well the hon. member from LaPoile, 182, and the answer to No. 5 is that if there are any refusals, most assuredly action will be initiated to recover any amounts due the Crown.

*Part I
Not question
H.S.*

AN HON. MEMBER: Well said.

MR. HICKMAN: What about the answer to yesterday's question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hour and a half getting on the Question Period has not diminished at all the ardor of my colleagues. My question, Sir, is, in the absence of the Premier, who seems to have left the Chamber, could be directed to the Minister of Finance. Could he tell us, Sir, please, whether his visit to Ottawa yesterday in company with the Premier has anything to do with the delay in bringing down the Budget of the Province?

MR. NOLAN: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: We had discussions with the various people in Ottawa dealing with various matters of financial interest to the Province and to the federal government. I would not comment on it any further than that at this time, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister is not going to tell us whom he and the Premier saw, so I will not ask him that. But can I ask the minister whether he is now in a position to tell us when we will get the budget, or if he wishes, will we get it before - I understand we are taking an Easter break from April 8 - April 18 are the dates that are -

MR. DOODY: I can go into that when I introduce the Supply Bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why is there something wrong?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am told that there is talk of an Easter break from April 8 - April 18. Will we get the budget before or after that break?

MR. DOODY: I can go into that when we do the Supply Bill.

MR. ROBERTS: Well answer it now with another bite at the Supply Bill.

MR. DOODY: I do not know what about the Easter break but that is very welcome news. I heard rumours of it too but I cannot -

AN HON MEMBER: So did I.

MR. DOODY: Yes, so did I but I find it very comforting coming from a very reliable source.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Fear, hear!

MR. DOODY: As for having the budget brought down before Easter, it is unlikely that it will be down by that time. It will probably be closer to the end of April.

AN HON. MEMBER: The end of April.

MR. DOODY: Yes, the end of April.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is to the minister. And I must say I can understand why the budget would not be coming in understanding what little I may understand of the problems confronting the ministry and the financial field at this time. But is there any - not is there a possibility, obviously there is a possibility. Can we be given the estimates at some point before the end of April. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the estimates are now ready or could be made ready quickly. Can they be made public so that we can have some idea of where the money is going to be spent even if we will not be going into the formal budget procedure until apparently in the month of May now.

MR. DOODY: To be very frank about it, the hon. leader is right. The estimates are for all practical purposes ready. We have got one major problem in preparing the budget and that is the Labrador Linerboard Limited. We can get that situation resolved and get the report in and it will tell us where to go and what to do on the Linerboard situation, I could bring the budget down tomorrow.

MR. FEARY: I can tell you where to go.

MR. DOODY: Yes, I know, I have been told where to go so often during the past six weeks, you know, the options are almost limitless. But that is the difficulty right now; we are trying to resolve the difficulty with the Labrador Linerboard Limited situation and it is going to take the final report from the committee before we can make a decision on it. And we hope to have it by the middle of the month.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville has a supplementary, I believe.

MR. McNEIL: The hon. minister has indicated that he has

MR. McNEIL:

received the Interim Report. Is he prepared to table this report?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: There is an Interim Report and it was a report from the sub-committee to the advisory committee and it is in one particular area of the entire problem. It does not deal with the woods thing and it does not deal with the conversion problems. It is a section of the total report. So to just present it to the House would be unfair and misleading and incomplete and inconclusive and we cannot draw any positive conclusions from it and hence it is a part of our dilemma here.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, I simply want to ask the minister whether the - and this arises naturally out of what he said - whether the government have asked the government of Canada for financial assistance with the Linerboard operation?

MR. DOODY: Well, as I said in answer to the hon. Leader's earlier question, we did meet with various senior people in Ottawa yesterday. We discussed various matters of concern to both the provincial and federal government and I am not in a position to elaborate on that anymore at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Can the Minister of Justice bring us up to date on the fishery gear scandal? The minister promised to get me the information yesterday.

MR. HICKMAN: On the investigation.

MR. NEARY: On the investigation and when further charges are going to be laid and what is happening and why it has been so long and dragged out?

f
MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I did undertake to get some additional information today for the hon. gentleman with respect to investigations being carried out by both the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Newfoundland Constabulary into the fishery gear replacement programme. I repeat what I said earlier, or said yesterday, that I cannot and will not refer the matters that are before the court and have to be very guarded in saying anything concerning matters which may come before court. Four investigations have been completed of recent date by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. When I say completed, their first investigation into these reports have been now submitted to the appropriate - to the Director of Public Prosecutions for his careful perusal

Mr. Hickman.

and then he will instruct the RCMP accordingly as to whether he needs any additional information or evidence or what further action will be taken.

I was under the impression yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that the Newfoundland Constabulary had just about wound up their investigation. But I am advised by the Director of Public Prosecutions that two members of the Newfoundland Constabulary are still continuing two investigations; one is near completion and the other will take several months. The note that I have here is a little bit confusing but it indicates that the Constabulary are being assisted by two auditors from the Auditor General's department. With respect to the RCMP, their major work appears to have been almost completed. They have one officer still working. I guess, full-time into one fairly extensive investigation which will take a few months to complete. And over and above that, of course, RCMP detachments throughout the Province are doing any investigation in their detachment area when requested by members of the Commercial Fraud Division of the RCMP.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand the minister correctly that four investigations have been completed by the RCMP? Are the two that are now before the court, are they included in the four and the two? Or are there six, over and above the two that are now before the court? Are there a total of eight altogether?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: I may have gone too far already in what I have said, but I certainly cannot go any further, because I can see

Mr. Hickman.

hon. gentlemen who will try to read things in there that are not there. I said, "Four other investigations!"

MR. NEARY: Four other?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. Please do not relate these to four persons, four companies, four anything, you know, and say that those are being investigated or similar to other charges that have been laid. I have not said that. I cannot say it. I will not say it. All I can say is that the evidence has been gathered by the RCMP in four cases, now submitted to the Director of Public Prosecutions. It is a very tedious and long and lengthy procedure to go - bearing in mind his other responsibilities - through - I am talking about the Crown prosecutors and the Director of Public Prosecutions - to go through the evidence, decide what additional facts they may require and also to decide what charges, if any, can be sustained under this evidence.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

X
MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when can we expect the Director of Crown Prosecutions to either just dismiss these six cases or proceed with further charges? When can we expect a decision? This thing has been dragging on now for a year and a half, eighteen months?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: The thing is not dragging on, Mr. Speaker. There has been a tremendous effort gone into it, and a tremendous cost, may I say, or I suspect it has. When the Director of Public Prosecutions is ready to proceed is his prerogative. I have no idea when he will do it. That is totally and absolutely up to him. And fortunately he will not come and ask me, and I will not tell him.

MR. NOLAN A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Does not the Minister of Justice decide when to prosecute, when to press charges or not to press charges? Has he not done so in the past? He does not.

In other words, his employees as such do not report to him for a decision one way or another and if so, what is he there for?

MR. NEARY: - new Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, traditionally any Minister of Justice with even a quarter of a brain and any sense of responsibility would leave the decision as to when prosecutions are taken, against whom and the nature of the charges up to the Director of Public Prosecutions.

MR. ROBERTS: In light of that statement is the minister against prosecutions?

MR. NEARY: In other words they can do what they like down there and the minister -

MR. HICKMAN: No, they cannot do what they like because -

MR. NOLAN: Do you not feel unnecessary -

MR. HICKMAN: Because the director of - I cannot explain to the hon. gentleman opposite how the administration of justice works -

MR. NOLAN: No, or to the province either.

MR. HICKMAN: But I will do my best to reassure the people of this province that we have an exceptionally competent, exceptionally strong Director of Public Prosecutions who is sustained by the largest number of crown prosecutors that this province has ever had and it would be very - I only know of one case in - There was a case in Ottawa where a Minister of Justice intervened and I am sure he regretted it. I know he did.

MR. RIDEOUT: Can you say that without prejudice?

MR. NOLAN: He must have been a liberal for you to say it.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. Does the minister foresee in the future that only a small number of processors will be operating in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is still probably referring to the situation in Port au Port where one Alan Baker was refused a license to operate and I thought I explained to the House and to the member exactly why that situation occurred.

MR. W. CARTER:

Certainly we are not going to be that restrictive, but we cannot possibly allow ourselves to get into the position of having fish processors in every community. There is only so much fish to go around and naturally there can only be so many fish processors. But certainly getting back to the Port au Port situation which I am sure brought on this question-

MR. FLIGHT: Answer the question.

MR. CARTER: If the hon. member is anxious to have Mr. Baker issued a license and in so doing he will no doubt have to assume responsibility for the elimination of National Sea in that area, well that is his decision. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention to cut out -

MR. ROBERTS: He is not competition.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, may I complete my answer? It is not our intention to eliminate small operators. But certainly we cannot allow licenses to be issued to every single person who wants to set up a feeder plant operation in maybe every community in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. J. HODDER: Does this mean that there is a policy of exclusive franchises within the Province by the Department of Fisheries?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, no. There is no such thing as an exclusive franchise policy on the part of the Department of Fisheries. But we do reserve the right - we have a duty, I think, our first concern must be the fishermen themselves, and if it means offending Mr. Baker or indeed anybody else, then I am afraid that is going to be the case because in certain parts of the Province we have to put a limit on the number of people who are processing fish. Certainly on the Port au Port Peninsula where last year, for example, there were three million

MR. CARTER:

pounds of fish landed, 500,000 pounds of which was landed by government owned boats. So you are talking about a potential production there of two and a half million pounds. That would not keep even a small feeder plant in operation. For example, National Sea operation is capable of processing about 100,000 pounds a day on a two-shift basis. So I would prefer to see a limited number of economically viable plants in operation than to have maybe three or four times that many plants that are teetering on bankruptcy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The member for Eagle River.

MR. I. STRACHAN: They should add it is the Deputy Minister of Fisheries who stated the policy of exclusive franchises and stated that was the minister's policy. But the question is that does he not see that in the rationalization of the fishing industry that there is a place for the small processor producing low volume, high quality finished products and that that low volume need not necessarily interfere with large plants and that we are concerned that what we are doing is giving a few large companies the rights to the fishing industry in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am obviously not getting through very well. There are in Newfoundland today roughly 101 fish plants, small and large plants. Fourteen of these plants are operating close to all year-round. The rest are operating very much on a seasonal basis. Certainly our ambition is to, first of all, protect the fisherman and insure that his catches are sold and that he gets the best price possible. Secondly we have the responsibility to insure that fish that is leaving the Province is of a high quality. And therefore, we have to exercise certain control in the issuance of

MR. CARTER:

licenses. But certainly we are not embarking on a policy of cutting out the small operator in favour of the larger operator. But in getting back to the original question, the situation on the Port au Port Peninsula which is the thing that has precipitated this debate was that there was utter chaos in the industry. The co-op failed, at the request of the fishermen in the area and of the Port au Port co-op society, or at least the Port au Port Development Corporation or whatever they call themselves.

AN HON. MEMBER: Association.

MR. CARTER: - We did canvas three potential operators for the area. Only one accepted the challenge, National Sea. In so doing they were given certain rights in behalf of the fishermen. And we think it is working very well. But again if they want to, if the fishermen want to push out National Sea or to bring in somebody else, that is their decision. But certainly it would be against our advice.

MR. SPEAKER: One additional supplementary. The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACAN: This statement that you are protecting the fishermen and this is what your policy is designed to do is to protect the fishermen indicates that the fishermen, if they are going to sell their fish to the small processor would not get a price for his fish. Is it now what the minister is stating, that the fishermen can sell their fish, in fact there is a need for the fish, a demand for fish both by small processors and large processors and that this is not valid?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: I said we want to protect the fishermen, yes, but we want to provide a healthy climate in our fishing areas where fish plants can indeed afford to pay the top price for fish. A fish plant that is bordering on bankruptcy is of little use to the Province or indeed the fishermen, and probably of less value to the operators of the plant itself. But certainly we are precluding small operators, in the Province we have many dozens of them and we are doing all we can to assist these small operators. As a matter of fact, most of these small operators, or a lot of them, are operating in buildings that have been provided by the Department of Fisheries, by the government -

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: - for which they are charging practically no rent at all, a very, very nominal rent. So that is hardly a policy of - that can hardly be interpreted as a policy of trying to push out or to discourage small operators in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Windsor-Essex.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Would the minister indicate to the House as to whether or not his department have received over the past week or so complaints or representations from people who have been unable to secure fire insurance on houses, on homes in which they either intend to install wood burning units or on homes into which wood burning units have already been installed? I will repeat the question again?

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

MR. MURPHY: To my knowledge we have received no communication, the only communication, the only information I received was from the hon. member who spoke in the House on Friday, I believe, and I contacted the group that are studying all the insurance needs for the Province and they have it under advisement. But there may be representations in, but I think everybody is aware that there was a slight delay in the post office delivery of mail in the past few days, and it may be hung up somewhere along the way. But I can assure the hon.

Mr. Murphy:

member that it is an ongoing thing in the Department of Consumer Affairs, particularly in the insurance group, and we are looking at it all together with all other matters of insurance. But if there is any specific one, Mr. Speaker, I will urge again please let us have names and addresses because when we approach a body with a protest of any kind, they ask us for particulars, so we just cannot pull something out of the thin air we must give the information that is required, and the names.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from St. George's followed by the hon. gentleman from LaFolle, and the hon. gentleman from Stephenville.

MRS. H. MACISAAC: I have a question for the President of Treasury Board or the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations whichever wishes to answer. Is the minister aware of the fact that patients at the Waterford Hospital are being ordered to - I will give a couple of examples - is he aware that a patient, an epileptic patient was ordered to install a light on the roof of the building, a spot light? And another case where two patients were ordered to clean up sewerage after there was a break in one of the lines?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: No, Your Honour, I can honestly say that I was not aware of that. I do not know - if I can get some documentation I will certainly check into it.

MRS. MACISAAC: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MRS. MACISAAC: I wonder would the minister endeavour to look into the situation and see if maybe those patients are being used in those positions because of their particular situation maybe?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Yes I will certainly do that, Your Honour. I was aware of the fact that various patients have volunteered to do various jobs in there for which they are being paid, washing floors and dishes

Mr. Doody:

and this sort of thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOOLEY: And, you know, I understand that is the situation that they are doing it voluntarily. The idea of ordering them to do such things as the hon. member suggests is something that I was not aware of and which, you know, I have some very grave reservations about. I would like to see some proof of it, I will certainly check it out to see what I can find out.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member from Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: If I may the supplementary to the Minister of Health if it is permissible, since he is the gentleman in charge of the Waterford Hospital. Could the Minister of Health fill us in on some of the questions raised by the hon. member, since things happening in health institutions are under his care and guidance. Perhaps the minister can enlighten us as to whether or not the patients in that hospital are required to do the things as suggested by my hon. friend.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that is the first indication that I have had, but I will certainly take it under advisement and check it out fully and get back to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question, Sir, to the hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation or the hon. Minister of Tourism,

MR. NEARY: whichever gentleman prefers to answer the question.

Sir an outstanding Newfoundland athlete by the name of Bren Kelly would like to run from Victoria - from coast to coast - from Victoria to St. John's arriving in St. John's on the eve of the summer games. The minister is aware of this. Would the minister tell the House if there is any way that the minister's department can help Mr. Kelly, Mr. Bren Kelly with his expenses in carrying out this noble ambition and in the process giving excellent publicity to Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it was only yesterday or the day before, within the past two or three days, my secretary informed me that this gentleman had called the office and we are in the process of setting up a meeting with him. I do not know if he wants some money or whether he wants some encouragement or whether he wants publicity but whatever it is we are setting up a meeting with him.

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question for the Minister of Tourism, Sir. Would the Minister of Tourism inform the House if he has received any communication from Mr. Kelly in connection with this running from coast to coast, from Victoria to St. John's, and if so, would the minister tell the House what action - if any has been taken on Mr. Kelly's request for some assistance to make this journey?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that I have a request. My staff are looking at the situation. I cannot say as to what we can do. Certainly we are appreciative of the efforts being put forward by this young man and certainly the effects that it will have as he goes across the country. But I am not in a position to say at this time whether there is any form of assistance

MR. HICKEY: that we can provide him. Certainly we will provide him with the usual gifts to present in various capital cities that he will visit and any other thing that we can provide him with. But in the terms of finances I am unable to say at this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Final question - the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, is either minister aware of the urgency of this matter that Mr. Kelly was supposed to have started on March 21st and if he does not get started this week, of course, the trip will have to be cancelled? So can either minister give Mr. Kelly or the House an answer this week sometime?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have assured the gentleman that we will have an answer for him. In this connection I have asked my staff to look very quickly and to get back to me to see if there is any form of assistance of a financial nature that we can provide and we certainly will follow through with that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Finance. Could the minister indicate whether the final report of the Advisory Board of Labrador Linerboard has to be submitted before the Provincial Budget comes down or is it just a report that the minister is waiting for?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DODDY: We are looking for as much information as we can from the Advisory Committee. Hopefully it will be the final report and if it is not it will certainly have to be sufficiently comprehensive for us to make a decision on it. But obviously if the final report is not in before the end of April we are going to have to bring in a budget anyway and so we hope that they will be in a position to advise us as to what course of action they think we should take out there.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. MCNEIL: From my sources, Mr. Speaker, the final report cannot be possibly delivered to the minister before the end of April. Could the minister indicate if the Interim Report was enough information to go on in order to set up the, to bring down the Provincial Budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: It is not really. We would like to have a more comprehensive report. There is nothing in that preliminary report that deals with one of the items I think that are really major or central to the whole problem and that is the conversion options and the costs of such options. I think that they can certainly get that information for us by the required date and I think that is the crucial bit and piece.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister tell us whether or not the conversion of energy have all been settled?

MR. DOODY: No, and the cost of converting it. We also have that woodland situation still out there too but I do not think that that would be crucial to my central problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy and I may say that I direct the question to him only because of an item in the newspaper today quoting his colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding discussions between the Newfoundland Light and Power on the one hand and the government on the other regarding Bay Bulls Big Pond. I would think therefore that the discussion centre around the claim and rights whatever they may be

MR. NOLAN: that Light & Power would have on the water body there, and perhaps others as well. Perhaps the minister might be good enough to tell us, since the water is now being developed to supply the city of St. John's, Conception Bay and so on, what meetings he has had if any? What the position of the Light and Power Company is, and what if anything is the government prepared to do, if they have dug in?

MR. ROBERTS: A good question.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Mines & Energy.

MR. PECKWOLD: I have not been directly involved. I am aware of the problem primarily because I came from - the previous portfolio was Municipal Affairs and Housing and I know that some discussions are ongoing but I am not at the center of the problem, and have not been for some time. I have been informed about what is going on. I know that there is a problem as it relates to ownership and reservation and so on between Newfoundland Light and what the government or Department of Municipal Affairs sees as what it needs in order for the proper operation and maintenance of the system. That is all I can say.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: I address the question now, then, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and perhaps I should not have gone after the Minister of Mines and Energy. It is just that using my information from the newspaper where the minister said he is not involved and other ministers are involved I automatically assumed that if anybody should be it should be the Minister of Mines and Energy. So, now perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be good enough to fill us in on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DENN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are preliminary negotiations going on now, or will be going on in the very near future with the Newfoundland Light and Power but there is nothing materialized as of yet. It is centered around discussions with respect to

MR. DINEEN: allegations or claims that they have on Bay Bulls Big Pond. But there is nothing, there are no meetings being held yet but there will be in the very near future. I would anticipate.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for White Bay.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir. Would the minister tell the House if there was any response at all from Eastcan in connection with the - concerning the regulations that the minister drafted and submitted to the company? Now there are probably other companies involved. Eastcan is the main one. Was there any reaction at all, was there any attempt at negotiating changes in the or mending the regulations at all?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we had meetings with Eastcan in Calgary, Ottawa, St. John's and also correspondence changed hands between ourselves and them, and them and ourselves. So, you know, there was a fair amount of discussion, dialogue between both sides over a table going through it in, you know, minute fashion, as there has been with other companies who have any interest off our coast, who are interested in contributing to the regulations.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know Eastcan is the big one but would the minister tell the House now if the game is over as far as Eastcan is concerned for this year? There will be no drilling by Eastcan. What will happen concerning the other companies that were drilling off our shore. Have they accepted the government's regulations? Will there be any drilling at all this year off the coast of Newfoundland or Labrador?

MR. PECKFORD: Whether there is going to be any drilling or not this year is a question I cannot answer yet. No. 1: It seems clear that Eastcan are not going to do any exploration drilling off our coast in 1977. No. 2: The regulations are still draft regulations. We are now moving as fast as we can to make them public with the kind

MR. PECKFORD: of backup material that is needed for everybody to understand.

MR. NEARY: But in the meantime everybody leaves.

MR. PECKFORD: The first criticism that we will get if we just publish a cold analytical scientific group of regulations that nobody can understand and therefore we cannot contribute in a worth-while fashion to their

MR. NEARY: These are just delay tactics everybody will be gone by the time white paper or the regulations are drafted.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, can I demand silence while I try to respond in an intelligent fashion to the hon. member's question.

MR. NEARY: Talk a bit of common sense, hey?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hon. minister should be allowed to answer with interruption.

MR. PECKFORD: So, we are trying to get them ready for publication.

No. 3: Because this process is still ongoing, vis-a-vis the regulations, the other companies involved who have acreage, who are moving towards some exploration activity in the next two or three years are still waiting to see what the final draft will be that will come out in the white paper which will be in principle, in any case, where we will be standing as it relates to the regulations.

MR. NEARY: But they will all be gone by the time you get your white paper out.

MR. PECKFORD: What will primarily -

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Motion two.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Timber Scalers." Carried. (Bill No. 37)

On motion, Bill No. 37 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion three.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Mining and Mineral Rights Tax Act, 1975." Carried. (Bill No. 35)

On motion, Bill No. 35 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion four.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act, 1976." Carried (Bill No. 36)

On motion, Bill No. 36 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion one.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOOLY: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The following is a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to the hon. the Minister of Finance.

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the public service of the Province for the year ending March 31, 1978 by way of Interim Supply, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend these Estimates to the House of Assembly.

(Sgd) Gordon A. Winter
Lieutenant-Governor."

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

RESOLUTION:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please?

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st. day of March, 1978, the initial sum of one hundred and fifty-nine million, six hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$159,650,000).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: How many bankruptcies are there in the Province?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to be able to say how many bankruptcies there are in the Province this year. Certainly the Province is not in that position, fortunately.

We have before us, Sir, a bill calling for an interim supply amount of nearly \$160 million which is a very, very large amount of money indeed. I had hoped and had informed the House prior to this that we would have had a budget ready but as I indicated during the question period we do have a major problem and I have got two major problems, one of them is out there -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if I could help the hon. gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: I sympathize with the problem, really. Sir, it comes up all the time. You know most of us in the House, Sir, have rather good lungs and we get lots of opportunity to exercise them, and particularly given the microphone that is turned on when we have been recognized we could speak pretty well any volume. But, Sir, it should not be necessary, it does nothing for the House, it does nothing for the temper of the House or the dignity of the House. The minister is making an extremely important statement and it happens to be the gentlemen on the other side who are guilty but my colleagues and I myself have been guilty on occasion. But could we all sort of take a self-denying ordinance, we all have access to common rooms and, you know, if we have to chatter loudly could we go in the common room and let the minister or whoever is speaking be heard in silence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! It would be superfluous to add to what the Leader of the Opposition has said so I would ask the hon. members to pay attention accordingly. Hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DCCDY: Thank you, Your Honour. As I have indicated to the House during the question period the main estimates and indeed the budget itself is pretty well prepared and pretty well ready. Our major problem has been dealing with Newfoundland Linerboard Limited, the amounts of money which will be needed for the mill and the course of action which it should take, how to deal with the amounts of money that will be involved. And there are major problems of current and capital account, both in dealing with Labrador Linerboard, has placed us in the position of having to delay the budget much longer than we had anticipated. Mr. Chairman, the government as the House is well aware appointed the advisory group in November and

MR. DOODY: asked them to give us the benefit of their advice on the Labrador Linerboard situation. It would be, I think, prudent for us, wise and sensible to at least wait for the most information that they can give us before we make any decisions on that rather major employer on the West Coast of the Province and indeed in other parts of the Province as well. And so Sir, that is the principle reason quite honestly and quite frankly why the budget has been delayed, and it is a problem that we have been wrestling with. As has been indicated an Interim Report was submitted by a sub-committee to the advisory group very recently and that is in our hands. It does not give us enough information to make a decision on, and as I say, we would prefer to wait until we get further information.

The hon. members opposite have asked if it is necessary for us to wait for the final full report. I do not think it is but I think we should try to get as much information as we possibly can before we make a final decision. And with that in mind, Sir, we are now asking the House to grant the supply in this amount which is in effect about two months supply. It covers about eight pay periods. And the various sub-heads as are listed there with the exception of sub-head (1) which is missing and that is a statutory sub-head and there is no Interim Supply needed for it, the consolidated revenue fund. All the other heads are there and this is the amount, I must say, that is to the best of our estimates, the amounts that will be needed if it indeed goes to two months, we do not think it will. As I say we will have the budget in before that time. The various sub-heads are listed here before us and if the hon. members opposite have questions

MR. DOODY:

on individual amounts or sub-heads I am sure that the ministers will be only too happy to respond to them. And further than that, Sir, rather than to request the House to give us the authority to spend that \$160 million, or \$159,650,000. That is about all that I can say at this particular point.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I intend to be brief but there are one or two points which I would like to make in the absence of my friend and colleague from Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir who is today in Bay D'Espoir, I believe, attending a very important function. First of all, Sir, the reason to be brief among others, is that we are now in the infamous seventy-five hour period and let it be noted that under the provisions of standing Orders, it is the final one in the book, it is

MR. ROBERTS:

116 sub something or other. The clock is now running and so any time which we spend now debating this Interim Supply must be subtracted from the main Supply debate. That is not an argument against debating interim supply, but it is certainly a consideration to be taken into account. The time which we consume now will come off the seventy-five hours, and we have seen in the last two or three years seventy-five hours is not enough, the way this House is organized. The way this House works, is not enough to enable a proper consideration to be given to the estimates.

Let me say in connection with that, Sir, and growing out of that that I very much hope this year, and I think all members of the House are involved in this, I very much hope this year we can find a way to ensure that all of the heads of expenditure are debated, at least to some length, I think. It is a matter in which nobody can take any pride, I think, it is a matter of shame and almost of despair that in this House in the last two or three sessions, in the last two or three years very large amounts of money have gone without any examination by the elected members. I do not think we have had a debate on the Transportation and Communications Department in three or four years. We only had a start of a debate on Fisheries last year. I think the minister was making his introductory remarks, his introductory statement when the clock ran out. I do not think we have an a debate on a number of other departments which ought to be debated if this House is to have any meaning and relevance, one of the items we must attend to is this question of improving the estimates procedure.

The government will not budge on the seventy-five hours. Whether they are right or wrong thus becomes irrelevant and of no account because they will not budge on it. Well that being so we will have to accept the reality and all of us, Sir, on both sides judge ourselves accordingly.

Mr. Roberts:

Mr. Chairman, having made that point let me go on to try to make clear my understanding of what we are doing now. We are being asked by the minister to vote authority to spend about \$150 million which is two months supply. In other words, we are to gather the total expenditure next year will be of the order of \$960 million, that being six times the amount now before us plus the statutory expenditures which last year were of the order as I recall in of \$150 millions, because the statutory expenditures include not only the debt servicing charges which are the major portions, I do not have last year's estimates in front of me at this point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOODY: Revised 1975-1976 Consolidate Revenue -

MR. ROBERTS: But we are 1976-1977 now.

MR. DOODY: 1976-1977.

MR. ROBERTS: We are going into 1977-1978.

MR. DOODY: \$106.4 million.

MR. ROBERTS: How much did you say?

MR. DOODY: The revised estimates \$106.4.

MR. ROBERTS: Well Consolidated Funds Services last year were shown as \$106,400,000, but to that, Sir, of course, would have to be added other statutory expenditures including the expenditures on Churchill which are not shown specifically in the estimates,

MR. DOODY: Lab Linerboard.

MR. ROBERTS: The expenditures on Labrador Linerboard and of course the two salaries that are paid out of the statutory, the Comptroller and his friend and fellow servant of the House the Auditor General.

Mr. Chairman, here is what we are talking about, in expenditure of at least \$1.2 billion this year on the budget.

Now, Sir, the point I want to make is that we are being asked now to vote on account, to vote authority for the government to spend pending discussion and final disposition by the Committee and by the House of the supply procedure. I want to make that clear, Sir,

MR. ROBERTS:

or precluded in any way from debating any and all items in the estimates. So by not taking advantage of this particular procedure to debate every single item, we are not in any way prevented - the full estimates debate must still go ahead. The only problem is that whatever time we take now comes out of the seventy-five hours, essentially the position in which we find ourselves.

So I really want to say to the press, Sir - I know that we address the Chair, we speak to the Chair, but we all realize that what is reported is what goes beyond the House in most cases and what is known to most of the people of this Province. I want to make it clear that when we on this side, and I cannot speak for my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and my friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) but I think I reflect their view on this as I understand their position at this time, that when we do not settle down for a knock down, drag them out fight on this particular item it does not mean we are conceding anything, all we are saying is that the government have to have authority to carry on the business of the Province. They have to pay certain bills. They certainly have to pay the payrolls which fall due every fortnight, the first of which will fall due as I understand it on the thirteenth of April. They do not have to pay necessarily the accounts of the Province, the bills for one thing and another, but they ought to pay them and if they do not pay them now they will have to pay them later. And given the fact that the House has not completed the supply procedure by the thirty-first of March, it will not have, then we have no option but to vote interim supply or see the government of the Province in default because the government of the Province cannot spend a nickel with the exception of very limited circumstances, cannot spend anything without the approval of the House of Assembly. And that is the way it should be.

MR. ROBERTS:

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to say very much more on it. The total amount is staggeringly large but it is the kind of amount to which we have become accustomed and I guess we will become accustomed. It was not so many years ago that the late Mr. Spencer, Ned Spencer was Finance Minister and in a famous peroration to the budget speech which he delivered, and I believe this was about the mid-sixties, 1964 or 1965, it said that this was the first \$100 million budget of the Province and he did not know how long the Province could sustain that level of expenditure. Well here we are now at the point where \$160 millions is one-sixth of the annual expenditure and that is ten or twelve years later. It is a staggeringly large amount of money, Sir, but it is going to be -

AN HON. MEMBER: Everything has risen.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am constantly amazed at how everything has risen. I happened to have a look today at the annual report of the Bank of Commerce which came in the mail and I guess they sent it to all their debtors, and in that case I am certainly entitled to one of them, but they had some interesting figures that show over the last ten years, just to take one example, the total revenue of the Bank of Commerce, a small institution with branches just about everywhere in Canada I guess, in 1967 their total revenue from all sources was \$386 million. In 1976, ten years later, it was \$2,208,000,000 you know, an incredible rate of increase, absolutely incredible, and that same sort of increase is being felt in the expenditures of the government of this Province.

Sir, let me say other than that, two things. First of all, we are disturbed over the revelation today that the Stephenville situation in the sense of its importance in the budget deliberations. Now I do not want to touch off the debate now. My friend from Stephenville may have a few words to say. But I do not think we have enough information to

MR. ROBERTS:

touch off a debate. We could certainly debate, heavens knows we have debated in this Chamber often enough without any information being given on either side, but I do not think we have enough to debate a situation which is obviously one of the more serious now confronting the people of this Province and their government. I hope the bill before the House will be called fairly soon so that we can get into a debate. There has been a paucity of information, a great dearth of information about the affairs of Linerboard. It is a matter of record that two days from now which will be the end of Linerboard's fiscal year will mark the second anniversary of the last financial statement that has been made public. There has not been a financial statement made public with respect to Linerboard for a period later than 31 March 1975, two years ago. The government have used all sorts of figures in public statements by the Premier, by various ministers about the anticipated or actual deficit of Linerboard for the current year, but these vary, as I recall them, from what? - \$20 million to \$25 millions on one hand to \$45 millions on the other. Nobody really knows. We do not know in respect of what items the deficit has been occurred, whether it is on capital account, on operating account or a combination of both.

MR. ROBERTS: We have remarkably little information given the fact that, well we are not the shareholders, the government - I guess the shares are held by three ministers. I have never bothered looking it up but that is the normal arrangement.

MR. DODDY: I am afraid so.

MR. ROBERTS: They are held by a number - but no the minister will be very glad to hear that no personal liability attaches to him. But, Sir, the fact remains that this House represents the real shareholders of the province - shareholders of the enterprise, I am sorry, to the people of the province because in the long run we are the guys who have to buckle up the monies necessary to keep that very important operation going.

So I guess what I am saying is a plea to the minister - possibly not today, it may not be the right place for it, - but to make public some information. If ever there was a case for a white paper the Stephenville Linerboard Operation is a case, and by a white paper I mean making public a lot of information. If ever there was a case for a standing committee of the House to look into an investigation, or to look into an enterprise, and I do not mean an investigation in the sense of allegations I mean just an ongoing continuing check, it is in respect of linerboard. We made that suggestion in the last debate we had in the House which was December 1975 about two o'clock in the morning. The then Chairman of the Board, Mr. John Crosbie, undertook to look into it. He may or may not have looked into it I do not know but I do know nothing was done. Nothing has been done on that suggestion although I still think it is a good one.

The gentleman from St. John's East yesterday spoke about Crown Corporations and the lack of control which this House holds and that is a very relevant point. It is one which we on this side have made many times. Stephenville is the most pressing example of it now, the monster of hydro. You know, hydro which is

MR. ROBERTS: a monster may or may not be out of control, it may or may not be monstrous but it is a monster, incredibly large. I mean Hydro must have assets and liabilities now of several hundred million dollars or possibly even billions of dollars if you take their true value. And there has been so little discussion by this House about Hydro it is almost laughable, just incredible. They are down there operating as a law unto themselves and that is bad enough but they are operating in the public interest as they see it and not necessarily as we the House of Assembly sees it and also they are operating with our money but with remarkably little accountability. We get an annual report. Eight months after the year ends, in comes a glossy coloured annual report with lovely pictures and photographs, honeyed words but again remarkably little information.

So I make that suggestion, that request to the ministry. I make one other one, Sir, in closing what I wish to say at this point that I would hope the budget and the estimates are brought down as early as possible. I asked one of my staff to look through the history since Confederation of budgets and I find there have been just as many in April or in May as there have been before the end of the financial year. That is not something of which anybody can be proud and I think the Liberal Administration was as guilty as the present administration of that. There is really no reason that I can see, Mr. Chairman, why the budget cannot be brought down before the end of the year, the end of the financial year and certainly no reason why the estimates cannot be brought down. I think we should look at the Ottawa practice. If we need a second set of estimates we could produce them. We would not change very many but there are some which do change by their nature. Furthermore if we need a second budget - well we have had two in one year

MR. ROBERTS: in this province. We had one in 1975-1976 year, we had two in that year - we could do that as well. But I think it is something we should do. Perhaps we should consider adopting a rule in the House, Mr. Chairman, that the budget shall be or the estimates shall be tabled by say the first of March in any given year and then the House can proceed from there because that would obviate the need to do as we must do today to vote \$140 million without really having any specific idea of what it is for.

One question, Sir. Can the minister when he speaks again tell us whether there are any new programmes included in this? The information is not here. We do not have any estimates. The question I want to know is whether there are any major new programmes because I think, Sir, it is improper to launch upon those without giving the House the opportunity to examine them and to debate them.

Mr. Chairman, that is really what little I have to say on it. It is about all we can say without launching a major debate. We do not have the estimates. We have no real way to debate them in any detail. We are faced with the matter of having to give the government the authority to spend this money because otherwise they will not be able to meet their bills at some point in the next fortnight or so and that is certainly not a situation we would want. But in saying that, and in saying that I for one and my colleagues for others will vote our approval of this, let it be recorded that we are not just giving the government a blank cheque. We reserve the right and indeed are determined to exercise it to have a full and a

MR. ROBERTS: complete debate on the estimates when the main estimates are called. Nothing we do today takes away from that, nothing we do will lessen our desire.

Mr. Chairman, that is really all I need say at this point. Some of my colleagues may have a word or two. The gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) may as well have a word or two, it would not be unheard of, the gentleman from Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) may wish to speak on this but, Sir, I think for our part, unless something else comes up in the debate that we feel the necessity to comment upon, at this stage we are prepared to let the matter pass with the hope that we will get the estimates early and be able to debate them fully. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I think what the hon. Leader of the Opposition was outlining there was the strategy that will be used this year to probably try to make and attempt to make better utilization of the seventy-five hours that we have at our disposal to discuss the estimates item by item. It strikes me as being a very reasonable proposition and I too intend not to take too much time during Interim Supply to go into the items in great detail, although I feel there are a number of questions that should be answered by the minister before we pass Interim Supply and so I will try to make my few remarks as brief as possible, Sir, so that when we do get - when the Budget is brought down that we will be able to deal with every department of government this year. Last year the Minister of Finance, the government, the administration played a cat and mouse game with the Opposition and they only called the departments that they were not scared of and they left the big ones, the money spenders, the controversial departments, left them until the seventy-five hours ran out and then just rammed them through the House without debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame! Shame!

MR. NEARY: That is not good enough.

MR. COLLINS: You had three days on Health.

MR. NEARY: Well we had three days on Health and we should have had three weeks on Health. It is one of the big spenders, Transportation and Communications, Health, Education, Social Services, and what other one?— Education are the big spenders, the top five.

AN HON. MEMBER: Education.

MR. NEARY: That is what I said, Education.

MR. MORGAN: You had eighteen hours on that one.

MR. NEARY: Eighteen hours, Sir, you could spend eighteen days on it. And if I had my way it would not be passed yet until the university put details of their estimates on the table of this House. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the President of this university making a statement outside of this House that he will give his estimates in detail to the press before he would give them to the members of the House of Assembly, a gentleman who himself at one time taught Political Science at the university —

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. NEARY: You think he would have better sense. No wonder we get our dander up and it sets the devil in us when we hear that sort of thing going on. If I had my way the estimates last year would have been stalled, held up.

MR. NOLAN: Well the government can make a statement on that. What is their position?

MR. NEARY: I heard the Minister of Education the other day on radio making wishy-washy, oh, feeble statement in connection with the university. And the minister has it all in his own hands and he was on the radio saying, Oh you know we are going to try to get it. All the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Education had to do to the university was say, No, you are cut off until you put on the table of this House, until you table

MR. NEARY: in this House details of your -

MR. LUSH: How do they do it in other Provinces? How do they do universities?

MR. NEARY: I do not care how they do it in other Provinces. They probably produce the facts..

MR. LUSH: I believe they do bring it before the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I had a discussion recently with the President of the University.

MR. DOODY: Did you find him very receptive?

MR. NEARY: Yes, most receptive, Sir. I understand there is going to be a couple of honorary degrees bestowed on politicians this year. The committee is now meeting over at the university to decide what politicians are going to get honorary degrees this year.

MR. DOODY: It will not be you.

MR. NEARY: I can almost assure the Minister of Finance right now that I will not be one of the candidates for an honorary degree.

MR. DOODY: You will get a degree all right.

PREMIER MCCREES: The third degree.

MR. NEARY: As I have told this hon. House, I told the people in charge of the university that I thought they should table the details of the salaries paid at the university and I was amazed, Mr. Chairman, I was amazed the reaction that I got from the President. He said, "Do you want to table the salaries and names of all the staff of the university?" And I said, "No, of course not." And

Mr. Neary:

I happened to have with me a booklet of the salary details that are tabled in this hon. House, and I produced it and I showed it to the President and he looked it over and he said "Well there are no names in here." I said "Of course not. All you see in this booklet is the classification and the salary." Not necessarily the salary that is being paid to the individuals either. It just shows the starting salary and the maximum salary, and the salary paid to the individual would be somewhere in between.

Well he thought that was absolutely fantastic because he understood that what we wanted in this House was a list of names of the employees of the University and the salaries that were being paid to these employees. And that is not so. And so I left the booklet with the President of the University. I do not know whether he will take my advice or not and provide the minister or the Minister of Finance with a list of classifications and salaries that go, the price tags to go with these jobs or not. I am hoping that the University will do this, Sir.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just got off the track here for a moment - somebody mentioned the University, and of course that is like waving a red flag in front of a bull, when I think about the statement, when I think about that statement that was made by the President of the University, that they would publish the budget in the newspapers, give it to the newsmen but would not give it to the elected representatives of the people.

I can guarantee you one thing, Mr. Chairman, that if I were Premier of this Province that the President of the University would not have to come up and threaten me with his resignation because he would be hauled into my office and hauled on the carpet, and not beg him to stay on as we were told happened when the members were being reappointed to the Board of Regents.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance has come in and asked this House for \$159.5 million in interim supply. The minister is asking for roughly \$160 million, Sir, at a time when the

MR. NEARY:

Budget should be brought down in this hon. House. And I am not going to be so kind, Sir, as the Leader of the Opposition and let the minister get off the hook with the excuse that the minister has to wait for the report of the Advisory Board on the Linerboard Mill at Stephenville. I think that is a colossal bluff, Sir. I think it is a great farce. How naive and stupid does the minister think we are? I am not prepared to accept that explanation, Sir, for the delay in bringing down the Budget in this hon. House. The Budget could have been brought down the same as it has been in every other year, and the minister could have estimated what it is going to cost to operate the Linerboard Mill, the same as we do with all of the other figures in the Budget, they are all estimates. The minister could have either laid it on the table, set it aside included it in the Budget, estimated it for the rest of the year, estimated it for three months, six months, could have -

AN HON. MEMBER: Six years.

MR. NEARY: No not for six years because the Budget is only for one year.

So, Sir, that is no excuse for a delay in bringing down the Budget before the end of the fiscal year, the end of the current month, the 31st. of March. I think it is a feeble excuse.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are you condemning now?

MR. NEARY: Well I am condemning the minister. I am condemning the minister for not bringing in the Budget on time. Rather trying to hoodwink the House into believing the reason for it is the Linerboard Mill.

DR. FARRELL: Hold on we cannot have that, hoodwink.

MR. NEARY: We can have hoodwink, Sir, it is parliamentary.

Mr. Chairman, there are other ways that this could have been done. I would suggest that the minister get rid of some of the accountants, some of the academics, some of the crowd that they brought over from Memorial University, if he does not know how to make up a Budget, including the Linerboard Mill,

Robert
Mr. Roberts:

because it puts the devil in me to read or to hear in reports of the House that the House today passed X million dollars whatever the amount may be, and I have not had it checked but I would think there has probably been an Interim Supply Bill three out of every four years since Confederation. But it puts the devil in me to hear that the House has voted X million of dollars in respect of interim supply with only Y minutes of discussion and X divided into Y usually gives a very high figure of dollars per minute.

Now, Sir, that is an interesting exercise, and that statement made by the press as it often is is true, but the fact remains, Sir, that what we say in this Committee at this point in this procedure does not in any way take away from the central fact that every tickal, every penny that will be in the estimates of expenditure to be tabled in due course by the Minister of Finance will still be debated. We are not prevented

MR. NEAMY: even though the report of the advisory board is not in, Mr. Chairman this Province is in such a shaky financial condition at this moment that it is imperative, Sir, it is a matter of urgent public importance that we have a statement from the minister. And the minister just gets up - and we should have the budget really, and the budget speech - and the minister just gets up and brushes it off, asking the House for \$159 million and does not give us any details of it, just merely apologizes for not being able to bring down a budget because the Advisory Board have not submitted a final report on the Linerboard Mill. Well, Sir, I do not think that is good enough, I do not think it is good enough.

Ways and means could have been found and should have been found to bring the budget down, not delay it for two months, or a month rather. We are not going to have it now so the minister tells us until the end of April. And every minute counts, Sir, as far as I am concerned in the Province at the present time. It could have been done. The minister got these high priced accountants down there, these academics, Mr. Martin and all his crew, that Mr. Crosbie brought up from Memorial University.

Surely God, Mr. Speaker, these so called geniuses could have put together a budget and included the Linerboard Mill, even if it was only for a limited period of time. Adjustments could be made at a later date. The minister saw fit a couple of years ago to bring in a mini-budget, a supplementary budget, supplementary estimates. The minister could have done the same thing again -

MR. DOODY: I hate budgets.

MR. NEARY: -this year. So the minister hates budgets. No wonder he hates budgets. He hates them so much that he cannot even bring them down on time. I would say that the minister is allergic to budgets.

MR. DOODY: Thank You.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about our steak dinner?

MR. MURPHY: You will have to bring your own provisions.

MR. NEARY: What about our steaks? My dear fellow we may never see a steak again. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of questions that the minister should answer before we allow this \$159 million to slide through the House, even though we are changing our strategy somewhat in allowing the main questioning, the main cross-examining of the ministers to take place after the main budget is brought down. For instance, Mr. Speaker, not only should we know the financial condition of the Linarboard Mill, what about the Oil Refinery situation? Are we not entitled to have a few answers in connection with that project? What about the Marystown Shipyard? Are we not entitled to an accounting of that operation for the last year or so? Do we have to wait another month until the budget is brought down? And what about, as my hon. friend says, Newfoundland Hydro?

MR. DOODY: Why do you not look at someone else for awhile I am getting a complex?

MR. NEARY: I am looking at the Minister of Finance, Sir, because it is the minister who is supposed to give us the answers in this hon. House. What about Newfoundland Hydro? What about the Brinco takeover? Has that-

MR. DOODY: Your seventy-five hours just elapsed.

MR. NEARY: That Sir is not parliamentary language. Mr. Speaker what about the Newfoundland Hydro? What about that forced Brinco takeover? Are we going to take in enough

MR. NEARY:

revenue in this current fiscal year to meet the interest and the principle that is due on that money that had to be borrowed almost a couple of hundred million dollars to kick out Brinco? And what about the development of the Lower Churchill, Sir, as my hon. friend reminds me, I am just coming to it. What about the development of the Lower Churchill? Should there not be a statement of policy now on the part of the administration? What about the negotiations that are going on with Ottawa? What about the transmission line? What about the tunnel that was started about the Straits of Belle Isle?

MR. NEARY: They set out off of a puff of powder on either side of the Straits spent 70 or 80 or 90 million dollars that my hon. friend objected to, to start the tunnel, what about it, has the hole been filled in again? Mr. Speaker, what about a statement on the economy of the province? Are we entitled to that at this moment when we have record unemployment? People are struggling for survival. They cannot live. They cannot exist. With the price of gasoline and the price of heating fuel, and the price of electricity going sky high are we not entitled to some explanation from the administration, Sir, from the ministers who are asking us for a \$159 million, or do we just have to accept the minister's word, that it is impossible to bring down a budget until they get the final report from the advisory committee set up to take a look at the linerboard mill?

Mr. Speaker, do we have to wait? Do we have to wait for that report to get a statement from the administration on the present state of our economy? Of course they do not want us to know. Mr. Speaker, we, I have myself, this session so far I would say put at least 250 to 300 questions on the Order Paper. So far I have gotten back about 15 or 20 answers. I can tell from the kind of answers that I am getting back that ministers have their instructions to answer the questions that are not controversial. Mr. Speaker, I have all the questions, and I have all the answers right here in front of me. There is every indication, Sir, from the answers that I have gotten so far that the ministry Sir, are just, the ministers' are just answering questions that they figure are harmless.

MR. MURPHY: As most questions are.

MR. NEARY: Most questions are not harmless, questions are asked to bring out information. Mr. Speaker, a number of questions to be put on the Order Paper arising out of the Auditor General's Report. We have not gotten the answers to these. The minister, surely when the minister is asking for almost a \$160 million. the minister is going to make some reference to the Auditor General's Report

MR. NEARY: and all the serious items and serious matters that were raised in that report. We are not going to just brush that aside. Are we going to leave that, let that hang over for another couple of months? Mr. Speaker, there was, for instance, in the Auditor General's Report some very serious charges made about the administration awarding contracts without calling public tenders. The Minister of Public Works and Services came in the House with a statement that made things sound so very plausible, expected to stop this squawking and the bellyaching of the Opposition. Well, Sir, it has not stopped me, nor is it going to.

The Public Accounts Committee, Sir, the dice are loaded on the Public Accounts Committee. There are more government members on that committee than there are Opposition members.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that unusual?

MR. NEARY: It is not unusual, no, but it is true, it is a statement of fact. Mr. Speaker, I only have forty-five minutes, so three quarters of an hour is not going to make much difference. Mr. Speaker, the administration, crown corporations, government agencies, and Memorial University are still awarding contracts for goods and services without calling public tenders.

MR. ROUSSEAU: They are not.

MR. NEARY: They are not? Well, all right let the minister get up and deny the fact that the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation just awarded a contract for security services. Did they invite or call public tenders? No, Sir, they did not.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Any contracts by any Crown corporation or any department of this government that is contrary to the Public Tenders Act is tabled within fifteen days up here by me.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Sir, I would like to see the contract tabled providing security services for the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation to look after their property and their buildings.

MR. DOODY: Who got the job?

MR. NEARY: Who got the job? Mr. Speaker, let my hon. friend - I am merely posing the question. And I want the minister to give me the answer. Newfoundland Hydro Corporation - who is doing the security work? Were public tenders called? No, Sir, they were not. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing every day a flagrant disregard for the legislation that was passed in this hon. House for calling public tenders. It is happening over at Memorial University every day. And I have put questions on the Order Paper in connection with all these matters. So far, Sir, I have no answers and I do not expect to get any answers because it would be embarrassing for the administration. I could go on and on and give the House a whole list of examples of where the public tendering procedure act, law of this Province has been bypassed. And I do not have time to do it now. I will do it when we get to the estimates. And the minister should also tell us before we put a rubber stamp on this \$160 million - what about the public service? How big has it grown in the last year? We were told at the beginning of the year that a lot of the part-time and casual staff were going to be laid off. Were they laid off and how many were terminated? I think the minister told us at the time they would probably try to find alternative employment. How many were laid off? And how many jobs did the minister find for these people? How big, what has been the increase in the public service in the last, say, three years? Has it levelled off? Is it still growing or is it getting smaller?

I believe the minister should tell us that now while we are debating this bill on interim supply.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this a debate?

MR. NEARY: It is a debate, of course it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, you will hear more of it before this is over.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to know is how many part-time workers have been removed from the government payroll since January 1, 1975 when we were told that this was going to happen? And were any plans made to find employment for these people who were being released?

Mr. Speaker, there is also the matter in the Auditor General's Report of the tobacco tax. Another question I would like to put to the minister, is list the individuals and firms who are in arrears on their tobacco tax as reported in the Auditor General's Report on page twenty-eight for the financial year ended 31 March 1976, and what attempt, if any, has been made by the minister to collect these outstanding amounts including penalties totalling \$404,000. That is a pretty important question, Sir. And I believe the minister owes the House an explanation.

Mr. Speaker, another matter that I would like to get the minister's opinion on while we are passing this interim supply bill. How many motor vehicles, how many motor cars, how many vehicles of various kinds are included in the subheadings under these various departments? Mr. Speaker, I am told that the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation buy their own vehicles. The Newfoundland Hydro buy their own vehicles. The Department of Public Works buy their own vehicles, The Department of Health go off on a tangent and buy their own vehicles, Memorial University probably buy their own vehicles. The Department of Finance buy their own vehicles.

AN HON. MEMBER: Buy their own booze.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is for sure. Mr. Speaker, the Department of

March 29, 1977.

Tape 1392

RH - 3

MR. NEARY:

Manpower buy their own vehicles.

MR. MAYNARD: All we do is pay for them.

MR. NEARY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other - Mines and Energy I believe buy so many vehicles a year and Tourism, Sir. Well what I would like to ask the minister, Sir, - Highways is another and Transportation and Communications. What I would like to ask the minister, Sir, if the government calls public tenders for buying cars for all government departments, crown corporations and government agencies?

MR. DOODY: No, departments and agencies.

MR. NEARY: Departments and agencies and not crown corporations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes they are all called on public tender and they are always given the vote.

The only thing I can think of is lay it on the table of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, does the minister call public tenders for cars for the Newfoundland Hydro?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, not the Newfoundland Hydro.

MR. NEARY: For the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No.

MR. NEARY: Oh well, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the point I am making.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You are spreading the brush over everybody. The -

MR. NEARY: I am not spreading any brush over anybody. I am just trying to find out from the minister if it would be better, if we could save dollars, save money for the taxpayers by having the minister call public tenders for all vehicles that are required for government departments, government agencies and Crown Corporations. Would that not be a good suggestion, Mr. Speaker? If it is I would like to hear the minister tell us while we are discussing the Interim Supply whether or not it is possible to do this.

And, Mr. Speaker, again I have to call upon the Minister of Finance to give me a detailed statement, a breakdown

MR. NEARY: of the cost of the Carbonear Hospital and I have been asking for it now for two years. We should get an accounting, Sir, of the Health Sciences Complex.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have it right here.

MR. NEARY: The minister has it right there and I have a few things right down here too that I guarantee you the minister does not have in his bag. And only today, Sir, only today I got a letter from Mr. Andrew Davidson, special delivery. Special delivery, A. Davidson, 375 Valery Street, Brossard, Quebec. Special delivery and in this letter - I am not going to read it now but I will read it at a later date.

MR. J. CARTER: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. J. CARTER: In fact, Mr. Chairman, it is a point of privilege.

It is a point of the privileges of this House as far as I am concerned. I was going to raise it earlier because the hon. gentleman from LaPoile obviously made some releases to the press, it was reported at lunch time saying he had this, he had that, he had the other, he had copies, copies of this, copies of that that he was going to table in the House. Now, Mr. Chairman, if he has something to table in the House let him table it. Now it is all very well for him to use these McCarthylike tactics and threaten us with this and threaten us with that, if he has something let him table it. Failing that, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that what he ought to do or what ought to be done with him is everything in his possession that can be found in this Chamber and in his office ought to be dumped on the table of this House and sorted out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. REDEBOUT: Dump the hon. member somewhere.

MR. ROBERTS: It really is a shame.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member should be dumped down in Robin Hood Bay.

MR. ROBERTS: It really is a shame. I hope the Hansard make it clear that I do not think that I am the hon. gentleman to whom my friend from LaPoile is referring. It really is a shame that the hon. gentleman from St. John's North insists upon raising omnibus points - they are not points of order and they are not points of information, they are not points of anything except possibly mischievousness or trying to be difficult or troublesome. The hon. gentleman, Sir, raised no point of order. He made no point of privilege. The gentleman from LaPoile has breached, I submit, no rule of debate and no rule of privilege. He may have ruffled the equanimity of the gentleman who represents St. John's North but resides on Mt. Scio and if he has done that, Sir, then I am sure the gentleman from LaPoile would humbly crave the hon. gentleman's pardon and would further ask his indulgence to allow him to carry on with some very interesting and relevant material. I may say that my friend from LaPoile has done me the courtesy to let me glance at this latest communication from Mr. Davidson. I say now it is a sizzler and I would suggest to the gentleman from St. John's North that he attend his place in the House.

MR. ROBERTS: with great assiduousness, Sir, so that he be present when the hon. gentleman makes reference to it.

Because, Mr. Speaker, you know a communication from Mr. Davidson is one we ought to take seriously and I have no doubt it will, Sir. But I suggest my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has offended neither the rule of debate nor the rule of privilege, Sir, and he should be allowed to continue without the interjections of the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would so rule.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the point I was making said there are a lot of unanswered questions in connection with the Health and Science Complex and the Carbonear Hospital and I would submit that the minister does not have the answer in his brief case. For instance, Sir, does the minister have the answer to a cheque that was issued, drawn on the Royal Bank of Canada on October 30th., 1973, main branch, Water Street, paid to the order of Mr. Andrew Davidson, \$28,930.00, drawn on the United Trust Fund, which is the Progressive Conservative Party Trust Fund and signed by Mr. Richard J. Greene, does the minister have the explanation for that in his brief case? Well, Sir, that is what I want. I know what the minister has in his brief case. I want to table this cheque by the way, Sir. I know what the minister has in his brief case. The minister has a history of the projects, the contracts that were ultimately negotiated, that is public information. What I want the answer to, Sir, is what went on behind the scenes, the wheeling and dealing, the influence peddling, not by the minister or anybody in this House but outside of this House that led to this kind of thing, or this cheque which was issued by Mr. Richard Greene, drawn on the Royal Bank of Canada.

MR. NEARY: main branch, 236 Water Street, and paid to Mr. Andrew Davidson, the gentleman who sent me a special delivery letter today that I will read in the House at the earliest opportunity, \$28,930.

We, Sir, this House, and the people of this Province should be protected against this sort of thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MURPHY: Is that a government cheque?

MR. NEARY: No, it is a cheque from the United Trust which is the Tory campaign fund. It is the Progressive Conservative campaign fund.

MR. MURPHY: What are the people of the Province so worried about if it is not a government cheque? What are you beefing about?

MR. NEARY: Sir, it is their money paid for the Health Sciences Complex -

MR. MURPHY: That is not true, not true.

MR. NEARY: - and extorted out of the government and out of the public treasury for the Cabonair Hospital.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Collusion, Sir.

MR. J. CARTER: Is this so called document going to be tabled?

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is going to be tabled. Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: With that delicious exchange of pleasantries I move that the Committee rise, and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have met, considered the matters to them referred, reports having made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. HICKMAN: I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at three o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved that this House now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M., those in favour "aye", contrary, "nay", carried. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 29, 1977

MAR 29 1977

QUESTION NO. 7 BY MR. CALLAN (BELLEVUE) ORDERS OF THE DAY DATED FEBRUARY 8,
1977

MR. CALLAN (BELLEVUE): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

QUESTION:

- (1) The number and locations of artesian wells drilled during 1976.
- (2) Expenditures to utilize existing artesian wells. Where were expenditures made?

ANSWER:

(See Attached)

(1) Number of wells drilled in Incorporated Areas - 7

LOCATIONS:

Anchor Point
Plate Cove West
Trinity, Trinity Bay
Riverhead, St. Mary's Bay
Norris Arm
Holyrood
Cormack

Number of wells drilled in Unincorporated Areas - 6

LOCATIONS:

Birchy Cove
Middle Amherst Cove
Stock Cove
Rattling Brook
Ferrole Harbour
Portugal Cove

(2) Incorporated Areas:

| | |
|----------------|-------------|
| Anchor Point | \$22,000.00 |
| Clarke's Beach | 5,000.00 |
| Meadows | 1,500.00 |
| Port Anson | 6,000.00 |
| Port Rexton | 1,200.00 |

Unincorporated Areas (Water Services Division)

| | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Bloomfield | 4,906.00 |
| Jamestown | 6,861.00 |
| Bunyan's Cove | 5,833.00 |
| Dunfield | 5,664.00 |
| Petley | 4,292.00 |
| Tickle Cove | 5,396.00 |
| Summerville | 3,718.00 |
| Charleston | 4,938.00 |
| Summerville | 3,126.00 |
| Birchy Cove | 4,073.00 |
| Sweet Bay | 5,401.00 |
| Burgoynes Cove | 5,179.00 |
| Bay Bulls | 1,583.00 |
| Bay Bulls | 4,367.00 |
| Brigus South | 6,454.00 |
| Cape Broyle | 2,795.00 |
| Fairy Pond | 2,886.00 |
| Witless Bay | 3,776.00 |
| Barachois Brook | 7,093.00 |
| Flat Bay | 20,710.00 |
| Heatherton | 1,863.00 |

Unincorporated Areas (Water Services Division) (Cont'd)

| | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| O'Regans | \$ 8,912.00 |
| Upper Ferry | 18,306.00 |
| Freshwater | 1,211.00 |
| Gull Island | 2,676.00 |
| Gull Island | 2,545.00 |
| Gull Island | 4,904.00 |
| Gull Island East | 1,517.00 |
| Langdon's Cove | 11,099.00 |
| St. Patricks | 4,774.00 |
| Brighton | 4,967.00 |
| Long Beach | 7,181.00 |
| Lower Island Cove | 4,461.00 |
| Northern Bay | 7,464.00 |
| Northern Bay | 2,261.00 |
| Western Bay | 6,679.00 |
| Burnt Point | 4,779.00 |
| Burnt Point | 4,019.00 |
| Burnt Point | 3,626.00 |
| Ochre Pit Cove | 1,000.00 |
| Cavendish | 6,285.00 |
| Cavendish | 853.00 |
| Hopeall | 7,122.00 |
| New Harbour | 10,760.00 |
| New Harbour | 146.00 |
| Green's Harbour | 5,239.00 |
| Blaketown | 7,110.00 |
| Blaketown | 6,835.00 |
| Bryant's Cove | 3,831.00 |
| Brazil's Hill | 7,027.00 |
| Crane's Road | 5,317.00 |
| Riverhead | 9,994.00 |
| Riverhead | 9,702.00 |
| Pointe Verde | 15,025.00 |
| Loon Bay | 10,938.00 |
| Phillip's Head | 14,655.00 |
| Harry's Harbour | 13,670.00 |
| Jackson's Cove | 19,860.00 |
| Rattling Brook | 13,774.00 |
| Too Good Arm | 64.00 |
| Harris Point | 3,073.00 |
| George's Point | 14,473.00 |
| Bell Island | 21,123.00 |
| Bell Island | 4,401.00 |
| Port de Grave | 2,554.00 |
| Jerry's Nose | 3,275.00 |
| Ferrole Harbour | 8,443.00 |
| Middle Amherst Cove | 4,618.00 |
| Stock Cove | 4,408.00 |
| Jackson Cove | 19,860.00 |
| Portugal Cove | 4,190.00 |

MAR 29 1977

QUESTION NO. 93 BY MR. NEARY (LA POILE) - ORDERS OF THE DAY DATED FEBRUARY 10,
1977

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

QUESTION:

- (1) What was the cost of printing the Henley Report - Commission of
Inquiry St. John's Urban Region Study?
- (2) How many copies were printed?
- (3) What amounts were paid to Mr. Alex Henley and members of his staff
during the process of producing this report?

ANSWER:

(SEE ATTACHED.)

(1) What was the cost of printing the Henley Report Commission of Inquiry
St. John's Urban Region Study?

ANSWER: \$1,800.00

(2) How many copies were printed?

ANSWER: 600 Copies

(3) What amounts were paid to Mr. Alex Henley and members of his staff during the
process of producing this report?

ANSWER:

COMMISSIONERS

| | |
|--------------------|-------------|
| Henley, Alex G. | \$17,450.00 |
| Andrews, Melvin G. | 11,250.00 |
| Morgan, H. B. | 10,500.00 |
| Greene, J. Derek | 8,000.00 |

SUPPORTING STAFF

| | |
|---------------|-------------|
| Cahill, Ellen | \$12,075.00 |
| Pugh, Francis | 1,750.00 |

1. Magistrates who have attended law school at full salary since programing for upgrading magistrates began are as follows:

John P. Trahey
 Clement Scott
 Dogan Ackman
 Edward J. Langdon
 Cyril J. Goodyear
 Robert C. Culton
 Joseph Le Clair
 Gordon W. Seabright
 Irwin N. Davis

2. Magistrates who have successfully acquired a Law Degree under this program are as follows:

John P. Trahey
 Clement Scott
 Dogan Ackman
 Edward J. Langdon

3. Total cost per magistrate and grand total of cost of this program to date as follows:

| <u>Name</u> | <u>3(a) Salary</u> | <u>3(b) Expenses</u> |
|-------------------|--------------------|---|
| John P. Trahey | \$19,521. | *Trans. Cost - \$ 852.00 Tuition - \$2295.00 Books - \$ 450.00 <hr/> \$3597.00 |
| Clement Scott | \$23,247. | *Trans. Cost - \$ 923.00 Tuition - \$2295.00 Books - \$ 450.00 <hr/> \$3668.00 |
| Dogan Ackman | \$20,188. | *Trans. Cost - \$ 284.00 Tuition - \$1530.00 Books - \$ 300.00 <hr/> \$2114.00 |
| Edward Langdon | \$32,911. | *Trans. Cost - \$ 568.00 Tuition - \$1530.00 Books - \$ 300.00 <hr/> \$2398.00 |
| Cyril J. Goodyear | \$28,578. | *Trans. Cost - \$ 284.00 Tuition - \$2295.00 Books - \$ 450.00 <hr/> \$3029.00 |
| Robert C. Culton | \$ 8,325. | *Trans. Cost - \$ 426.00 Tuition - \$ 763.00 Books - \$ 150.00 <hr/> \$1341.00 |
| Joseph Le Clair | \$26,204. | *Trans. Cost - \$ 426.00 Tuition - \$1530.00 Books - \$ 300.00 <hr/> \$2256.00 |

3. (Continued)

| <u>Name</u> | <u>3(a) Salary</u> | <u>3(b) Expenses</u> |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Gordon Seabright | \$28,989. | *Trans. Cost - \$ 355.00 Tuition - \$1530.00 Books - \$ 300.00 <hr/> \$2185.00 |
| Irwin N. Davis | \$13,885. | *Trans. Cost - \$ 426.00 Tuition - \$ 765.00 Books - \$ 150.00 <hr/> \$1341.00 |
| Total Salaries | \$201,848.00 | |
| Total Expense | \$ 21,929.00 | |
| Grant Total | <u>\$223,777.00</u> | |

* (Includes Air Fare or equivalent to and from Law School for Magistrate and family).