

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.  
FRIDAY, MARCH 30, 1979

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Davidsville, Main Point, Harris Point, George Point, Clarke's Head, Wing's Point, Victoria Cove, Rodgers Cove. The prayer of the petition is that "we hereby petition the government of the Province of Newfoundland to have all gravel roads in the area upgraded and paved." And they give mileage here, Mr. Speaker, from Rodgers Cove to Home's Cove which I think most of that mileage is in -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order.

The hon. the Premier is on his way to the House for "Statement by Ministers". He has a short statement to make and I wonder if we could revert to that and then come back to the petition. Would there be consent with that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is being very rude interrupting my friend presenting a petition. We will give the Premier an opportunity to make his ministerial statement somewhere along the line.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay. Thank you.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so rude and nasty.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection if the Premier - As I stated, Mr. Speaker, the request in this petition deals with quite a number of miles of roads in the Lewisporte district, although all of the petitioners

March 30, 1979

Tape No. 596

NM - 2

CAPTAIN WINSOR:                    are in the district of Fogo,  
and the request in the petition is calling for all gravel  
roads to be paved and this, I would suspect, means all of  
the roads leading to the ferry terminal at Farewell from  
Stoneville, Horwood and down that stretch of road, then all  
of the gravel roads around Clarke's Head.    I might also  
include in supporting the petition that all of the gravel  
roads on the Mainland side of Fogo district now should be  
upgraded and paved, and certainly while the paving equipment  
is in that area, and this would include

CAPT. E. WINSOR: the branch road leading down to Aspen Cove and Ladle Cove. There is not a terrible amount of gravel road left in that area and while the equipment is there I think the government should take advantage of it and do all of the gravel roads. Once done and completed in the long term I think the government will save an awful lot of money because they will no longer have to keep those gravel roads maintained as they do now. I certainly support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and have it laid on the Table of the House and direct it to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by my colleague for Fogo district (Capt. Winsor). The petition does call for the upgrading and paving of a considerable amount of road in my own district, namely, the section from Holmes Cove to Rodgers Cove and the branches to Horwood, Stoneville and Port Albert. Those who do not know the significance of this road should remember that it is the main link between the Trans-Canada Highway and the New World Island - Twillingate area. At the present time they use the road to Lewisporte, which is paved, but it is an extra seventeen miles long. It is my contention that this road should have been included in the Loop Road programme a few years ago because it is part of the Loop Road in that area, and it is my contention that that should have been included then and I would hope that some move is made in that direction. We also have a new ingredient now to the importance of getting that road paved, The new ferry terminal for Change Islands is going to be built at Farewell and this will mean additional traffic coming over that highway.

So I do hope that the government sees fit to provide a programme this year for the upgrading and of paving this area. And I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave to revert to "Statements?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By Leave.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I wish to thank members of the Opposition for allowing us to revert to a previous order of business. I regret that I was not here. I was on Her Majesty's elevators and was not able to make it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the report of the Auditor General to the House of Assembly for the financial year ended March 31st., 1978, which was recently tabled before the House. I would like to report that measures have been taken to ensure that the irregularities and other concerns pointed out in the Auditor General's report do not re-occur. In this respect, I wish to table copies of a memorandum sent to all ministers and deputy ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:

to ensure that extra care is taken with respect to the Public Tendering Act and the Financial Administration Act. Furthermore, the Deputy Minister of Finance and comptroller for the Province, through the Internal Audit Division of the Department of Finance, are presently reviewing the report of the Auditor General in detail and have in fact already had intensive discussions with all of the department involved with a view to developing specific remedial measures.

This detailed review will be made available to the Public Accounts Committee at an early date. I would like also to draw the attention of the House to Section 14 of the Report of the Auditor General, page 8. In that section the Auditor General asks that a separate Act constituting the Auditor General's Office be passed by this House. The Auditor General further asks that the mandate of the Auditor General be expanded to incorporate the value of money concept of analysing the Government's finance stewardship. Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General's suggestions in this regard are worthy of this House's most serious consideration. Consequently, may I suggest to the House that we establish an independent review committee of the office of the Auditor General. Officials of Government are currently reviewing the work of similar review committees in other jurisdictions particularly as to the best composition and exact terms of reference of such a committee. Government will be placing suggestions in this regard before the House at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the House that this administration will do all in its power to improve the procedures used to ensure the proper expenditure of public funds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Before the hon. member opposite responds,

I would like, perhaps, for the two House Leaders to get together a little

PREMIER PECKFORD: bit later on - as hon. members know there is a press conference this morning that CN is having relates to major matters in transportation in the Province-and the Opposition will have a chance, of course, to respond as well - that later on in the proceedings of the House this morning I would like an opportunity to table the Government's response to the latest initiatives made by CN and to give the Opposition a chance to respond to them. I will have a copy, it is now being typed, for the Opposition, long before it will be tabled and, say, five minutes for each side to just respond in a general way to these initiatives. I think they are very important.

Thank you very much for allowing me to make this statement.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me, on behalf of the Opposition, thank the Premier for his rather prompt response to the generality of what is contained in the latest Auditor General's report. This is a first in that we never had

MR. SIMMONS:

this kind of response from government as a whole on the subject of the Auditor General's Report. We have had lots of ducking the issue, you remember. Indeed, last year at one point government undertook to give us definitive statements in respect of each department of government which had been named in the Auditor General's Report. To this date we have only had one such statement from the former Minister of Public Works, the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau). I hope that the indications given by the hon. the Premier this morning are followed through and that we will indeed hear something, indeed in detail, about the various points made by the Auditor General. I say I hope. Without doubting his word at all, I do not hold out a lot of hope and I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Because, you see, while the impression is given in the Premier's address or statement to the House that somehow this document it is a new document to the permanent heads of departments, the fact is that the heads of the respective departments have seen draft versions of what is in this report as much as four months ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: The draft document was (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. They would be aware as much as four months ago, Mr. Speaker, of what the Auditor General purposed to say in respect to their particular department. They did not see the full report. For example, the Deputy Minister of Public Works would not have been made privy to what the Auditor General is going to say about Fisheries, for example, but he would have been made privy to what is going to be said about his department, which is the important thing. So for four months the Deputy Minister of Public Works, for example, would be aware of what would be the substance of this report. And so I say it is a bit late now - not too late, I did not say that - but it is a bit late now, Mr. Speaker, for those in government just to be taking initiative on this particular report. And that is why, Mr. Speaker,



MR. SIMMONS: we have been asking questions all week on this particular report. We realize the ministers are only in their new portfolios this week, but their deputy ministers, without exception—with one exception; Mr. Pike who was recently named to another department—with one exception the deputy ministers have had lots of time to do their homework and prepare the piece of paper for their new minister to read. However, better late than never.

The Premier in his statement, Mr. Speaker, mentioned the Public Accounts Committee. Now I wish somebody once and for all, either on the radio, which seems to be the way we get most of our news from the Public Accounts Committee these days from government, either on the radio or in the House would tell us what they intend to do about the Public Accounts Committee, as long as they \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. Simmons: tell us in one consistent way rather than telling it several ways depending on the time of day. For instance, I have heard, one, they are going to make the committee effective. And then I have heard, two, they are going to have the House appoint four Government members and three Opposition members, and let the committee pick a chairman. One, they are going to make it effective, and, two, they are going to have the committee pick its own chairman. These two, Mr. Speaker, are mutually exclusive. You cannot make it effective in that particular way. It will continue to be a government whitewash committee.

I would hope that the Premier will change his mind on this particular issue, if indeed the member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) was reflecting his viewpoints when he spoke on the radio, I think in the last day or so, on this business of how they are going to reactivate the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's comments with respect to a new audit approach, the value for money approach, the need for additional, or separate, I ought to say, audit legislation, a separate Audit Act. I understand, for example, Mr. Speaker, that a separate Audit Act is a fact of life in five or six other provinces of Canada at this very moment. Indeed, not only in Ottawa, but also in Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba; and Quebec is getting ready to bring in an Act right now. Saskatchewan I am not sure of, but the other provinces in Atlantic Canada do not have such an Act.

There is quite an extensive report on the role of the Auditor General at the federal level called by the same terminology that the Premier choose this morning for his purposed study, an Independent Review Committee of the office of the Auditor General. That is existing - others have been done - not only existing, but it is quite recent; it was done in the last couple of years. And there are other reports on the function of the Auditor General.

Mr. Simmons: I would submit, Mr. Speaker, while I cannot take a position against more knowledge at any time, I would submit that the more expeditious route here would be a white paper on the type of audit legislation we ought to have. I believe the study of the Auditor General tends to introduce, either unwittingly or otherwise, a red herring into the whole question of scrutiny of the Public Accounts. And I do not think in any respect that the Auditor General has been lax in his duty. There have been two issues, one relates to the politics of the matter which - and it is not the time to go into that - but the other relates to narrow scope of the legislation under which he operates. And I would submit to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriate route to go would be to bring in audit legislation, or as a first step probably a white paper for appropriate audit legislation, given that we are not breaking new ground, we would be doing what six other provinces of Canada and the federal government have already done, and in so doing we would have the availability of an Independent Review Committee's Report at the federal level only in the past couple of years.

MR. SIMMONS:

With these comments, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the Premier's announcement that the report is being scrutinized. We wonder why it has taken so long - it is better late than never.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there further petitions?

(Mr. Ottenheimer)

ORAL QUESTIONS

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier, Sir, in connection with the reactivation or the reopening of the oil refinery at Come By Chance.

Mr. Tamraz of the First Arabian Corporation has expressed impatience publicly. He is becoming impatient with the government, so he says. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could tell us if he is concerned about Mr. Tamraz's impatience? Whether he is impatient or not, what difference it is going to make. whether they are threatening to pull out? Give us an update on the situation as far as the First Arabian's proposal is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have just in the last couple of days had meetings, I think yesterday morning, on the whole Come By Chance refinery situation with various departments of government and with the ministers for those departments and the status of the whole question of the Come By Chance Oil Refinery is simply, this that by next Wednesday or Thursday the report of Thorne Riddell should be in our hands and we will be in a position then to review the proposals of both corporations as it relates to their



PREMIER PECKFORD: in a position to say where we stand on both proposals; by so doing we can expedite the whole process of getting the refinery started.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would assume from the hon. gentleman's answer that Mr. Tamaraz and the First Arabian have agreed to allow Peat Marwick to give up their proposal to the Newfoundland Government so that they can have both proposals on the table, they can evaluate both proposals at the same time. But I would like to ask the Premier, the Thorne Riddell Report is due in next Wednesday or Thursday, what about the First Arabian proposal, when is that due in? Is there any guarantee, any assurance, that the government is going to get that proposal so they can compare the two proposals? Does the Premier have any guarantee that that is forthcoming?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well we will have at our disposal all the information on both proposals. That was what I said on my original statement a few minutes ago to the hon. member's first question.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but the hon. gentleman also told me the other day he had not been in touch with Peat Marwick or the First Arabian since he became Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: At that point in time.

MR. NEARY: That was the day before yesterday.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That was the day before yesterday. This is the day after yesterday and now I am in possession of additional information. One of the joys of being in any office is that as each day goes by one learns more and I hope that that continues onward into the future for a long, long period of time and therefore now I am in the possession of additional

PREMIER PECKFORD: information that I was not in possession of the day before yesterday and therefore I am able to respond the way I have just responded.

MR. NEARY: Well, a supplementary question then.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Let me put it to the Premier directly.

Has the Premier now been, or since the day before yesterday been in touch with Mr. Tamaraz or anybody in the First Arabian Corporation concerning their proposal, or has the Premier been in touch with Peat Marwick to find out if the First Arabian proposal will be made available to the Newfoundland Government just the same as the Thorne Riddell Report on the Shaheen proposal? Will they get all the details?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question -

MR. NEARY: No, you have not.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - both directly and indirectly. Yes, in the last number of days members of the Government of Newfoundland have been in touch with representatives responsible for the proposal from the First Arabian Corporation and that we will be in a position within a week or so to have all the information on both proposals at our disposal so that we, as a Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, we, as having a vested financial interest in the complex at Come By Chance, will be able to make a firm decision as to how we want to proceed as the Government of Newfoundland or as how we want to see this whole transaction proceeded with and to support it so it can be expedited.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure what impact or what influence the government's decision will have or not because the ultimate decision is left in the hands of the courts and I have heard the Premier express outside the House, publicly, I believe on one of the radio stations, that any company would be foolish to come into Newfoundland unless they had the blessing and the co-operation of the Newfoundland Government. But is that as far as we can go?



MR. NEARY: What is our legal position? Can we force this? Can we say to the British Government, ECCD, 'Look, we favour Shaheen,' or, 'We favour First Arabian,' and that is it - no ifs, ands and buts. And if the government takes that position, will it have any effect on our borrowing or our financial position in the international financial business world? Can we tell the British Government, can this government say to the British Government, 'Look, here it is; we favour Shaheen,' or, 'We favour First Arabian' - no ifs ands and buts.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, my response at this point in time is that the Government of Newfoundland, and hopefully, as the hon. member knows - the House does - if the Government of Newfoundland takes a certain position on a preproposal for economic development in the Province, if that is the position of the government then that would carry, we would hope, a fair amount of support and weight to the various corporations who are vying to stimulate that economic activity. Secondly, of course the ultimate weight on this matter would be a radical departure and that would be if the government was prepared to bring in a bill or something in this House and have this House debate and then order through an act of the legislature some particular movement or some particular preference. I think that would be a radical departure.

MR. NEARY: We would have no legal status then?

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, our status then would be one of the clout that any normal provincial government has in the ongoing business of economic development in a province. Other than that it would have to be some kind of act of the legislature.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, can the Premier tell us the source of the crude oil, both proposals? The Premier should

MR. NEARY: know by now the source of the crude oil. If Shaheen gets the oil refinery, where he is going to get his crude? If the First Arabian gets the oil refinery, where they will get their crude? What I am getting at here, Sir, just for the benefit of the hon. gentleman before he answers the question, I would like to find out from the Premier if he knows now in advance when we talk of crude oil that we are not talking about just contracts between affiliates. The First Arabian is not just going to say that they are going to get crude from one of their affiliates, in other words, the crude oil will come from the Opec countries, from the Arabs or somebody else and not just sort of from a subsidiary of the First Arabian Corporation, or the Shaheen Corporation for that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it from the information that I have now the crude oil would be coming from the source, if you will, from the Middle East or the Opec countries because all the Opec countries are not in the Middle East. I know but most of them are. The source of the crude would be from there and hopefully it will not be from the Ayatullah or some of his people in Iran unless the place stabilizes even more than it has now and that the women are allowed to keep shawls in their pockets. I think the source of the crude will be from the Middle East in both aspects.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for St. John's West, followed by the hon. gentlemen from Burgeo Bay d'Espoir and Lewisporte.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier. There has been a report going around that the Premier is in favour of either freezing electricity

DR. KITCHEN: rates or doing something about them, and now we hear that the Chief Mandarin in charge of hydro electricity in this Province, Mr. Young, is saying that hydro electricity rates will be going up, up, up, up. Now my question to the Premier is who is the Premier? Is it Mr. Vic Young or is it himself?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There are two questions. I thought the latter one had been established as of a couple of days ago by an act that was performed at Government House. So I think that one is a facetious and silly question.

The other one is a very serious one and that has to do with the whole question of power rates. I think one has to remember that when a chairman of a Crown corporation responsibility speaks, he is speaking for the corporation, and when the Leader of the Government speaks he is speaking for the government and all its agencies. From the corporations point of view, obviously electricity rates have to continue to go up in order for the corporation to pay for its ongoing expenses. The question is, then, where will most of the money come from to pay for the expenses of the Hydro Corporation? The Hydro Corporation must always say, unless told differently, that it must come from higher electrical rates. However, government in its wisdom, or lack thereof, can at any point in time inform its Crown corporation that it will be providing some of the revenue to the corporation from other sources, from government sources, which will therefore offset the necessity for ongoing increases for that given fiscal year. So, Mr. Young is speaking as the head of a Crown corporation responsible for electricity and he must be responsible in his statements to that corporation. It is up for government and Cabinet, as we go through the budgetary process now in the next number of weeks, to decide whether in fact all of Hydro's revenue will come out of increased electrical rates or whether some of it will come from electrical and other revenue will come from government. That is a decision that we will make in due course.

MR. KITCHEN:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the supplementary is - I thank the Premier for answering that part - but the question is that the chairman of the corporation has said that while a rate freeze may be politically popular it is financially not achievable, and here I believe he is speaking more than just as the chairman of the Crown corporation but is speaking on political matters. I wonder if the Premier would assure us that despite what the mandarin has said that he will introduce, as he said he would, some sort of a rate freeze on electricity rates in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. OTTENHEIMER) Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate what I have said on many occasions in the last month or so and I would with pleasure reiterate now that in the whole budgetary process that we are involved in, government will be considering all measures necessary to stabilize electrical power rates in this Province. And if that means a freeze there will be freeze, if that does not mean a freeze then there will not be a freeze, but all alternatives will be explored by us in the preparation of our Budget. And we recognize that electrical power increases in the Province have escalated at a tremendous rate over the last number of years and over the last several months and that it is becoming a very heavy burden upon the normal, average consumers of electricity in the Province. And we are very aware of that and we are looking very carefully at it as we prepare our Budget.

DR. KITCHEN:

Final supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

Final supplementary.

DR. KITCHEN:

One final one. I wonder if the Premier would undertake to speak to the mandarin in charge of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and tell him to not make political statements but just to make statements having to do with the cost of electricity?

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the government and the ministers representing the government will act in a very responsible way as to how they treat their corporations and the head of their corporations.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.  
(Mr. Ottenheimer).

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I too have a question for the hon. the Premier. It relates to an announcement by his predecessor, an announcement sometime in October of 1978, setting up a Newfoundland Development Council of which Mr. Andrew Crosby, a St. John's businessman, was appointed chairman, I believe, in the Premier's announcement and there were five other businessmen named to that council. Would the Premier, first of all, indicate to the House what is the status of this council now? Does it continue in existence now in view of the changeover of the Premiership? Is the council still in existence? Have its terms of reference changed in a respect, if indeed it is still active?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.  
(Mr. Ottenheimer)

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, yes, as the hon. member points out, an Economic Council of Advisors was appointed by the former Premier and is still active. I think they have one person, one secretary who does some of the typing, and they have undertaken a number of studies dealing with government. I think they have undertaken a study on the whole land question, they have undertaken a study on two or three other aspects of government and two or three of the reports are due within the next few weeks. The whole business of that council and any other agencies of government are being reviewed now in the whole budgetary process and the government's position as it relates to that council, as well as many other things, will be made clear as we go down the road and publish a Budget in this House.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: I gathered from the Premier's answer that no reports have been received from the council to date, is that correct?

PREMIER PECKFORD: No. They have a couple finished and they are waiting to meet with me to present them.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. So that pretty well answers one of my supplementaries that there are reports forthcoming.

My other supplementary, Mr. Speaker, relates to the relationship of Mr. Crosbie's organization, the council - Development Council, not his other organization which would make an interesting question too - but the relationship of Mr. Crosbie's Newfoundland Development Council to the Planning and Priorities Secretariat of government, Does this replace the Secretariat? Does it take precedence over it? What is the ranking now?

MR. SIMMONS: Are there two separate arms of government, as it were, one, the Development Council, the other the P and P Secretariat which is giving competing advice to government, or are they meshing somehow? Are they working together? Are members of the Secretariat represented on the Development Council or sitting there in an advisory or consultive capacity for example? What is the relationship between these two bodies?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.  
(Mr. Ottenheimer)

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, they are separate as of the present moment and the Economic Council is doing reviews of a number of agencies and programmes of government, if you will, whereas the Planning and Priorities Secretariat up to now has been formulating, venting policy that is already in existence, scrutinizing policies that come up from various departments to Cabinet on a regular basis each week, whilst the Economic Council has been scrutinizing existing programmes. The Planning and Priorities Secretariat at this point in time has not spent a great deal of its time in that area scrutinizing existing programmes and policies but rather in dealing on a weekly and monthly basis with initiatives being made by individual departments as it goes through the Cabinet process.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Premier made reference in one of his replies to secretarial backup for the council and his indication that some reports are being prepared would seem to suggest that the council has some research capability. I am wondering if the Premier could indicate to the House what kind of budget the Newfoundland Development Council has for its various activities, its secretarial, its research and whatever other expenses



MR. SIMMONS: it might incur. I would presume there are per diems and travel requirements or travel allowances and so on, but what kind of budget? Is it open ended or has a dollar figure been placed on it for the operation of Mr. Crosbie's council this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.  
(Mr. Ottenheimer)

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am getting that information now, so I cannot give the hon. member an exact figure. I asked the question yesterday and I think it is around \$60,000 or \$70,000, but I do not know if that is the final figure on it or not. I will have to take that under advisement, but I think the figure is somewhere between \$50,000 and \$70,000. I will get the information for the hon. member in the next couple of days because I am in the process of getting it myself in any case.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Lewisporte followed by the hon. gentleman from Terra Nova and the hon. gentleman from Fogo.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a question for the Premier and it concerns a matter that he has been concerned about for a number of years.

In this House for the last four or five years, Mr. Speaker, we have heard various ministers introduce all kinds of new programmes and realignments and so on with regard to the sad situation of Crown lands in Newfoundland and now it is even worse than ever, Mr. Speaker, according to recent information that I have obtained. I wonder if the Premier can do anything about this terrible situation and try to alleviate some of the backup that is going on in Crown lands now that he is in a position to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.



March 30, 1979

Tape 605

EC - 4

PREMIER PECKFORD:           The hon. the member for Lewisporte  
(Mr. White), Mr. Speaker, hit a very sensitive nerve with  
me, as he well knows. Hopefully, through the - I hate to  
keep saying this, Mr. Speaker - but hopefully, through the  
budgetary process

Premier Peckford: and so on, we can devise ,  
I am eager and have it as one of my first priorities to examine with the new Minister of Lands and Forests the whole land question in the Province from the point of view of getting the process speeded up somewhat, and getting the whole question of land and land registration looked at in the Province. I know the land registration part of it is a very expensive item, and the Maritime Provinces are presently going through that on an agreement with Ottawa. But I think the most immediate problem is that if a person in this Province applies for a piece of land, either by letter or by application, that it should be possible for that person to have his letter or application acknowledged within a ten day period so that he knows that it got somewhere and that he then knows that it is being referred out very quickly to the agencies involved. That it has to be referred out I think goes without saying. But where the great lapse of time and where the great frustration comes in is not after it is referred to the various agencies, but the time it takes to get it acknowledged, it is here or somewhere and referred out, and then after all of the referrals come back in the time it takes of having it said that it is approved or disapproved or rejected, and the final documentation done. So it is on the front end and on the back end, not with the referrals themselves. where I think we can condense the amount of time that it takes so that instead of the two or three year process we should be able to reduce that substantially. And I take that as a high priority in the establishment of a budget and in trying to streamline some parts of government.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A supplementary. The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am told that there is a three to a four month back-up in the simple drafting of Crown Land leases at the moment. I mean, can the Premier give us an undertaking that he will hire another ten or twelve draftsmen to try to catch up with this problem, this serious problem? People are waiting on mortgages all over

Mr. White: this Province because of that.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am quite aware of that, Mr. Speaker, and I will be moving quickly to try to do something about it. I do not know if it is hiring a lot more staff or what is the problem there, but the hon. minister and myself have already talked about this to some degree in the last few days, and I will be moving quickly to try to see whether we can speed up the process.

MR. WHITE: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, this supplementary has more to do with the philosophy of government with respect to Crown lands. Right now a person in this Province cannot get a piece of Crown land to own himself, all he can do is rent it from the government for the rest of his life for the next fifty years. And I heard the Premier the other day indicate that he might bring back the grant system, which is what I think should be brought back. Will the Premier give us a commitment now that a person in this Province will be able to own a piece of land and get a grant for it rather than just a lease?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A great conservative principle which I thought I articulated well-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - in the last several weeks of the leadership campaign, and one which I believe strongly in, is one that the hon. member has just mentioned, and that is the whole question of lease versus grants. And, yes, we are reviewing the whole lease system and I can assure the hon. member that the grant system, either totally or partially, will be reintroduced to the whole question of land in this Province in the very near future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that I would recognize the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for, again, the Minister of Labour and Manpower, but he is not here, so I will ask the Premier the question. Mr. Speaker, it relates to the offshore oil and gas vessels. And just in the way of a brief preamble, in recent weeks I have gotten a lot of inquiries about how people should get jobs on these offshore oil and gas vessels, and I have instructed people as to what to do. But in following up, I have not found one person out of possibly thirty or forty that I have directed to the hiring centre, not one person has gotten a job. So my question to the Premier is, what is happening? Are there any Newfoundlanders getting any jobs on those offshore oil and gas vessels?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of Newfoundlanders getting jobs as it relates to offshore activity in the Province this year. That the hon. member's efforts to date have been highly unsuccessful can be attributed to a number of reasons, many of which I am sure the hon. member might be aware of and that I am aware of. There are hundreds and hundreds of applications. You know, I cannot give the reason why out of the thirty that the member recommended only a couple have been hired.

MR. LUSH: None.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The only thing is, I do not know if the hon. member realizes it or not, but the activity offshore has not really begun yet, and that could be a good reason why

PREMIER PECKFORD: a lot of them have not been hired. In the next month or so, I think, Imperial and Shell-Texaco will be moving into the Province. Right now they have been only establishing their offices here, their control offices if you will, for the ongoing activity this year so there will be some time before the supply vessels arrive on which there will be a lot of jobs on the oil rigs themselves. So, perhaps, we are into the situation where there will be a few weeks yet before actual high levelsof employment will occur.

MR. T. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ottenheimer) Supplementary.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I believe the very setup of how this is done sort of militates against all people throughout the Province getting a fair crack at those jobs. As I understand it, I believe that there is a registration centre here in St. John's and I am just wondering whether that setup is not discriminating against all Newfoundlanders getting a reasonable opportunity, so I have a question to the Premier:- will he undertake to ensure that all Newfoundlanders are given an equal opportunity to get jobs on these offshore oil and gas vessels?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: This is the first time I heard that there was even the hint or suggestion that because the centre was established in St. John's, primarily because that is where most of the onshore base for the offshore will be taking place, that there will be any discrimination versus Newfoundlanders in one part of the Province over other parts of the Province. I think it is fair to say of last year's activity that the majority of Newfoundlanders who worked with any of the companies were from rural parts of the Province and not from St. John's. If anything it has worked in reverse from what the hon. member seems to be suggesting. I can assure him that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. C. Doody) and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn)

PREMIER PECKFORD: are fairly familiar with the way this thing operates and that there will be no discrimination in hiring practices as it relates to Newfoundlanders from one part of the Province over Newfoundlanders from another part of the Province.

MR. T. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Supplementary.

MR. T. LUSH: I wonder if the Premier would undertake to provide the House with just how many Newfoundlanders have obtained jobs on those offshore oil and gas vessels up to this present time and indicating what areas of the Province that come from?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I can not very well do that now. I do not think that there is anybody started to drill yet. I do not know if the hon. member -

MR. LUSH: Oh, yes! People were hired from the 19th of February.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, there are some people hired. I am not arguing the point that there are not some people hired. The fact of the matter is that before you can get a true reflection of the composition of the labor force that is going to be servicing the offshore, one should wait until additional vessels and oil rigs and drill rigs are near our shores or actively engaged on our shores and then a list of the sort the hon. member refers to can be easily supplied, no problem.

MR. S. NEARY: Supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary? Hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. S. NEARY: I was going to ask another question, Sir, but I will follow through on the question that my hon. friend was asking there. Would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House who has control of the lists? Because the Government recently asked people interested in these jobs, acting on behalf of the oil company, to send in their names if they were interested in a job. Who

MR. S. NEARY: controls these lists? What department of Government? And why did this Government not follow the procedure that is laid down by Canada Manpower and have people be processed through Canada Manpower for the jobs? And the third part of my question, why is Crosbie's companies competing with the Newfoundland Government? And I saw an ad recently in one of the papers signed by Dr. Stewart Peters, who is very closely associated with Bruno and with this Government. What role is he playing in it? He is also asking for people to send their names in, people who are interested in these jobs. The whole thing seems to be confused at the moment, so why not let Canada Manpower have it? The Government of Canada, the taxpayers, are spending millions of dollars to set up Canada Manpower; why does the Newfoundland Government have to stick its finger into it? And will people be processed along political lines? That is the danger in sending your name to the Newfoundland Government; if you are a Liberal you will not get a job, if you are a Tory you are guaranteed to get a job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Order, please! Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Turn the whole thing over to Canada Manpower and let them handle it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! First of all I wish to point out that when I call order I wish hon. members to take their seats and to stop speaking. The point I was to make was that the questions can not get into debates. Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I understood that the way we operate around this Province that if an employer wants to put an ad in the paper asking individuals if they want a job

PREMIER PECKFORD: or not that they could do it. I did not know that we had come to the point in this Province where a private business could not put an ad in the paper to advertise for people to go to work here there or somewhere else. So I see no conflict in the fact that the Crosbie group of companies or one or two of their companies want to advertise for employees.

MR. NEARY: There is still a big connection between the individual and this government.

PREMIER PECKFORD: On the question of why the Newfoundland Government is involved in hiring, the Department of Labour and Manpower wants to get a full - you know, we have a responsibility too, as a provincial government, to get a record of the number of Newfoundlanders who are not only interested in the offshore, but the amount of training they have and so on and to re-enforce and to ensure that Newfoundlanders get a first crack at a lot of those opportunities. And no doubt, all of these people who -

MR. NEARY: Could not Canada Manpower do that?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to answer the question.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would like to have silence.

No doubt all the individuals who are putting their names into the Provincial Department of Labour and Manpower have already registered with Canada Manpower and all we are trying to do is to re-enforce the efforts that are being made by Canada Manpower to ensure that Newfoundlanders are involved. And if the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wants to see that list, Mr. - I forget his name; a young man.

AN HON. MEMBER: Langdon.



PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Langdon. No, that is the Assistant Deputy Minister. There is a Mr. -

AN HON. MEMBER: Clarke.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - Rupert Clarke who handles the names. There is no political interference, and if a list of all the names are in now, if the hon. member wants them he can get them. He can call up Mr. Clarke or he can go down to his office and so on.

MR. NEARY: How about the minister? The minister can -

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 1, Committee of Supply.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, before we get into Committee of Supply, the hon. the Premier has a copy of the telegram in connection with Canadian National that he was referring to a few moments ago. He would like to read it and I was wondering if perhaps - it is a little bit not in order for him to read it in the Committee-but perhaps with the consent of the Committee we might allow the Premier to read it.

MR. NEARY: I thought we were going to get a copy of it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. I just got it here now.

MR. NEARY: What is it anyway? Is it a telegram from you?

MR. MARSHALL: It is a telegram from the Office of the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is a telegram from me to

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Lang in response to initiatives in the last twenty-four hours as it relates to CNR.

MR. NEARY: Yes, boy. Go ahead.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to put in the record for this day, because I think it is very important, initiatives that have been taken in the last two or three days by CNR and the federal government as it relates to the CN rail and bus transportation in this Province that concerns this government a lot. I have a meeting in a few minutes with Dr. Bandeen and some of his people who have arrived. What has happened is that on Tuesday of this week the Office of the Premier here in the Province was notified that Mr. Bandeen would like to see me today to go over some new announcements that he had. We did get a little bit of information yesterday out of Mr. Bandeen's office concerning the announcement, but there was very little consultation. Therefore, last night and this morning we were very surprised to hear announcements on the radio and in the media from Mr. Jamieson's office and Mr. Lang's office.

In response to all of this I have sent this telegram this morning to Mr. Lang to express my displeasure. As a matter of fact, the press conference was due to be held in the Cabinet room downstairs which I cancelled this morning to signify in a tangible way my displeasure with the way this whole thing was handled. In any case let me read into the record the telegram that I have sent Mr. Lang this morning. This was compiled quickly so one will have to excuse any grammatical errors.

March 30, 1979

Tape No. 608

NM - 4

PREMIER PECKFORD: "I have to express my displeasure with the handling of the new initiatives being undertaken by CN in our Province. On Tuesday of this week my office was contacted by CN informing me that Mr. Bandeen wished to meet with me and inform me of new initiatives that CN intended to take in Newfoundland. I was concerned about these new initiatives since it was the first time the government had heard that new moves were imminent. Additionally, the government was surprised since no meaningful consultation had occurred. A meeting of the Federal/Provincial Review Committee on the Sullivan Commission was held on January 16th., when

Premier Peckford: the general aims and objectives for CN were tabled by the federal government. "No discussion occurred at this meeting relative to the establishment of a Newfoundland Division of CN. Therefore, no consultation has occurred on this matter, although such is hinted at in the CN news release.

"In the meeting of January 16, the federal co-Chairman indicated that you would be writing the Premier of Newfoundland concerning the direction that you saw for the Newfoundland Railway "-this is to Mr. Lang, that is why I paused there. I got confused as to whom I was sending the telegram - "No such communication has been received. I also understand that the Railway Union has not been consulted in this matter. I do not believe that a real effort to assist the Newfoundland Railway can be achieved unless all parties affected are involved in new policies before they become a reality. While I welcome the establishment of a Newfoundland Division of CN in Newfoundland, and the appointment of Mr. Messenger, the major issues at stake have still not been addressed in the view of the Newfoundland Government. These are, (1) a commitment by the federal government that the Newfoundland Railway will stay not for five years, but permanently.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number (2), agreement that the user-pay concept is not appropriate and will not apply to CN's operation in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number (3), agreement that the level of service provided by CN will not fall below that which existed in 1977 and that every attempt will be made to improve the service above 1977 levels.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And number (4), agreement that the level of employment in CN's operations be stabilized at 1977 levels."

This is the telegram that I wanted to read into the record and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the Opposition House

Premier Peckford: Leader, I know with his interest in CN matters in the Port aux Basques area, would have wanted me to put this into the record today to give him an opportunity to respond as well on this very important matter, one which concerns the transportation system in Newfoundland to a great degree. I wanted to read this into the record so that before I left to go to meet with Mr. Banteen the House would be aware of it, and the Opposition members would have a chance to respond.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. CROSS): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am completely amazed and shocked, as I am sure all other members of this hon. House are, at the childish behaviour and the childish attitude of the Premier and his government on one of the most important and significant changes that have been made in CN in this Province since Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this crowd talk about prior consultation. Well, Sir, did the Minister of Fisheries before he announced a superport for Harbour Grace, did he have prior consultation with the Government of Canada?

MR. SIMMONS: Not on your life.

MR. WHITE: No. Not on your life.

MR. NEARY: Did the former Premier when -

MR. MORGAN: A CN spokesman (inaudible) in the House.

MR. NEARY: Did the former Premier when he was out in Corner Brook announcing a harbour development that could -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) for CNR.

MR. NEARY: - announcing a harbour development, did he consult with the Government of Canada? Does this government consult with the Government of Canada on any project?

MR. WHITE: No, not on your life.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, they do not. They do not. And now, Mr. Chairman, because the hon. Don Jamieson and the hon. Otto Lang

Mr. Neary: make one of the most important changes in CN -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - in the whole history of its operation in this Province, because they did not hold prior consultation with the new Premier and his Cabinet they sulk and act like crybabies, and that is a pity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is a pity, Mr. Chairman. That is a pity, Sir. That is a pity. Mr. Chairman, that is a pity. Because what this government should be doing is getting behind CN now in this announcement that they have made. The unions are behind it.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, yes.

MR. NEARY: Everybody. Every man, woman, and child in Newfoundland will welcome this decision except the new Premier and his Cabinet.

MR. WHITE: He did not get a chance to announce it.

MR. NEARY: Because they did not get a chance to upstage Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: They have been following a policy here for the last six or seven years now of making announcements and then going to Ottawa with hat in hand asking them to support the projects that they announce.

MR. SIMMONS: Jamieson finally beat them at their own game.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes. That is right.

So anyway, Mr. Speaker, we on this

MR. NEARY: side of the House, Sir,  
we welcome, Sir, a separate division of CN to operate  
the railway in this Province and to operate CN Marine.  
That is what we have been fighting for for years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We also welcome the announcement  
by Mr. Lang that the train service is going to be restored  
to seven days a week. That was done with prior consultation  
with the unions, especially the unions in Bishop's Falls.  
CN is on the upgrade in this Province. I know what is  
worrying the hon. gentlemen. The hon. gentlemen on the  
opposite side of the House have not been able to get their  
priorities straight.

MR. MORGAN: It is the election gimmick fever.

MR. NEARY: They have not been able to get  
their priorities straightened out. The Government of Canada  
said to this government several weeks or several months ago,  
'Tell us the order of priority that you want the Canadian  
National Railways in Newfoundland, where you want it in  
order of priority.' And they did not get an answer from  
this government. Well, Sir, we want it to have equal status  
with the Trans-Canada Highway and if there is X amount of  
money going to be spent in Newfoundland on transportation  
then this government should be the ones to tell the  
Government of Canada how and where it is going to be spent.  
And the railway will play a prominent role as a mode of  
transportation in this Province in the future. It is on  
its way back. And this crowd, Sir, seems to resent the  
fact that it is bouncing back.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: It is on the way back and the  
thing that will bring it back is the shortage of energy in  
the world - fossil fuel. I can foresee the day ten years

MR. NEARY: From now that we will have electric trains going back and forth across this Province if we can get a change of government and get the Lower Churchill developed and bring some of the power down here, some of the electricity down here to the Island of Newfoundland, bring it down and have electric trains going back and forth across this Province. So, Sir, it is a good move. We welcome it. We say to CN and the Government of Canada, at long last it is on the right track. They have agreed to what the unions asked for and what the people of this Province wanted, and I am sorry, Sir, to see that the new Premier and the Newfoundland Government are sulking and behaving like crybabies because they were not advised in advance of the Government of Canada making the announcement. This is a federal matter, not a provincial matter. What does this crowd want to do? Do they want to run the North American continent? They cannot even run a bullseye shop.

MR. MORGAN: You want to run the (inaudible) every day here in the House.

MR. NEARY: The Government of Canada had every right to make that decision and the ministers who made the decision had every right to make that decision. And we welcome it, Sir. It is going to be a good thing for the railway in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Cross) Committee of Supply.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. NEARY: Sir, we are now back on the Interim Supply Bill, and my few remarks a couple of moments ago were just merely a warm-up to some of the things that I have to say about the government coming into this House and asking the House to approve three months supply amounting



MR. NEARY:

to \$354 million.

Now, Sir, I do not know if hon.

gentlemen are aware of it or not - it is not unusual to come in, I suppose, for a government to come in and ask for two or three months interim supply, but it is unusual, Mr. Chairman, for the government to come in and ask for \$354 million, which is the biggest amount ever asked for in the whole history of this Province. That is one aspect of it that is significant. And the other significant thing about the \$354 million Interim Supply Bill, Sir, is that it includes Capital Works projects. To my knowledge it is the first time since Confederation that an Interim Supply Bill included Capital Works projects money - the first time. Usually an Interim Supply Bill is requested by the government to defray expenses in the Public Service of a housekeeping nature. So that makes this bill different in two ways. First of all, it is the largest amount of interim supply ever asked for by a government in this Province, and number two, it includes a substantial amount of money for Capital Works.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) made no reference at all to what these Capital Works programmes are going to be. Obviously, Sir, the government is gearing up for an election and they have included in the Interim Supply Bill, the \$354 million,

MR. NEARY: some Capital Works Projects that they can get under way in the event that the new Premier decided to call a Provincial General Election before a budget is brought down. But, Sir, I think in all fairness to the House and to the people of this Province we should know what, we should have a list of these Capital Works Projects. The Minister of Finance yesterday would make no commitment to my colleague, the official Opposition spokesman on finance, would make no commitment as to when the government intends to bring down a budget, the whole thing was left up in the air. And then we were threatened and scolded by the new Government House Leader, we were told that if the House behaves itself, if everybody is a good little boy and a good little girl and the House is meeting next week or the week after or the following week, then we may bring down a budget, we may bring down a budget. Sir, that answer is not good enough, we have to have a commitment from the government as to when. Give us the time frame as to when the government expects to bring down its budget. Or does it expect to bring down a budget at all? Or is this it? Is this it now? Three months Interim Supply, \$354 million could tide the government over until sometime up in June or July and by that time they could have an election over without bringing down a budget. If the new Premier intends doing that, Sir, then I would submit to this House and to the people of this Province that he would not be acting in good faith, that it would be one of the most cowardly things that the new Premier could do, to go to the country without bringing down a budget. We have already stated Mr. Chairman, both inside and outside of this House that it is our intention, it is the intention of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to co-operate with the new Premier in every respect. We understand, Sir, we understand that the hon. gentleman has a very difficult task ahead, we understand that the hon. Premier, the new Premier, has a very difficult job to clean up the mess that he inherited from the former Premier, we understand, Mr. Chairman, the bad blood that exists

MR. NEARY: as a result of the Tory party just coming through a leadership convention, we understand that the present Minister of Mines and Energy every day, probably, looks at the new Premier very resentful, with a jaundiced eye, wishing that it was he who was standing there answering the questions and making the statements on behalf of the government. We understand that, human nature being what it is, Sir, we understand, Sir, that there is savage resentment in the heart of the Minister of Fisheries towards the new Premier. We understand all that so, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that the new Premier's difficulties and his problems and his troubles will not emanate from this side of the House because we intend to co-operate as much as we can within reason with the hon. gentleman. His trouble, I am afraid, will be on that side of the House and not over here, so there is no need really, there is no urgency, there is no need to go to the country. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, though, before I say that, that we were never as prepared - I am talking about the Liberal party in case the hon. gentleman may think that I am being wishy-washy and weak about this, I am trying to be statesman like about it and so is the Liberal party - we were never as prepared for an election as we are at the present time. We have more candidates named now than we did prior to the 1975 or any other election in our whole history. We are ready for an election and we would welcome it. We would welcome it, but is that the thing to do to the people of this Province force an election on them when it is not necessary, when the government's mandate can go until the Fall of 1980? Now if that is what they want, Sir, well let us have it. If that is what they are trying to do, play little political games, oneupmanship, coming into the House and making these childish and nasty statements about, "Oh, if the House functions properly well then there will be a budget," threatening the Opposition, playing games with the Opposition,

MR. NEARY: being nasty and rude, interrupting the Opposition in attempting to carry out its duties in this House. Now if that is what they want to do, Sir, if they are going to continue to play these political games, to be nasty and rude, then I would say call the election, clear the air and get it over with. If that is the kind of a game they are going to play, a political game of oneupmanship with the people's money and with the people of this Province, if that is the kind of a game they are going to play then I would say they would be very irresponsible and their behaviour, Sir, will not get the good will of the people of this Province. Because what the people want right now, they want good government, they want a government that will come to grips with the problems that are facing the ordinary people of this Province and I will talk about some of the problems shortly.

So what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, and what my colleague said yesterday, if this is the budget, the Interim Supply Bill is it, that is it, well then let us call it off, and let us go out and have an election and clear the air. But if there is going to be a budget, give us some time frame of when we can expect that budget to be brought down and then everybody can relax. Nobody will have the election jitters, we can all relax and get down, take off our coats and roll up our sleeves and get down to doing the business of this Province and let us see how my hon. friend can govern this Province.

Newfoundlanders, Mr. Chairman, are a fair minded group of people who believe in British justice and we in the Opposition subscribe to that philosophy and we are prepared to give the hon. gentleman a chance. We are prepared to give him a few weeks, take six months if he wants to, to show the people of this Province how he can govern

MR. NEARY: the Province. That is what everybody wants. Nobody wants an election. I would say if you polled the Tory Party right now you would probably end up fifty-fifty. Fifty per cent would say, "Yes, you should have gone the day after the leadership," the other fifty per cent would say, "No, hang her down for a while and show the people what you can do."

Now I realize there is a bit of a gamble involved in that too. If you polled the Liberal Party you would probably get the same thing, fifty-fifty. Fifty would want an election right away and fifty per cent would say, "Well, no, just take it easy." The other fifty per cent would say, "Leave them alone and let them hang themselves." Or, "Leave them alone and let us see how they can govern and maybe they will be the best thing that ever happened to Newfoundland." But I would bet you if you polled the people throughout the Province, in every district in this Province, at this present time, at this moment, everybody but everybody would say, "Give the hon. gentleman a chance. Do not jump on him. Give him a chance." Well, Sir, we have no intention of jumping on him. We are quite prepared to give him a chance. We are prepared to co-operate and we are prepared to give the government their housekeeping money. We are quite prepared to give the government sufficient money to pay civil servants and to pay social assistance recipients and to pay the routine bills. We are prepared to do that, but we think, Mr. Chairman, that the government is being very unreasonable to come in and ask for \$354 million without giving us any details at all, without giving us a list of

MR. NEARY: the capital works projects. We think this is too much money, too much to give the government when, as I say, Sir, and I can speak personally and I think I can speak for my colleagues, that we want to see what this hon. gentleman can do. We want to see if he has it in him, if he is as good a man as he said he was when he was on the campaign trail, if he is a better man than my hon. friend, and that I doubt, I have my own reservations about that. I think if I was in the Tory Convention, and I had to cast a vote, as much as I like my old friend the Minister of Fisheries, whom I think could have given the Liberals more trouble than any other candidate in an election, could have given us more trouble in a provincial general election than anybody else on that side, as much as I like my hon. friend, as much as we get along well together,

MR. S. NEARY: and once a colleague of mine I had the greatest respect for the hon. gentleman, as much as I detest the way they smeared the hon. gentleman during the campaign by saying that he was paid off by the big fish companies, and I know I was once the brunt of that kind of smear myself. As much as I detest that, and I do not think for one moment - if the hon. gentleman got \$100 from the big multi-nationals, the big fish companies, I do not think for one moment that the fish companies own my hon. friend. Although I will say this, I do not agree with the hon. gentleman's policy and his philosophy, I think he is catering too much to the big fish companies - but I do not think for one moment, Sir, and I think it was wrong for his colleagues to smear him the way they did during that leadership convention, as much as I like the hon. gentleman and as much as I like the present Premier, I like to see a man come up by his boot straps, but I think, Sir, having said all of that that the most able man, and I believe I would have, if I had been there, cast my ballot for the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, the most able of them all.

MR. DOODY: That is probably what happened to me; you spread it around.

MR. S. NEARY: No, Sir, I did not spread it around at all. I did not spread it around. No, I do not remember spreading it around. I only made one statement during the leadership and that was not public, I said it to a crowd of people and I said it in this House and I will say it outside this House, but I believe the hon. gentleman has been in bad company of late because the hon. gentleman has started now to play his little political games. The hon. gentleman was the only man in the former administration who would give us a straight, honest answer. I said that inside the House, I said it outside the House and I still say it, except I am beginning to have doubts in the last couple of days about the gentleman. If



MR. S. NEARY: I were the hon. gentleman I would not start playing games. It is not all over yet, not all over yet.

MR. DOODY: What are you talking about now?

MR. S. NEARY: I am talking about the question the hon. gentleman just put to me that may be his reason for losing the leadership. The reason the hon. gentleman lost the leadership I will tell him why in case he does not know.

MR. RIDEOUT: He did not get enough votes.

MR. S. NEARY: No, Sir, that is right he did not get enough votes. The reason he did not get enough votes was because there was the Moores faction versus the Tory St. John's East cocktail set. That was the battle, Sir. The battle was between the St. John's East Tories headed by the present House Leader of the House of Assembly taking on Moores and his crowd and taking great delight in beating them and then going out after and boasting about it. The present House Leader and his crowd beat the charming Mr. Moores and his crowd. That is what happened, my friend, in case the hon. gentleman does not know. That is what happened. And then they went out and laughed and gloated about it and that is why the new Premier has cuddled up to the hon. gentleman there for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). I think the hon. the Premier has made one of the most colossal blunders. Yes, Sir, he has made a colossal blunder in putting the power of his Cabinet back into the hands of the St. John's cocktail set. My hon. friend is from St. John's, I realize that, and would have given us lots of ammunition going around the Province to say we have a St. John's Premier. It would not have been very difficult. But now, Sir, we can go around this Province and say that the power of the Tory Party is back in the hands of the well-to-do, the well-heeled St. John's cocktail set. All you have to do is look to the Premier's right. Look to his right! Who are his chief lieutenants and his advisors? Just look to the right. The Minister of Finance - I think that will be a mistake. That will turn out to be a mistake to have an inexperienced St. John's



MR. S. NEARY: doctor as Minister of Finance. Maybe the hon. gentleman did it out of desperation. There was some talk he was going to bring people in off the street, Mr. Leo Barry, another old buddy of mine, a man that I like very much, some talk he was going to bring him into the Cabinet, Some talk he was going to bring in Mr. Cabot Martin. I do not know who Mr. Martin is speaking for these days. whether its Newfoundland Hydro, whether its Nordco or himself. I do not know who he is speaking for. I was surprised recently to hear that he was silenced, he was not allowed to go down and make his annual political speech to Rotary. He was silenced. It is too bad the Premier did not silence Mr. Vic Young yesterday, but maybe it was a desperation move, maybe the Premier had no choice, maybe

MR. NEARY: he could not get some of his colleagues to agree to serve in the Cabinet. But anyway, be that as it may, Sir, I think now we have a Cabinet comprising of the influential St. John's cocktail set that will have a strangle hold on the new Premier, and in addition to that -

MR. MORGAN: Ah!

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend says, 'Ah!' In addition to that we have the campaign managers and the backroom boys who defeated the Siamese twin there now, the backroom boys comprising of the elite in the St. John's cocktail set, and they are the ones who will decide the election; they are the ones who will decide the direction of this government. And I know who some of them are. My hon. friend knows full well that I know who they are. They are out now - you should hear what they are saying now. They are telling the new Premier what to do. They are deciding the strategy, they are deciding the election. It is all being decided now over a few drinks. The future of the people of this Province is now being decided over a few drinks in the cabarets and the bistros of this city.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman laughs at that. That is not as funny as the hon. gentleman thinks.

AN HON. MEMBER: It sounds funny.

MR. NEARY: It sounds funny? Yes, it sounds funny. It is almost - you would not believe it if you did not hear it.

Mr. Chairman, getting back, Sir, to my main point, my main point is this, Sir, that we are prepared on this side of the House to co-operate with the government within reason, with the new Premier, give him a

MR. NEARY: chance to see what he can do, but we are not prepared to co-operate to the tune of \$354 million. And, Mr. Chairman, before I carry on, Sir, with my few remarks of why I do not think the government should be given \$354 million carte blanche by this hon. House, because of their reputation of the past, because of their mismanagement, because, Mr. Chairman, of the Auditor General's report just tabled in this House, the worst Auditor General's report, the worst condemnation of a government in about twenty-five years in this Province, because, Sir, the government have not outlined their plans for the future to tell us how they are going to deal with the fishery, how they are going to deal with unemployment, the cost of electricity, the cost of food in this Province, because there is no programme before the House, because the ministers are new in their positions, Sir, inexperienced and immature, a lot of them, and incompetent - and I could go on and give a hundred reasons, Sir, why we should not give this government \$354 million without having some control on it.

I would like to move an amendment, Sir, and add the following words to the resolution, the amendment seconded by my hon. friend, the member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) "That this \$354,120,000 be divided into equal monthly amounts of \$118,040,000 so that the House of Assembly in legislative session will be given an opportunity after each thirty day period to decide whether or not a second or even a third instalment is necessary or justified. This procedure would be followed until the total amount of the bill is exhausted or a Budget brought down, whichever comes first."

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. That amendment is totally and completely out of order.

March 30, 1979

Tape 614

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL:                   The principles with respect to amendment of legislation or amendment of a bill is that you cannot bring in an amendment which is going to completely negate the bill. Now, the bill before this Committee and the bill being considered, the resolution before this Committee,

MR. W. MARSHALL: is to provide \$330 million or \$340 million of Interim Supply. To make an amendment of that nature would be to put strings on the supply itself. In other words, we ask for \$340 million of supply for approximately two and one half months, and to provide that we have to come back next month and the month after would really, in effect, negate the effectiveness of this Committee and would negate the resolution which we are considering, so I submit to Your Honour that the amendment is entirely out of order.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, obviously, Sir, the hon. Chairman realizes that the Government House Leader made a very weak case. This motion, this amendment does not negate the original bill. The hon. gentleman was quite right, it adds strings. but it does not negate the original motion. No, Sir, it does not. All it does, Sir, if it is passed is to force the Government to come back to the House a month from now, give us a report on how they spent the first installment then we will review it and approve the second installment and the third and so on. That is all we are asking for, Sir, a report to the House, it does not negate the original motion in any way, shape or form, Sir, I might point out for the benefit of Your Honour that it is perfectly in order, perfectly in order to move a reduction in amounts of money that the Government asks for. That is perfectly in order, it is always in order, it is traditional in the British Parliament, Sir, the British Parliamentary system.

MR. WHITE: We are not even doing that.

MR. S. NEARY: We are not even doing that, we are not even reducing the amount, Mr. Chairman, but if we did we would be in order. The only thing you can not do in Committee of the Whole or when estimates are being discussed, you can not increase Government expenditure. But you can decrease or you can place strings on the money the Government is asking for, so I would submit to Your Honour that the amendment is 100 per cent in order.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, look, it obviously negates the whole purpose of Supply and it negates this motion. What we have asked is for the Committee of Supply to grant to the Government \$330 million or \$340 million. What this motion does, it says that the Committee of Supply cannot give the \$330 million or \$340 million but it must come back and reconstitute itself. So, therefore, it obviously does. I know Your Honour is new to the Chair but I mean this is an accepted - I think the House Leader on the Opposition side has already indicated, anyway, it is an accepted principle that you cannot have a motion that negates an amendment that negates the main motion which this quite obviously does.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite clear, from experiences over the last few years, that indeed amendments have been moved relating to expenditure of Government money at the Committee stage. I would like to remind the Chairman and the Committee of two examples: one year back in - let us see, the Government was first elected in 1974, the Minister of Education's salary was reduced to the minimum wage hourly rate and was, in fact, passed. No, it was not passed at that particular time.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is different.

MR. F. ROWE: No, it is not different, Mr. Chairman. Last year an amendment was made whereby the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture's salary was reduced to one dollar, I believe.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: This amendment does not even go that far, there is no reduction of any expenditures whatsoever. It simply asks that government be held accountable, held accountable,

MR. F. ROWE: for the expenditure of its money on a monthly basis. There is no reduction in the amount whatsoever. There is no negation of anything, no negation of anything, so, Sir, I think the amendment is perfectly in order. It also gives the Government an opportunity to bring down a Budget, which is the most important thing of all. In fact, this amendment is a very positive amendment, Sir. It does alter, obviously, the motion before the floor.

MR. S. NEARY: Slightly.

MR. F. ROWE: Slightly, ever so slightly.

I might emphasize that, very, very slightly. They can expend the same amount of money exactly, they are simply being asked to be held accountable on a monthly basis and have been given the opportunity to bring down the Budget

MR. SIMMONS: here which is a very positive suggestion. There is no negation whatsoever in this amendment therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. CROSS): Order, please! I have heard some argument from both to my left and to my right. I will recess for five minutes to make a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. CROSS): Order, please! I am ready to make a ruling on that amendment. First I would like to read from Beauchesne, page 233, section (7); and Beauchesne page 233, section (7) reads: "An amendment is out of order if it imposes a charge upon the Public Treasury, if it extends the objects and purposes, or relaxes the conditions and qualifications as expressed in the Royal Recommendation."

I would also like to read from the Journals of the House of Commons, June 17th., 1969, Page 1172, and I read; "I bring to his attention that not only cannot the total amount of the expenditure be changed by a motion such as this, but the objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications of the moneys authorized by the recommendation of His Excellency cannot be changed."

Now, there is no doubt that this is a Royal Recommendation, because I have before me the message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, and I will conclude my ruling by reading again, Beauchesne 181.

MR. SIMMONS: Is that the page number or paragraph?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 540, That is page 181, paragraph 540.

"The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the Royal Recommendation is attached, must be treated as



MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. CROSS): laying down once and for all (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of the charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. "

So all of these citings certainly rule the amendment out of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, you are quoting from the newer edition?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is the Fifth Edition of Beauchesne.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if that amendment is not in order perhaps I will try another one. Or is any amendment in order, Mr. Chairman? Could Your Honour tell us if an amendment is in order at all?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know that that is a hypothetical question, really, and a ruling of the Speaker or Chairman cannot be challenged.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I move the following amendment, "that the amount of \$354,120,000 be reduced to \$118,040,000 to cover expenses for a period not to exceed thirty days."

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, that amendment can be ruled out, I would submit, Your Honour, by the same basis of the authorities that you have written and you have referred to which clearly show that a Royal Recommendation, which this resolution is, cannot be reduced but must be voted in total. I think the authority that you have already quoted, Your Honour, answered the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Cross) Order, please! I do not think there is need for a recess this time. The citings that were made regarding the first amendment, I think, rules out the second as well. "An Amendment is out of order if it imposes a charge upon the Public Treasury, if it extends the objects and purposes, or relaxes the conditions and qualifications as expressed in the Royal Recommendation." On paragraph 540 again, page 181 of the Fifth Edition of Beauchesne reading from the top of page - possibly I should read it all again for the simple reason that there is no full stop or sentence there, "The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the Royal Recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down once and for all (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of the charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications." I therefore rule the second amendment presented by the hon. Opposition House Leader as out of order.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In order to continue my few remarks, Sir.

DR. COLLINS: I do not think the Chairman has recognized the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the Chairman has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, can I just bring up a point of explanation?

MR. NEARY: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. F. ROWE: There is no such thing as a point of explanation.

MR. NEARY: The Chairman is making a ruling. Is Your Honour finished with his ruling?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am finished with the ruling.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the following amendment. I believe, Sir, the problem with the first amendment that I made was that it included amounts of money and I believe this amendment that I am making now, Sir, will be in order because there is already a precedent for it in the Parliament of Quebec. Add, Mr. Chairman, the following words, "Provided the government's authority to expend these monies does not extend beyond April 30, 1979 until further approval of this House." That would be perfectly in order, Mr. Chairman. It does not specify

MR. NEARY: the amount, it does not reduce the amount. And when Your Honour is talking about stating objectives Your Honour is talking about the Minister of Finance telling us how the money is going to be spent and that is exactly what we are trying to find out.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly in substance the self same amendment that was moved the first time and the second time. It is going to negate what Your Honour refers to as a Royal Recommendation. It is going to negate the Royal Recommendation and it is going to - you know, it changes the character of it. The answer is exactly the same. Now you know we have a Supply Bill, a resolution here before the committee, and that resolution, hopefully, is going to pass in the very near future because the government obviously needs supply by March 31st. But the fact of the matter is I do not see any point, Your Honour, in continuing on in this vein. I mean, this is the third amendment in a row that has been proposed and it really - what they constitute are really just reiterations of exactly the same proposition that Your Honour has already ruled on.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. Mr. Chairman, the last comments of the hon. House Leader, of course, should be treated with the disdain

Mr. Simmons: they certainly deserve. We have every right, Mr. Chairman, to make amendments. Our problem is that we are not parliamentary experts, and we may well on occasion, as we have done twice so far this morning, submit amendments which do not fall within the purview of the Chairman's prerogative to accept, or to accept within the rules of parliamentary procedure.

What we are attempting to do, and if it takes fifteen attempts, Mr. Chairman, we give notice we will make fifteen or twenty attempts to do it, what we want to do is to see to it that this government does not go on an uncontrolled spending spree without a budget. And I submit that the amendment now before the Chair is one which is eminently sensible without in any way abrogating the request from the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council or the Lieutenant Governor. It does not abrogate or restrict that in any way. It does not address itself to the dollar amount at all. The motion as it would be amended would allow for the full amount of \$354 million to be approved by this House. The amendment would do one thing and one thing only, it would ensure that the government's authority to spend that amount of money would be for a time definite, for a time definite expiring on April 30, at which time, or before which time the government would be obliged to come back to the House for further authority to expend beyond that time definite.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment satisfies the objectives of the resolution before the House or before the Committee, and at the same time it satisfies our particular objective of wanting to put some kind of a rein on this government and make it realize, Mr. Chairman, make it realize that it does have a responsibility if it is going to administer the Province's affairs into the new fiscal year, to have a budget to do it with. And we can understand that they need some time to get the budget ready, but they do not need licence, Mr. Chairman, they do not need an unlimited time. And we submit (1) that a month is time enough, and if experience shows

Mr. Simmons: that a month is not quite time enough, we have even indicated in our amendment that we are prepared to consider further time. So let us do it a bit at a time, a month at a time, which we think is reasonable.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. CROSS): To that third amendment that has been presented by the hon. Opposition House Leader. Again I would refer back to one of my initial citings, that of the Journals of the House of Commons, referred to in Beauchesne, of June 17, 1969 on page 1173. I would like to read it and then make an effort to explain it. I think it is very clear as it stands. "And I bring to his attention that not only cannot the total amount of the expenditure be changed by a motion such as this but the objects, purposes, conditions, and qualifications of the money authorized by the recommendation of His Excellency cannot be changed."

Here in this third amendment we are not talking of changing money but we are talking of changing dates for a month and not three. And I feel that that is one of the conditions in the message from His Excellency that was read in this House only a couple of days ago. So I will rule the third amendment presented by the hon. Opposition House Leader as out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move -

MR. SIMMONS: Now you see why we wanted a debate on the Deputy Speakership.

MR. NEARY: I was following very closely Your Honour's ruling there. Your Honour read out -

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. And this is not something that we are going to allow in this House. The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) made an unfortunate comment that was heard in the Chamber about debating on the Deputy Speakership. I imagine that the hon. member made the comment in the heat of the moment, or what he presumed to be the heat of the moment.

MR. MARSHALL: but I would submit to Your Honour that the type of comment that was made is not one that can be allowed to be made in this Chamber because at all times the dignity of the Chair and the person in the Chair, whoever he may be, has to be upheld in order that we can maintain any decorum whatsoever in the House. So I would suggest to Your Honour that the unfortunate remark that was made, that the hon. member may wish, and if he does not wish, should be required to withdraw.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would assume now, Sir, that I can start off again with my -

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Cross) Order, please'. It appears that this matter cannot be settled in Committee.

Order, please!

In reference, just now, to the matter not being able to be settled in Committee. I was referring expressly to the point of order raised by the Government House Leader regarding a member of this hon. House casting aspersions upon the Chair.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

Mr. Chairman, now that we know what the supposed point of order was all about - it was on that point that I was waiting to hear from the Chair, waited at some length, I may add, to find out if the Chair had acknowledged that there was a point of order. And I can now construe from the Chair's latest comments that perhaps the Chair considers there might have been a point of order. If so, I would be pleased to hear from the Chair what point of order has been recognized and what action, if any, the Chair might expect from any member of the House resulting from that point of order: then, I think, and only

MR. SIMMONS: then could we decide whether the matter could be settled in Committee or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Cross) Order, please!

I did understand the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) in his remarks regarding the election of the Deputy Speaker and as to why the Opposition wanted to be informed or wanted debate in the House, and this is what I meant by 'casting aspersions upon the Chair'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I have ruled that the point of order does exist and I am asking that the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir retract the remarks that he made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, for clarification, I have no intention of withdrawing a remark which states that I would like to have had a debate on the matter. There is no need to withdraw that. If Mr. Chairman is asking me to withdraw any suggestion of unfairness or partiality on the part of the Chair, if that is what the numbskull member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) thought I had said a minute ago, I withdraw all that. I will do anything to cater to his small mind until he understands our problem over here, what our concern is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, there was no aspersion cast on the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Am I allowed to withdraw or not? How many Speakers do you have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to refer now to another remark made by the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.



MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Cross) I believe there are words in Beauchesne that are unparliamentary and I think it is very unfriendly and I think unparliamentary to call another member of the House a numbskull.

MR. SIMMONS: I could not agree with you more, Mr. Chairman. I withdraw my reference to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) as a numbskull. It is a fact of life that many realities are unfair when stated. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw also any aspersion to the Chair and in view of the fact that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) raised the matter and misconstrued the full intent of what I was trying to say or the complete intent of what I was trying to say. Just let me say that I feel strongly that the matter of the Chair in this business is so important that it ought to have been debated fully and that was my entire point. He also said that I raised it in the heat of the moment. Indeed I did, Mr. Chairman, in this context; it is my understanding that when the Chair is hearing argument from both sides he is listening, and I found it somewhat annoying that while I was putting my argument there was a full-scale conference going on on the subject and I do not think Mr. Chairman heard a word I had to say in my submission.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I think I clearly now understand the ruling that Your Honour gave, that reading from Beauchesne there, especially the part that Your Honour stressed about objectives, purposes and conditions. I think that is the reason why our amendment was not in order. I would like to try again, Sir, try another amendment and I believe this one will be in order. I do not think there is any doubt about that at all because it does not impose any objectives, purposes or conditions or it does not change the resolution in any way, shape or form.



MR. NEARY: The amendment, Sir, is to add these words, "And that a budget be brought down in this hon. House in thirty days or at an earlier date if possible." Now that does not in any way, Shape or form, Sir -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour has already made a ruling that there can be no conditions attached to a Royal Recommendation which is what this committee is now considering. That clearly constitutes a condition and I would submit that Your Honour's ruling, in effect, has been made in the first instance and these particular amendments that are being proposed are really just, in effect, non-acceptance of Your Honour's ruling. It is clear and it is there. The British parliamentary procedure set it down that when we are in Committee of Supply and we are considering money bills, money bills are always considered pursuant to a recommendation of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, pursuant to a message from the Lieutenant-Governor, the representative of the Queen, it is a royal recommendation and consequently it cannot be changed. The hon. members opposite, their prerogative is to vote against it. The government's prerogative is to vote for it, obviously, because it brings it in. But these amendments of this nature, I suggest, are only delaying the valuable time because, as we all know, there has really to be supply by one o'clock today. And we hope with the co-operation of everybody that His Honour will be able to give assent to it by one o'clock today in order to be able to pay the public bills which will be accruing on Monday next.

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order which the member alleges to have raised: First of all, his last comment again. There is no need, Mr. Chairman, for him to mislead the House on his stated need for supply at one o'clock today. That is not the case at all. That is not the case. The earliest they need it is Tuesday or Wednesday of next week and if they need to they can do what they have been doing for the last three or four months, use governor's warrants or bring in a budget. That is all we are asking,

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman. Now the

amendment -the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I submit is quite in order. It in no way abrogates the requirement from the Lieutenant-Governor, the money bill we call it. In no way does it restrict the parameters of that particular resolution. All it does is places a requirement on government quite in addition

Mr. Simmons: to the requirement that would be laid down in the resolution, additional requirement that government act on a matter by a certain time, namely the provision or the bringing down of a budget.

Now I believe the Committee is being misled into missing the entire point. All the Opposition is asking for is that this government would show us how they intend to spend the public's money in the next year. They call that a budget. And if they cannot have it in three weeks, how about four weeks? Can they give us some indication when they plan to have a budget? And I repeat and I give notice, if it takes fifteen or twenty attempts to find the right words then we will try it fifteen or twenty times. What we want to do is to get a commitment from this government that in reasonable time we will have a budget to consider in this House.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I just want to - I am not going to respond to what the hon. gentleman said except in one thing, because it shows an abysmal ignorance by the hon. gentleman of the rules of supply. I am surprised that a person in the position, financial critic in the Opposition, the alternate government, would make the observation. But I do think it has to be clarified because it is a matter of some seriousness.

To everybody's great surprise he talks about the government can use warrants, executive warrants. It is clear, crystal clear in The Financial Administration Act, Mr. Chairman, that governor's warrants cannot be used while the House is in -

MR. SIMMONS: Why do you not (inaudible)?

MR. MARSHALL: - while the House is in session.

MR. SIMMONS: Why do you not (inaudible)?

MR. MARSHALL: I correct the hon. gentleman because I think it is a matter of public information, it should be known. And I am rather surprised that a person in the position of the putative Finance Minister in the next administration, if he should live that long, should make such an observation.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. CROSS): Order, please!

I will rule on the fourth amendment put forth by the hon. Opposition House Leader. Certainly that amendment makes an additional requirement, and because it makes an additional requirement I feel that certainly it is changing the conditions, again, of a Royal Recommendation.

MR. SIMMONS: You remind me of Fred Staggon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So I rule that out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman! Mr. Chairman!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. NEARY: It looks like, Sir, we are in a sort of a predicament here that we are not going to be able to get the right amendment to -

MR. SIMMONS: We will try.

MR. NEARY: What we are trying to do - the point we are trying to make here, and I believe, Sir, we have made our point now - is we are trying to find out from the government if and when they intend to bring down a budget. We are trying to get some kind of a time frame of when the government will be bringing a budget into this House, if indeed they will be bringing a budget in at all. And we are trying to control the spending of the government. We think they are asking for too much Interim Supply. Too much, Sir, Three months, \$354 million is too much to put in the hands of a group of people who have proved over the last six or seven years that they are not capable of managing the affairs of this Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have made our point and we did so, Sir, in the spirit of trying to co-operate with the new Premier. We feel that the new Premier should have at least one month's Interim Supply, \$118 million - we really and truly and sincerely felt that, Sir - and then come back after a month or so and then we would give him another \$118 million or however much he needed for that month, and we could do that for the next three months. Obviously the government is being unreasonable, Sir. They are not prepared to

Mr. Neary: co-operate. We are prepared to co-operate. We are prepared to let Interim Supply go through before 1:00 o'clock today. I think I can speak on behalf of my colleagues and say that if the government would be reasonable, if the government would agree to reviewing the situation after a month, every thirty days, there would be no problem. We are quite prepared to co-operate because we think, as I said earlier this morning, Sir, that the new Premier should have a chance, he should be given an opportunity to show the people of this Province what he can do, whether it be good or bad. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, our strategy is all wrong. It could work to our detriment. The hon. the Premier, by us giving him a chance and not forcing him into an election, by co-operating, by getting down to the business of the Province, by trying to accommodate the hon. gentleman, maybe it will work out to our detriment, maybe the hon. gentleman will do such a

MR. NEARY: tremendous job that we will be annihilated in the next election. We are prepared to take that chance in the interest of the people of this Province, of the ordinary people. We are prepared to gamble. So, Mr. Chairman, personally speaking, I would like to be able to give the hon. gentleman a wide berth, but I think it is a mistake to give him \$354 million. Now, we have no choice as far as I can see but to let it go to a vote and the government will use brute force, they will use their majority to railroad this \$354 million through the House before 1:00 P.M. today. They will railroad it through and give the people of this Province no indication, no commitment at all of when they intend to bring down a Budget, if indeed they are going to bring down a Budget. They have no intention of telling the people what their programmes are for the year, Capital Works programmes; they have no intention of telling the nurses if they are going to get any increase, the Public Service employees. All the union negotiations that are going on at the present time will be all left up in the air. They have no intention of telling welfare recipients and low income people what benefits they are going to get, if any, in addition to what they are already receiving, in the next fiscal year, whether for instance, anything will be done about providing no income and low income people with eyeglasses and dentures and that sort of thing, increasing their allowances so that they can cope with the high cost of living and inflation. The government has no intention of telling us what they are going to do about the Auditor General's report and the use and the misuse of government aircraft and helicopters that has gone out of control. They have no intention, Sir, of telling us if we are going to have a continuation of the session of the House and a new Budget and what is going to

MR. NEARY:                   happen to all the public inquiries. We have heard so much about the former Premier bringing democracy to Newfoundland. Well, the man who brought democracy to Newfoundland, his administration refused to give us in this House a list of secret loans made by the Rural Development Authority and by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation - absolutely point blank refused to give us in the House a list of these secret loans. And now we are not going to get it and the government is asking us for \$354 million. They had no intention of giving us a progress report on all the investigations that are going on, police investigations and commissions of inquiry, again the result of the gentleman who just retired from public life in this Province, the man who brought democracy to Newfoundland, the man who did away with the Public Accounts Committee, the impartial, independent Public Accounts Committee - the man who brought democracy to Newfoundland did that. Mr. Chairman, half the administration is being investigated for some reason or other, not because you change the name and change a few faces; the people are the same, the administration is the same.

                                  What about the investigation into the St. John's Housing Authority and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, a police investigation carried on by the RCMP Commercial Crime section for the last year? No mention of it at all - carried on in St. John's and in Happy Valley - Goose Bay where you have hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money involved - not a word about that - swept under the carpet, keep it covered up. I am told that a quarter of a million dollars was ripped off in Goose Bay through maintenance contracts. And here in St. John's, the St. John's Housing

MR. NEARY: Corporation by one of the suppliers was billed for items that were never delivered. That investigation has been ongoing. And this same firm is insisting and still doing business with the Newfoundland Government instead of being put on a suspension list, is still doing business with the Newfoundland Government and, in fact, I am told, have taken civil action against the government because the government withheld their payments - the crowd that brought democracy to Newfoundland. The Public Treasury, Sir, has not been adequately protected in the last six or seven years and people are very nervous about giving this hon. crowd another \$354 million to spend. There are too many questions to be answered. What about the oil refinery? What about the Linerboard mill giveaway? What about the development of the Lower Churchill? No announcements on plans of what the government is going to do to reactivate the oil refinery and to get the Lower Churchill off the ground, no accounting of the money they have squandered and wasted in the last fiscal year. We hear now the Norma and Gladys is going to sail up to Toronto again. No doubt the amount is included in the Interim Supply Bill. That money could be used to buy wheelchairs for some of the handicapped



MR. S. NEARY: people in this Province. that money could be used to buy eyeglasses and dentures for some of the low income and no income families, individuals in this Province. Mr. Chairman, I think it is terrible, it is ridiculous. And what a gall Sir, the Minister of Finance has; the new Minister of Finance, a man who you would think would like to leave the impression with the people of this Province that the government is going to take a new direction, that we are going to see a little integrity and honesty restored to government and not a continuation of what we have seen in the past. And the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who used to champion the cause when he was on this side of the House that all the decision regarding the Public Treasury, financing, should be made in this hon. House and not down in the Cabinet Room on the eighth floor, now that same hon. gentleman is asking the Opposition where he stood one time saying, "No, do not do this, it is wrong, immoral, irresponsible, do not do it," that same hon. gentleman now is asking the Opposition to approve \$354 million for three months with no guarantee, no assurance, no commitment that a Budget will ever be brought down in this House to give the people an accounting of the administration for the last year or so. I would like to draw to the hon. lady's attention, Sir, that we had an interruption and then when you stand you can speak in the Committee as many times as you like. So I have a little longer than one minute left. I started my forty-five minutes again.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, no.

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, yes.

MR. HICKMAN: Not with a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Would you want an explanation?

MR. S. NEARY: No, it does not make any difference. I can get up again. If the hon. gentleman wants to get his Interim Supply Bill that he says is so urgently needed by 1:00 p.m. -

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. CROSS): Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Well, then, Sir, I am quite prepared to wind down my remarks because, I mean, it is falling on deaf ears anyway, Mr. Chairman, the government intend to use their majority, use brute

MR. S. NEARY: force to railroad this bill through the House, There is nothing that the Opposition or the media can do or say that would change the government's mind. They are acting in a dictatorial fashion, irresponsible and Mr. Chairman, there is nothing we can do about it, apparently. We could drag it out, we could filibuster if we wanted to, but what is the point, Sir? What is the point? It is a no-win situation. The only thing that we can say, Sir, is that when the Minister of Finance speaks now that he will tell us if the government intends to bring down a Budget and give us some time frame of when they expect to bring it down. Maybe the only way to resolve this thing is put it to a vote and let the government in a dictatorial fashion railroad the bill through the House.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman,

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has brought up a number of points that I think should be responded to. The first point he mentioned, this cocktail set, the St. John's cocktail set, I really must respond to that because I think he included me in that group. I cannot recall having been to a cocktail party for the last year. Now I have been invited to cocktail parties. I can recall an invitation to a cocktail party at a bank, for a visiting president of a bank; I can recall receiving an invitation to a cocktail party by a firm that has to do with aviation in the Province, I can recall receiving an invitation to go to a cocktail party when the Village Mall was opened,

DR. J. COLLINS: and I think there were one or two others, but I cannot recall having attended a cocktail party in the past year. However, I am going to look into this. If there is a St. John's cocktail group on the go I want information about it and I intend to ask the hon. member for - the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, in any case, because the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said that the hon. member's supporters were members of this St. John's cocktail set. And if I remember correctly, the present hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications was his first supporter in his road to the leadership. So if the hon. minister knows anything about this cocktail set I intend to get that information from him.

Also, the hon. Minister of Tourism, he was one of the early supporters in the leadership race, for the present Premier, and he also presumably is in this cocktail set. His district is Ferryland but I suppose that is reasonably close to St. John's. I intend to get information from him about it.

Also the hon. Minister of Public Works, whose district is in Harbour Grace. He, apparently, also is in the St. John's cocktail set because he was a very active supporter of the present Premier in his leadership race. And I expect that he should come across with information.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Will you table that information?

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member for Lewisport, not Lewisport, for -

MR. HICKMAN: Grand Bank?

DR. COLLINS: No, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: Exploits.

DR. COLLINS: Exploits, pardon me. The hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) apparently is also in this St. John's cocktail set. He was, I think, the second or third declared supporter for the hon. Premier, so then he must be in the St. John's cocktail set also.

All these hon. members should inform me, if they are colleagues, of the details of this cocktail set in case I want to get into it. I am not sure I do but certainly if they have any information I would think it most discourteous and unkind of them if they do not let me into the secrets of the St. John's cocktail set.

MR. HICKMAN: Will you table it?

DR. COLLINS: And if I get that information I certainly will table it.

I think I would now like to go on to another point. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) brought up the point of the amount of this Interim Supply Bill, I think a very legitimate concern. I did, I think, touch on that when I first spoke but I think I would just like to go into it again a little bit.

The amount is a very large amount; \$354 million of the taxpayers' money of this Province is a very large amount and I am very conscious of that. But the amount covers a three month period and by and large the amount is based on that. One quarter of the expected expenditure for the whole year was looked at and that comprised the bulk of that \$354 million.

Now there are a few exceptions. If it was just simply that, simply a quarter, it would be a lesser amount. There are additions to what would be the amount, if just a quarter was looked at, and I do not think I should go

DR. COLLINS: into a whole lot of details now but I will just give an example. For instance, there are equipment rentals and maintenance contracts which the government departments have each year. Now many of these rentals, well over fifty per cent of them do become due in the first quarter of the fiscal year so that this increases the amount. In other words, not one-quarter of those contract costs are in Interim Supply because there has to be a cash flow to satisfy fifty per cent of those rentals for a full twelve months. So there is a larger amount in the Interim Supply Bill for these items than would normally be the case if we were just going on one-quarter of the whole year's cost.

Similarly, there is an item there for the purchase of a car. Now the car is not for a member of the government but it is a responsibility of the government to supply such a car. There is an item in there for this. Well this amount is in there. The amount will be paid in the first quarter and that is in there. It is due to be paid in the first quarter.

There are grants in there. For instance, a grant to the Institute of Research on Public Policy. This is something that

DR. J. COLLINS: the Government has subscribed to for many years, it is a very worthwhile institute to belong to and that annual grant does fall due within the first quarter. The amount extends throughout the whole year but that amount falls due in the first quarter so that amount is in the Interim Supply Bill.

And there are others, Some of the amounts are very largely refundable. Eventhough they extend throughout the whole year, they are refundable from Federal Government sources. But these amounts do add up and they increase the Interim Supply Bill amount over what would be the amount if we only took one-quarter of the expected vote required for the full year.

Now, the other point I would like to go into is in addition to, as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) pointed out, in addition to the housekeeping amounts required, and this was the conventional way of drawing up the Interim Supply Bill, In addition to those housekeeping amounts there is another amount in there which does have to do with other expenditures. I thought I did mention this and I did mention it in my earlier remarks but I will go into it a little more fully now. The amount relates to monies for the Department of Transportation and Communications, If the Supply Bill only covered the ongoing contracts in the Department of Transportation and Communications for road improvements and reconstruction-those contracts, by the way, that are presently in force amount to just over \$8 million - if we wished to just put in the Interim Supply Bill the amount of cash flow that those contracts already in existence had to be serviced for, we would have an amount in of \$1.6 million and that amount is in there. In other words, there are ongoing contracts. The total amount of those contracts add up to something over \$8 million. The one quarter year's requirement to continue those contracts is \$1.6 million and that would normally be the amount for road reconstruction and improvement in the Interim Supply Bill. However, in addition to that there are

DR. J. COLLINS new works and those new works add up to \$27 million. Now, it is not the case that that total amount of \$27 million will be expended in the next three months. In fact, the amount that will be expended from the \$27 million is just over \$7 million. That is the actual cash flow during the three month period in regard to these new projects. However, as they are new projects the total amount has to go in, the total amount that will be required for the full year has to go in so that the full \$27 million has to go in and that, shall we say, spuriously increases the amount of this Interim Supply Bill. So, there are monies in this Interim Supply Bill for the three month period which will not be expended during the three month period because the new projects have their full amounts included by the requirements of the Statutes of this Province, they are included but the cash flow and, therefore, the amount that will go out under the Interim Supply Bill is considerably less.

Now, the final point I think that needs to be alluded to that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) brought up is the question of the Budget. The hon. members opposite have indicated a concern that there will not be a Budget. Now, is this a real concern?-I think that is a question we have to address-or is it for some other reason they are bringing up this point? I do not know, quite honestly. Because I think we would be naive if we said that everything is said in this House is just for information or just for honest concern. There are other reasons why things are said in this House. There are political reasons. But if there is a real concern opposite I would like to make



Dr. J. Collins: these remarks. Firstly, it would be untrue to say that the budget is ready. The budget is not ready. It would be totally irresponsible for the outgoing Premier to have prepared a budget and then expected a new Premier to come in and take over that budget without any alteration. I think that would be totally irresponsible. And that was not done. Whether it would be irresponsible or not, the fact is it was not done. The budget is not completed, that is the first point.

The second point is that there is a new Minister of Finance, there is a new President of the Treasury Board. It would be totally unrealistic to expect new people like this to be able to, within a week or something of that order, to get down to bringing in a budget which is not complete in the first place. That would be totally unrealistic.

The third thing, I think, that one has to look at in the process, and I would like to bring this out, I am not bringing it out in regard to the Interim Supply Bill, I am talking now about the budget, the main budget when it comes down. Traditionally, again I can only go on what I have heard, what I have learned over the period of time that I have been an hon. member of this House, but traditionally the budget essentially comes up from the Civil Service, the line departments establish their requirements and so on and so forth, so the major input is from the Civil Service. I think that we all recognize that. There are other inputs, clearly. There should not be people in the process of government other than the Civil Service, if it was only the Civil Service involved. There are other people involved, but by and large the Civil Service was the major input into the budget process.

Now I think that there is a feeling generally that this is too narrow that not only should the Civil Service have input, not only perhaps should politicians have input, but other elements of society should have some input, and I would like to see this. As



Dr. J. Collins: Minister of Finance I would like to see this. I would like to see other aspects of the community, be they labour unions, be they the business community, be they development corporations, be they individuals, I do not think that they should be automatically excluded from the budget process. I am not saying that they should sit down and decide points.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman aware of the confidentiality and the secrecy -

DR. J. COLLINS: What I am trying to say -

MR. NEARY: - of the budget (inaudible).

DR. J. COLLINS: I am getting to that point. I am trying to say -

MR. NEARY: Or are you going to let Bruneau and Crosbie write it?

DR. J. COLLINS: No. I am trying to say that there are other people in our society than the Civil Service, there are other people in our society than the politicians who do have interest in the budget process. And if such parts of society wish to express their ideas, their concerns, their wishes in whatever form they wish, whether they wish to express them in their own meetings, in speeches in meetings, whether they wish to express them in letters to the paper, whether they wish to express them in private letters to me or to my officials, all this input would be appreciated. No commitment is given and, of course, no commitment could be given that a single one of these ideas would be reflected in the budget. But this commitment can be given, that if any input is forthcoming it will not be ignored. It will be assessed. And this is quite reasonable because how does, shall we say, the Civil Service put its input into the budget? It puts it in because it gathers information. And there is much information that is not available to the Civil Service, so this is just another mechanism for getting information.

Now, for all these reasons, that is, for the fact that the budget is not completed, for the reason that there is new personnel involved, for the reason that the process in arriving at this

Dr. J. Collins: budget may be a little bit different, may be a little bit different, therefore may be a little bit more time consuming than in the past, it would be unrealistic to expect the budget to come down next week. It would be physically impossible.

MR. NEARY: We are not asking for it next week.

DR. J. COLLINS: It would be physically impossible for the budget to come down the week after that. I suggest that it would be -

MR. NEARY: What we are asking, will we have the budget before the next election?

DR. J. COLLINS: It would be physically impossible, I suspect, I cannot be absolutely certain at this point, but I suspect very strongly that it would be physically impossible for the budget to come down the third week from now.

MR. NEARY: But how about before an election?

DR. J. COLLINS: It is possible, it is just conceivably possible it might come down the week after that but I doubt it.

MR. NEARY: Do not be evading the question.

DR. J. COLLINS: And one could go on like that, and as you

DR. COLLINS: go on in time the likelihood of the budget coming down gets nearer and nearer.

MR. NEARY: Sit down. You are boring us.

DR. COLLINS: I can give the hon. members, if they require reassurance, I can give the hon. members this reassurance and I have already given this, and the hon. member asked for a commitment.

MR. NEARY: A commitment that there is going to be a budget.

DR. COLLINS: Would the hon. member give a commitment that the bills which the Premier wishes to bring in - he has stated this publicly, he says, "In this session I have a number of bills I wish to bring in" - will the hon. member give the Premier a commitment that these bills will be passed?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation at all, Sir, I have no hesitation at all in giving the hon. the Premier -

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I think I have the -

MR. NEARY: - a commitment, Sir, that any legislation -

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor, I believe.

MR. NEARY: - brought into this House that is reasonable and in the best interest of the ordinary people of this Province -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - will have my blessing.

DR. COLLINS: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

DR. COLLINS: It is my understanding that I had the floor and whilst I had the floor I understand it is my right to be able to speak.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman wanted a commitment. Well, he has my commitment, Sir, that any legislation brought into this House by the new Premier that is worthwhile -

DR. COLLINS: A point of order!

MR. NEARY: - that is worthwhile, Sir, that is in the best interest of the ordinary people of this Province, I will support it. Now the hon. gentleman has my commitment.

DR. COLLINS: Is the hon. member speaking to the point of order?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has my commitment.

DR. COLLINS: Is the hon. member speaking to the point of order?

MR. NEARY: Now, can I have the hon. gentleman's commitment that there will be a budget? The hon. gentleman has my commitment.

MR. LUSH: Before the election.

MR. NEARY: Before the election.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I understood that the minister had yielded the floor.

DR. COLLINS: I brought up a point of order.

MR. NEARY: No point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Well, let the records show that

MR. SIMMONS: the government side is filibustering now.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, do you wish to rule on a point of order I brought up?

MR. NEARY: What was the point of order?

DR. COLLINS: The point of order was that whilst I was speaking the hon. member was interfering with my right to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. CROSS): Order, please! I would ask hon. members to refrain from talking when an hon. member has the floor.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I give the House this commitment, that as soon as it is physically possible to bring in a budget, provided this House is sitting, a budget will be brought in. If this House is sitting this budget will be brought in and it will be brought in as soon as it can be compiled. Now if hon. members do not accept that commitment -

MR. NEARY: No.

DR. COLLINS: - clearly they are doing it not out of concern, but they are doing it for some other reason. And I do not think that the people of this Province will be well served by playing these sorts of games in this House.

MR. NEARY: Call a general election.

DR. COLLINS: I intend to bring in the budget as soon as it can be compiled and it will be brought in if this House is sitting. I do not think there were any other points of note to be commented on from the hon. member and I would now therefore move that the resolution come to a vote.

MR. NEARY: A budget or an election?

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. CROSS): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the minister used an unjustifiable amount of his time talking about the cocktail

MR. SIMMONS: circuit. I cannot get as uptight about that circuit as he is. I say to him that he ought to take pleasure as I do that I am not in it, as he says he is not. But if he wants some information he is, I suggest, essentially wasting his time talking to the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), who is not in it, or the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power). There is another person on his side he should talk to who is not in it either but was the direct victim of it and that was the Minister of Fisheries. He knows a lot about it. He talked about it during the leadership quite openly, as a matter of fact, how he was scared that the cocktail circuit gang, he called them by another name, he called them in his campaign speeches, or campaign whisperings as the "St. John's clique", and he was afraid they were going to get him and they did get him and if you want some good advice on it, whatever the name, a thorn by any other name smarts just as much. I am sure the Minister of Fisheries will testify from experience. The jab is just as deep. The wound takes just as long to heal. But he can tell you of a certainty all about this circuit, as my colleague calls it, or this clique, as my friend from St. Mary's - the Capes (Mr. W. Carter) calls it. So if you want some first hand advice, first hand knowledge of the subject, you talk not to the other people you mentioned, I say to the Minister of Finance, but to the Minister of Fisheries.

Now, Mr. Chairman,

MR. SIMMONS: I do not think the Minister of Finance only in the job a few days and not particularly expert and not expected to be particularly expert in the field of finance because that is not his background, but with that aside I do not think he can be as dense as he tries to pretend to the committee. He is just not that dense. He just is not. He is known in this House as an intelligent man, a rational man, a person who understands that one and one are two, a person who, when you put a point to him, can be expected to respond rationally. He might not give you the answer you want but that is his prerogative. He will give you what seems like a rational answer with one exception: On the subject of this budget he goes into double talk and not only double talk but orchestrated double talk. I notice that he addresses himself very freely to the committee on most points but when he comes to the line about the budget he always glances back down to his paper to make sure he is reading it right. 'If the House is still in session, he has been told to say. Well, look, Mr. Chairman, we want one or the other, we want a budget or an election. A budget or an election.

Now the honourable thing for the government to do - but after what they did with the beer barons, as reported in the Auditor General's Report, I do not really expect them to do the hon. thing - but the hon. thing for them to do would be to come in with their financial programme, their budget and then go to the people on the strength of it. But to come in with this backdoor approach under the guise of a three-month Interim Supply! It is well-done, Mr. Chairman, there is no question about it. The ruse almost worked until you pick up the expenditure for the past couple of years. In, for example, the Department of Transportation, what is the revised expenditure for 1977 and 1978 in Transportation? \$53 million. What is the projected expenditure for this current year which ends tomorrow? \$53 million for the whole year. And what are they asking for now for three months? \$53 million.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman! Mr. Chairman, I wonder could you restrain the kiddie's corner over there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Cross) Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, you are not allowed to play poker in the House, are you?

Mr. Chairman it may be in many respects an Interim Supply Bill, or a request for some interim funds for a two or three month period in many respects, but I submit that in terms of the patronage departments, the buy-the-votes department. and I use Transportation as an example -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I fully intend to have my say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would ask the hon. members to my left to refrain from carrying on private conversations.

MR. SIMMONS: All right, Mr. Chairman, let them amuse themselves. They find so little that is amusing these days, particularly the four fellows in the front bench there. They are still smarting and any little distraction they get helps them forget. They cannot drink in the House so they have to look for some other way to intoxicate themselves so they talk to the minds behind them, like the minister from St. Barbe, the minister from Trinity, on some brilliant intoxicating discussion. You can talk to these fellows any day, Mr. Chairman, whether you have wounds to heal or not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the subject of the Department of Transportation, they are, I submit, asking for a full year's supply if you judge by the expenditure pattern of the past two years. I repeat, in 1977-78 and 1978-79 the expenditures of that department have been \$53 million and a few thousand dollars, \$53 million. This year the request under



MR. SIMMONS: the guise of Interim Supply for Transportation is that exact same amount, \$53 million. Now I can understand the argument that the minister puts forward, that in addition to the ongoing expenses there are some capital provisions there. I can buy that. I can see that. I would see that if, for example, with the total expenditure of the last two years being \$73 million a year and a quarter of that being eighteen or nineteen million and they lumped in

MR. SIMMONS: another \$10 million or \$12 million or \$15 million for capital, and they came up with a Budget request of \$35 million or \$40 million, I could understand that. But for the minister to come with a straight face before this House and expect us to believe that \$73 million is just three months Interim Supply and a provision to take care of some of the Capital Works, he is just going to have to do better than that. What he has done, Mr. Chairman, is provided for the full year's expenditure, or just about that. I can understand that with an election in the offing the government would be politically wise to pad Transportation just a bit more and I have no doubt that when the full Budget for Transportation is revealed it will be something in excess of \$73 million, but I am addressing myself to the spending patterns of the past two years and they are asking for the exact same amount, give or take a few thousand bucks, the exact same amount, \$53 million plus, that they spent in 1977, 1978 and that they will have spent in 1978 - 1979.

So let nobody be under the illusion, Mr. Chairman, that this is a routine Interim Supply budget.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to a point or two since the Minister of Transportation is in the House. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) earlier committed various ministers to answer certain questions of detail -

MR. MARSHALL: I wonder could I ask the hon. gentleman, just for one moment, a question not relating to what he said, but I just want to ask if I might make a statement.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MARSHALL: It is in relation to His Honour

MR. MARSHALL: and a couple of other things that -

MR. SIMMONS: Well, I will yield for a question but I will not yield for a procedural matter.

MR. MARSHALL: No, well, it is not really a procedural matter, it is really from the remarks and the tenor of the Opposition, the remarks that were made by the Opposition, I had assumed, hopefully, that Supply would be going through today, and based on that I asked His Honour to come to the House; and if the Opposition is going to continue until Monday, in which case we will be in a position with respect to payment of bills, I would like to know because I would like to be able to do His Honour the courtesy of letting him know now - it is only ten minutes before - as to whether or not he should return to Government House or whether he should stay here for a while.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, I appreciate the position the Government House Leader got himself into - and I put it that way, got himself into - because the answer we wanted some time ago we still do not have. And are we going to get a Budget? You know, I understand if the House is open and that kind of thing, but is a month, five weeks a reasonable time to expect a Budget? You know, if there is no election, that kind of thing, we understand all that, of course, but -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Four to ten weeks.

MR. SIMMONS: No, now come off it. The Premier is playing with us - four to ten weeks! Four to five weeks, can we have a Budget in four or five weeks?

DR. J. COLLINS: If it were physically possible to have a Budget next week, we would have a Budget. I cannot say we will have a Budget within four to five weeks. I do not know if that is physically possible,

DR. J. COLLINS: I suspect it is not. I tell you that quite honestly, I suspect it is not within four to five weeks, but as soon thereafter as is physically possible there will be a Budget.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I owe the Government House Leader an answer; he rose on that particular point. We have some other questions we want to put. We think we can get the answers in a matter of minutes. It is not our intention to obstruct at all. We are utterly disgusted that the budgetary process is admittedly, from the government side, so much in limbo. I would have thought that I could have taken the word of the former minister that 85 per cent of it was in order. So we now can construe, we now know that the former minister was not levelling with the public when he told us that 85 per cent of the Budget was already locked away. And from what we hear now there is going to be a long-winded consultive process, Letters to the Editor, we are going to go out and ask everybody, and you are talking about a six or eight month process. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is talking about a Royal Commission, he is not talking about a budgetary process.

I am really amazed, Mr. Chairman, that the budgetary process is in such slings, and we have that, Mr. Chairman, as a direct admission from the Minister of Finance, that we are a day from the end of the fiscal year and they are still in the process, not of sharpening their pencils or deciding on financial priorities, they want to know how to go about it. They are going to go out and ask now, they are going to read the Letters to the Editor column, they are going to find what people would like to have in the Budget, whether it is the tax taken off booze or more taxes on cigarettes or whether they are going to have four lane highways or six lane highways.

MR. SIMMONS: They are looking for that kind of input, Mr. Chairman, one day before the end of the fiscal year.

I say to the administration, the country does not stop while you pause to choose a leader. We understand there are some ramifications there in terms of timing but the country does not stop. We still have to pay our bills.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a question to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) in particular. I wonder, in line with the undertaking which his colleague,

MR. R. SIMMONS: the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) gave a day or so ago in committee, could the Minister of Transportation (Mr. C. Brett) provide the Committee with a breakdown of the expenditure of \$53 million, in particular the capital part of it, and could he spell out any individual projects to which this capital amount will apply? Two questions really; of the \$53 million, what part of it is capital and could he be specific on the capital amount in terms of individual projects?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Chairman, the new amount that is committed, I think was given by the Minister of Finance, is a total of \$27 million; two million of that is for the DREE agreement, \$21 million for TCH reconstruction and \$10 million for provincial progress. However, at this point in time there is no decision on what provincial projects will be undertaken, therefore I could not table a list. We are not aware right now what programs we are going to do this year as far as capital works is concerned, the final decision has not been made; therefore, there is no such list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, as I said when I wound up my remarks earlier this morning and I must say, Sir, the hon. gentleman House Leader, again without prior consultation with the Opposition, invites His Honour to come into the House and puts himself in the embarrassing position, Sir, that he may have to go and send His Honour back to Government House again. I do not know on what basis the hon. gentleman decided to invite the Governor to come up, a representative of Her Majesty. We could very easily drag out this Interim Supply Bill until the middle of next week. We could, but we have no intentions of doing it as I indicated a few moments ago. We want the thing to come to a vote because obviously we are not going to get the information that we asked the Government for. We are not going to get a commitment before the next election, no commitment, and here we are over here telling the people of this Province that we are

MR. S. NEARY: prepared to co-operate with the new Premier, give him a chance to show the people what he can do and the hon. gentleman, obviously, wants it to be a one-way street. He wants to act like a little dictator, like Mussolini -

AN HON. MEMBER: Idi Amin.

MR. S. NEARY: Idi Amin, with no intention of making the House work, wants to railroad things through, ram them through in a dictatorial fashion. Not a good -

MR. R. SIMMONS: 'Steve,' Idi Amin with a frontal lobotomy.

MR. S. NEARY: That is not the kind of co-operation, surely, the kind of spirit, the kind of reforms the hon. gentleman likes to see in the House. A one-way street! Come in and run the House with rudeness and nastiness, not on the part of the new hon. Premier but on the part of his House Leader, and being very discourteous to His Honour, who is a representative of the Queen.

Let me say this in conclusion,

Mr. Chairman, that we have desperately tried, yesterday afternoon and today, to get a commitment from the Minister of Finance that there would be a budget brought down in this House before the next election, and the hon. gentleman has refused to make that commitment. I call upon the hon. the Premier now to make that commitment. If there is an election, Sir, before a budget is brought down in this House it would be one of the most cowardly acts that the new Premier could carry out. The people want an accounting and the people want to know the direction of the new government, And here we are. Mr. Chairman, Your Honour is aware that we could drag out this debate on Interim Supply for 75 hours if we wanted to, but we do not want to; we want to co-operate with the hon. gentleman and we will co-operate. The hon. gentleman said to me this morning, "Will you commit yourself to support any legislation that the Premier brings into this House?" I got up and I answered the hon. gentlemen and he did not like it. I said, "I commit myself to support any good legislation that the hon. Premier brings into this House that

March 30, 1979

Tape 630

RT-3

MR. S. NEARY: is in the best interests of the masses of the people, and not, not, not the minority."

MR. W. DOODY: And as long as we have a majority.

MR. S. NEARY: " Not the classes - that is in the best interest of the masses of the people and not the classes."

MR. F. ROWE: You will have to get after them  
100 per cent.

MR. S. NEARY: One hundred per cent support.

AN HON. MEMBER: And then you would take it away.

MR. S. NEARY: Take what away? What did I take away?

I took away the support for the doctors and the lawyers and the business people. If that is the



MR. S. NEARY: kind of legislation the hon. gentleman is going to bring in, then he will not get my support but if the legislation is in the best interest of the ordinary people of this Province, 100 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: The masses not the classes. And so, Sir, it has been very disappointing to us that we have not been able to get answers, we have not been able to get our questions answered, we have not been able to get explanations on things. The government are going to use their majority, they are going to use brute force to railroad this bill, this Interim Supply Bill through the House which is the largest in the whole history of this Province. They could have done it month by month, The House is sitting, Nothing urgent about it, It could have come back after a month or so, got an extension, got another installment and then the third month get another installment. No, they wanted to be unreasonable. The co-operation they are talking about is just a one way street and they want to run the House with a government House Leader who comes into the House every day with his nasty pills. And I will tell you this, Mr. Chairman, we have no intention of putting up with that on this side of the House.

I want to say to the administration, to the Premier, if he wants to call an election, call it, but we should either have a budget or an election, one thing or the other. We are prepared and anytime the Premier wants to lay his political future on the line he can go down to His Honour or he can go in the back room there now to His Honour and say, "Your Honour, dissolve the House and let us have it out and clear the air." But the people of Newfoundland do not want that, as I said earlier this morning, the people want to give the hon. gentleman a chance. British justice, British fair play. I subscribe to that. I am prepared to give the hon. gentleman a chance, but I hope the hon. gentleman does not abuse the privilege.

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

MR. SPEAKER(Otteneheimer): Before the hon. Chairman's report, is it agreed to stop the clock for two or three minutes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Cross): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having adopted a certain resolution and recommends that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed a certain resolution and a bill consequent thereto, carried.

On motion, report received and adopted.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eight, And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a first time, ordered read a second time now, by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March Nineteen Hundred and Eighty, And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER(Ottenheimer): Admit His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. Your Honour, it is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour a bill for the appropriation of Interim Supply granted in the present session.

THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR(Hon. Gordon A. Winter): In Her Majesty's name I thank Her loyal subjects, I accept their benevolence and I assent to this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of great co-operation, before I move the adjournment of the debate I would like to do the courtesy to the Opposition of informing them that on Monday it is the government's intention to call the bill. "An Act To Provide For Additional Representation For Labrador In The House of Assembly" appearing Order 8 on the Order Paper. I pass this on to the Opposition in the spirit of co-operation that is characteristic of this side of the House. I know all members are interested in it but there will be certain members who will be particularly, probably, even more concerned with it than others.

So with those words, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at three o'clock in the afternoon and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that this House adjourn until tomorrow Monday at 3:00 P.M. Those in favour "Aye". Contrary "Nay". Carried.

This House stands adjourned until Monday at 3:00 P.M.