

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, AUGUST 14, 1979

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

I am pleased to welcome to the galleries today on behalf of all hon. members the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committees from each of the provinces in Canada and I trust that their visit to our Province will be both enjoyable and productive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to

welcome on behalf of hon. members a former member of the House of Assembly who is in the gallery, Mrs Hazel McIsaac

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the

Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I have not had

an opportunity to speak to my friend opposite on this point. Perhaps he may wish to be associated or might allow us to be associated with the action of the government in moving that an appropriate message be sent by the Clerk or by Your Honour, as the case may be, to the family of the late Mr. James Walsh, who, as we know, lost his life in a very tragic accident on Friday past.

Mr. Walsh, I think, was well

known to many of us in this House, Sir, and made many and memorial contributions to the public weal of this Province. I think it is fitting that the passing of such a prominent citizen, particularly in such tragic circumstances, should be noted. It is something, as Your Honour knows, we have done in the House on occasion when a leading citizen of the Province dies and the House takes appropriate record of it. If I had been able to get here a moment or so earlier, I would have had a word with my hon. friend. Perhaps I would be allowed to second the motion on behalf of those of us on this side and my hon.

MR. ROBERTS: friend might be allowed, if he wishes, to move the motion and the House will adopt the appropriate action.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we would certainly wish to be associated with remarks made by the hon. member. Mr. Walsh was well known to most of us and his untimely and tragic death is very much regretted. As manager of the Main Branch of the Royal Bank of Canada he had been involved in the business community and in other community activities in the Province and in particular in the St. John's area. As I say, the tragic events that transpired last Friday are deeply regretted by all, and, certainly all members of the House, unanimously. I do not really think that it matters who proposes or seconds it. I think we can all unanimously express our sympathy to the widow of the late Mr. Walsh and his family.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Those in favour, 'Aye',

Contrary 'Nay", Carried.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that the provincial Department of Fisheries has introduced a special fishing gear subsidy programme for Labrador fishermen.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Under this programme the department will pay 30 per cent of the cost of purchasing certain types of new fishing gear up to a maximum of one-half the quantity of the same type fishing gear owned by the fisherman prior to his application for the subsidy.

The subsidy will apply to caplin and smelt traps, seal nets, herring traps and nets, trawl lines, cod traps, groundfish gillnets with five and one-half inch mesh and larger, and char and salmon nets. The subsidy on char and salmon nets will be paid only to resident Labrador fishermen who live and fish in Renley Harbour and settlements North of that Labrador community.

Only full-time seasonal fishermen who have resided in Labrador for a minimum of one year and who are owner-operators of a commercial fishing vessel will qualify for the subsidy. Applicants must be sixteen years of age and over and operate a fishing vessel thirty-five feet in length or under.

Guidelines have been built into the programme which limit the quantity of each type of fishing gear which may be cost-shared depending on the size of the vessel and the number of fishermen affected.

Government's investment is covered by a pay-back procedure for cases where an applicant leaves the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this programme will go a long way in the further development of the Labrador inshore fishery.

Unlike their counterparts on the Island, Labrador fishermen have to contend with a short fishing season, harsher weather conditions and higher prices for fishing gear.

MR. W. CARTER: Officials from my department are now on the Labrador Coast explaining this programme to the fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, although I am not the spokesman for fisheries, as it pertains to Labrador I wish to make a few comments.

I am very pleased that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), did see fit to offer this gear subsidy programme for Labrador fishermen. In fact, it is sort of double-barrelled, because back in November I worked with the Department of Fisheries and I was one of the main bodies behind this move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: I believe at that time we got our six fishermen from Nain to Red Bay and met in Happy Valley - Goose Bay with two other members of the Department of Fisheries, and this is exactly what was discussed and

MR. G. WARREN: What was discussed and what came out of these meetings. So I am glad that, although it is six months later or 7 months later, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) does see fit to put such a programme into effect. I would like to congratulate him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement about Grade XII. I wish to clarify the government's plans for the introduction of Grade XII in the Province.

There seems to be some public confusion about the implementation of Grade XII, which may have been compounded by recent conflicting press accounts of the discussion during the Social Services Committee review of the Education Department estimates.

The government decided to implement Grade XII as a part of a reorganized senior high school program spanning Grades X through XII.

There are three main reasons for this decision: Number 1, improving the quality of high school education by enabling students to experience a broader programme; Number 2, giving students an extra year of growth and development before they graduate from high school and enter post-secondary institutions or the work force; and number 3, bringing the high school system in our province more in line with those in other provinces.

In February 1979 the Department of Education began planning for the implementation of a Grade XII programme. A Steering Committee was established, chaired by Cyril McCormick, Assistant Deputy Minister of Education, with representatives from the Education Department Instruction Division, the Denominational Education Committee, the Federation of School Boards, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, Memorial University and parents. The committee has been meeting regularly since April.

The Steering Committee has set up sub-

MS. L. VERGE: committees on six aspects of Grade XII. Those are; community concerns and public relations; curriculum reorganization; facilities and cost estimates; post-secondary considerations; in-service and personnel, and last, student evaluation.

The sub-committees are now working and are expected to report before the end of this calendar year. The information being gathered by the sub-committees will be used by the Steering Committee to make recommendations on how and when Grade XII should be introduced.

Although the target date set for the introduction of the reorganized senior high school programme including Grade XII was September 1980, with students entering Grade X in September 1980 who would go on to become the first Grade XII class in September 1982, graduating in June 1983, the government's final decision on that ~~time frame will not be made until~~ .

MRS. L. VERGE:

time frame will not be made until the Steering Committee has submitted its recommendations at the end of this year.

The government's major concern is the educational quality of the high school programme, rather than the speed with which Grade XII is started.

The government is committed to implementing Grade XII and the Department of Education intends to keep the House of Assembly and the general public informed of progress made on the plans for its implementation and the starting date.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, in response to the minister's statement I note that I did not get an advance copy again, which is, I suppose, the way things usually run. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that it is obvious now, I would think that the government will not be able to implement this Grade XII at the target date. I do not know if that is a bad thing or not, but when we look at the implications and the massive changes that will have to take place in this Province in order to accommodate Grade XII, and if we look at the minister's times when the committee reports, I do not think that we will be ready in September of 1980 to start this programme. And, as I said before, I do not think that this is necessarily a bad thing because when we consider that from some of the information that we have received about Grade XII recently, considering that the Department of Education has now decided or is now thinking in terms of consolidation of schools, and when we look at the fact that there will be a fair upsetting of the structure in schools in certain geographical areas of the Province, that it is a major thing and it must be brought in very carefully.

But I would ask the minister and I would ask this government to make sure that there is full public discussion. I realize that these committees have been meeting and that there are sub-committees and that they are working along their own lines, but I also realize that really the general public get

MR. J. HODDER: Does not know exactly what these committees are doing. Indeed, we do not know which ways they are moving. How great is this going to be, the centralization of schools? Because I did hear in the committee, the minister mentioned that there would be centralization in some areas. Is this going to be done non-denominationally, in areas where geography dictates or declining enrollments are such-

AN HON. MEMBER: Denominationally?

MR. J. HODDER: Non-demoninationally, I said.

- in areas where there has been a great decline and where you have maybe three or four denominations and three different separate school systems? These are just questions that I think the general public should be aware of and I think that

MR. J. HODDER: the school districts themselves, where there will be disruption, I think that they must know. But I would say to the minister that I feel that it is time now to let the general public know exactly where we are going as far as Grade XII is concerned, what the proposals are and what it is going to mean to the general school structure in the Province.

I am glad the Grade XII programme - for a while we had almost heard nothing about it until the committees discussed it - I am glad that there is something positive on the Grade XII now, that the government has indeed committed itself to going ahead with it, but I would urge that they do it very, very carefully and that the public be fully informed as to what is happening starting now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions for the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins). May I refer him, first of all, to the budget of 1979 and the heading "Outlook for 1979," in which he forecast that, "The Newfoundland economy," in his words, "will remain strong throughout 1979 and should demonstrate real growth of more than 3.2 per cent." Today the Conference Board of Canada in making some forecasts for all of the provinces of Canada puts Newfoundland, strangely enough - and it is not a very promising forecast for the country as a whole at a very low level - but puts the figure for '79-'80, I would assume it would be, at 2 per cent. Does the hon. minister have any reason to reconsider his forecast for the remainder of this year in the light of that and would he care to give us a figure for 1980?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have only had an opportunity to see newspaper reports on the Conference Board of Canada predictions to date and my understanding of those reports was that for the remainder

August 14, 1979

Tape No. 779

NM - 2

DR. J. COLLINS: of this year, the current fiscal year, they were predicting actually quite a good increase for Newfoundland, I think it was 6.4 per cent, and I think the 2 per cent relates to 1980-81, that period. So in the budget we did predict 3.2 per cent and if my interpretation is right, and I believe it is, in actual fact we were being rather conservative.

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

MR. JAMIESON: That is putting it mildly, Mr. Speaker. With the greatest of respect for the figures, I do not know how the minister could have been off as much as he appears now to be in the remainder of this year from 3.2 per cent to whatever he quoted. I have not seen any figure of 6. per cent or 5. per cent, nearly 6 points for this year.

But does he agree with the 2 per cent figure for next year? And I ask him that in light of the fact that as of today also we have again doubled the national unemployment rate. A few days ago I asked him for some forecasts about this Winter. I forecast now that given this 14.5 per cent or approximately 14.5 per cent now, that we will have a rate of 17 per cent or 18 per cent at the very least comes the high unemployment season for this year. I ask the hon. minister how does he feel about or how would he react to that kind of forecast?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there are two questions there, one is the projection for the economy next year, and the other is the projection for the employment next year. We have not at this point in time made a projection for next year. We have not established what our projection will be. When the appropriate time comes, we will certainly be doing that.

In terms of the unemployment figure for next year, the anticipated unemployment figure for next year, I have taken that under advisement and I will get back to the hon. member when the details are available.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: In line with the questioning of my hon. colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, I wonder if the Premier could inform the House if the strike that is being made, the announcement by the Premier that gas and oil has been discovered off our Coast, if

Mr. Neary: it is a major strike or is the Premier exaggerating?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I never exaggerate. I have never been known to exaggerat in the past, not known to exaggerate today, will not be known to exaggerate in the future. I call the shots as they are , Mr. Speaker, and the shots are,as it relates to offshore right now on Mobil acreage, a well called Hibernia has encountered hydrocarbons at around 4,000 metres, in a zone of,obviously, sandstone which is the **conducive** geology for hydrocarbon appearance. How much is there is not know until the company has completed drilling the well and then does its test as it comes up from the bottom of the well through the various zones.

So the extent of the discovery will not be known for a couple of weeks until the company has had opportunity to test. But the drill ship has encountered hydrocarbons and it is not clear for sure whether it is a substantial amount of gas or a substantial amount of oil present in the well.

AN HON. MEMBER: What assumption (Inaudible)

BREMIER PECKFORD: Well, they have encountered hydrocarbons. We are not such which takes precedence over the other.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I might point out for the benefit of the hon. the Premier in case he did not hear his Minister of Mines and Energy from Halifax, his minister was very vague about this whole strike even though the Premier seemed to be very enthusiastic about it, quite excited about it. Could the hon. gentleman just tell us just what is involved? Hydrocarbons. There is no indication whether there is gas or oil there, although the Premier is leaving the impression in the Province that there has actually been a discovery of oil and gas off our coast when in actual fact this is not so. Even if there were a strike of oil and gas, could the hon. gentleman indicate to the House how long it would take to get a gas or oil strike off this coast, how long it would take to develop the technology to get it on shore where it could be of some benefit to Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, anybody who knows me at all know that I am not very excited right now, right this moment, and I have not been last evening or all through last night or this morning or right now. I am very cool and calm and collected trying to go about doing the business of operating the government as best I can in my own humble and modest way. I say to the hon. member that, like the Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry), the Minister of Energy issued a statement yesterday indicating that the company have encountered hydrocarbons which mean that the drill ship or the drill rig has encountered oil and gas. In most wells it is not unusual to encounter both. In the wells off Labrador, for example, there was substantial gas with minor amounts of condensate,

PREMIER PECKFORD: which is a sort of a weird term to describe a hydrocarbon between oil and gas, neither one nor the other. I will leave it to the physicist or the chemists to work out which it is more of. But in any case, the discovery - and it is a discovery; how significant we do not know - is in a very interesting area. It is on the Northern Grand Banks so-called, really. It is out the narrows 200 miles and veer a bit to yourself. That is where the Hibernia well is, which is in an area unknown to this -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - unknown up to this - and you cannot miss it. Just take your thirty foot skiff and go on out with my directions, just given verbally, and you have to strike it - not the oil, the rig. The interesting thing here is that, number one, the discovery represents a new acreage area that hithertofore had not had any encounters of hydrocarbon with the Southern Grand Bank play that Amoco was involved in ten or fifteen years ago, that

PREMIER PECKFORD: the other hydrocarbon discoveries had been off Labrador on the Eastcan acreage. So this really marks the first time of any encounter of hydrocarbons directly off the Island of Newfoundland and, more particularly, off the Northern Grand Banks off St. John's. Thirdly, it is interesting from the point of view that it is in shallow water as opposed to the deeper water that Shell-Texaco is drilling on, which is in 4,000 to 5,000 feet of water; Imperial is on 3,000 to 4,000 feet of water; B.P. is on 2,000 to 3,000 feet of water; Eastcan is on 1,000 to 2,000 feet of water. This is the shallowest depth of water and, therefore, from that point of view, is extremely interesting. Fourthly, it is very interesting because it is as far South now as you can go on the prospective acreage that is being looked at by the companies and, therefore, it is out of the immediate, and even more than that is out of the iceberg alley kind of situation. So there are two very positive factors to it, shallow water and out of the ice zone.

The extent of the discovery, as I have indicated before, is not yet known, so I do not know whether we should be excited or whether I should be excited, and therefore, not knowing, I am going to remain very cool and calm.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A final supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I was hoping the hon. gentleman would tell us, Sir, when we can all pack up and just stop working and we would all get our Cadillacs and get the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. The hon. gentleman was very evasive now; not quite as evasive when he was on the television and radio last night and this morning. The hon. gentleman left the impression, throughout the province, Sir, that we are all going to strike it rich. Now the hon. gentleman is very vague about it. But I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, is this why the other day when I put the question to him about protecting the environment and protecting the fishery - because if we have a major blow-out there is no way to cope with it - the technology is not available on the face of the earth to cope with it, and it would threaten our fishery - is this why the hon. gentleman said that we would soon need

MR. NEARY: a major debate in this House to talk about whether we were going to stick with the fishery - that is the impression I get from the hon. gentleman - or whether we were going to take the route of looking for gas and oil off our coast, even though it threatened the fishery in this Province, which is, as members know, our real basic resource in this Province? So when will that debate take place? And was this what the Premier was concerned about when we were talking about the environment the other day and oil pollution off our coast?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that was one of the factors which led me to make that statement, the factor of offshore exploration, but also because of the Come By Chance deliberations that were involved and also because of the recent Kurdistan disaster on the South Coast - for all of those reasons, neither one being given any more preference than the other. At the time I made the statement, I was not aware of the latest news on Hibernia, which only became known in the last forty-eight hours or so. So it was not done in the light of that information, it was done just as a general thing.

Secondly, I think very soon we are going to have to have that debate. There is right now legislation pending as it relates to environmental assessment procedures, a new Act that the member for Gander, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook) is involved in, and I guess that would be an appropriate time for the kind of debate that we have talked about.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I put a series of questions to the hon. the Premier which related to the helicopter crash on Friday and the

MR. R. SIMMONS:

very tragic consequences which follow therefrom. I wonder now would the Premier, having an opportunity to check into the matters I have raised, would the Premier and/or the Minister of Transportation (Mr. C. Brett), who was absent from the Chamber when I first put the question- indeed, I had intended to put it to the Minister of Transportation - I wonder would the Premier and/or the minister responsible indicate to the House now what steps are being taken to ensure the safety of public servants and others who may have occasion to use the type of aircraft which was involved in the accident at Clareville?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) just informed me that we are waiting for information now from the company and the Department of Transport but we do not have that information at the present moment but we will add up the information.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

I thank the Premier. Would the Premier and/or the minister consider requiring the contractor, the contractor who provides the aircraft services, would the Ministry consider requiring the contractor not to use the particular type of aircraft? And perhaps I should qualify by saying that I understand the contractor uses two different types of Bell Jet Ranger and that it is my understanding that it is the so-called Long Ranger which was involved in this accident and two other accidents in the last month or so, and the same type was involved in the rather tragic accident in Quebec, the so-called Long Ranger. And I wonder would the Ministry consider requiring the contractor not to use the Long Ranger in performing its government contracts, ferrying back wildlife people, air ambulance cases and so on, not to use

MR. R. SIMMONS: that particular type of equipment until the safety considerations have been adequately dealt with?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, that is strictly a matter for MOT, and as much as I may feel like calling the company involved and making such suggestions, I think that the company would have every right to tell me that it is really none of my business. I would assume that the company is operating under the rules and regulations as laid down by MOT and as long as they are then I do not think I have any right to request that they stop using these particular helicopters.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS: This is not the point to debate this, but surely it is well within the minister's prerogative. The minister, as I understand it, administers this particular contract. Literally hundreds of people, ministers of the Crown, whom I have a special concern for, senior public servants, wildlife officers, my good friend from Bonavista South (Mr. J. Morgan), whom I would not want to lose,

MR. SIMMONS: air ambulance cases, literally hundreds of people in the run of a month have occasion to use this type of aircraft under the auspices of the government contractual agreement with the supplier of the air services. And I quite appreciate the fine point which the minister makes that the matter of grounding is a decision for the Ministry of Transport, the federal agency, but the question of whether or not this type of aircraft ought to be used, I suggest, is a contractual matter between the minister's department and the contractor, Sealand Helicopters Limited, and it is in that vein, and perhaps I could just put the question one more time as a supplementary, would the minister, as a part of his responsibility to see that the contract is responsibly administered, would he undertake to require the contractor not to use a Long Ranger until the question of safety has been fully answered?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Again, Mr. Speaker, I have no reason to suspect that that particular helicopter is unsafe and unless I have some concrete evidence, or even some suspicion of evidence that it is unsafe, then I feel I have no right to ask the contractor not to use that type of helicopter. I mean, after all it is strictly the responsibility of MOT and not the Provincial Ministry.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder could I -

MR. SPEAKER: I think you indicated a final supplementary but if there is nobody else standing.

MR. NEARY: Let the hon. gentleman go.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House in the minister's absence I indicated that I had knowledge that the manufacturer of this type of aircraft, the Long Ranger, had circulated an internal memo to purchasers of that type of aircraft, including the purchaser in this Province, the supplier of Government air services, and that memo

MR. SIMMONS: pointed out that this particular type of aircraft, the Longe Ranger, often has or can be expected to have sudden engine failure when the aircraft is in the climb position, before it reaches its cruising altitude. I submit to the minister that that is the kind of evidence in the light of the three accidents we have had in this Province with the same type of aircraft, in the light of the one they have just had in Quebec with the loss of five lives, I would suggest to the minister that that is the kind of evidence that the aircraft may be unsafe. Nobody is making a charge, nobody is saying it is unsafe; there is the question that it may be unsafe and I submit to him that that is enough of a matter of doubt that he ought to take the necessary steps to ensure the safety of members of Cabinet, senior public servants, air ambulance cases, and those other people who have occasion -

MR. NEARY: Highways people, Forestry people.

MR. SIMMONS: - all the many hundreds of people who have occasion to use - What I am asking really, Mr. Speaker, to put it in practical terms, is that the minister

MR. R. SIMMONS:

ask the company not to use eight of its twenty-four aircraft.

I understand that only eight of the twenty-four or twenty-six are Long Rangers. The company still has sixteen, eighteen or twenty aircraft - eighteen, I believe, other aircraft, the so-called the original Bell Jet Ranger, not the Long Ranger - the company still has another eighteen or twenty aircraft that they could put at the disposal of the government to perform its government service contract. And that is the essence of my question that in view of the possible unsafeness of the aircraft, would the minister take the necessary steps to ensure the safety of the people who are using the aircraft?

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) Hon. minister.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I have no such information and I feel very strongly that if the hon. member has some information - I do not know where he got it or how he came about - but I feel that he certainly has a responsibility, not only as a member of the House of Assembly but as a private individual, to see that that information is passed along to me and to the Ministry of Transport. But again, I repeat, I have no such information and I see no reason why I should call Sealand Helicopters tomorrow -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. C. BRETT: - or this afternoon and suggest that, 'Look, I have heard a rumour from the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) that your Long Ranger helicopters are subject to engine failure and therefore will you ground them until such time as I am convinced that they are safe.'

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you not concerned?

MR. C. BRETT: I am concerned, yes! Of course, I am very concerned! I indicated yesterday when talking to somebody from the press that I am not concerned! But this is the responsibility of M.D.T. and not me. I have no right to call to Sealand Helicopters and ask them if they will ground eight helicopters because of a rumour.

MR. C. BRETT:

No reason in this world.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

We have the information.

MR. C. BRETT:

Well, if the hon. member has the information, why does he not give it to the people who are concerned?

MR. R. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

I do not know why, Mr. Speaker, but the minister for some reason is walking away from this one. Now, look, I said yesterday in the House, and I say again today that the purchase of - I will be more specific: Sealand Helicopters has the memo; that is where I had access to it. Mr. Speaker, if the minister has a genuine concern in this matter he need not classify my information as rumour. All he need do is undertake to -

MR. S. NEARY:

Pick up the phone.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

- pick up the phone and call Sealand and see if they have such a memo. I will tell him now they have such a memo. And what I am asking the minister is will he take the necessary steps; I am not asking him to be semantic or to blame it on M.O.T. There is a matter of concern here, and it is widely shared in the public, a matter of concern about Cabinet officials, senior public servants and many hundreds of people whom I have mentioned already. And the least, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the minister could undertake to do is to check into this matter and if there is any reasonable grounds for requesting the contractor to suspend its use of these eight pieces of equipment, I believe the minister should at the very least undertake to check out that possibility. I am asking him one more time if he will agree to do so.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the M.O.T. is carrying out a very extensive investigation at the moment. I am in touch with M.O.T. I have instructed my officials to get in touch with Sealand Helicopters. There are a number of points that I want clarified; there is information that I want, I gave the instructions yesterday; I did not have them up until the time I came to the House. But if any information comes to my attention which indicates that the helicopters are not safe, then I have no hesitation in asking the company - well, I will not have to do that because M.O.T. will do that automatically. But I can assure the hon. member that I was not aware that the company had a memo. If the company has a memo, well then I would assume that M.O.T. are aware of it or will be made aware of it and will take the necessary action.

MR. L. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Am I to understand that the minister is not taking the simple, safe, precautionary measure of instructing his civil servants, wildlife officials, etcetera, ministers and so on not to fly on this particular ship until after the Ministry of Transport brings in its report? It is a simple, safe, precautionary measure that should concern every one of us in this bloody House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman is not going to answer the question as he has been informed by the Premier, his boss, not to answer the question. What I want to ask the hon. gentleman is if -

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

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wants to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, I think he should get on with asking the question, side comments which have nothing to do with the

PREMIER PECKFORD: question he is going to ask should not be permitted, and I do not think under the rules are permitted. For the hon. member's information, seeing he is so eager to know what the hon. Premier is doing every second during

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Question Period, I did not instruct the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) to answer.

MR. NEARY: It would appear that way. You refused to get up.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I did not instruct. And I think it is unfair of the hon. member to make such comments which reflect upon the behaviour of another member of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: - I would have hoped that the Premier would have taken the opposite position and instructed the hon. gentleman to do something about this.

MR. MORGAN: Start your question now, The House is not open for debate.

MR. NEARY: My question to the hon. gentleman, Sir, if anybody in the public service -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! With respect to the point of order that has been raised, again I quote 31 (c) for everybody's attention, everybody is very much aware of it "That in putting oral questions no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same."

I will ask the hon. member to direct his question, please

MR. NEARY: I apologize to Your Honour.

My question for the hon. minister, Sir, is a follow-up to the one my colleague, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) asked. In the event that public servants are told to go on assignments aboard of these helicopters that are considered to be

Mr. Neary: dangerous , that is the Jet Long Ranger, and they refuse to go, what will happen? Will they be disciplined? Will their services be terminated? Will they be laid off? What will happen in the event of anybody in the Forestry, Fisheries, Tourism, the Department of Tourism or in any other part of the public service refuse to get on these helicopters, what will happen to them? Will they be disciplined in any way? Or will their wishes be respected?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: That matter has been discussed, Mr. Speaker. No, to the best of my knowledge no civil servant would be disciplined in any way if he refused to fly. We have lots of civil servants who refuse to fly for reasons - some people are afraid to fly so they do not fly; they walk or they go by car or train or whatever, and they are not fired or disciplined.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary to the minister. Has the minister in his capacity as minister flown the Jet Long Ranger? And would he do so now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister for Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: This is getting a bit ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I have flown the Long Ranger, AS a matter of fact, I flew it two or three days before she went down. I think it was the same machine. I would fly it again but I think I would be afraid.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Fisheries. As the minister is aware, on July 6 a number of fishermen in the greater Lamaline area lost considerable gear as a result of storm damage. My question to the minister is I understand an assessment of damages have been made. I would like to know what the size of the damage was and whether or not it qualifies under the federal-provincial per capita cost sharing formula?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Fisheries,

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I know the survey has been conducted. I am not aware yet as to exactly the extent of the losses. But I can say that we do not have any gear replacement programme as such. We pay a subsidy on groundfish that is suppose to compensate for lost and worn out gear,

With respect to the latter part of the question, I doubt very much whether the losses sustained by the fishermen would qualify them for assistance under the federal-provincial cost shared, EMO arrangement. I think in that case the losses must be for an amount in excess of the one dollar per capita of the total population of the Province. And that being the case, I doubt very much whether the losses suffered by the fishermen would exceed or at least would match the criteria that is established by the federal government whereby assistance can be rendered under the Emergency Measures Organization programme.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Just to set the record straight, if I am correct, is it not the case, if I may direct this to the minister, that where the amount is less than the per capita that it then becomes the responsibility of the Province to deem whether it is in fact a disaster or not and to absorb the cost? And the question is, since it appears to be under the per capita amount, will the Province compensate this particular group of fishermen who have been severely hurt?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker,

MR. W. CARTER: whether it is over the amount or under, the Province does not have any legal responsibility to replace lost gear. We do pay a subsidy, of course. It is a very substantial subsidy, that is the overall amount that is supposed to be used for the replacement of lost and torn up gear. But I repeat, once the amount of the losses suffered exceed a certain amount - I think it is \$1 per capita - well, then, automatically on the request of the Province, the federal scheme will fall in place. But certainly, for an amount less than that, we have no jurisdiction; in fact, we have no legal obligation.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that we are aware of the losses and anything that we can do we will do to assist the fishermen up there.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)
Trinity - Bay de Verde.

A supplementary, the hon. the member for

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated that the Province has no legal responsibility in this particular matter; however, the Province in a number of Throne Speeches have indicated that they were trying to get a low cost- shared gear insurance programme established within the Province.

MR. ROBERTS:

Did they not promise one?

MR. F. ROWE:

And they promised it in a number of Throne Speeches and in a number of election campaigns. Therefore, I ask the minister, Does he not think they have a moral responsibility to install such a gear insurance programme for the fishermen who do not qualify under the federal programme?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, we are very much committed to the proposition that a gear insurance programme should be in place and we have worked on that now for quite some time. In fact, I announced

MR. W. CARTER: last November that such a programme would be in place on a limited scale by hopefully, April 1st of this year. In the interim, of course, the federal government announced its intention to get out of the vessel insurance programme. Of course, when that happened, then the Fishermen's Union got their forces together and decided they would come up with their own programme of vessel insurance to fill the void. It was determined, I think, Mr. Speaker, that any such programme on the part of the Fishermen's Union or indeed, the Department of Fisheries, would only be viable if it could be a package proposition, and by that I mean gear as well as vessel insurance. I am told that the union has since lost interest in that kind of a programme and we are now pursuing it. And hopefully we will have such a programme in place in the very near future.

MR. F. ROWE: What is the very near future?
It is eight years now.

MR. W. CARTER: I am hesitant, Mr. Speaker, to put a time frame on it, but certainly, as soon as we can we will have such a programme in place.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired.

I am pleased on behalf of all hon. members to welcome to the galleries a former member of this House and former minister, Mr. Ank Murphy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And on behalf of hon. members, I would like to welcome to the galleries, as well, a delegation from the Town Council of Bishop's Falls, Mayor George Saunders, Deputy Mayor Oliver Rose and Town Manager Patis Hancock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees, Notices of Motion, Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given, Presenting Petitions.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the hon. House will agree to revert, we have passed the Answers to Questions?

MR. NEARY: By leave.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Do other members of the House agree, as well?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) By leave, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Alright, then I have unanimous consent, I take it. There are a number of other members in the House who would like me to present -

On the Eastern Provincial Airways verbal question asked by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) some time ago, I table the answer to that question. And there was one other, I think, to do with Atlantic Place and the contract or something, and I am having that retrieved at the present moment.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the House is rapidly drawing to a close, Sir, and I have over thirty questions on the Order Paper, written questions that have not been answered. I would like to ask the Premier when I am going to get the answers to these questions, if I will get the answers before the House closes down, whether it is this Friday or next Friday?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, I do not think it is a point of order and it is a question that the hon. member for LaPoile should have more appropriately asked in Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER: I would rule with respect to the point of order that it is clear in the Standing Orders that a minister may, in his discretion, decline to answer any question. Obviously, this is not a point of order.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 3.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order 3, Concurrence motion, the

report of the Resource Committee.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, I do not

intend to take very much time in this particular debate nor in fact to be dealing with any of the specific items in it, but since I was inadvertently and unavoidably absent yesterday when this procedure began I feel that I ought to at this time say a word for the record with regard to this whole new process and with regard to some of the advantages as well as what I now come to see as some of the weaknesses in the system. And I say that because, as members will recall, when there was widespread agreement in this House to proceed with committees on estimates, I made the point most emphatically that we were proceeding, (a) on the basis of good faith and (b) on the basis of experimentation and that clearly there would be, over the process of the first phase of this new procedure, things which each side would discover and which we would wish to have changed at some point in the future. And it is in the context of that initial intervention of mine that I say these few words today on the particular report on concurrence which is before us.

On the matter of the committees themselves, I think it is not necessary for me at this stage to access or to go into the procedures other than to say that I believe, with the benefit of hindsight - and incidentally I am not in this context making any declarations or accusations. I think it was by, in a sense, mutual agreement that certain processes were followed - but there is no question that having three committees meeting simultaneously is probably not a very good process or a procedure to follow on a consistent or long-term basis. And therefore I would recommend and indeed hope, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriate officials of the House, including as well as the House Leaders, might want to have a look at that for future consideration. I think it also particularly important to note in the light of the fact that all hon. members, I have no doubt, are most anxious that the public get as much

MR. JAMIESON: information as possible and of course one of the difficulties when one has at least the three committees meeting simultaneously is the difficulty, which has been conveyed to members on all sides, of the media with regard to the reporting procedures. The second weakness, I think, is the one where it is probably being demonstrated by me right now, and that is that in effect the concurrence debates have really become in a sense an extension of the Budget Debate and I do not believe that that was what was in hon. members' minds. It certainly was not in my mind and I want to make it clear that while it may be strictly speaking and technically correct as we are now proceeding, and as we are proceeding by agreement with a certain number of hours and so on, that it does not give to hon. members the opportunity for that remaining period of time that we have in order to cross-examine, in a sense, and to have answers from Ministers of the Crown. I am not the learned gentleman that my own House Leader is or the Government House Leader is and so I will not argue the point as to whether or not it is technically correct for a concurrence motion seeking supply for Her Majesty to be moved by a non-minister, I am not sure about the technicality of that, or that the minister not in some way participate in the procedure. I am merely raising it now so that over the next short period of time these matters can be assessed and discussed. But I do think that what we have here is a clear indication of one of the shortcomings and the weaknesses of the system and I believe that there will be others, as I forecast at the outset, that it will become apparent to members we will want to change. For example, if we were in the old procedure these concurrence debates or their equivalent would require the responsible ministers to be in their places, would require that members have the opportunity to question. Now I repeat once again that we may not have utilized all of the time in committees and what I am saying here now is merely, I emphasize it clearly for the basis of putting it down and making no mistake

August 14, 1979

Tape No. 788

AH-3

MR. JAMIESON:

about the fact that we would like to have this looked at again. There will be heads which will be examined this afternoon, (a) in the absence of the minister- perhaps through no fault of his own, but clearly also what is happening

MR. JAMIESON: is of course that there is no responsibility on the minister to respond or to do anything other than to merely sit it out, as it were, and wait for the guillotine or the time lapse to come to an end. Now, I believe that this process would be much more beneficial, much more useful to members and to the people of Newfoundland in terms of giving them information, if we had a technique whereby, by no other means than by agreement, that ministers would be afforded a certain amount of time at the end, or in some form or other, in order to answer very real questions which (a) may have been brought up by members in committee and which they may not have had a satisfactory answer to and they wish to pursue the matter further in, if you like, Committee of the Whole or in front of the whole House; that is one part. The second thing we have to remember, I think, which is vital, by the way, if the committee system is going to function, is that not all members can attend all committees, particularly if there are three committees meeting simultaneously. Consequently there are inevitably, going to be members of this House, and maybe some on the government side as well, who want the opportunity during what has come to be described as the concurrence debate, to put questions directly to ministers and to get answers to those questions.

Now, what we have seen yesterday, as the new process evolved was that indeed - and I recall incidentally that the House Leader made the point some days ago that a member had lost his opportunity to speak to the budget debate, again through no fault of his own, but that he would speak in the concurrence debate - and so what we had, in a way, was a maiden speech, if you wish, made during a period when in fact we were supposed to be in this House concentrating upon specific heads and dealing with specific items of expenditure.

I therefore maintain, and I will watch this very closely, as I am sure all colleagues will over the next little while to see whether or not it is going to be possible for us to make

MR. JAMIESON: this portion of this exercise as effective as the majority of members, I think, believe that the initial portion was. But if that is going to work, then we must work out a system in some way or other where the responsible minister or ministers are in the House at the time of the concurrence debate, that it is being held in such a form that there is the opportunity to ask and to get answers. Because if that is not going to happen, then the likelihood is that all the time, whether in fact it makes sense or not, is likely to be taken up in the committees, and that, I submit, would also be an aberration on what was basically intended.

I say all of that by way of a continuing desire to see, first of all, the process refined and improved and, secondly, and most importantly, to ensure that the process does not lose credibility, and I think that that is terribly important, that if in the country as a whole it turns out that the public comes to regard, and some people have already described it as a rubber stamp kind of exercise, then it will be a very sad day for what was initially described as a reform. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, as my only comment on the process at the present time, I would hope that all hon. members, and particularly those who have had now experience with the committees, and perhaps even the House Leaders themselves, or indeed the Premier and myself, may at some stage be able before we move into the next session, or whatever the new process may be following this session, that we, in total objectivity, look at this exercise that we have had in the last three or four weeks, see what its strengths are, what its weaknesses are, so that above everything else we will emerge from this with a better system and one with which the people of Newfoundland are going to be satisfied. If we have a system, I repeat, in which there is a feeling abroad that in some way or other very large amounts of money are being granted

MR. JAMIESON: in a casual sort of way without adequate examination, and we all know that there is a certain resentment about rules which were established long before I and many others were in this House, limiting to seventy-five hours, but we must surely be able to demonstrate that those seventy-five hours, and the process, is totally open and that those members who want to ask questions do not simply face a potential stone wall in the interest, for instance, of trying to be co-operative. So I put those remarks on the record now and say that we for our part will continue to co-operate with the arrangements that the House Leader has worked out, but that we do insist that before this process begins again we have the opportunity to examine it very carefully and to ensure that, and I recall using these words at the time, that the spirit as well as the letter of what is implicit in this process, that the spirit as well as the letter of it are both sustained and carried through.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)

On a point of privilege, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

I apologize. I suddenly realize that perhaps I ought to have waited until the Chairman of the Committee had moved the Concurrence. I did not realize that that had not been done, I am sorry.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He already did.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

He had.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)

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

MR. H. BARRETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am quite honoured and pleased to be able to respond on behalf of the Resource Committee struck to review of the estimates and particularly to take note of some of the remarks that have been made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson). As I made notes during his speech, he has identified two basic weaknesses in the system, and I think that these can be easily identified as being the fact that the committees met simultaneously, and that the system was, indeed, an extension of the Budget Debate. I think that I probably have made reference to these and paraphrased it a great deal using greatly less verbiage than the hon. Leader of the Opposition. However, I think that the intention of this particular exercise was to permit an indepth analysis of the estimates.

I think that this, in fact, has been achieved. I do not think it makes a difference as to what form of system one could envisage to address itself to such an important subject as to the estimates of certain departments without incurring some form of failure or some aspect which does not meet with the approval of every person involved. From my own point, I might have liked to have attended a meeting of one of the other committees at a particular point in time; however, I would assume that if I were

MR. H. BARRETT: so inclined to make representation at each particular meeting, then I could have one of my colleagues address the specific questions to which I was seeking answers.

We must recognize the fact that we are unable to sit to review such estimates until the estimates have been brought down in the Budget debate. Once that has happened, there is, obviously, some time frame in which concurrence must be obtained. The people who drafted the outline or the guidelines for these particular committees at this point in time suggested that fifteen days or fifteen sitting days was adequate time. The Chairman of each of these committees met and we did look into a number of alternatives, Mr. Speaker, to try and have the committees meet in a non-concurrent fashion so that the problem that was eluded to by the hon. Leader of the Opposition might not have occurred.

I might say that the Chairmen of the committees were quite prepared to pursue scheduling that would have allowed the committees the timing so that they would not have met simultaneously. However, by agreement, without

Mr. Barrett: any pressure, there was a suggestion that the process be attempted to be sped up to allow the House to have the report of the various Committees in a shorter period of time. And with the full knowledge of all members of the House, a rescheduling process was done and Committees did in fact meet simultaneously.

However, I do not think that this in any way detracted from the information that was obtained. And I would like to suggest that some of the people who have been most vocal in their objections to the Committee system made it a point not to show up at any of the Committee meetings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: And it is very difficult for -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: - any person to make any assessment on the validity of any Committee or any system without having firsthand knowledge of what is going on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: And to be able to sit back and take shots at some people who made an honest effort to obtain the information from the department heads respecting items of vital interest to this Province is certainly not to my way of thinking a firm basis for making undue criticism of the system itself.

The Committee of which I was a part, sat in session for a total of twenty-seven hours, and this spanned ten separate sessions, in review of the estimates of six departments. There were eighteen members of this House of Assembly who attended our particular Committee meetings other than those who were members of the Committee.

I would have to acknowledge and thank the Vice-Chairman of this Committee, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: - who made every attempt to see that a proper procedure took place whereby the Opposition members were given every

Mr. Barrett: possible opportunity to explore fully those areas of the estimates that they wanted to explore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: And I think it was shown in Committee and reported adequately in the press whereby members of the Government side of the House had no hesitancy in asking pointed, direct questions that might, in some quarters, be construed as embarrassing questions to the ministers.

AN HON. MEMBER: The proper thing.

MR. BARRETT: And they obtained, in all respects, full co-operation from the ministers of the various departments, full disclosures as was required, no tendency to hold back, and if all of the items were not covered it was possibly because of the failure of some members to address themselves to questions rather than to try and state a point of view or a philosophy on a particular item.

I might mention that this Committee, as the other two, shared facilities in the old Legislative Assembly Room of the Colonial Building, in the Collective Bargaining Room on the Third Floor of this Building, and in the Department of Health Board Room on the lower floor. It was not our intention initially to use the third location and I would have to state that it was far from being satisfactory. However, the other two locations certainly were adequate, but I think that the location deemed most appropriate by far was that of the Colonial Building.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: I think, and I think this view is shared by most other people attending these sessions, that every effort should be taken to have this historical occasion again restored to its original condition and used as a permanent facility for use by Standing and Special Committees of this House.

August 14, 1979

Tape 791

Pk - 3

MR. BARRETT:

I would like to review, briefly, some of the areas that were considered by the Resource Committee.

MR. BARRETT: These included the Department of Mines and Energy, where quite a bit of discussion centered around the Buchans situation on the discontinuance of the present mine as we know it, on the results of recent assessments to the Tulk's belt deposits and the genuine concern of all members of the plight of the people that are resident of that area.

I think we all shared the sentiments of the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) when he made every effort to bring to everybody's attention the need to take quick remedial action if at all possible.

This important department also received a great deal of consideration as it related to Newfoundland Hydro. A great deal of discussion centered around the Lower Churchill development and the Upper Salmon development. A lot of discussion and questions were also asked as it relates to offshore jurisdiction.

In Forestry, Resources and Lands, items covered included the spray programme, the forest management programme as it relates to Crown lands, and as it relates in particular to lands held by the major paper companies.

We also touched on, in some detail, the forest access roads, their construction, their usage, and who should exercise control.

Forest fire protection was covered as it related to facilities, adequacy of personnel, and the future direction of the department in that very critical area.

The procedures presently being put into place with respect to Crown lands, grant and lease programmes, were also covered in some detail.

The Department of Tourism, Recreation and Culture covers such areas as the advertising programme for tourist development. And changes, very constructive suggestions came out of the Committee as to the direction of this advertising programme, where different emphases could be placed whereby a better return on the investment in that direction, should be obtained.

MR. BARRETT: Information was obtained concerning the policy on new facility construction, where these facilities should go, the private sector involvement in our tourist resource, and, not the least of which to mention, the future role of the vessel the Norma and Gladys.

Details were obtained regarding the continuing parks programme, their upgrading and expansion, the need for additional facilities, the need to recognize the different needs of the Newfoundland people, the need to restate the emphasis that these parks are for the enjoyment of Newfoundland's people, and not necessarily to respond to the needs of tourists from outside this Province, the fact that these needs differ as it relates to campers or trailers. We reviewed the new park facility at Salmonier, the Wildlife Park, and the impact that it is having on our tourist development.

A great deal of questioning also surrounded the control of licences for big game hunters and which direction this should take in the future.

The recreational sports programme grants, assistances, various community facilities, capital expenditures and the role of the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission were also reviewed.

The Department of Fisheries received a great deal of time as it related to obtaining information on the various types of vessel and equipment experimentation which is going on, the various research thrusts

MR. BARRETT: into technology, the inshore programme and the assistance programme, the need for better attention or more attention to the marketing of the product and product development, obtaining information on the department's direction as it relates to the existing marine haulout facilities, additional expenses related to further construction, further locations where these were to be located, how they were responding to the needs of the fishermen, whether or not the revenues derived from these facilities were sufficient, primary involvement in the government's direction on establishment of a primary landing facility in Harbour Grace and a refrigeration facility policy as it relates to other locations, the availability and the need for further funding for new vessel construction, quite a bit of discussion as it relates to the cost comparison of the construction of vessels as it relates to similar costs incurred in other provinces. Information was given in this regard to the effect, basically, that the construction aspects of vessels in Newfoundland are of a much higher standard than those available in other provinces.

In Industrial Development, such areas as Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, NORDCO, Regional Economic Councils, and, in particular, the Marystown Shipyard, received a great deal of attention. A lot of information was sought and given as it related to the deficit which was incurred in that shipyard, the necessity for government to have full awareness of the financial position of this and other Crown corporations - and in all probability, a lot of this might have been due to the lack of response of the board of directors in reporting to the various ministers. There was some suggestion that it might be appropriate that senior civil servants not be made members of these boards of directors.

Under Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the Loan programme was fully pursued, as was the Labrador Development programme, the Depot programme, Community Development, Arts and Crafts, Water and Sewer, Native Associations, Agricultural Production, Land Development, and so on.

MR. BARRETT: I think there is no need to say further, that in all aspects, the subheads reviewed by this Committee were given a thorough and complete review -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: - that I do not think otherwise could have been achieved, certainly not under the present facilities of this House. So I would have to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Committee system was, indeed, a very worthwhile system -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: - and I highly commend it in its continuance. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks in the Concurrence Debate on the Resource Committee, as Vice-Chairman of the Committee representing members on this side of the House, I want to begin my remarks by saying that I think those of us who served as members of that Committee and those of us in the Opposition who served on all the Committees would agree, basically, to a man that what we saw in the Committee system was the kind of examination that the Estimates of the various departments of government was the best time, as far as I am concerned, that those Estimates were ever reviewed since I have been in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now that is not to say, Sir, that there is not room for improvements. I think the Leader of the Opposition expressed a number of concerns that we have observed

MR. T. RIDEOUT: over the last number of days and I think that we ought to be big enough, those of us on both side of the House, ought to be big enough to do something about it. Personally, I think that the concurrence debates, as we see them here yesterday and today, would serve a much better purpose, a much more useful purpose, if they would take place in Committee of the Whole, where ministers would get a chance, an equal chance - ten minutes interchange - would get an equal chance to respond to the new points that we would bring up in those debates. I think that that is an excellent suggestion and I think that both sides of the House, politics aside, ought to be big enough to accommodate that kind of change in the rules for another session. And, of course, it was a new thing, a learning experience for all of us, but I have no hesitation in saying whatsoever that I think the committee system for the first time - it was the first time for all of us - I think it worked well, I think the intention of examining the estimates was done well, done diligently by all members on all committees and, speaking for our own, I was quite satisfied with it.

Now, I also want to take the opportunity to publicly compliment the Chairman of this Resource Committee. I think we found him fair and reasonable in all of his deliberations and I do not believe there is any of us on the committee who could have left when the committees were over with any rancor or any feeling that our rights were abrogated by or degraded from by any actions of the Chairman. I want to go on record as saying that. You know, we can put politics aside for a little while and I think that the government, the Premier, ought to be complimented for introducing the committee system for the first time, in a real sense, in this Legislature. And I would like to see it extended, I would like to see, for example, the Resource Committee become a Standing Committee of this House, a committee that would examine proposed legislation.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: in the resource area, for example, a committee that would be able to call witnesses and really delve into any resource legislation brought before this Legislature. And that, I do not think, Sir, is taking away anything from the workings or from the beauty of this Legislature but, I would submit to Your Honour, that it is exactly the opposite. It is enhancing and helping us as legislators, as scrutineers of the public purse, helping us to do our job much better and I think that that is the whole essence of the committee system and in that respect I was delighted with it and I only hope that we can be big enough, men enough, to sort of modify the system, refine it as we go along. It did not work perfectly but I think it was a good start and I would think that we could build on that start and hopefully let it run more smoothly, more effectively in the sessions to come.

Now, having said that, Sir, I want to say also that in large part I think the ministers were very co-operative with the committees and so the ministers should be co-operative with the committees. The ministers ought to come before those committees basically as humble people looking for the right to spend the amount of money that they are looking for. And most of the ministers, I think, came with a co-operative spirit. I mean, the fact that we have information from two or three ministers being circulated around today, information that I never saw before, information that the committee asked for, I think is an indication that the committee system worked and that we certainly found more information about what is happening in government than we have ever had an opportunity to see before when, in essence, all we have ever done was debate the whole department under the ministers' salary. So, I think from that respect also the ministers must co-operate with the committee; in large measure they did this particular time. There was only one exception and that led to a few bitter exchanges one particular night but I believe the minister in question, having slept on it for a few hours, came back the next day in a little bit finer form and was

MR. T. RIDEOUT: more forthcoming with information than he had started off to be the night before. So, I am quite happy with the way it turned out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to confine most of my remarks this afternoon to the energy policy, the Hydro policy of the administration. Some of my other colleagues who were on the committee will talk about fisheries, they will talk about lands and forest, and they will talk about all the other things, I hope, that time permits that came up in the committee and are still left outstanding. But I want to take a few minutes to talk about my particular shadow or responsibility as it related to committee, because I was not satisfied as a member of the committee with the kind of information that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) in particular provided to our committee.

Mr. Rideout: the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), in particular, provided to our Committee. Now I am sorry that I had to say this when the hon. gentleman is not in his seat but, Mr. Speaker, I have no control over when the Orders of the Day, the particular Order of the Day is going to be called. And I have one opportunity to say what I have to say and that is today, I will have no other opportunity to speak in the Resource Concurrence Debate because it will be over some time this evening. So the minister is not here, but I know he will be able to read Hansard, and I am sure he will find out what I had to say, and hopefully do something about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, the minister made very light the other day when speaking on the LCDC Bill of the fact that, you know, the critic for the Opposition on energy did not even know where Gull Island was versus Muskrat Falls. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will admit, having read Hansard myself that it was a very poorly constructed question, but to stoop to the lowness in debate to suggest that somebody does not even know where it is at, then it is a new low; it is certainly something that I have not experienced in this House in the four or five years I have been here. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, for the record, that that is immaterial anyway. Whether I knew or whether I did not is immaterial because what is important is the cost, and that is the point I was trying to make, whether there is a change in government policy and what is the cost to this Province of the particular energy policy that this administration has pursued since 1972.

Now in 1978 - well, let me start it another way. The minister started to play a numbers game with me the other day. He started to play a real numbers game - and the House; not only me but the House. He tried to get us all confused as far as numbers went when it came to looking at the Lower Churchill development. Now, Mr. Speaker, two people can play that game; the numbers game can be played

Mr. Rideout: by both sides. The minister told the House on Friday that \$68 million had been spent in 1975 on the Gull Island project. I have checked Hansard, and I have checked the news clippings, and he told us that \$68 million had been spent. And he told us that that investment was now worth \$77 million. These were the figures that he gave us.

Now I ought to analysis that for a second or two. Let us go to the Budget Speech of 1978, The Budget Speech of 1978, the Minister of Finance at that time - I believe it is on page eight of the Budget - told us what the Province had invested in the Lower Churchill development up to that particular point in time. And he said on page eight, in his Budget delivered on March 17, 1978, "that in the Labrador section our Province the major hope is for a construction start on the Gull Island project in early 1979. The targarted date for delivery of power to the Island is early 1985," which I would suggest is somewhat off the track right now, "and the construction work on the project will generate 10,000 man-years of employment with about 3,000 men being employed at the peak of construction."

Then he goes on to making the revealing thing, "The Province of Newfoundland has already expended great effort and indeed invested \$110 million in this critically important project." March 17, 1978, the Minister of Finance, in his Budget addressed to this House, tells us that as of that date the Province of Newfoundland had invested \$110 million in the Lower Churchill project,

The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) representing that particular facet of our development now tells us one thing, the Minister of Finance in March, 1978 tells us one thing. And, Mr. Speaker, the important thing for us all to remember is not a question of who is right or wrong - that is immaterial - the important thing for us all to remember is that the difference, the difference between those two versions is almost staggering, practically

Mr. Rideout: staggering. The former Minister of Finance told us that it was \$110 million. The present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) says it was \$68 million. That is a staggering difference of \$42 million. Any simple-minded person can subtract \$68 million from \$110 million and know there is a \$42 million difference. That is not nickel and dime stuff.

What happened to the \$42 million? That is the real question. That is what we are trying to find out, that is what the Committee was trying to find out, that is what we have been trying to find out in this House in Question Period: Where was it spent? How was it spent? What was it spent for?

Now let me look at it from another angle. The Minister of Mines and Energy tells us that \$68 million is now worth \$77 million. The original investment, he says, is now worth \$77 million. That is a difference of \$33 million when compared

MR. T. RIDEOUT: With the figures given us a year ago by the former Minister of Finance. So if they are going to play a numbers game we deserve to have some answers because we are talking again, Sir, about very staggering amounts of money. Now what set of figures - this is the real question - what set of figures is correct? I think that in this debate—and again it is too bad the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is not here, but he has colleagues who can speak for him - the government should come clean, They should come clean once and for all on the Gull Island project. Was Mr. Hickman right when he said it had cost us \$110 million? That is word for word in his Budget Speech a year ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: Approximately.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: No approximately! The Province has invested, to the point he delivered his Budget Speech he said, \$110 million. Is he right? Is the Minister of Mines and Energy right when he says that the current assets of that project are \$77 million? Is he right? If he is right and if his former colleague is right, somewhere along the line we have lost \$33 million. That is the crucial question. Now what about the depreciation of the physical assets? No, the minister would not touch that with a barge pole in committee. Now I am no accountant, Sir, but I understand that on those kinds of things there is such a thing as depreciation of those physical assets - depreciation of the physical assets and there is appreciation of a number of the other assets. So if the Stephenville lawyer would listen, Mr. Speaker, he might learn something. So I am suggesting to the House that there is a nigger in the woodpile here somewhere.

We have never received any answers to those questions, and the fact of the matter is, Sir, that the Bechtel Report, which the minister gave us here a few days ago, which was done and presented to government in October 1978, not quite a year ago, the Bechtel report gives a different set of figures altogether

MR. T. RIDEOUT: So we have got the figures of the former Minister of Finance, \$110 million, we have got the figures of the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry), \$68 million he said, which is now worth \$77 million, and on top of that we have got the figures of the Bechtel Report which was done in October 1978. And they tell us, they tell us in Table 73-which any member can have a look at, it was tabled here in the House - they tell us that as of October 31st 1978, not quite a year, almost a year ago, \$86 million was piled up in assets in the Lower Churchill Development project, \$86 million was the current assets of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. And they tell us that the current value of those assets is \$80 million. As of August 31st a year ago there was \$86 million spent and that \$80 million was still a real asset. Now that figure, they say, includes interest of almost \$18.75 million, \$18,653,000 as a matter of fact. That figure includes \$18.75 million of interest. And they also go on to tell us that \$3.5 million of that was interest during the construction period and that \$15.5 million was interest built up since the project was suspended back a couple of years ago, back in the Fall of 1975.

So here we are, Mr. Speaker, We have three very divergent sources of information on exactly what has gone on to this point in time. We have a Minister of Mines and Energy who will not even look at it, who sort of gets his dander up because somebody got the gall to ask those kind of questions, who even questions whether you have got the ability to ask those kind of questions - that is where we are. We have three divergent sources of information on what has taken place on the Lower Churchill Development up to this point in time. We have got the former Minister of Finance (Mr. Hickman) who told us March 17th, 1978 that it had cost us \$110 million. We have got the present Minister of Mines and Energy who told us in Committee, and told us in this House, that it had cost us \$68 million but it was now worth

August 14, 1979

Tape No. 796

SD - 3

MR. T. RIDEOUT: \$77 million; and we have got the Bechtel Report who told us October 1978--after the March 31st Budget had been presented to this House, by the way, it is interesting to note--that we had invested \$86 million and that \$80 million of it was current in assets. Now, that is the

MR. RIDEOUT: three widely ranging positions that we have on the Lower Churchill Development at this particular point in time. And, Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to know, before this debate is finished, exactly where we are. What is the true story? Now, having pointed that out, I want to say to the House, here is what is absolutely crystal clear. There can be no argument from either side of the House on this particular point. In 1977, the Newfoundland Government made a loan of \$78.3 million to Gull Island Power Company, which was a wholly-owned subsidiary, by the way, of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. In 1977, in two instalments, March and June, the Government of this Province loaned that company \$78.3 million - money, by the way, that we had borrowed on the bond markets a year or so before that, on which, I understand, we paid 10 per cent interest. But in 1977 we finally loaned that money to the Gull Island Power Company.

Since that, there have been three fiscal years go by - we had 1977, 1978 and now we are into 1979 - and we are paying to the bond markets where we borrowed that money, Mr. Speaker, almost \$8 million a year in interest. In fact, 10 per cent - \$7.8 million - we are paying almost \$8 million a year in interest on the original Gull Island loan. So, in fact, over the past three years we have spent \$24 million, about \$8 million a year, on servicing that debt. Now if we add last year's interest on to what Mr. Hickman told us - he told us it was \$110 million as of March 17th last year - if we add last year's interest on to that it is now \$118 million. And the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), Mr. Speaker, becomes the \$118 million man, because he was the one who made the whole premature decision back in 1975 to set off what I have often referred to as 'the gunpowder plot' on both sides of the Strait.

Now, that is crystal clear. We borrowed that money - the Province is on the hook for it.

And the other thing that is crystal clear is that the only money in play in all this sad story is money advanced to Gull Island Power Company by the people of this Province. That is the only

MR. RIDEOUT: money that has been in play in that project up to this particular point in time. Now we may eventually get some of it or all of it back - I hope we do. I have no hesitation about saying that at all. But, Mr. Speaker, the terms of the Gull Island loan, the terms of the loan that this Province negotiated when we turned over the \$78.3 million to Gull Island Power Company, says specifically in the terms of the loan that if the project is not reactivated by 1980, the loan will be forgiven. If the project is not reactivated by 1980, the \$78.3 million that this Province gave the Gull Island Power Company will be forgiven, and that is contained in the latest report of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Any member who wishes to have a look at it, it is public knowledge. That is what the terms of the loan say. Does anyone know in certainty whether the project will go ahead by 1980 or not? I will say this to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the minister was very vague when he was before the Committee. He suggested there was some reasonable doubt as to whether it would go ahead. He suggested it was not very probable that it would go ahead before the end of 1980. Therefore, under the terms of that loan, it will be forgiven. That is what the terms of the loan say. As a citizen of this Province, a shareholder, Mr. Speaker, my money and the money of everybody else in this Province, made under the terms of that loan to Gull Island Power Company, can be forgiven. And in view of the study and reassessment that is going on now under the Lower Churchill Development Corporation - and let us not kid ourselves, that is what it is at this particular point in time, a study and a reassessment to make further recommendations; we do not know when they are going to report - every taxpayer in this Province stands to lose \$78.3 million, because the terms of the loan are such that if the project is not reactivated by 1980 then the loan to Gull Island Power Company can be forgiven. And we, the people of this Province, will therefore continue, if the loan is forgiven, to pay almost \$8 million a year in interest for God knows how long. I do not know what the terms of the loan are. Probably for all of my lifetime we will continue to pay that \$8 million. And that is not all. At this moment,

MR. RIDEOUT: the Gull Island Power Company, Mr. Speaker, has no money. The Gull Island Power Company has no income, so Newfoundland Hydro pays the interest on the Gull Island loan for the Gull Island Power Company to the Government of Newfoundland. Now, I hope that is not lost on members of this House. Gull Island Power Company has no income whatsoever. About \$8 million must come out of the general revenue of Hydro to pay the interest on the loan that its wholly owned subsidiary owes to the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, that is equivalent to Term 29, and we have had members on the other side of the House talk about renegotiating Term 29. That is exactly what that is equivalent to. The people of this Province own Newfoundland Hydro, we own the largest share of Newfoundland Hydro. If that company were earning money, it would be turning money over to the people of this Province. Now here is what it has to do now under this particular set of circumstances: Now it must take \$8 million a year from its earnings to pay the interest for its subsidiary on the Gull Island loan. That is indirectly coming out of my pocket and every other taxpayer in this Province, because Newfoundland Hydro has to take that out of their operating expenses. It is our company, our money is used. What is happening, Mr. Speaker, to put it in a nutshell, our money is used to pay interest on the money we borrowed to give those people in the first place. Now, there is no other way to look at it. It is an \$8 million annual operating expense that Hydro would not otherwise have to wrestle with. It is an \$8 million annual operating expense that Hydro otherwise would not have to find were the premature blunder of 1975 not committed. It is an \$8 million annual debt that Hydro would not otherwise have to grapple with in reaching and maintaining its desired equity ratio of 1.2. I do not know if anybody read the document that they presented to the Public Utilities Board a few days ago, but they say—and they must by law, by the way, through an act passed in this legislature

MR. RIDEOUT: couple of years ago - strive to maintain a debt equity ratio of 1.2, and that \$8 million that they must pay in interest certainly has a very drastic effect on that. Looking at it in another light, Mr. Speaker, it is an \$8 million annual debt that must be considered and it is part of the reason that Hydro is currently before the Public Utilities Board seeking rate increases so as to achieve that debt equity ratio of 1.2. In that light, every consumer of electricity in this Province is paying through the pocket for the 1975 blunder that was created by the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). We are almost shellshocked! If you come to sit down and look at the figures, Your Honour, it is almost enough to shellshock you when you see what has happened to us in this particular deal. To put it in a nutshell, we are on the back of \$78.3 million loan, and that is the only money that came into play in the whole fiasco, the thing that went on. We are on the back of a \$78.3 million loan. The terms of the loan say that if the project is not reactivated by 1980, the loan will be forgiven, and, on top of that, the interest that Newfoundland Hydro currently pays government on the loan has a decided negative effect on its debt equity ratio. Now, that is where we are. Those three things are very important. We are on the back of the loan. In the beginning, yes, we borrowed it and let them have it. If the project does not fly by 1980, the terms of the loan say it can be forgiven; and on top of that, the \$8 million a year that Hydro pays us as interest on that loan has a very negative effect on its debt equity ratio which forces it, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to the House, to have to go to the P.U.B. more often for more substantial increases than it otherwise would have to do. Now, that is the true picture as I see it, having researched it over the last number of days, and that is why I am upset we did not get answers to those questions in Committee. That is the legacy of the \$110 million man, who, this year, is the

MR. RIDEOUT: \$118 million man who, next year, will be the \$124 million man. It goes up \$8 million every year. That is the fruit of the 1975 gunpowder plot that was perpetrated on the people of this Province, and that is where we are five years later and that, Mr. Speaker, I would submit, is a shameful set of facts that the minister and the government are responsible for. Now, hopefully in the end, down the road, I hope that the people will come out okay. I think it deserves a thorough accounting. I do not believe that there is any room for ifs, ands, buts and ors. If there is any issue, if there was any

MR. RIDEOUT: issue before the Resource Committee where there is no room for ifs, ands, buts or ors, it is this one because it has cost the Province dearly, it is going to continue to cost the Province dearly, and I would hope that somebody speaking for the administration will get up and tell us the cold, hard facts of this situation. If they can refute what I have said, fine, but I hope they will tell us the cold, hard facts, because we ought to know. The facts have been long overdue. The facts are not out yet and there was no evidence of them coming out in the Committee. Mr. Speaker, I think we have a right to know what has happened, what has taken place and why we are now fooling around, monkeying around with three particular sets of figures and we cannot really get a grasp of what has happened in the four or five years previous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: It is even worse than that, Mr. Speaker.

The situation outlined by my colleague is even worse, ten times worse than my colleague indicated. We know nothing at all about what is involved in the interest and the money borrowed to nationalize the Churchill Falls Corporation. We have not been able to get accurate figures on that situation. I understand now it is well up over \$200 million, that the interest alone on that blunder, that colossal blunder of nationalizing the Churchill Falls Corporation is costing the taxpayers of this Province - the interest - anywhere between \$20 million to \$30 million a year. That is not to be sneezed at, that colossal blunder. That is why, Mr. Speaker - my hon. friend just gave one of the reasons why - Newfoundland Hydro is asking for an increase in electricity rates. It is not because of the increase in oil, although that may be part of the reason. The other part of the reason is the blundering of this government, the reason why the consumers of electricity in this Province have to pay through the nose for their electricity rates. The \$110 million that was thrown away on setting off these two firecrackers on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle is

MR. NEARY: one of the reasons why the Newfoundland consumer has to pay more for his electricity. And the other thing is the colossal blunder made in nationalizing the Churchill Falls Corporation. Taking it over, I think the government had to borrow \$165 million. They had to pay interest on the interim financing at the bank. And the interest now, Sir, runs, I would say, in the vicinity - it is probably closer to \$30 million than it is to \$20. But for heavens sake, will the minister get up and tell us what it is? And is the money to take care of the interest on this \$200 million coming from Newfoundland Hydro or is it coming directly out of the Public Treasury? We would like to have answers to these questions, Sir.

And, you know, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I fired out a series of eighteen or twenty questions to ministers. Just to show you, Mr. Speaker, how clever the government are, how skillfully they have silenced the Opposition in this House in their clever way, and they are now getting a free ride, we cannot cross-examine ministers in even the seventy-five hours that we had.

AN HON. MEMBER: Of course you can.

MR. NEARY: No, we cannot, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: You would not go to any Committee meetings.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we were elected to serve in this House, Sir, and not in the board rooms of Mr. Crosbie's buildings or Mr. Dobbin's buildings.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: We were elected to this House.

MR. MORGAN: You boycotted (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, it does not make any difference if I went to the Committee meetings, if I were on the Committee, if I boycotted them or not, I still maintain that as an elected representative of the people of this Province it is the right of every member in this House, on the floor of this Chamber, to cross-examine ministers and to ask questions when we are doing the Estimates.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) a great buddy of one of your colleagues over there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let the word go out to the people of this Province that we can ask questions in the half hour we have now when they are moving the concurrence of these Committees, we can ask questions with no hope at all of getting any answers, none at all, Sir. You cannot cross-examine ministers.

MR. J. CARTER: Why did you not come to the Committee meetings?

MR. NEARY: In the first place, I was not on a Committee, and in the second place, I had other far more important things to do than to waste my time. My job is to protect the Public Treasury right here on the floor of this House.

MR. MORGAN: You are no more than anybody else, no more than all your colleagues.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. Maybe one day every member who is now sitting in this House may come to the sudden realization that they were elected to serve in this House and not in the tunnels and the dungeons of Confederation Building. If these Committees, Mr. Speaker, could meet year round with unlimited time, then I would say they could serve a very good purpose. But look what is happening now, Sir. Look what is happening in the rush

MR. NEARY: to get the House closed in the middle of Summer.

MR. J. CARTER: It is a lie.

MR. NEARY: What is it?

MR. J. CARTER: Lies.

MR. NEARY: Lies? This is lies?

Mr. Speaker, in the rush to get the House closed the Committees wound up their affairs in very short order and now we are here in the House and we cannot get answers to questions. We can put the questions, half an hour we have, we can put a lot of questions in a half hour. We are not in Committee of the Whole. Your Honour is sitting in the Chair. All we can do is debate, as if it was a Budget debate, a Throne Speech debate or any ordinary debate in the House. No way! And the Leader of the Opposition was right when he raised this matter earlier this afternoon. I would have made it more forceful. It is dictatorial, it is arbitrary, it is meant to muzzle the Opposition.

MR. MORGAN: Do all your colleagues agree with you?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I happen to have an opinion, and whether -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman agrees with me, whether the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) agrees with me, I happen to have an opinion, and I am going to express it. I am going to express it, and that is my right in this House. Well, I have not said it strong enough yet. This is very cleverly, very cleverly designed to muzzle the Opposition, to restrict debate in this House, to eliminate the opportunity for members to control the power of the purse, of the public spending. I can stand here now, we have six hours. At six o'clock this evening I can fire out all the questions I like, from now to six o'clock, which will

MR. NEARY: have used up one and a half hours of Committee time. We have six we can debate in this House. I can ask the questions once and will not get an answer, at six o'clock, bang, she is gone through, she is gone through.

MR. MORGAN: Ask a question of me and let me answer it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I asked -

MR. MORGAN: How many questions do you want answered?

MR. NEARY: - I asked 18 or 20 very important questions yesterday that were not asked in Committee, not asked in Committee, and one of the members on the government side, stalling for time, got up and made his maiden speech as if he was speaking in the Throne Speech, the member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe). Now, that is getting information, that is getting answers! And the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) got up and made a fool of himself as usual, as he usually does every day.

MR. STAGG: I was good yesterday.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. gentleman was good. The hon. gentleman is not a minister; we were asking questions of ministers. The Chairman of the Committee today spoke, oh, he enunciated philosophy and policy as if he was a minister. What a misuse of power, Sir! What a misuse of power, what an abuse of power, telling us all about all the wonderful things the government is going to do, as if he was a minister.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: So, I say, Sir, it is a waste of time right now. It is a waste of time and all we are doing is rubber-stamping, rubberstamping. I thought for sure when we came back into the House that we would be able to cross-examine ministers the same as we did in Committee of the Whole. Now our 75 hours is further eroded, further eroded, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the laughing hyena down there thinks it is funny, very funny. Democracy, I would say, democracy is in pretty bad shape. Democracy is in pretty bad shape in this Province. After yesterday's performance by the hon. gentleman, Sir, and I hope hon. members' Hansard will record that the little snide remarks and the innuendoes started yesterday with the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the President of the Council, and the day before with the President of the Council and yesterday with the President of the Council, and hon. gentlemen will remember talking about Mr. John C. Doyle, the hon. gentlemen had to have a flick at me about that, so I hope hon. members will remember who started this, who started it.

MR. MORGAN: They say he takes himself seriously.

MR. NEARY: Now, there we are, Mr. Speaker, here we have it again now. Well, if hon. gentlemen want to get down and roll in the mud, I will get down and roll with them.

MR. MORGAN: He takes himself too seriously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: College law (inaudible) saying anyway.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying, Sir, is this, what I am saying is this is a farce. I believe in committees. I think we should have reform. I think the committees should meet year-round. There should be no restrictions placed on the committees. I think we should go through the estimates here in the House, cross-examine ministers and let the committees go off and hold their meetings and do as they please, but the business of the House should stay in this House, and my hon. friend knows what I am talking about. I have checked with all the constitutional people I can, who I can reach on the face of this earth so far, and I am told

MR. NEARY:

it is the only jurisdiction where you cannot cross-examine ministers during the debate on the estimates and that is what we are debating,

MR. HICKEY: Yes, you can.

MR. NEARY: No, you cannot, Sir.

MR. HICKEY: In the Committee,

MR. NEARY: In the House I am talking about, where the business has to be done.

MR. STAGG: In Committee you can.

MR. NEARY: Yesterday, I put eighteen or twenty questions to ministers and at six o'clock, bang, the reports went through and I never got one answer from one minister.

Now, Sir, I am going to put another question to the Premier as a result of an answer he gave me today to a question that I asked him some time ago in connection with Eastern Provincial Airways.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Question Period is over.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the Question Period is over, Mr. Speaker. How could you be so ignorant? How could one be so ignorant of the parliamentary process? How could Crosbie's representative in the House be so ignorant of the parliamentary process, the British Parliamentary system where you ask questions in the House and you try to get information from ministers in the House? That is where the business is done. But anyway I am going to talk about the hon. gentleman's boss now and perhaps the hon. gentleman knows what I am coming to and that is why he is making his snide remarks.

MR. MORGAN: Another vicious attack, I suppose. Another attack on a personality.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, this will not be a vicious attack. This will be factual. I have in front of me the total file from the Ontario and Quebec Securities Commission in connection with the EPA transfer.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) out of the House again (inaudible).
out of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have silence, please? I am fed up with the beer baron from Bonavista.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Your Honour. I had to ask Your Honour for the protection of the Chair. This is a very significant item, Sir, and more significant than members realize. I asked the hon. the Premier one day to tell me about the EPA transfers and if the government had any involvement, and the hon. the Premier, the hon. minister who is now sitting there and the hon. minister to his left, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett), the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and all the other ministers who were in the previous administration, were in on this. They were all in on it. They all participated in the decision.

MR. HICKEY:

On what?

MR. NEARY:

On the EPA deal. The transfer of ownership of EPA had to be approved by the Cabinet.

MR. STAGG:

A fly-by-night. A fly-by-night.

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. STAGG:

A fly-by-night.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should know after being Deputy Speaker of this House that he has to go to his own seat. Mr. Speaker, all the snide remarks and all the sarcasm and all the smear tactics and all the character assassinations from the other side of the House is not going to stop me. I am going to say what I have to say and I am going to ask the questions that have to be asked on behalf of the people of this Province. If they want to use their smear tactics and their character assassinations that they learned from Mr. Moores and Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Hickman, well let them go ahead. But the people in the gallery who are listening to me right now, I want to tell them that \$6 million of their dollars, tax dollars that were given to EPA on a guarantee from this government, were not protected in October of last year when the government met in Cabinet in the Eighth Floor of this building and allowed the ownership of EPA to be transferred from Mr. Andrew Crosbie to Mr. Harry Steele.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, in the last paragraph of the answer that I got from the Premier today here is what he said, "Earlier", he said, "in 1978, Eastern Provincial Airways sold one of its Boeing 737's. The proceeds - listen to this, Mr. Speaker - the proceeds from the sale were used in part to retire the debt secured by the plane and in part to improve the financial position of EPA." Would hon. gentlemen who sat in the Cabinet say that that is a fair statement? It came right from the Order in Council, the directive from the Cabinet, that is where that quote came from. Would hon. gentlemen say that that is what happened to the sale of that Boeing 737?

Well, I will tell hon. gentlemen, just to show you how deceiving this statement is - first of all, Sir, let me say that the government extended its guarantee of \$6 million to EPA. That was one of the things they did, the \$6 million long term debt. They extended the term of it from the end of 1978 to the end of 1981.

MR. NEARY:

And here is what they said when they did it: "Terms and conditions attached to this guarantee will insure that E.P.A. remains a strong Newfoundland based company and that substantially all of its administrations, accounting and maintenance endeavours will occur within this Province." Well, that is wishful thinking, when they already had allowed 90 per cent of the operation to be moved over to Halifax, when they allowed that training centre to be built in Halifax.

MR. ROBERTS:

It might have all gone if Newfoundlanders had not got wise to it.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, 90 per cent of it is gone now. They only have a skeleton crew as far as the air crew is concerned in this Province.

MR. HICKEY:

Have we not got (inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

But anyway, I am not going to deal with it. I dealt with that before in the House. But what I want to deal with is the statement made in the Cabinet directive, "The proceeds from the sale were used in part to retire the debt secured by the 'plane, and in part to improve the financial position of E.P.A." My interpretation of that, Mr. Speaker, is that they obviously had some debts incurred in connection with that aircraft that they paid off, or partly paid off, and they used the balance of the profit made on the sale of that 'plane to improve the position of E.P.A. What garbage! What hogwash! What a gigantic bluff! This is anything but true, Mr. Speaker. Do hon. members know what they did? E.P.A. paid themselves a big dividend - that is what they did! And how do I know that? I got it from the records of the Ontario Securities Commission. Listen to what they say here.

MR. MORGAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

I know it is a new procedure in the House in dealing with the reports of the various Committees it is the first time doing it in the House, but the hon. gentleman is now involved

MR. MORGAN: in a debate supposedly involving the report of the Committee on Resources. Yesterday the House dealt with the report on Government Services which dealt with Transportation. I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, the relevancy of the E.P.A. as an airline involving the Resource report from the Committee dealing with Resources. It should have been dealt with yesterday when we dealt with the Government Services report dealing with Transportation.

MR. NEARY: We are dealing with Industrial Development, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) With respect to the point of order, it is very difficult at times to rule on the matter of relevancy and the reference books will indicate that the hon. member speaking will get the benefit. I would remind the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that perhaps he is treading on the area of irrelevancy, but at the same time, I would caution him to keep his remarks pertaining to the matters that we are now discussing under the Resource Committee.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. We are discussing, Sir, I presume, Industrial Development, of which under this head comes E.P.A. in case the hon. gentleman is not bright enough to comprehend what I am talking about.

Listen to this, Sir. Here is what the Ontario Securities Commission said: "Results for 1978 include gain on a sale of a Boeing 737 aircraft of \$2.317 million." In other words, they made a profit off the sale of that aircraft after taxes - or, they say, \$1.91 per share.

Now, here is the letter they wrote in connection with it: "We confirm the following sent to you." This is to the Montreal Stock Exchange. "The board of directors of Eastern Provincial Airways Limited has today declared a dividend of \$1.80 per Series A shares, being the dividend and arrears on its Series A preferred shares to October 1, 1978, together with all arrears of dividends on its Series B preferred shares. It has also declared a special dividend of ninety cents." Now what bearing did that have on improving the position of E.P.A.? It might have improved the financial position of Mr. Andrew Crosbie.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is the date (inaudible).

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) attack Andrew Crosbie.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman asked me for the date. The date is very significant also, by the way, November 22, 1978, and if the hon. minister will recall, I said in this House some time ago, from November 16th to November 22nd a number of very significant decisions were made down on the 8th Floor of this building. One was the Abitibi takeover - November 16th, 1978 - and the other one was the rental of office space from Andrew Crosbie in that white elephant building he had downtown, November 22nd, and now

MR. S. NEARY:

we have the transfer of EPA on November 22nd.

MR. HICKEY:

What is the hon. gentleman charging?

MR. S. NEARY:

I am saying, Sir, it is too much of a coincidence. And what I am charging now, I am charging the administration now with not protecting the Public Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, the dividends, the dividend on that -

MR. T. HICKEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

On a point of order, the hon.

Minister of Social Services.

MR. T. HICKEY:

This is the point I wanted the hon. gentleman to come out with and he has now come out with it. He accuses the administration of not protecting the public interests. I want to go on the record of the House, whatever about the rest of my colleagues, and say that I have not, Mr. Speaker, participated in the passing of any minute in Council, while I was a member of the former administration, which in any way, shape or form gives credence to anything that the hon. gentleman said. Each minute in Council stands on its own merit. If he is now talking about something that happened after the fact, then I suggest, Your Honour, that his charge against this administration or members of it who were members or participants in it in the former administration is certainly unfounded and it should not be allowed, should not be allowed to cast reflections on ministers, presently, who were members of the former administration in this manner.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the point of order, I would rule that it is a difference of opinion as to facts and an opportunity for the hon. minister to explain or clarify remarks.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying here, in effect is this; that there was a profit of \$2.3 million made on the sale of that aircraft. The Newfoundland Government should have

MR. S. NEARY: taken that \$2.3 million to retire part of the debt of \$6 million that was owed to it by EPA. The Newfoundland Government is the Cabinet, the Cabinet of which the hon. gentleman was a senior minister. Instead of that, according to this Cabinet directive - the hon. gentleman, I do not know if he sat in on the meeting or not; I would have to have the minutes of the meeting of Cabinet - the Cabinet decided to extend this \$6 million guarantee to EPA and to allow them to pay a dividend. They were duped; they were hoodwinked. They were told that the money that the profit made out of the sale of this 737 Boeing was going to be used to retire the debt on the plane and to improve the financial position of the company when, in actual fact, all it did was fatten the purse strings of those who had held the highest number of shares in that company. The government should have taken their pound of flesh.

MR. J. CARTER: Will the member say this outside the House?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have said it. Oh, what a cowardly way for the hon. gentleman to behave. - will I say it outside the House. I have said it outside the House, I will say it inside the House, I will say it on the roof, down in the basement, any place the hon. gentleman wants me to say it, I would say the ministers were negligent in their responsibility, they did not protect the Public Treasury as they should. And I would like to know why? I have my reasons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: No, it was taken - answer to verbal question given to me today by the Premier, who told me he took the information, he did not give me the Cabinet directive but his special assistant over there had it.

Earlier in 1978, Eastern Provincial Airways sold one of its Boeing 737. The proceeds from the sale - in other words, the profit, just listen - were used to retire the debt secured by the plane and, in part, to improve the financial position of EPA." And what it did, Sir, it did not improve the financial

MR. S. NEARY: position of EPA, who are still in financial trouble because they have not got their fare increase approved by the Canadian Transport Commission. They still have their problems with the federal tax people over a previous plane that they sold and that resulted in a lawsuit of \$768,000 they had to fork over. And now they say that, this was back in 1977, they sold another plane and they are telling the Montreal Stock Exchange that subsequent to the year end, "the company received an unfavourable federal court ruling on a federal sales tax assessment of \$768,000 including interest. This ruling is being appealed and is not reflected in the above results." So, they are still having a bad year, they did not improve their financial position, they have not taken over Nordair-although I understand Mr. Frank Moores in tow with a former Industrial Development minister in this Province, Mr. John Lundrigan, have been up sniffing around

MR. NEARY:

Ottawa about taking over Nordair, and EPA have, Sir, EPA have, and I repeat have, contributed to Mr. Moores' holding company, SSF Holdings Incorporated, and so has Omega Investments. It is all too much of a coincidence, Sir, and I am arguing now that the ministers did not protect the Public Treasury, they did not protect the taxpayers of this Province and we demand an explanation of why they did not, of why they allowed - and not only that, Sir, but the dividend that was paid out to Mr. Andrew Crosbie was above normal, was above average. Three major decision made between November 16 and November 22, 1978: One, give away Abitibi to Price - give away Linerboard, rather, to Abitibi-Price - give it away for \$16 million and \$28.5 million in preferred shares in the company, not cash, give that away; approve the change of ownership of EPA and extend a \$6 million loan between November 16 and November 22; rent office space from the white elephant building downtown owned by the owner of EPA, who benefitted from the sale of this aircraft, who fattened his purse strings from the sale of this aircraft - November 22, 1978. Three major decisions. And now, Sir, here we are giving the wrong information in the House, misinformed, anything but the truth. That is anything but the truth, that is anything but the truth, Sir. That profit on the airplane was not used to retire the debt. Some of it may have been used to retire the debt on the plane, but it was not used to improve the financial position of EPA. It was used to fatten the purse strings of those who had the controlling interest, the shares in EPA.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know I am running out of time again. Here it is again. There it is now quarter past five. We will get no answers, except a few snide remarks and a bit of smear from the other side and bit of character assassination,

MR. NEARY: no answers on whether or not they protected the Public Treasury in this instance and on the loan they got to nationalize the Churchill Falls Corporation. And I have a host of other questions I could ask, but we are muzzled, We cannot ask them, Sir, We have not got a hope in hell of getting the answers.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we just heard a debate, a typical debate, emanating from the hon. gentleman which is the type of debate that characterizes him but, thank heavens, does not characterize the other members of the House, So I am not going to deal to any great extent, I will come to it in a moment, but there are a few remarks that I wish to generally make with respect to the matters that have been said here this afternoon.

First of all, if I may say, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he got up, he got up and he made certain suggestions in a constructive frame of mind for the purpose of assessing the system that has been brought in, the committee system. The fact of the matter is, whether the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) likes it or not - and I know he, obviously, in voicing his opinion does not like it - that this has been one of the most constructive moves that have been taken by any government to improve the proceedings of the House and the whole Assembly, with one or two exceptions, certainly with one very singular exception, is the only one that dissents from its effectiveness. And effective it has been, and this is the way it will go on. The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) got up today and made a very constructive suggestion which will certainly be looked into for the next proceedings as to whether or not it would be more effective for these concurrence debates to take place in the Committee of Supply rather than the whole House. Now that is certainly a

MR. MARSHALL: point and, you know, it is a very constructive suggestion, I mean, all that we are concerned about is improving the manner in which the business of the House is carried on and the manner in which, particularly, the financial affairs of the Province are examined by the elected representatives. And certainly the hon. member has a very good point and if there is anything that needed to underline the worth of the point that he made was the way in which the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) led off the debate yesterday in concurrence debates and got up and spoke for an hour. I would say that if we got into committees that one of the benefits under the new rules would be that each member would be able to get up for ten minutes and have to get up and down again, and this was one of the

MR. MARSHALL:

reasons for the changes in the rules itself because it became quite obvious that certain members, and in particular one certain member who does not like the rules of this House, attempted to dominate the House and was successful from time to time because if anyone wishes to appropriate the proceedings of the House and the rules of the House and use them for their own particular political advantage, it is an easy thing to do and we could all do it if we wished to. So the suggestion made by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is a very good one. We will certainly look into it. I will say that the concurrence debates were moved into the House because this was the procedure used in the Legislative Assembly in Ontario. And I think that the whole purpose of the thing was that the Opposition, which would be the ones who would carry the ball really in the concurrence debates because they would be recognized, although not in the rules, as the first speakers, would be able to get up and underline things which were unsatisfactorily answered in the Committee, things which in the Committee did not appear to them to be answered in as full and as complete a manner as they ought to have been, and so they, really, are the ones who can set the tenor for the concurrence debates.

That is why I drew issue with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) earlier this afternoon when he spoke about how some people had indicated that they had a fear that the concurrence debates would be a rubber stamp and merely an extension to the Budget Debate. The concurrence debates will be exactly what the members of this House wish them to be and I would suggest that matters pertaining to what went on in Committees, particularly matters that were unsatisfactorily dealt with in the judgement of those people who sat in the Committees themselves, are matters that should come up in the concurrence debates. Obviously, this is a procedure which is new. It has been a very successful one but nobody pretends that it is the Holy Writ and the complete system under which the Assembly will operate for the next 100 or 200 years or however long it lasts for.

MR. MARSHALL:

So we will accept suggestions and we will strive with all members of this House who have shown in this Assembly that they wish to improve the way in which the public business is carried on, all members from both sides of the House, as I say with one not unexpected, but one obvious exception. I will point out in the Committees themselves too because, you know, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has indicated it was an attempt to muzzle the debate, and it was not, I do not need to re-emphasize that it was not an attempt to muzzle the debate. What it was was an attempt, and an successful one, and it succeeded in allowing all members of this House to participate equally in the workings of the House and the deliberations of the House itself. But for the information of the House, it might be of interest to know that when sixteen departments were assigned to the Committees, the Standing Orders provide that there would be three hours for each department so referred. So there were, in effect, forty-eight hours consumed. Forty-eight hours would be credited to what would normally go through in Committee of Supply and in the concurrence debates. In actual fact, the three Committees in total used up a total of between sixty-seven and seventy hours. So that shows that in time as well as quality, there was much more indepth analysis, much more of an indepth analysis given to the estimates this year than in any other year. It is also important to note that the time consumed was less than the fifteen days. We all know that the Summer is on us and all of the Summer is gone. There is very little of it left. And when Budgets are considered in the future, which is normally in the Fall of the year, there will be even a greater opportunity for a further and fuller investigation of the estimates themselves.

So I conclude on that theme, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the proceedings of the Committees were an outstanding success which is due mainly to the way in which all members of the House carried on the deliberations of the Committee itself. All questions, in fact, that were asked in Committee were promptly answered by the ministers themselves. And it was, in the assessment of everyone,

August 14, 1979

Tape 805

IB-3

MR. MARSHALL:

both inside and outside of this House, a resounding success.

I do not know if this House has to be bored to tears in future by hearing one hon, member get up from time to time and say that it is

MR. MARSHALL:

an attempt to muzzle the House and over and over and over again repeating his allegations when that particular member did not even attend one single minute of the Committee deliberations themselves.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

But that member got up in the Concurrence Debate and tried to carry on the Concurrence Debate as if we were in Committee of Supply by asking questions of the various ministers. And that is not the purpose of the exercise. Any questions that the hon. member wished to ask the ministers, the ministers would have gladly given to him had he attended the Committee in question. The ministers, for that matter, are here available day after day, a full compliment unless there is very good reason to the contrary, to answer questions during Question Period. There is a Late Show on Thursday afternoon. This government here bubbles over with democracy, Mr. Speaker. There is no attempt and no intention whatsoever to muzzle, and I think that the results from the way the government has performed is indicative of that.

Now there are a couple of matters that were brought up this afternoon that I think require a certain amount of attention, particularly - you know, I do not -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, maybe I will deal with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), but I shall deal with him last because if I run out of time and do not have the opportunity to reply, it will not make as much difference as if I reply to the comments made by the other members.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), when he was speaking, if I may indicate, if I may be so presumptuous to indicate, I thought that the way in which he carried on his delivery of the Concurrence Debate was the way in which really it was envisaged that it should be carried on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

As a member of the Committee, he got up and he pointed out various concerns to him of questions that were unanswered

MR. MARSHALL: by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) in the Estimates. Now it ill-behooves me to answer for the Minister of Mines and Energy. The Minister of Mines and Energy is many times more capable of answering for himself than your good self here speaking at the present time is, but there is one thing that occurred to me when the hon. member was talking. First of all, he talked about the valuation of the \$78 million that was tabled by the hon. minister yesterday or the day before, and I would point out that this was on the basis of a valuation done by an independent firm of chartered accountants in Alberta. They looked over the assets that had been acquired and were still existing and available for the development of the Lower Churchill Development, and it was found that the value of these assets equalled in the vicinity of - I forget exactly, but I think it was about \$78 million - or was it \$67 million?

AN HON. MEMBER: Eighty.

MR. MARSHALL: Eighty millions of dollars. And the hon. gentleman referred then to what was an alleged inconsistency, that is the Budget Speech of last year when the then hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech indicated that \$110 million had been spent on the Lower Churchill. It was my impression - and I believe that this is a fact - that the \$110 million refers to the principal as well as the interest.

MR. RIDEOUT: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Both of it together because the -

MR. RIDEOUT: (Inaudible) principal and interest at \$86 million.

MR. MARSHALL: At \$86 million?

MR. RIDEOUT: The Bechtel report.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, the Bechtel report shows principal and interest, but I think if the hon. member will look into it he will find that certain aspects of the interest were capitalized and transferred to other accounts. But the point I am trying to make is this, no matter whether it is spent or owed by Hydro to the government, be it owed by any Crown corporation, Gull Island Power Corporation or the Gull Island Development Company or by the government itself, the fact of the matter is, it is owed

MR. MARSHALL:

by the people of Newfoundland.

And we owe that money whether it is transferred - if we had the luxury of being able to cancel our debts by transferring our liabilities to Crown corporations, there would be a lot of Crown corporations with very healthy debts and we would be in a very strong financial position. So the point of the matter, I think, as the hon. member knows, is that this is a debt and it is a debt owed by the people of Newfoundland. But there is another factor as well, as was indicated when we were debating the Lower Churchill Development Corporation Bill, and that is the fact that this amount has,

MR. MARSHALL:

in effect, of hopefully will, in effect, be recovered and represented in capitalization up to \$100 million of shares which we will own, hopefully, in the Lower Churchill Development Corporation if it gets off the ground. The feasibility study shows that, as we all hope it will, that the development of the Lower Churchill is feasible. Then in that case, both the provincial government and the federal government will have a capitalization of \$100 million each in shares. \$100 million of that will come dollar for dollar from the federal government. We do not have to put in our dollars because the federal government will take it as already invested and that being represented by the assets already expended for the development of the Lower Churchill. So, granted, it is something that we owe, it is something that the people of Newfoundland owe, whether they owe it through the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation, whether they owe it directly themselves, but the fact of the matter is that this amount has been capitalized and, as I say, it is quite a bit too early yet to say that the amounts of money expended at that particular time on the aborted attempt to develop the Lower Churchill, you know, are lost. They can be recouped and I believe under the direction of this government that there is every chance that they will be recouped and they will be represented by common shares owned by the people of Newfoundland. Now that, I think, deals with the remarks made by the hon. member and I would say, once again, that it is my opinion and it ill behooves, I think, any member to get up and give advice as to how debates should be conducted, but the hon. Leader of the Opposition today got up and, you know, made, in his view, constructive suggestions as to the committees themselves and the way they were carried on, and I would suggest to hon. members that in order to give the Concurrence Debates and the present characteristic in the House itself a proper chance of being as effective and as successful

MR. MARSHALL: as they were in the committees, that what we ought to do is, perhaps, zero in members- and here am I talking not having been in committee myself, but by way of suggestion- members in the committee being at least the initial speakers for the purpose of saying the things that they were dissatisfied with.

Now, I do not know whether it is really necessary to answer, because nobody can answer, really, the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary), There is no way in this world that one can answer to his satisfaction whether the answers are satisfactory or not, the hon. member for Lapoile. But in all of this thing, the hon. the member for Lapoile seems to love to come up here and paint pictures of persons doing things, you know, he is almost like spiders crawling up the back of the bank or he sees hands in the till at all times. He tries to picture a picture all the time of corruption and what have you, so I do not really choose to answer the hon. -

MR. NEARY: You do not (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: I do not really choose to answer the hon. member, to enter into debate with the hon. member, but the point of the matter is this: With respect to Eastern Provincial Airways, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is this, that Eastern Provincial Airways are indebted to the government, I believe, by guarantees, I do not think they are direct loans, but the government has guaranteed certain borrowings that EPA has made over a period of time. I am not aware of the fact that Eastern Provincial Airways are in default under those guarantees. I believe that Eastern Provincial Airways are paying, and have been for some time, their obligations and honouring them as they fall due from time to time. Therefore, if a sale takes place, why should, I ask, why is it necessary for the Government of this Province to say to a concern, whose indebtedness it has guaranteed, that you may not use this money for the purpose which you wish to use it, or you determine to use it by virtue of your Board of Directors, the Board of Directors

MR. MARSHALL: themselves, but you must pay it to the Province? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time to enter into that particular type of condition would be at such time as the indebtedness is either in default or very plainly in jeopardy of being called in and the people of Newfoundland incurring a liability.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now in connection with that sale itself, I think the hon. member sees all sorts of significance that I cannot see and appreciate in the giveaway, as he calls it, to Abitibi. And I am sure the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), the constituents in the Stephenville area will be very interested to hear, once again, that one of the frontbenchers in the Opposition of the Liberal Party, once again, how are you, are talking about the reactivation of the Labrador Linerboard as being a giveaway. I prefer to think of it as the institution of 800 permanent jobs in the mill, another 800 jobs outside, a possible reconstitution of the mill with yet another 800 or 1,000 jobs itself. And I think that the hon. the member for Stephenville will be interested to know that, once again, from the front benches of the Opposition comes the charge that in the West Coast of this Province, the reactivation of the Labrador Linerboard under the direction of one of the strongest firms in Canada today, giving security to the West Coast, is deemed to be a giveaway,

MR. STAGG: The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) should repudiate that.

MR. MARSHALL: Well we will not ask the hon. member for Port au Port, We all know that the hon. member for Port au Port is a sensible individual and we can all predict how the hon. member for Port au Port will feel. But we also feel that the hon. member for Port au Port - we will not put him to the embarrassment in the House, of repudiating the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) - but we would expect the hon. member this Summer, on the West Coast, to so repudiate and we will look forward to reports to that end coming from the hon. member for Stephenville and the hon. member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe) since we now control a majority of the seats in that industrious area of the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another point I want to make. You know, he sees, as I see, in this triumvirate of things - EPA; the giveaway, as he calls it, to Abitibi; the sale of shares in EPA (I forget what the other one is: Renting of office

MR. MARSHALL:

space by the previous administration]- he sees all of this as being a matter that, you know, is nasty, brutish and short with some ulterior motive behind it. He has not indicated what the ulterior motive is. He leaves it up to one's imagination and casts innuendo. But let me say this with respect to the issue of jobs. The fact that Eastern Provincial Airways has been sold-is not the fact that it was sold but the fact, I think, that it remained in the hands of Newfoundland interests, which is a matter that we ought to applaud rather than get up here in the House and attack and try to, at every turn, attempt to see something sinister involved in it.

The fact of the matter is that if Eastern Provincial Airways had not been sold to Newfoundland interests, the great likelihood is it would have been sold to interests in Quebec or interests -

MR. NEARY: The Newfoundland government decided that.

MR. MARSHALL: - on the Mainland of Canada.

MR. NEARY: The Newfoundland Cabinet decided that.

MR. MARSHALL: In which case, Mr. Speaker, a large measure of the jobs that are provided by Eastern Provincial Airways, particularly in the Gander area -

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I wish to point out, Your Honour, that the gentleman who is now speaking is misleading the House, whether it is deliberate or otherwise, Sir, and I would submit that that is unparliamentary, that the hon. gentleman is out of order because it is the Cabinet that had to decide who became the new owners of EPA, the Cabinet, not Mr. Harry Steele or Mr. Crosbie. It was in the hands of the Newfoundland Cabinet, so therefore it could not go to a Mainland company unless the Newfoundland Government approved it. So I would submit, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is misleading the House and is completely out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, It is not even a point.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect I would rule that there is not a point of order here but merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members as to a fact.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The point of order is this, the hon. gentleman in making his point of order got up in this House and said that the hon. gentleman is misleading the House whether deliberately or otherwise. One may say that a member is misleading the House, but one may not say that one is misleading the House deliberately. When the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) gets up in this House and says that I or any member of this House is misleading this House whether deliberately or otherwise, it leaves the innuendo that it may be deliberately and I raise this point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, and ask that the remark be withdrawn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) The hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if ever I heard of a tempest in a teapot, the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has just raised a storm in a thimble. The member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) said, and I think the words were quoted accurately, that the hon. gentleman from St. John's East was misleading the House, whether deliberately or not. That is anything but a statement that the hon. gentleman from St. John's East is misleading the House. In fact, it is to the contrary. It is a statement that the hon. gentleman from St. John's East is not misleading the House deliberately. It is obviously -

MR. STAGG: Obfuscation.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Stephenville?

MR. STAGG: Obfuscation.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the hon. gentleman from Stephenville knows all about obfuscation, having been a master of it himself.

Mr. Speaker, the point is this, that it is obviously unparliamentary, and properly so, I would submit, for a member to accuse another member of having misled the House. It is not unparliamentary to say that the hon. gentleman opposite is misleading, whether deliberately or not, because that is to say that he is not misleading the House deliberately. I think this falls under that rubric which Your Honour so wisely and so often falls back upon, whether guided by the advice of the clerks at the table or not, that this is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. The hon. gentleman from Lapoile has said what he thinks, the hon. gentleman

MR. ROBERTS: from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall)
has said what he thinks, and now the debate should be allowed to go on so some others can speak before it winds up at six.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) To the point of order, I would draw hon. members' attention to Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, page 105, where it states, "It has been ruled unparliamentary to use the following expressions:", page 108, "mislead", and further, "deliberately misleading, deliberately misled". I would suggest that the easiest way to dispose of the point of order would be to ask the hon. member for Lapoile if he would withdraw those remarks.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw, Sir, and -
no, never mind, I will raise the matter again later.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the hon. President of
the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I will wind up now in a few moments by just indicating as I was saying that, as far as the sale of Eastern Provincial Airways, something that has escaped the hon. member's attention is quite obviously the fact that Eastern Provincial Airways remains in the control and in the hands of Newfoundland interests, as a result of which I am given to understand that there are measures that have taken to see that Newfoundland benefits as much as possible from Eastern Provincial Airways. It is refreshing in this Province when you see entrepreneurial skills such as those that were exercised in the acquisition of it as well as the carrying on of it before, because there have been few true entrepreneurial skills shown in this Province by the business community over the years, which, to a large degree, seemed to regard themselves before Confederation to be content with being -

MR. NEARY: Carbonear and (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: - were content to being manufacturers' agents for Britain, and now they tend to be content to be manufacturers' agents for Central Canada, But in this particular case we have, I say, entrepreneurial venture in the true sense and I am glad that Eastern Provincial Airways, if it had to be sold, was acquired by Newfoundland interests and glad for the jobs that will be protected and which will grow in the Province of Newfoundland. Now, if the hon. member thinks that is a bad deal, we can classify that - the people of Gander can realize that the hon. member, the same frontbencher of the Liberal Party is, in effect, indicating that perhaps this is a bad deal, Anyway that apparently brings jobs to Newfoundland, be it on the West Coast or in Central Newfoundland, is obviously a bad deal in the hon. member's estimation.

MR. NEARY: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) Point of order.

The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I would submit if the hon. gentleman is going to interpret what I said properly, Sir, the hon. gentleman should do so and not twist my remarks, Sir, and in so doing leave the wrong impression in the House. I cannot use the word 'mislead', it is too strong, but I can say 'leave the wrong impression in the House'. But I am all for EPA, Sir, all for it, But what I said was that I am against the Newfoundland Government leaving the Public Treasury unprotected, and the transfer was not made in the interests of the people of Newfoundland, it was made in the interests of the moneybags in this Province, That is what I am saying, Sir.

MR. NEARY:

that the minister, the gentleman who just took his seat, did not adequately protect the Public Treasury.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): To that point of order, there is no point of order in my opinion.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I will just clue up now by getting off that tack and just saying that as far as the Committees themselves are concerned, you know, we value the remarks made today by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson). We think that the Committees have been a resounding success and have been greeted by everybody, both in this House and outside with the one exception that happens to be in the House itself. We do not regard it to be, as I say, the Holy Writ and we will be looking for improvements in the future and hopefully we can make improvements because it is out intention, our desire, really, to have the affairs of the government conducted efficiently and particularly, as I say, the financial estimates and the financial measures the government is taking, investigated by all measures in the greatest depth possible. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak for a few moments on the Northern Development part of the resources. In particular I am going to dwell on the Fisheries and Rural Development as pertaining to Labrador. In last year's budget, there was \$5,348,700 allotted to the Northern section of rural development. This year it is reduced down to \$2,390,100, a reduction of over \$3 million. Now, the hon. Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) told me at Committee meetings that it was because of the transfer to the Department of Fisheries, fish plants, etc., over to the Department of Fisheries. Going back into the Department of Fisheries estimates, we find that there is \$1.2 million. This doubtless leaves a difference of over \$2 million in the current

MR. WARREN:

budget for development in Labrador as compared to the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of subheads in the Northern development that I am concerned about and in particular, number one, is the trading supplies and produce for the five retail stores that are operated by the Department of Rural and Northern Development. It is estimated that the trade supplies this year will be much less. Again the minister said it is because of the transfer to the Department of Fisheries, fish plants, over to the Department of Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned because if we go back over the last three years we will notice that come December month, from December month to May month of each year there are chartered aircrafts from Goose Bay to Nain, Makkovik and so on carrying fresh fruit and vegetables to the Northern ports, which is very, very essential. But, however which is also very important, there is an extremely large amount of goods taken in there of canned fruits and vegetables that should be in there before the last boat stops in the Fall of the year. This is where it is a great lot of expense. I am afraid that come May or June this year the same thing will happen because there is not going to be enough money allotted in Northern development for enough food and produce for the residents of Northern Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to go back and forth to the Department of Fisheries, off and on. Earlier today the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) made a fantastic announcement concerning the fishermen of Labrador of getting a 30 per cent rebate or gear subsidy on their fishing gear. I later learned from the hon. Minister of Fisheries that this Programme comes into effect today. I believe it is very disgusting to know that the representatives of the Department of Fisheries were advised since last May to contact every fisherman in Northern Labrador and Southern Labrador and advise

MR. WARREN:

them to keep their invoices and anything they bought, any fishing gear that the fishermen bought as of March 31st would be subsidized. And now the minister says it comes into effect today.

I would like to advise the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) that in most of Labrador the majority of the fishing is over. The fishermen have already purchased what gear they are going to buy for this year. This programme will not be very beneficial to the fishermen in Labrador this year. That is my greatest concern, that although it was announced - officials of his department were told to go to each individual community and advocate to the fishermen that this gear programme would be coming into effect, 'so keep your invoices,' and the fishermen have been doing so - now we understand that it is only coming into effect today.

I hope that the minister can clarify that although the programme is coming into effect today that it will be retroactive for any gear purchased as of March 31st.

Mr. Speaker, under the heading Labrador Development, there is \$120,000 allotted to the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. In concurrence with the Premier's statement in Goose Bay on Friday in proposing that the Labrador Resources Advisory Council would become the consulting body, I do not think this \$120,000 will go very far. I believe if they are going to be the main consulting firm for Labrador and for the government that we are going to have to find more monies than \$120,000.

Mr. Speaker, another concern is that in Postville there is a boat yard, costing in excess of \$200,000, that has been lying idle for the last year and a half because neither the federal government nor the provincial government want to have anything to do with it.

Now, I have been looking through the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development Estimates and I do not see anything there for ship building in Postville. I have been looking through the Department of Fisheries Estimates and there is nothing

MR. WARREN: there. And although it is in a prime forest area, I do not see anything under Lands and Forests.

Are we going to leave this boat yard sitting idle in Postville where we have adequate boat builders, where we have an abundant supply of timber right at their fingertips? As of three years ago, when they did build two longliners there, they had to send to B.C. to get lumber up to Postville.

Mr. Speaker, I would advise the ministers concerned that they should take a deep look at the potential of boat building in Postville. We have thirty or forty adequate boat builders there. So I think we should take a serious look at Postville and see if, in the very near future, a development could begin.

The people of Labrador are crying for boats. Just a matter of last week, we have had a fisherman waiting for a boat to be done in Labrador that he ordered last May, and here they have boat building facilities right in their midst and this government cannot see fit to utilize it.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to continue much further because I understand we are going to close up today and I am sure there are other members who wish to say a few words.

I wish to thank you, and again, I would like to say that I am quite pleased with the way the Committee system is working. It is my first attempt in this House, and the way the Committee system is working, I am quite pleased with it and I hope it does continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, would like to add my voice to those of the members of the Committee who found this a very useful experience. The Committee system appears to me to be on the road to working very well.

MR. STIRLING:

I would like to compliment the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, one from that side, one from this side, who worked very well on the Resources Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: I would like to add to the concerns that have been raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) and my colleague who served as co-Chairman of this Committee, Deputy Chairman, that it seems that we can achieve some balance, that there is no doubt that in this Concurrence Debate - for example, to use an example brought up by my colleague who spoke a moment or two ago, I am sure that the Minister of Fisheries would like to have the opportunity, and a procedure should be found for the Minister of Fisheries to be able to answer that specific request that came out on the effective timing of this - if it is true and I am sure that it would not have been brought up as being true unless it were true - that if the officials of the Department of Fisheries went around and told the people on the Coast -

MR. WARREN: I was the official.

MR. STIRLING: And he was the official that did it, if the Department of Fisheries gave that instruction, I am sure the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), in this procedure, would like to be able to clarify that position. I would even give way now if the Minister of Fisheries would like to say that it is effective March 31. But I think that points out a good example of why we need to have the points brought out by the Leader of the Opposition, and I think we can also satisfy some of the concerns of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) if he can have that give and take that he was looking for.

In the few minutes that I have left, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of points. In the area of Industrial Development, it has become very obvious - and I think the Premier mentioned it at the time he was appointing his Cabinet - that Industrial Development is one of the areas that is going to be given a serious look at or a serious review. I look at it almost as a department that was left over. He did a lot of the other things to this

MR. STIRLING:

point, and Industrial Development was left over and it was put with the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). The department is far too important to be shared by any other Ministry and it is a department that needs to have a complete overhaul. I understand from the Committee stage that the minister himself is aware of that and that the minister is talking in terms of a Department of Development.

I made the suggestion then, which I would like to make now to the House, that in keeping with the spirit of the committees and the spirit of improvement and suggestion and a spirit of development, that instead of bringing in this thing as a completed, final, reorganized department that it should be put out in the form of a White Paper. It should be put out so that the members of the Board of Trade can make comments and input. It should be put out so that the people in Rural Development, if they are going to see that department lose some of its authority, can make some comment. The people in Fisheries may want to make some comment, if all of that loaning authority is being brought in under one super department. I think prior to getting something developed and accomplished that those of us on this side of the House may make some concrete suggestions. So I suggest that the Industrial Development Department be brought up in a White Paper form or some other form of discussion before we have it in its final form.

I think we have had - and I give credit to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) for putting his finger on a problem at the Committee level. One of the problems that we seem to have run into, and I am sure the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would be interested in this, one of the problems we have seen run right through the whole question of the job being done by directors who have been appointed because the Province has an interest in some companies and Crown corporations, the member for Stephenville pointed out that he felt that, at least in one case, a civil servant who was appointed a director could not feel free to speak up and could not feel free to carry on as a director should and with the freedom that a director would.

August 14, 1979

Tape 812

IB-3

MR. STIRLING:

Moving quickly to Rural Development,
I do not want to single out names either or name names, but I would say
that the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) has shown to be
one

MR. STIRLING:

of the most able and co-operative ministers that we have, certainly in my dealings with the minister at the committee level. But he has not been given enough money to do the job. I would like to suggest, as I have suggested before, that the minister should talk to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) to find out how it is that the Minister of Fisheries can put in \$8 million in new money, whereas in Rural Development the \$2.7 has been cut to \$2 and then the \$1.5 offsets that, so, in effect, the Minister of Rural Development only has \$500,000 worth of new money to do anything with in the loan area.

In the area of Tourism, another minister who was very co-operative and very helpful, but I believe going in a little bit of the wrong direction too quickly before we have lived up to certain commitments that we have in the parks area to the people of Newfoundland. If we have to develop this Province, surely we must develop this Province first for the people of Newfoundland. If we must make choices, the whole development of the Province must first be for the people of Newfoundland, And in the provincial parks area the minister knows that - I am not saying anything that I did not say to him directly - in the provincial parks area we were very disappointed that no new money has been made available for new construction this year and no money for the development of parks, the extension of parks, and that many Newfoundlanders have bought what amounts to summer dwellings on wheels in the form of a tent or in the form of a trailer, and they do not have a place to use them. They are spread all over gravel pits and all other types of facilities, and in the Department of Tourism there is definitely, from the estimates, a retrenchment and a turning their back on their responsibilities to develop the parks system. I know we all are in agreement that we will conclude this debate and, therefore,

MR. STIRLING: while there is enough time left,
Mr. Speaker, I will sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
On motion, the report of the Resource
Committee, carried.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence and
blessing of the Opposition on Private Members' Day tomorrow, we could
perhaps go to the final Concurrence report on Social Services, I
think that is agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of
Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: While looking at me, quizzically
I hope, my hon. friend from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe)
was either over there, Mr. Speaker, conveying the news that we were
quite prepared in the interests of expediting the public business
to have tomorrow as a public day, either that or he was making a
deal of some sort, and I tend to believe the former and
I very much hope the former, so we will go along with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Therefore agreed?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is
I am so timid I did not want to announce it without making sure
it was all right with the Opposition.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its
rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that
this House do now adjourn.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I am not at all certain if the Premier
is going to be in the House, probably not, tomorrow and I think all

MR. JAMIESON: Newfoundlanders, including us on this side, wish him well in the meetings and hope that the results will be productive for the Province and for the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite and both sides of the House for their support. I can assure the hon. House and the Leader of the Opposition that the water will still be flowing down the Churchill River and into Lake Melville after Saturday of this week.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3 o'clock.