

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1930

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to this House on the Report of the Public Accounts Committee for the year ending March 31, 1978, released yesterday.

Number one, those matters in the report dealing with the Department of Finance will be addressed by the Minister of Finance over the next number of days in this House. Suffice it for me to say that the major improvements in the operation of that department have been instituted by the present minister, especially those that deal with the Auditor General's reports over the last couple of years.

Number two, those matters dealing with helicopter hire will be addressed by the Minister of Transportation and Communications in the next few days, through the medium of this House. Once again, let me say that major improvements have been made by the present minister to the way in which that helicopter contract is administered by government. And I think most hon. members are familiar that a number of changes and a number of improvements and refinements have been made to ensure that the public trust is carried on.

Number three, the Public Tender Act. Because this item involves many departments, I will personally examine the recommendations made by the Committee on this matter and have the matter reviewed by Cabinet. After this is done, I will report back to this House on whether government intends to change the present act in light of the recommendations. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I cannot today, twenty-four hours afterwards, deal with that in a substantive way and not having an opportunity to meet with Cabinet to discuss the recommendations

PREMIER PECKFORD: contained in the report. But I undertake so to do and to report back to this House in this session on that matter and to say just exactly what the government intends to do, if anything, relevant to those recommendations for changes in the Public Tender Act.

May I make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that since assuming the office I now hold, I have requested all departments to strictly follow all regulations that apply to the disbursements of public funds. Two actions that I implemented were:

Number one, a memorandum on March 29, 1979 to all ministers and deputy ministers requesting that proper controls be implemented, and I quote from that first memorandum: "Care should be taken in particular to ensure that the requirements of the Public Tender Act and the Financial Administration Act are met."

Secondly, I felt it incumbent upon me as Premier to send out a second memorandum on August 9, 1979 to all ministers and deputy ministers reiterating the theme of the memo, the first one of March 29, 1979.

PREMIER PECKFORD: As a result of the present report yesterday, I have today informed all ministers and deputy ministers that in future, if there is any doubt whatsoever about whether the awarding of any contract might be contravening the Public Tendering Act, then a legal opinion from the Department of Justice in writing must be obtained first.

Number four, the matter concerning the hon. James Morgan, the Minister of Fisheries, has been discussed with me and I have had a number of meetings with the hon. Minister of Fisheries on this matter. The Committee contends that Mr. Morgan knowingly contravened the Public Tendering Act. Mr. Morgan for his part adamantly maintains that this is untrue, that he did not 'knowingly' breach such legislation. Obviously, an honest difference of opinion exists between the members of the Committee and Mr. Morgan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: If any mistakes were made, I accept they were made in good faith.

Mr. Speaker, the government I lead will continue to do all in its power to ensure that the taxpayers' money is spent according to each and every requirement placed upon it. It will continue to scrupulously comply with the letter and the spirit of the Public Tendering Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, the Premier reminds me of the person who slaughtered his father and mother and then pleaded for compassion on the grounds that he was an orphan. The truth of the matter is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Big deal!

MR. JAMIESON: Big deal nothing! Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity that this Premier had had to really show that he meant what he said about legitimate and open government and that he would not tolerate any hanky-panky.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Now, Mr. Speaker, he must know too that his argument about a legitimate difference of opinion between the right hon.-or the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan); I will not elevate him to right hon.- the hon. Minister of Fisheries, to say that it is an honest difference of opinion is also to say that the man who is convicted in a court has an honest difference of opinion with a jury or a judge who found him guilty.

SOME HOM. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have no concern whatsoever for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in this matter insofar as he and his own integrity and the like are concerned. But the truth of the matter is, and it cannot be denied, Mr. Speaker, that a unanimous finding, a unanimous finding of this House, a unanimous one which involved a majority of members from the government side as well as members from this side, found unequivocally that on two separate occasions, the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the then Minister of Transport and Communications, and I quote the word "knowingly", knowingly went around the Public Tendering Act.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as I know the Public Tendering Act is a law of this Province. It is a law of this land. Therefore, what a jury of his peers, which is what it amounts to -

MR. E. ROBERTS: Having heard the evidence.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - having heard the evidence, having brought in the previous Premier and having listened to him, having given the hon. the minister the opportunity to give his side of the case fully, having examined all of the evidence that was presented before it, came to the unanimous conclusion that in fact the minister knowingly contravened that particular act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you and I suggest to any members opposite who have any knowledge whatever of parliamentary procedure or anything of the like, that there is only one honourable course for the hon. minister to take right now and that is to resign from the Cabinet of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have seen far less by way of offences in which that action has been taken. What the hon. member does after he resigns is something else again, but to continue to sit in a Cabinet, indicted by members on both sides of this House - by a chairman, it is true, from this party, but by members from the opposite side as well - and having said that he knowingly did this, this is a finding, this is not a difference of opinion. It is like somebody being carted off out of a court and saying, 'Your Honour, it is a legitimate difference of opinion between you and me.' That simply is not anything that is going to wash. But, Mr. Speaker, the real, real responsibility rests upon the man who leads the Government of this Province, the Premier of Newfoundland, who has said over and over again that integrity, openness - that he will not tolerate anything. What he is really saying, however, is that he will not tolerate anything that has happened since the 18th of June of last year.

MR. S. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: And how can we believe him on what he will do after the 18th of June of last year when everything before that is to be

MR. D. JAMIESON: swept under the carpet and we are supposed to forget the whole business?

Mr. Speaker, I realize I may be going over the normal required amount of time, but I say to the House and I say to the Premier that if he is to have credibility on this issue, if he is to have credibility on any of the other things that he is saying to the people of Newfoundland about 'Let us have all the facts out in the open,' if he is to do any of those things, then no later than this day he should demand the resignation of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: That is a powerful, powerful statement!

MR SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the House that the Newfoundland Medical Association and the Newfoundland Medicare Commission recently have reached an agreement for the fiscal year 1980-81 affecting fee for service physicians in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I am taking the rather unusual step of making this announcement in the House because I believe that the agreement reached between the Medical Association and MCP represents a significant milestone in the ongoing development of medical care services throughout the Province. I might preface the remarks by noting that a joint committee consisting of representatives of the Medical Association, Medicare and the Department of Health and Treasury Board undertook a broad review of the Province's current situation with regard to provision of medical care services and the remuneration of physicians in the Province.

One of the important conclusions of that committee was that the payment schedule currently in effect for fee for service physicians in the Province is substantially behind the equivalent payment schedules in the rest of Canada. The conclusions of this committee along with the input that I have received from other agencies, including my own department officials, confirm the fact that the current low pay schedule is one of the major factors which has negatively affected our Province's ability to recruit physicians and especially specialists to our Province.

Newfoundland on a population basis has the lowest number of specialists of any province of Canada. The resulting impact of this low number of specialists is twofold: First, the regional and district hospitals tend to have the greatest difficulty in recruiting specialists, and we are aware of several major gaps in the provision of speciality services throughout the regions of the Province. And I look in some places, and I use the Western Memorial Hospital in Corner Brook which is a

MR. W. HOUSE:

tremendous facility but we do not seem to be able to attract specialists there.

The second point is that the low number of specialists put additional burdens on the existing specialists in the Province, often forcing them into unusually long and arduous working hours, a fact that when seen by potential new physicians often further discourages them from coming into the Province.

It is within this context that I feel that the new agreement by the Newfoundland Medical Association and MCP is significant. The primary focus of the agreement is to create a payment schedule and an environment which will be encouraging to physicians and which will aid in recruiting much needed physicians to appropriate locations throughout the Province.

The agreement embodies the two following objectives, First, a recognition that the payment schedule is significantly behind the rest of Atlantic Canada; secondly, a recognition that there exists within the payment schedule several major inequities in individual fees

MR. W. HOUSE:

which have resulted largely because of the unusual generally low number of medical manpower in the Province. A major revision of the payment schedules is now being undertaken by MCP and NMA with input from other government agencies, especially the Department of Health.

The application of the increase will be as follows: Effective April 1st, 10 per cent will be added to the current payment schedule pending the thorough review and revision of the payment schedule that I have just mentioned. This, we anticipate, will require somewhere between three and six months following which the new payment schedule will be applied with an additional 5 per cent percentage points being applied in specific areas where significant inequities exist and where recruitment has been especially difficult. And I think that adds to about 15 per cent on the overall.

We anticipate that the net impact of the new payment schedule will be one which is fair and equitable to each physician relative to his colleagues in general practice or in specialty fields within the Province. It will also at least partly reduce the existing inequity compared to payment schedules in other Atlantic provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the nature of the agreement recently concluded by MCP and the Newfoundland Medical Association provides a very clear indication of the dedication and commitment of both government and the medical profession to the improvement of medical services in the Province.

The spirit and intent of the agreement has not only recognized the need of our physicians to receive fair and reasonable remuneration but also has recognized the need to enhance quality and quantity of services available to our citizens.

The president, executive and negotiating committee of the NMA and, of course, the chairman, board and senior

MR. W. HOUSE: officers of the Medical Care Commission are to be congratulated for their efforts in bringing about the significant and worthwhile approach to this new agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, thank the minister for his courtesy in doing as he did in letting me have a little advance notice on the statement and I do appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, the minister really has said two things, if I understood the morass of words that made up his statement. First of all, the doctors in this Province are to get an immediate rise of about ten per cent, with a further five per cent to be distributed in some way to be determined, and that, secondly, the fee for schedule payments are to be revised in the sense that the fee schedule is to be amended.

The minister, to deal with the first item, Mr. Speaker, did not give us any figures. There is not, that I can see in the Budget and in the material with which we have been supplied, any indication of the bill on Medicare. Perhaps the minister might give us some figures. All that we know from this document, the Budget and the estimates, is that the vote we are going to be asked to approve is \$37,000,000 this year out of the provincial treasury for Medicare. That is obviously

MR. E. ROBERTS: only a portion, I would assume, of the total bill. The method of payment from Ottawa has changed with the established programme of financing grants, so I am not sure, to be quite candid, whether that is a portion or if so, what portion. Perhaps the minister might tell us exactly what we are talking of in dollars and perhaps he might tell us as well, in between his congratulating himself and all concerned, exactly where the money is coming from in the sense if it is provided in these Estimates or not.

Secondly, let me go on to say that we on this side feel, as any fair-minded people must, Mr. Speaker, that the doctors in this Province have a right to fair remuneration for their services. I do not think anybody could quarrel with that. The doctors feel, and there is obviously some evidence and they have obviously convinced the Medicare Commission, and I think it is fair to say they have obviously convinced as well the hard-hearted doctor who is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the guardian of our treasury, and the other members of the Cabinet that their case is justified and so they will get more money. No quarrel with that at all! But I do think further efforts have got to be made by the government in conjunction with the Medicare Commission and the Newfoundland Medical Association, which is the trade union representing the doctors on matters of this sort, to see what we can do about the distribution of doctors throughout this Province, a problem, and I cannot go into it here now. which is getting worse, the disparity between the services available in particularly the St. John's area and those available elsewhere in the Province, particularly in the realm of specialists, is getting greater, not lesser; a trend which has developed over the last few years and I

MR. E. ROBERTS: think it is being fostered - there is another place for it to discuss this-by government's policies or by government's lack of policy.

Let me just say one other thing; it is high time the fee schedule was amended and changed. I would say to the minister it ought to be a root and branch job. The fee schedule grew up out of the old Blue Cross payment schedules. It is entirely inappropriate for the purpose which it is being used. The same kind of procedure had been adapted across Canada in the late 1960's when medicare came in. It is obvious, I think, to anyone who looks at it that it is a most inept and inappropriate way to remunerate doctors for their professional services. Perhaps Newfoundland and Labrador can take the lead and can work out a new method that is fair and equitable to all concerned, to the doctors who are performing the services and who make their livelihood from so doing; to the taxpayers who bear the shot being we are talking 100 cent Newfoundland dollars. These no longer are shared costs as such due to the ending of the old system of shared costs and the institution of the established programme financing grants which we now get, and most importantly, to the people who must look to those doctors paid by those taxpayers for their medical services.

And there I would simply say to the minister again, because I think it is a crucial problem, that the disparity is getting worse. The people of this Province are not getting a fair and equal medical service and it is getting worse and worse and worse all the time, and this money will not help. In fact, this money may make it worse, it will help the doctors but it will not help the distribution of doctors throughout the Province and that is where the minister ought to be putting his attention now, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

2036

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. the Premier a question, please? Given the statement which we heard earlier this afternoon, when he has had an opportunity, he and his colleagues, to look into the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, has he in mind any kind of procedure whereby it may be possible for us in this House, either through a concurrence debate on the report or in some other manner, to discuss and to learn in detail what the proposals are he is referring to?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, number one, as it relates to the Minister of Finance, and the things that were mentioned in the Public Accounts Report for the year 1978, that have to do with the Department of Finance, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will answer those on those recommendations immediately, within the next two or three days. The Minister of Finance is now preparing a detailed reply dealing with all the items that come under his department because since 1978 to 1980 we have implemented a lot of changes, and since March last year to now, have implemented a lot as a result of actions we took last year after the Auditor General's Report for that particular year.

The Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) will answer as it relates to the helicopter hire because it is old news in the sense that the helicopter contract was signed, the Auditor General and the Public Accounts Committee legitimately criticized the number of ways in which that helicopter contract was being administered, and we have tightened that up substantially and the minister will give specific ways in which we have done that. As it relates to the Public Tender Act, and this was not in my statement, but after the Cabinet has a chance

PREMIER PECKFORD: to review the recommendations of the Committee, I am quite prepared to permit, or have the House debate, if you will, the recommendations and possible changes that could be made to the Public Tender Act with a view to strengthening it. I think the only qualification I would put on it is it is not a matter of whether there would be a debate or not, in my view it is a matter of understanding that we will never be able to legislate every particular situation. But there may be various measures that can be brought in which would tighten up the Public Tender Act and be in the best interest of the Province totally so to do.

I have tried myself since March last year, August and again today as a result of this report, to tighten it up as much as I can with the existing legislation by requiring every department, if it has any doubt at all about whether the Public Tender Act is being contravened, to get a legal opinion in writing so that before any award or lack of award occurs that kind of tangible evidence will be there to support or otherwise condemn the department for the kind of action that they took.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Just one supplementary. I can understand and appreciate the fact that

MR. JAMIESON: ministers will be making specific statements, What I had in mind was indeed that it is conceivable at least that a debate prior to the conclusion of the government's judgement as to what appropriate actions are desirable-and I am talking in the broader field. I am not speaking of any specific incident or anything at this time. Whether in fact 'debate' may be the word but that in some way or other as I believe - I am not sure if it has been done in this legislature before or not but it is entirely -

MR. ROBERTS: It is the first time we have had a real (inaudible).

MR. JAMIESON: I think it is the first time we have had it in this form, that if it were by concurrence, or in some other way, we could have a discussion and a debate upon the substance of the report itself.

MR. ROBERTS: It would have to be a concurrence debate.

MR. JAMIESON: A concurrence debate, I think, is the appropriate term -I will leave that to the House Leader on my side - but something along that line that would enable us to get more than will come from, unquestionably, the one on one sort of Ministerial Statement and reply approach.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number one, I think it is significant that the Leader of the Opposition acknowledges that it is under this administration it is the first time that they have had this kind of a report produced. I think that that is a wonderful thing and that it should be continued. And secondly, by the same token that sometimes ministers and myself do not give notice to the Opposition about certain matters of ministerial and governmental import are to be announced through a Ministerial Statement, I did not anticipate that the Leader of the Opposition would ask that particular question about a general concurrence debate as it relates to that particular report. Obviously now under the rules of the House there is room for debate of that report

PREMIER PECKFORD: and many other things under the Budget Speech which will be called and all hon. members will have an opportunity to debate, wide-rangingly, if you will, to use an unusual phrase, to debate that and many other things. But I will take under advisement the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition for a full-ranging concurrence debate on that particular report and give the hon. member an answer in due course, within the next week or so. But there are obviously under the rules now a lot of ways in which members can debate especially the Budget Speech, can debate this kind of debate. But I will not say that the government is against it; obviously I will take that matter under advisement not knowing in advance that the Leader of the Opposition was going to ask that kind of question and want a sort of an immediate answer from me today.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) regarding quite an extraordinary and serious and sad situation with respect to the Fisheries Loan Board where we have still quite a number of fishermen in this Province who have no indication of whether or not their applications are going to be approved this year or not and they are already trying to get into the fishing season which has opened up in many areas of the Province. Could the minister, Sir, indicate

MR. F. ROWE: how many applications are now on file and how many have been approved, and how many have been approved in the last several weeks or the last month? And would he undertake, Sir, to direct the Fisheries Loan Board to indicate to these fishermen, who have applications in, a definite yes or no if at all possible so they will have some idea of where they stand and where they would have to go, to a chartered bank or keep on waiting for some reply from the Fisheries Loan Board?

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am unable to give the details with regard to the number of applications at this time, but I will attempt to get the information for the House in the next few days. The Loan Board is now dealing with as many applications as possible under the interim financing programme until the Budget Estimates are approved for the Fisheries Department for this season. And, of course, as soon as the Estimates are approved in the House of Assembly, the new funds allocated can be spent by the Loan Board.

The applications that are being dealt with now are the ones that have been screened and processed by the board along the lines of dealing with hardship cases, fishermen who have boats with no engines or engine problems or boats that need new gear and these are the applications getting priority at this time, during the month of April. Of course, we are hoping the Estimates will be approved around the end of April or early May and then, of course, there is a new amount of funding allocated and they can carry on with dealing with all the applications, screening them and checking out for more information, checking on the federal subsidies and getting as many as possible approved.

With regard to the chartered banks, the fishermen have been made quite aware through the Fishermen's Union at two different meetings and, in fact, one again this afternoon with the Fishermen's Union and yesterday afternoon with eighty-five fishermen and their unions from different parts of the Province here in St. John's - one again this afternoon - and they have been made quite aware that the chartered banks are only going to be dealing with loans over \$50,000 -

MR. F. ROWE:

That is right.

MR. J. MORGAN:

- which means, of course, you are dealing with new boats, larger boats, primarily in the range of 35 feet to 65 feet.

So the fishermen around the Province, I think, are being made aware through the regional offices; we have asked them to make contact with the fishermen who have applied for loans, giving this information to them, telling them that their application, if it is a hardship case, will be dealt with now and all others will be dealt with as soon as possible after the new funds are allocated for the coming year.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE:

That is not quite the way I am hearing it from the fishermen, Mr. Speaker. I am wondering if the minister would indicate - I do not know if he can supply the exact number, but is the Fisheries Loan Board actually turning down loan applications now - obviously, the minister has indicated that they are approving hardship cases only for this month. Would the minister indicate what criteria are being used in order to identify a hardship case? Because I have had quite a number of representations made to me where people in some cases are having loans approved and others are not and they have no knowledge whatsoever of what exactly a hardship case is. So the message is not getting through to the fishermen as to what a hardship case is and I am wondering if the minister could give the hon. House,

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, the criteria that are being used for identifying a hardship case.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, we have been working in close liaison in co-ordination with the Fishermen's Union, and of course the Fishermen's Union is also in a position to relay all information to the fishermen who are the members throughout the Province. In fact, I arranged approximately a month ago to ask the union to appoint a delegate, in this case Mr. Ray Greening was appointed by the union, to work with the officials of the Department of Fisheries in drafting up new regulations and operation procedures for the board. So Mr. Greening, on behalf of the fishermen, is there working with the officials of the Department of Fisheries.

So the union is fully aware of what we term hardship cases. It is a case where a man, a fisherman, has a boat he cannot use for some reason. It could be a reason because of equipment needed on the boat or there could be a need for a new engine. That is a hardship case. In other words, a case where a fisherman has a boat or equipment and he needs some extra equipment to get him back in the fishery. But of course that would not apply in a case where a man has a boat now, can go fishing in a thirty-five foot boat and he has applied for a forty-five foot boat. That would not be a hardship case. He has a boat to go fishing already this season and he can go and use a thirty-five foot boat and we would not, therefore, process the application for a forty-five foot boat at this time, not until the new funds are allocated.

So the criteria we are using for hardship cases have been thrashed out and agreed upon by the Fishermen's Union on behalf of the fishermen and I must say that right now, from the field offices around the Province, and we have different field offices, that we have instructed them to make sure that as many as possible of the applicants that we have on file, that these field officers contact them and give them

MR. MORGAN: all the information regarding what the board is doing at the present time, and what the plans are of the board in the future.

MR. F. ROWE: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde, followed by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I can give the minister an example of where hardship cases are being produced and that is where the Fisheries Loan Board is informing fishermen that their application will be approved when the appraiser or the inspector gets around to look at the boat that he is going to buy or is in the process of being built. Now that is holding up a great number of applications. Would the minister indicate to the House, Sir, how many appraisers or inspectors, whatever you call them, we have in this Province for the purpose of going around and inspecting or appraising these boats in order to get the word back to the Fisheries Loan Board to approve these applications? In my opinion they are quite insufficient, the number of these bodies around to appraise boats and it is causing delay in the processing of the loans. Would the minister indicate the number of appraisers or inspectors there are and would he give some consideration to increasing the number of appraisers that go around? And also in answering that question, I would like him to answer one further one, Sir, and that is of the \$8 million that

MR. F. ROWE: has been voted for the Fisheries Loan fund this year, would the minister indicate how much of that \$8 million has already been committed and how much is left to spend for applications that are before the Loan Board?

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Well, to answer to the first question, Mr. Speaker, the problem of inspection of boats whereby loans are approved and then subject to an inspection being carried out, that point is well taken and it is well taken with government on the basis that there is a definite need for increased numbers of inspectors. Unfortunately, we have had a very major problem in recruiting qualified inspectors from the Province and we do not know why. We have advertised a number of times; in fact, if you notice recently there were advertisements in the local paper no later than last week again advertising for vessel inspectors, electrical inspectors, hull inspectors and we are having a difficult time in recruiting qualified inspectors.

We have been emphasizing getting if at all possible qualified Newfoundlanders. If the most recent ad which was placed as of last week, if that ad is not successful in recruiting qualified applicants in Newfoundland, we will have no choice but go outside. It is the last resort to go outside the Province, but it seem like we will have to to get an adequate number on staff of qualified inspectors.

Now, the second part of the question was in connection with -

MR. F. ROWE: How much of the \$8 million -

MR. J. MORGAN: - the \$8 million. Well, that will be all new applications. There are no commitments given now on that new funding for this year, in fact, we can not do that, the hon. gentleman should realize that. We can not spend next year's allocation of funds this year. And until the estimates are approved in the House and the funds allocated to departments officially by the House of Assembly, that is the procedure we all know, that the

MR. J. MORGAN: funds are not committed for the coming year. So what I am saying is that the \$8 million will mean the processing of new applications, applications on file now but they will be processed and the new funds allocated to these applicants.

MR. T. BENNETT: Supplementary to the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT: Regarding the hardship case, I have had communications from a constituent who informs me that last year he borrowed \$3,000 to get himself into the fishery - \$3,000 from the bank - in order that he could acquire a \$12,000 valued boat through the Fisheries Loan Board. \$1,350 went against his loan to the Fisheries Loan Board. In the middle of the season he lost his engine, consequently lost a great deal of gear equipment, presently owes the Fisheries Loan Board \$965 and is asking for a \$3,000 loan from the Fisheries Loan Board that he might get back into the fishery for this season. I am wondering if this is a hardship case, if this can be described as a hardship case? The gentleman tells me that at the present time his boat would probably be valued at the bank as is for about \$2,000 if the Fisheries Loan Board foreclosed and put it on the market. They would probably recapture \$2,000 where they have in essence \$12,000 invested in the boat, and he is having real problems. He owes the bank nearly \$3,000 because of his original loan to get into it, he bought radar equipment independent of his loans from the Fisheries Loan Board which will go away from the boat, it seems, because it is not built into the agreement with the boat. And I am wondering if this gentleman can now make a claim under this special hardship case, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me from listening to the hon. gentleman and the information he supplied in asking his question that that could be very well considered a hardship case. And I will be glad to meet with him after the Question Period and get the name of the gentleman concerned from the hon. gentleman and pass it on to the Loan Board Chairman, have it checked out and see if he can get the application approved.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) The hon. member for Torngat Mountains, followed by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House). In respect to the budget that outlined emergency air transportation, I notice from the budget that it did not specify what date this subsidy was going to become effective. Could the minister advise the House of what time it will become effective?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I am not certain.

I would presume it becomes effective, I do not know if it is September or not. I would have to get a look at that now. It will be September of next year or as of when the Budget comes down, the first of April.

I want to point out that

the full details of the whole matter have not been worked out yet. You know, we have been talking about emergency airlifts so far and I think when we discussed the matter here in the House in the Private Members Bill, we discussed the same kind of operation on the Island. So, I want to take note of what time we are bringing it into effect. I believe it is right now, at the beginning of the fiscal year but I have to take a check on it.

In the meantime, I would also point out that we have not worked out the details of the matter as yet through government.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the minister has been very evasive in his answer.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Look at what he is up against.

MR. G. WARREN:

He is saying maybe it is the fiscal year, which was fifteen days ago, or maybe it is another four months down the road. Why does not the minister go on the public media and tell the people who are concerned when it is going to be? I am having calls from every district, in particular every district in Labrador, asking me, 'Is it in effect now?' Will it be in effect next year or will it be in effect four years down the road? like a lot of other things in the Budget.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the minister is saying that not too many details are in line yet in this emergency air transportation subsidy. I just came back from Labrador and I have heard through the media down there that there are some things going on concerning this emergency transportation. And one thing which was announced is it is possible that residents would have to pay the airlines themselves first and be reimbursed by the government later. I would like to know if the minister could confirm if that is one of the possibilities that they are looking into? If so, I can tell him now that it is not very much comparable to the Island portion of the Province.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the general policy was that we would be paying for the emergency airlifts in the Province, the Budget Speech announced that. The details of what would be done would be worked out through government. It has not been done yet and I will notify - there has been no notification given anybody in Labrador as to the procedure, except that it will be coming into effect this year.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, It is going to come into effect this year, this year runs from April 1st to March 31st next year, probably March 30th next year we may see it is possible, what the minister is saying now. You know, we have already had two cases since the 1st of April that had to come out to St. John's. There may be many more cases before the minister comes up with an official date. I would also like to ask the minister, in his deliberations on how this subsidy will work, if a person is required to come out to the hospital on the Island and he has to pay his transportation out here and once he does recuperate, is he left on his own now to get back the best way he can or is he going to be taken care of getting back

MR. G. WARREN:

to his home town?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, these are part of the details, these are part of the details and if we work it the same way we work in the ambulance, we will be working it the same way we would on the island portion of the Province. And the details have not been worked out. I mentioned that. When we make a general statement of policy that we are going to implement a service, we have to go through government procedures for the details and that will be done and I will get that to the hon. gentleman as soon as it is complete.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests (C. Power). Mr. Speaker, due to the high cost of electricity in the Province, particularly in rural areas, an awful lot of people have been cutting wood at an alarming rate, in many areas of the Province. Particularly, I would point out, in my own district of Port au Port, which the foresters tell me is in a terrible situation, and I am told as well that the Avalon Peninsula, the Fogo area, Twillingate, a lot of those areas of the Province are having problems with the domestic, or should I say the community wood supply, and I was wondering if the minister had any statistics on what

MR. HODDER: the length of time of the wood supplies are in wood lots in adjacent areas to communities in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, obviously in the last five or six years the trend back toward wood burning sources of energy, stoves and what have you, has been an extremely popular type of trend. Still we are not in a stage in Newfoundland, I would not think, today where we have as many wood burning stoves today as there were twenty years ago. In certain areas of the Province our wood inventory possibly is being depleted, but not to the level that some persons are saying that it is. Maybe in the Port au Port area there is a problem. I have asked my foresters to check on a public statement made by the member the other day. But again the situation as it relates to Newfoundland, we have in Newfoundland over 80 million cords of wood, approximately 100,000 acres per year are used in domestic use and, again looking at those inventory amounts of 80 million cords as in relationship to maybe 100,000 cords which might be used locally and domestically, it seems that we have a very adequate wood supply for a very large amount of time. In certain given locales in the Province, it may be in the Avalon for instance we are having a problem, not so much with the wood inventory but the fact that the indiscriminate cutting by persons along every side road that is on the Avalon which is causing the foresters some concern because certain areas are being depleted when certain other areas should be accessible to the public and should be used more efficiently and more wisely.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, in listening to the minister's answer, I cannot seem - he says there is an awful lot of wood in Newfoundland, there are sufficient inventories -

MR. ROBERTS: All in the wrong places.

MR. HODDER: I think that the problem is that the wood in adjacent communities, the small communities in rural areas, that is the wood that is used for the building of the boat, the building of a house, with the high cost of fuel today and that sort of thing, you cannot expect them to drive from one area, a long distance, to another area. And what we are finding - I see those community wood supplies as being sort of the heritage of that community and I would ask the minister if he would give any consideration to developing community wood reserves, and I am thinking particularly in terms of replanting the forest for those particular communities, for those particular areas, replenishing the forest by replanting techniques and perhaps I would ask the minister if he would consider that perhaps we should teach people proper cutting procedures because the general fellow who goes and buys a wood stove and goes out to cut wood, he is not necessarily trained in any form of wood cutting, to leave every fifth tree or whatever. Perhaps we should have some sort of education programme. And another question I would ask him to address himself to when he stands is whether he considers that the fact that now that the electrical rates are higher because the Public Utilities Board allowed Newfoundland Light and Power to put the rates higher on electric users, if this not going to encourage more people to get into wood stoves and put more problems and pressures on the wood reserves?

MR. ROBERTS: Carried.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in response to the first portion of the question as it relates to the heritage wood supply around communities, if you want to call it that, obviously as the demand for wood and wood supplies around the community becomes greater and greater, of necessity it is going to mean that persons living in those communities and going to have to go some greater distance from home in order to get an adequate supply of wood. That has always

MR. POWER: happened in Newfoundland. It happened in my father's day, my grandfather's day. As you cut out wood close to a community, you have to move farther away. Now reforestation is one possible solution, an assistance to that. But as the member made an announcement the other day talking about a ten year problem down the road, obviously reforestation is not going to solve that problem. If we are going to plant trees they are not going to be harvestable for about thirty-five or forty or fifty years. And that is the type of planning that we have to get involved in. We in Newfoundland have a really active reforestation programme, primarily in association with our industries. We this year will be planting over 1 million seedlings and we are hoping that we will have a programme in place that five years down the road we will be planting in excess of 5 million seedlings. So there will certainly be an adequate wood supply fifty or sixty years down the road. There may very well be a problem with wood supply in the short term, and the mid term because of this great demand in wood stoves.

With regard to the education procedures of cutting of trees and how to properly proceed with burning procedures and what have you, the Department of Mines and Energy does put out a brochure telling persons about how to burn wood safely in their homes. And certainly I agree with the

MR. C. POWER: member that maybe an education programme might be necessary to teach persons in the Province that they just cannot go in and cut every tree of any diameter and any size in a given locale.

MR. J. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. HODDER: I keep noting that the minister keeps referring to the large inventories of wood, but when you look again - and I want to stress again - when you look at the wood supplies in a very large number of communities in this Province, that large inventory that we have across the Province, including commercial lands, is just not available to them. And I think the minister would agree that the community wood supply is part of their heritage. But my question, Mr. Speaker, is in looking over the minister's statement on the Royal Commission which was appointed yesterday in the House, and looking at the terms of reference, there is no specific terms of reference to look into this particular problem, although it could be implied in perhaps term of reference (e) where there might be broad public input. The others seem to deal with health and the forest industry. Could the minister not put another term of reference in there to look at this whole problem of domestic wood supplies? Because, Mr. Speaker, we cannot tell people that they cannot cut wood. We cannot tell them that they cannot cut the wood supply alongside their place, but we can help them to preserve it and we can make sure that we help them with reforestation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in response to the enquiry as to whether we will have the Royal Commission examine commercial and domestic wood stocks, again, I do not think that is an aspect of the Royal Commission. It has been set up only in the broad sense that they will be looking at the full utilization of our forestry sector and again, the domestic sector will be considered in that, but only as secondary and not as the primary purpose of the Royal Commission.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The time for Oral Question period has expired.

I wish to welcome to the gallery on behalf of all hon. members, Mayor Richard McDonald and councillors, Alphonsus Carroll and Kevin Piercey from the town of St. George's in the district of St. George's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file the statutory report required under Section 32 of the Mineral Act (1976) setting out the various claims which have been staked in the Province in the period April 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980 and covering some 250,000 acres.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further reports?

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Section 43, Mr. Speaker, of the Workers' Compensation Act, requires that the annual report be tabled in the Legislature by April 15th. I wish to hereby table the 1979 report.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

Head 1, Consolidated Fund Services.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, yesterday when I made a very valid point in connection with lawyers who sit in the Cabinet serving two interests, serving two masters, in this case, the Bank of Montreal - which is no fault of the Bank of Montreal, by the way; the Bank of Montreal

MR. S. NEARY: is entitled to hire whatever lawyers they want. If they want to hire the hon. the member for St. John's East, the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall), that is up to themselves, but it is up to the hon. member for St. John's East, the President of the Council, to decide

MR. S. NEARY: whether or not it is ethical to sit in the Cabinet at the same time he represents the government's bankers, namely the Bank of Montreal. Now when I raised this matter yesterday I raised it, if hon. members will recall, in the form of a question. I asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to tell the House if it was indeed the policy of this government, if the Minister of Finance and the administration felt that it was wise to have a minister or two sitting in the Cabinet at the same time they represented the government's bankers. I wanted to know from the Minister of Finance if in his opinion this sort of arrangement was indeed a conflict of interest situation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not get a reply from the Minister of Finance but I got a scolding from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the culprit in this particular instance. And the hon. gentleman got up, Mr. Chairman, and more or less through his - in his usual nasty manner tried to leave the impression that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who he considers to be dirt under his feet, attempted to smear him. All I did was ask a question in the beginning and I got no reaction and no response from the government benches, and then I had go a little further and I eventually provoked the gentleman to standing up and confessing, he confessed to this House that indeed he does represent the Bank of Montreal at the same time he is sitting in the Cabinet. And it really does not matter if he is a part-time minister or a full-time minister, he is indeed a minister. And I got scolded for it, Sir, reprimanded for it by the hon. gentleman and I was told that I am less than nothing. Well now, Sir, I will tell the House this, that I could not care less what the hon. gentleman thinks about me. If he does not think that I am in his social class, if he does not think that I am real true blue blood like himself, I could not care less! The fact of the matter is,

MR. S. NEARY: Sir, that I was so mad I was boiling over when I heard that hon. gentleman make a statement when indeed I sat in this House. And I have to say, Sir, that one of the rottenest, one of the slimiest, one of the nastiest things that you could do in this House - you could even get away with criticizing the church in this House - but about the slimiest thing you could do was attack somebody's mother. And I happened to be sitting in this House when that same hon. gentleman who scolded me because I am trying to do my job on behalf of the people of this Province, because I am trying to see that the Public Treasury is protected, that I am trying to see that nobody is in a conflict of interest situation and I am scolded because I am not in the hon. gentleman's social class, I do not hobnob around St. John's with his kind of people so I am less than nothing, anybody who does not do that should be wiped out, they do not exist as far as the hon. gentleman is concerned - and then he decides he wants to get nasty about it - and that same hon. gentleman in this House did about one of the rottenest things that I have ever seen in my eighteen years in this House and that was to insult a member's mother and that is the rottenest thing you could do as far as I am concerned in this House.

That same hon. gentleman, if the hon. member will recall who is scolding me now because I am trying to smear him trying to do my job for the people of this Province, was the same hon. gentleman who took a minister to task because he was being looked into by a commission in connection with the Port de Grave town council. The gentleman was later exonerated, but he had to resign from the Cabinet.

MR. S. NEARY: And that same gentleman, Mr. Chairman had his name on a share list of Metro Engineering, Mr. A.B. Walsh's company, and stood in this House and told us that it was only a qualifying share and this is allowed under the Companies Act.

And also, Mr. Chairman, this same gentleman, who now wants to try to belittle me, is the same gentleman who had a trust fund down in his office at the Royal Trust Building on behalf of Charbonneau Associates, which is the crowd that swindled the insurance company that swindled the taxi drivers in this city.

MR. NEARY:

The same hon. gentleman is now trying to smidge, in his nasty way, trying to belittle me because I am not a member of his social class. That hon. gentleman has gotten away with too much, Mr. Chairman. He can stand up in his pious way in this House and say, "Oh, I am the only honourable, decent man in this House, the only member of integrity in this House." And the news media up there in the press gallery overhead have swallowed it, they take it hook, line and sinker. 'Oh, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) criticized his own party yesterday, or today, when he was over there, when the Moore's administration was here;' they lap it up. They never bother to listen to the real member for St. John's East. Thank God, I have a good memory. I can sit here and I can remember everything that happened in this House from the first day I arrived here. I did not smear the hon. gentleman. I merely asked some questions. And then I am scolded by a member who got up and did one of the slimiest, rottenest things I have ever seen done in this House and probably in any other jurisdiction in the world and that was to criticize a member's mother, and he got a clink in the side of the jaw for doing it. A member had to go across the House. That was the only defence he had, this member, and give him a belt in the side of the chops and I happened to be here when it happened. It is a good thing I have a good memory, Mr. Chairman. And now he can stand up, this hon. member can stand up and say, "Yes, I represent the Bank of Montreal but I abstain myself from any decisions. Whenever the matters come up involving the government's bankers I abstain myself. I have never done anything wrong." Nobody said the hon. gentleman did anything wrong except that he has placed himself in a conflict of interest situation. That is what he is doing wrong. And I am tempted, Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to lodge an official complaint to the Newfoundland Law Society. They were so quick to do it - one of the members sitting over there was so quick to do it about my colleague, and now I am tempted to do it to see what they think about ethical practices and what they think of lawyers, of their members when they claim that a member should be so careful and

MR. NEARY: so scrupulous about not placing himself in a conflict of interest situation, what they think of the hon. gentleman sitting as a Cabinet minister in a public position, in a position of public trust and at the same time representing a client that is doing business with the government, namely the government's bankers. And I want to make it clear this is not a condemnation of the Bank of Montreal. It is a condemnation of the hon. gentleman and the Premier of this Province who today made one of the biggest mistakes of his life when he got up there. There are times, Mr. Chairman, there are times when party solidarity comes into play and today was not one of them. The Premier has not yet reacted to my charges that the hon. - and I am making charges today, I never made any charges yesterday - that the President of the Council, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), a senior minister in the government, is in a conflict of interest situation. And if the Premier is going to brush that aside like he brushed aside the Public Accounts Committee report today, then I would say that Newfoundland and the Newfoundland people better take a good hard look at his sincerity and his integrity and his honesty. There has finally been a crack in his armour. He is going to pick and choose when it effects his administration, when it lands on his doorstep. If it effects Frank Moores that is different. When it lands on his own doorstep, then he chooses to come to the rescue and the protection of the culprits. That is the kind of integrity and honesty and openness we are getting in this government. And I say it is wrong and it is improper and probably illegal for the President of the Council, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) to sit in the Cabinet and at the same time represent the government's bankers. I understand my

MR. S. NEARY: ten minutes are up, Sir. If I can get one of my colleagues up for a minute, I will get up and have another go at this situation.

On motion, Clause 105-03-05 and Clause 105-03-08 carried.

On motion Head 1 - Consolidated Fund Services carried.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Before you call Head II, I think it might be an idea, I think it would be a value to the Committee if the Committee were informed what the situation is with respect of the time under the Standing Orders for the estimates.

Now, according to my calculations there were sixteen headings referred to committees themselves which would bring it up to fifty-seven hours there in committees. There is three hours for the concurrence debates, which will come afterwards, which are nine and then there is the time spent for interim supply and to date, but I think it might be a value to the Committee members, I do not know whether the rest of the Committee agrees with me, if before we proceeded not counting this time when you are counting it up if, Mr. Chairman, you took the advice of the officers of the Table and told us how much time is left because there are two other headings. There is Legislative and Executive to be heard in the Committee of the Whole, and I think it would be beneficial for the members to know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it would be beneficial to all parties concerned. Pursuant to Standing Order 116 (1) "Consideration of supply is confined to seventy-five hours. This includes consideration both in Committee of Supply and in the main estimates and interim supply." As well, pursuant to Standing Order 119 (2), "For each department referred to in the Estimates Committee, three hours is deducted from the period of debate in

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

the Committee of Supply."

The times used so far are as follows -

that will be excluding the prior ten minutes we went through today - interim supply, two hours and fifty minutes; the main estimates, yesterday's debate really, was one hour and fifty-five minutes; and the sixteen departments referred to in the estimates committees - three hours for department for forty-eight hours: That give a total of fifty-two hours and forty-five minutes. So the remaining time in the Committee of Supply in the House is twenty-two hours and fifteen minutes. Of this time, three hours may be used for concurrence debates on the reports from the estimate committees.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I think that is nine hours,

Mr. Chairman, I think it is three hours -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Oh, yes, three hours -

MR. W. MARSHALL:

- per committee and there are three committees so that will be nine hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

- and three committees, okay,

Resource, Estimates and Services.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

So that gives you an idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Right.

Legislative - Head II.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, just a very brief

word on this merely to say that traditionally this head is the responsibility or at least presented to the Committee by the Minister of Finance although it deals with the elected representatives of the House and, of course, the hon. Speaker is, shall we say, the head in that respect. It also deals with the Auditor General's report or division, and it also deals with the Parliamentary Commissioner, more commonly known as the Ombudsman. I have the details available to me on the items in their various estimates and I do not propose at this time to make any general statement on them but I will be willing to answer any questions that I am able to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Chairman, we are quite prepared to allow this vote to go through without any discussion. I do not know, though, if the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) is familiar as to - I realize the Ombudsman is an officer of the House. Is there any provision for other than his written report? I presume that if members wished to have him called as a witness or appear before a committee or something, I presume that could be done. It is a matter of curiosity on my part as to whether or not the Ombudsman identifies with the Legislature in any way other than his written annual report. Would the minister know?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

I perhaps cannot give a very authoritative answer to that. My understand though is that he

DR. J. COLLINS: reports to the House of Assembly and my only function in this regard really is to stand in his place in presenting his estimates.

MR. JAMIESON: Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, I believe we are talking about the subheading under the Ombudsman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Legislative, yes. Head II.

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I made a few comments last year at this time and the Ombudsman then came back publicly and refuted some of them, but there is one thing, and I do not intend to spend only just a moment, that there is still, in my opinion, and I am certainly sure in the opinion of other members, there is still not sufficient knowledge throughout the Province, perhaps in St. John's but now in the rural outports, of the function of the Ombudsman. And I do believe that the Ombudsman has at times sent out to certain areas of the Province, sent out some information about his office, but I found, Mr. Chairman, that any problems of any major nature which has come up in my area of the Province, and I will not say my district but in my area of the Province, that these people are more likely to send it off to what used to be the - I believe it is not in existence any more, I think they had the last programme the other night, but the CBC Ombudsman, and I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if it would not be perhaps to the advantage of the Ombudsman's Office and the Ombudsman himself, to again, and I guess this is the second time I have called on him to do this, but again to make his services known throughout the Province. Because just a few days ago I met with a group of workers in Stephenville, and my hon. friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) knows about the situation, who had a problem with severance pay and their first reaction was to go to the Ombudsman in Ottawa, not to the Provincial Ombudsman, and I know of where I speak when I say that his office and his functions are not well known throughout

MR. HODDER: Newfoundland and I would like to see more publicity and I would like to see perhaps every Newfoundlander in one way or other to be informed through whichever way the Ombudsman wishes to do it to be informed of his services and the fact that he is there ready to mediate problems of our rural Newfoundlanders.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend has provoked me, motivated me into getting up to have a few words on this particular subhead, especially about the Ombudsman.

First of all I want to deal with the Department of the Auditor General. I would like to ask the minister if the Auditor General now has the staff that is required to do the job for the people of this Province? For a few years there was some problem with staffing the Auditor General's Department. He never seemed to have enough staff to do all the things that needed to be done and there was an outstanding request for additional staff. I would like to know now where the Auditor General is housed, where his offices are, how many staff he has, if he has sufficient staff to do the audits that needs to be done and how often, Mr. Chairman, how often do they do an audit? We are told in the Auditor General's Report that he merely does a spot check. Now in these spot checks recently, and the spot checks that the Auditor General did last year, he picked up a number of examples of what could only be called corruption, dealing with McConnell Advertising and the former Premier of this Province. Now that was picked up merely by spot checking. Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, and I throw this out as a question to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), is it possible that there are in the records in the Department of Finance and in other departments in Confederation Building, there are other examples of corruption and wrongdoing? If the Auditor General can pick up a few examples of wrongdoing and corruption by merely spot checking, would it not be advisable, in order to protect the Public Treasury of this Province,

MR. S. NEARY: that the Auditor General be given additional staff so that he can do more than spot check. We just came through seven years of corruption in this Province that the administration wants to blot out as if it never happened. They jump over seven years to criticize the previous, previous administration, the Smallwood administration, they jump over seven years of corruption to do that. Hon. members may not have been sitting in the House during that seven years, but that does not make any difference; it is still a continuation of the same government. And we saw today, Mr. Chairman, the greatest example of hypocrisy we have even seen in this hon. House.

MR. STAGG: That is unparliamentary.

MR. S. NEARY: No, that is parliamentary, but when you refer to an individual member then it is unparliamentary, but when you are referring to the government collectively and their policies it is perfectly in order to say that it is the lowest form of hypocrisy.

MR. STAGG: That is unparliamentary.

MR. S. NEARY: No, it is not unparliamentary. If it was Your Honour would bring me to task. I have been long enough in this House now to know when I am parliamentary and when I am unparliamentary, and I am on pretty safe and solid ground when I say that the policy of the administration, their philosophy is hypocritical. And we saw an example of it today when the Public Accounts Committee, reporting on the Auditor General's report, unanimously found the former Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Morgan) guilty of breaking the laws of this Province. They sat in judgement they heard evidence, and four members on that side of the House and three members on this side of the House found the hon. gentleman guilty. And the Premier

MR. S. NEARY: of the Province gets up and says, 'Well, we are sorry it happened and we are going to see that it does not happen again', and that is it. Well, if I were an hon. gentleman on that Public Accounts Committee, I would be clamouring for a greater decision than that, because, Mr. Chairman, never again can the people of this Province have any faith or confidence in their Public Accounts Committee. The Premier has reduced it, reduced it to nothing. It is just a farce! It may as well not exist. They took the Auditor General's report, they investigated the wrongdoing that was pointed out in that report, they came to the conclusion that the former Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Morgan) was guilty and the Premier shrugs it off and brushes it off by saying, 'Well, we are sorry we have sinned but we will see to it that it does not happen again'. What kind of justice is that? That is the double standard that this hon. crowd have been noted for in this Province since 1972, setting double standards.

And the Premier gets up and camouflages the issue by saying, 'I am going to have an open government, there is going to be honesty and integrity -

MR. STAGG: That is not relevant, Mr. Chairman.

MR. S. NEARY: It is relevant, We are talking about the Auditor General's department.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: No, we are on Legislative in case the hon. gentleman got lost.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Legislative, Sessional, Department of the Auditor General and Office of the Parliamentary Commission.

MR. S. NEARY: Now I can wait, if the hon. gentleman wants to wait until we get down to the Auditor General's Department, I will repeat everything I said again.

MR. W. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order. We are on Legislative, Head II and it is 201-01.

MR. W. MARSHALL: 201-01?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the first one.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is now debating the Auditor General's Department which is 202.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Actually in this particular case when I called Head II the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) immediately stood.

MR. HODDER: I did, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. So if it is in order now just to clarify the situation, just the general Head of Head II was called Legislative.

Shall 201-01 carry?

MR. S. NEARY: Do you want to carry that now or are we' allowed to have a few words on it or what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, you can speak to that, of course. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, I am quite satisfied to let the Lieutenant Governor's establishment go. I do not necessarily agree with everything that is in there. I am hoping that they are taking -

MR. W. MARSHALL: But that is not in there. The Lieutenant Governor's salary is in Executive. We are on Legislative now, 201, which is Sessional Indemnities.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, boy, let her go. I could not care less! Let her go, boy!

April 15th., 1980

Tape No. 776

DW - 4

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I say for the sake of orderli-
ness, Mr. Chairman, if you would like -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Item by item.

On motion, subhead 201-01 and 201-

02 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

I can respond to some of the questions with regard to the Auditor General that the hon. member raised there.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

'John', you are on the wrong subhead.

DR. J. COLLINS:

No, we are not, we are on 202-03, are we not?

MR. W. MARSHALL:

No, we are on 201-03.

DR. J. COLLINS:

I am sorry, I thought you said 202-03. On motion, 201-04 through 201-06, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall 202-01 carry?

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

That is the one the minister is going to give us some answers on. While the minister is up, could the hon. gentleman also tell us, in addition to the questions that I already put to the hon. gentleman, if the Auditor General now has the authority to audit the books and records of Crown corporations and other government agencies? There was a time when the Auditor General was not allowed to audit the records of Crown corporations and Crown companies and so forth, and Labrador Linerboard is a classic example of that, where there was \$500 million of corruption. The Auditor General could not go in. The Auditor General was not invited and could not audit the books of that company, which is a Crown company, was not a private company as the former Minister of Justice used to stand up and so sanctimoniously tell me. It was a Crown company of which the Minister of Justice of that day was an officer, was President of the Board of Directors of that company at one stage of his career in this House, presided over \$500 million of corruption and has since been amply rewarded for that, plus all the other weak-kneed things that that hon. gentleman did while he was Minister of Justice and Minister of Finance in this House.

But can the Auditor General now go and audit the books of Crown corporations?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why not ask the Auditor General?

MR. S. NEARY:

No, I am asking the Minister of Finance.

Words -

MR. F. STAGG:

Do words fail you?

MR. S. NEARY:

No, words do not fail me.

Ignorance is bliss, Mr. Chairman. I am asking the minister, who is the appropriate minister to ask in this House, if the Auditor General is not auditing the accounts, the books, for instance, of Newfoundland Hydro, of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission? And the minister can get up and say, 'Well, there are independent audits done on these accounts.' The independent audits may be well and good, but I would feel safer if the Auditor General were allowed to go in and take a look at the books of these Crown corporations and government agencies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY:

The Auditor General reports to this House. The private individual auditors report to the Crown corporations and to the agencies. And the Auditor General can indicate to the House if there is any extravagance and waste and spending not in accordance with the allocation of money from this House, not a private company - only the Auditor General can do that. The Auditor General has to interpret and take his instructions from this House. So I would be curious to hear what the minister has to say about this situation.

Other than that, Sir, there is not much else. Anything else, I think, we can deal with when we get to another subhead.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

The hon. member asked firstly in regard to the Auditor General's department, where it is situated. As far as I know, it is situated in an office building on the South side of Elizabeth Avenue at the corner of New Cove Road, in the building formerly the head office, I believe, in St. John's of the Imperial Oil Company. As far as I know the head office is there. There may be branches elsewhere, but I think that is the head office of the Auditor General.

With regard to staff, the hon. member asked if

DR. J. COLLINS:

there was sufficient staff. I suppose that is a bit of a subjective question. I can certainly indicate, I hope, what staff the Auditor General has. In the vote, the salaries for the Auditor General amount to just over one and a half million dollars, which would suggest there is a sizeable staff. And in actual numbers, there are sixty-nine on staff there. That is broken down as follows: There are three in the executive section and of the three, one is the Auditor General himself and one is the Deputy Auditor General, and then there are five in the administrative section. There are six in the research and the development section, of which five are auditors. There are ten - no, wait now; I am sorry, there are fifteen in the public accounts section, all of which are auditors. There are a further nine auditors in another part of that section so that in the public accounts, totally, there are twenty-seven of which twenty-four are auditors. And then in the section for other accounts there are another twenty-eight personell, twenty-three of which are auditors.

In regard to how often audits are done, the Auditor General, at any time, his authority allows him at any time that he so wishes to investigate any of the departments of government or other organizations under his purview. As hon. members know, there is a report annually, and I think the usual practice is to audit any departments on an annual basis but certainly it is open to the Auditor General that he could audit a dozen times if he so wishes.

I am not aware of whether he makes more than one audit in any department, but I know that he makes at least one audit annually in each department. The hon. member also asked whether Crown Corporations come under the scrutiny of the Auditor General and that is so. His responsibilities, I might read these out:

DR. J. COLLINS: He is responsible for auditing the accounts of all provincial government departments and reporting thereon to the House of Assembly. Auditing and reporting on the accounts and financial statements of various Crown corporations, agencies and municipalities. And hon. members will recall that when reports, say, of the Liquor Corporation or the Liquor Licencing Board or whatever, are tabled in this House, there is a section in the report which is verified over the signature of the Auditor General and presumably if there was anything that the Auditor General wished to bring to the notice of this hon. House, there would be some comment in that section.

On motion Clause 202-02-01 to
Clause 202-02-04 carried.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the member from Port au Port (J. Hodder) as well as the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) in talking about the Ombudsman and the need for publicity. There is one civil servant in this Province who serves everybody and basically the need for advertising is even more so now that program on CBS is discontinued. Secondly, with regard to the Auditor General's Report, I am rather concerned, as a new politician, that the things that were uncovered in the last session, after he made his report, that these were uncovered only as a result of spot checking. It only poses the question in my mind that if the spot checking with such an insufficient staff, what would happen if we had a lot more staff to do more investigating? So I would like to support the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) by saying that we need more members on the Auditor General's staff and also to have the Auditor General go and audit Crown Corporations and government agencies, thereby giving our people in this Province more self-assurance and a sense of security, that the money

MR. E. HISCOCK: that is collected through taxation in this Province, will also be spent in the correct manner. So only on these two matters would I like to lend my support to my two fellow colleagues.

On motion Clause 202-02-04 through

202-02-04 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

203-01.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Briefly, I want to make our annual

comment on the office of the Parliamentary Commissioner, commonly known as the Ombudsman. I want to say here that for what good it is, for what good the office of the Parliamentary Commissioner is, Sir, we may as well wipe it out and retire him, let him go home and live on full salary. That office of Parliamentary Ombudsman - which was a Liberal idea by the way, an idea that was born during the final days of the Smallwood administration. It was not us who appointed the Ombudsman, it was the administration that succeeded the Smallwood administration, but the idea and the philosophy was pioneered by the Liberal government in this Province and it ended up, Mr. Chairman, far short of what we had in mind. All the Parliamentary Commissioner is doing right now is trying to rectify mistakes that are made by ministers and bureaucrats in the government. His scope is rather limited, due to no fault of the Ombudsman. The poor fellow must be sitting down there in his office completely frustrated. People have given up. First when the office was established, Mr. Peddle, who I had the pleasure of sitting in this House with when he was a member of this House - it was a political appointment; it is just as well to face it, I sat in this House with the hon. gentleman when he represented Grand Falls. When he first got appointed he was besieged with letters and complaints from people all over the Province but religiously the reply went out, "I am sorry I cannot help you. This is not under my jurisdiction. I do not have the power to deal with it." The only thing the Ombudsman can deal with are decisions that have been made by ministers or bureaucrats. And you might have noticed from the Ombudsman's report this year, it was probably the briefest report that he has ever tabled in this House. The first one he wrote, I remember, was riddled with humour because the gentleman is a very witty individual who gets a great kick out of life and we all enjoyed it very much as he outlined the various cases. Most of them he had to reject because he could not deal with them. This time he dealt exclusively with the government's handling of claims that are

MR. NEARY: made against the various departments of government for damage to people's vehicles and to their property and so forth. He dealt exclusively with that matter. And I had a similar case come up myself about a week after the report was tabled in this House and I went and discussed it with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and I was glad to hear from the Minister of Justice that the government is taking a look now at involving private insurance companies so that people who have claims against the government will not have to take on the big government, will not have to hire expensive lawyers to take on the big government, will be able to deal with an insurance company the same as any other individual who is covered for accidents with insurance companies. This would be a good thing. But as I started to say, Mr. Chairman, the Ombudsman must be completely frustrated. I had occasion myself to write the Ombudsman with what I thought was an open and shut case on numerous occasions and I finally ended up writing the Ombudsman for the CBC and I bet you all the members of this House, if they were to tell the true story, would have to get up and say they were completely frustrated and they had to write some other source, they have had to refer people to Legal Aid or they had to write the Ombudsman. I remember writing Mr. Cooper.

MR. NEARY: I had one outstanding case and I involved Mr. Cooper, he finally got it settled, involving a hunter who had all his ammunition, his guns, and his motor vehicle confiscated because he did not bring the testicles of a male moose out of the woods and give it to the wildlife officer on the way out. And there was nothing on the licence that said that you had to do that, and he won his case. They had confiscated everything belonging to him.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to find out from the minister now, does the government have any intention of broadening the terms of reference of the Ombudsman to give him a little more power and authority so he can deal with some of the real complaints in this Province? Because if they have not they may as well shut down the office, close her up, send the Ombudsman and the staff home and retire him on full salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Shall 203-01 carry?

MR. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: If the minister is not going to respond, I think I will take advantage of this opportunity to put on the record, even though probably no one will pay the slightest attention to it, what I consider to be one of the most serious deficiencies in government and in our democratic system today, and that is the almost callous disregard of the ordinary individual by so many with whom they have to come in direct contact. I have mentioned this in the House before and I am sure that it must be of at least as much concern to members opposite as it is to me. The kind of case that my friend from LaPoile has mentioned, there are scores and dozens and dozens of others. But one of the real problems is to visit the small fishing communities, the smaller settlements of Newfoundland and indeed here in St. John's, and to find the difficulty that citizens have in getting what I would describe as a compassionate response out of government. And that is something which really has to begin at the top. It has got to begin

MR. JAMIESON: with the ministers who are saying to their officials, "Look, you must be both civil and you must be servants", and sometimes, unfortunately, that does not turn out to be the case. Now, I am not looking in the way that my friend from Lapoile (Mr. Neary) is, I am not on the same subject as he is, in terms of the Ombudsman, but I do suggest - I am not even looking for a response, I suppose, when I say this - but I do suggest that every minister of the government, it is incumbent on him first of all to understand himself the necessity for being responsive, but above everything else to ensure that the departments and the ordinary people down the road are that way. You know, one of the problems, Mr. Chairman, that prompts this kind of difficulty is the fact that it is far easier for an official to go strictly by the book, even though it makes no sense to do so, but at least he cannot be faulted by going by the book. It is far easier for him to do that than to use a little common sense, and as in the case of the hunter, winding up with a whole series of representations to Ombudsmen and goodness knows who else. I think we see it with regard to the game laws, we see it with regard to welfare, we see it with regard to most of what I would describe as the less fortunate elements in society, the people who cannot go and hire the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) to represent them - I guess he comes pretty high - or the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), whose brilliance in the law is unquestioned. They cannot go to these kind of people and get them to represent them. So, therefore, they do have real difficulty when they get into what I would call the bowels of the bureaucracy, and it really is shameful and I would hope - by the way, it is not just something that is confined to this Province, I think it is a growing trend everywhere - it really is shameful the way some unfortunate person comes to you with a mass, literally: He brings out of his pocket a great big envelope and he has had ten or fifteen or twenty letters, and if ever you could invent a game -

MR. BARRY: Some people from Petit Forte were in to see me on Sunday with just that type of problem.

April 15, 1980

Tape No. 780

GH-3

MR. JAMIESON:

I am sure the hon. member is happy,
and I am sure that he must agree with my proposition that if you could
market this

MR. D. JAMIESON: game and call it 'Send the Fool Further', the bureaucracy would make a fortune. And I would certainly commend to this administration that a crash course - and, by the way, it is not all departments because not all departments are that much involved with the ordinary citizen - but when you see day after day, week in and week out - I had the good fortune to spend the holiday period at one of the best resorts there is, namely, Swift Current in Placentia Bay, but every day there were people coming in with very, what seemed to be ordinary problems. I am glad the Premier is in his seat because I am sure he will thoroughly agree with me on this, what seemed to be serious problems to them, when you look at it you will find out that it is only a matter of somebody using his common sense. Sending out a letter, whether it be in Petit Forte or whether it be in North Harbour or Garden Cove or somewhere, and saying, 'In answer to your letter, Subsection 45(a) (d) Paragraph Z or something or other of the regulations means 'Please go and look this up,' What is the fellow going to do in a small community? So I make the appeal to the minister, if he is the man who is responsible for the Ombudsman in terms of expanding the effectiveness of this man's role, that something be done on this score.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could have a moment just to revert to the head under the Auditor General? I would just like to give a little supplementary information, if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Right.

DR. J. COLLINS: The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) asked if the Auditor General audited the accounts of Crown corporations, and I made an answer to that, but I do have a fuller answer now that perhaps I can give him.

MR. S. NEARY: No problem. Did you give a wrong answer?

DR. J. COLLINS: No, I did not really, but I just want to give fuller details.

DR. J. COLLINS: The Financial Administration Act provides that the Treasury Board or the Executive Council can request the Auditor General to examine the records of government boards, etc. In most of these agencies, for instance, the Newfoundland and Labrador - a financial agency, the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation and so on, the Auditor General is the statutory auditor. And in the Accounts of Crown Corporation Boards and Authorities for 1978, if hon. members wish to look into that, hon. members will see that in almost all instances those particular types of Crown corporation and agency are actually audited by the Auditor General. Newfoundland Hydro is also audited by an auditor for the bond holders, Peat, Marwick. Various building corporations such as the Confederation Building Corporation, Hospital Building Corporation and so on, these are audited by the Auditor General.

MR. S. NEARY: What about Newfoundland and Labrador Housing?

DR. J. COLLINS: Newfoundland and Labrador Housing - I can actually look up that for the hon. member here - and this refers to 1978 - that was audited by the Auditor General.

MR. S. NEARY: The Newfoundland Liquor Corporation?

DR. J. COLLINS: The Liquor Corporation similarly, I am pretty certain, but if the hon. member will just give me a moment I can just find that. Yes, that was also audited by the Auditor General.

A few agencies such as Workers Compensation Board and the Public Utilities Commission are audited by commercial auditors; there are a few audited in that way. Generally, corporations incorporated under the Companies Act are audited by public accounting firms such as the United Cotton Mills and Newfoundland Fibbrply and so on.

I think that gives a rather fuller answer to that.

If I may now just make a brief comment on Subhead 203. A number of points were raised there - that is, whether the Ombudsman sufficiently publicizes his activities.

DR. J. COLLINS: Again that is a bit subjective; what is sufficient? I do know that the Ombudsman does undertake a certain amount of travel, so he is not only confined in his activities to the St. John's area where his office is. He does have a travel vote, there is also an investigator in his office, so that presumably does allow him, and in actual fact to my certain knowledge he has himself as well as his investigator moved outside of the St. John's area for activities.

The question also came up as to whether there was any intention on the part of government to broaden the activities. I think that if there was any specific problem brought up there I am sure government will take it under advisement. To my knowledge there has not been any initiatives from that point of view from the Ombudsman himself nor has there been any definitive deficiencies pointed out to government. But I am sure government would be quite open to any facts in that regard.

The last point I would just like to make in response to the Leader of the Opposition: He commented on whether the general public get a fair shake in their dealings with government and he suggested that a good example should be set by the ministers. Well, I can report to the House that the hon. the Premier, one of his early memos to the ministers was to point out to them that all approaches to the various ministers' offices, be it in writing or in visiting or whatever these should be attended to very promptly and that has been followed up by a number of reminders over the time that this administration has been in office. And I think by and large there has been attention paid to that. I think that as far as is possible in the volume of paper that goes through this building, that the general public usually is responded to very quickly.

DR. J. COLLINS: Now the general public does not only come in contact with the elected representatives and certainly not the ministers, they also deal with the civil service. There is a large number in the civil service and I have no doubt that the general public sometimes has an unfortunate experience there. But in my own experience I have been really rather pleasantly surprised by the dedication and the courtesy and the general handling of the general public at the hands of the Public Service.

AN HON. MEMBER: Efficiency.

DR. J. COLLINS: And efficiency quite often too. Now as I say there is a large number of people involved here and I do not think you can expect 100 per cent perfection. But I must say that in general I would say that the response to the general public has been good. I think we should also bear in mind that the Public Service is not usually in a position to respond to criticism directed their way. So I think that it behooves us to be straight in our facts when we make comments about the Public Service and not make them in a general way, but if we have a specific complaint I think it should be backed up with facts rather than just making general statements which are difficult to track down and of course are almost impossible to respond to even if the Public Service was in a position so to do.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Just in case the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) got the wrong impression, I was not, in case that was what he was implying saying that the Public Service was insensitive. And incidentally if he wants cases I have not the slightest doubt that we can find dozens of them. What I was saying was that we have become systematized in government to the point where a lot of the responses that are going out to people are not phrased in language and the like which they can understand.

MR. D. JAMIESON: And, also, the second and only other point I was making was that there is not enough what I might describe as flexibility within the authorities given to people in the field to do the sensible thing as opposed to doing what I might describe as bureaucratically exact thing, and it is those kinds of situations, not that the public servants

MR. JAMIESON: are insensitive, quite the contrary. A lot of them go out of their way and so on. Perhaps I could, it is out of our own time, I will give them an example. It is not one that comes precisely, precisely under a government department as such, but it is Newfoundland Hydro. On Christmas Eve a gentleman on the Burin Peninsula ran into trouble with the meter on the outside of his house. He could get permission to get the meter disconnected on Christmas Eve so that he could get the line fixed, but the regulations for getting it put back in rested with, I think it was either the Newfoundland Hydro or some other agency, the man from which had gone home for the holidays and was not expected back for ten days. In that particular case, it required a phone call from me to the head of Newfoundland Hydro in order to get somebody to do it. Now, I think it illustrates my point clearly, because the fellow said, "I am standing here by the meter". "Can you do it?" I asked him. He said, "Oh, yes". "Have you got the licence?" He said, "Oh, yes, I have the licence, but I cannot get the boss who is supposed to give me the necessary permission". Now, there is where I say that bureaucracy tends to get so tangled up in itself that common sense goes by the board, and that was the only reason that I raised the issue, not out of any sense of criticism.

On motion, subheads 203-01 through to 203-02-03, carried.

MR. MARSHALL: Head III.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) Head III, Executive Council.

Shall subhead 301-01 carry?

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is the 301-01 and subsequent subheads 302 and 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308 and 309, which cover many of the areas that come directly under my responsibility under that of Executive Council, which involves both the President of the Executive Council, who is to my right, the Government House Leader, and involves the Treasury Board Secretariat of which the President, of course, is the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor), and myself as responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs and some other areas that I will get into.

PREMIER PECKFORD: First of all, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can deal with them individually, and I do not know how the members want to play it. I can get up on each subhead, 301 and 302, I can do them all at the one time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: - (inaudible) a few minutes ago when I was on the previous subhead when the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) rose on a point of order and said that we were not debating the particular subhead that I was speaking on at that time. I was speaking on the Auditor General's department. We are now on Lieutenant-Governor's establishment, but if the hon. gentleman wants to have sort of a general debate before we go down item by item, I mean, I have no objection to it. That is the way things were always done in this House until the President of the Council, the member for St. John's East, decided that the Opposition should be silenced and muzzled.

MR. MARSHALL: If I could rise on that point, that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman loves me and I reciprocate with an equal degree and probably plus more of affection for the hon. gentleman. The situation on this, Mr. Chairman -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) get you a cup of coffee.

MR. MARSHALL: - the situation on this, Mr. Chairman, I think, when we come to 301, the Lieutenant-Governor's Establishment, unless the members of the Opposition particularly wish to debate that particular area, I think that it is a matter of custom and courtesy that I know the members on the opposite side would share, to the effect that this particular vote of His Honour's establishment is usually passed without any great debate, unless there is some real reason for it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, Mr. Chairman, will I take it then -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - if I have the ear - I will just deal with 301, the Lieutenant-Governor's Establishment. It speaks for itself, and any increases there, I think, are the normal increases in salaries and so on. There is no substantial increase. The revised 1979-80 was \$265,000 and it is now \$293,000, which is reflective of just the normal inflation in salaries and other things, and I just leave it at that and then deal with each subhead as we come upon them.

On motion, subheads 301-01 through to

301-02-06, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

301-03.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just for the information of the Committee, that is the Name Board that we talked about last year that the present Lieutenant-Governor has now put in place. It had been constructed in England and is now on the site. The cost to the Treasury was \$35,000 - \$40,000 and it is there in place -

MR. ROBERTS: In perpetuity.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - in perpetuity.

On motion Clause 301-03, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause 302-01 carry?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: This is the Premier's office we are doing now, Mr. Chairman, and I was hoping that the hon. gentleman would have given us an explanation, but seeing that he did not, I will have a few words on the - well, I am going to pop a few questions at the hon. gentleman that he can answer for me.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I did not want to (inaudible)

I misunderstood the number that the Chairman was giving out, that is why the hon. member is up before I am.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, you have got to be (inaudible)

MR. W. MARSHALL: I rise to a point of order, to a point of order.

MR. S. NEARY: - sit in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I refer Your Honour to Standing Order 118. (5) which says: "Notwithstanding Standing Order 49, the minister introducing his estimates and the member speaking immediately in reply shall not speak for more than fifteen minutes and every other member shall not speak for more than ten minutes." Now, that, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to Your Honour,

MR. W. MARSHALL: presupposes the fact that estimates are introduced, and I think as a matter of the procedure in which -

MR. S. NEARY: Utter garbage! That is garbage!

MR. W. MARSHALL: A matter of procedure, Now if the hon. gentlemen -

MR. NEARY: Garbage.

MR. W. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentleman opposite would like to turn the table and get up and speak first, he could perhaps introduce the hon. Premier's estimates and then the hon. Premier can get up and question the hon. gentleman; perhaps he would like to do it that way. But the fact of the matter for the orderly conducting of the business of the House, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this be implemented and, number two, I suggest it is inherent in that particular Standing Order.

MR. S. NEARY: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: It is utter nonsense, rubbish and garbage, Mr. Chairman. There is no such thing. All it says is that the Premier is entitled, or whatever minister is talking, is entitled to so much time, the member responding is entitled to so much time and that is all it refers to. It does not indicate in any way, shape or form who the Chair recognizes. In this particular case the Chair happened to recognize me, I thought the Premier was going to sit there and have questions flung at him and the Chair is perfectly within its right. It is unheard of, Mr. Chairman, and I hope Your Honour does not create any bad precedents in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (BUTT) To the point of order, ordinarily when a new subhead is introduced, the minister responsible would ordinarily introduce that subhead and presumably if the hon. the Premier rose and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr.S.Neary) rose then I would recognize the hon. the Premier. But since he did not and the hon. member for LaPoile rose, I would recognize the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to raise a matter, and I want to keep the Premier in the House because I do not want him to get up and just make a statement then run away as he has been doing in the last two or three days. The Premier is more interested in having his picture taken, he must allocate a number of hours every day to have his picture taken and to give interviews.

I was just looking at the newspaper here, page 3 of the Evening Telegram, "Premier calls for action to stabilize interest rates", "Peckford wants to know why trawler in Northern waters", "Peckford disappointed with Throne Speech", Peckford this and Peckford that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY: How many hours - that is my first question to the Premier - how many hours a day does the Premier allocate to have his picture taken and to grant interviews? Because it seems to be interfering, - the reason I raise the matter, Mr. Chairman - it is interfering with the business of this Province.

The hon. gentleman is so preoccupied with having his picture taken, thirteen times once in Oil Week, that he can not do anything else except talk about gas and oil and have his picture taken. In the meantime, every other industry in the Province, every service in the Province is deteriorating. She is falling apart, the construction industry is complaining savagely -

AN HON. MEMBER: Eat your heart out.

MR. S. NEARY: - the construction workers are complaining because they can not find jobs. They all have to go out to Alberta to find jobs, tradesmen have to leave this Province while the Premier has his picture taken.

People can not get water or sewerage because the Premier

MR. NEARY:

cut \$50 million out of the estimates and is too busy having his picture taken to do anything about it. People cannot get their roads repaired because the Premier is too busy having his picture taken. The Fishery Loan Board is in a shambles, the Premier is out having his picture taken. No housing, young people in the Province cannot buy houses, they cannot find a building lot. The Premier steps into federal jurisdiction instead of dealing with matters that fall under his own jurisdiction so he can have his picture taken, so he can get a headline in the paper and have his picture taken. We have a Premier whose policy is to have your picture taken as often as you can, get interviewed as often as you can and let the Province fall apart. And that is what is happening, that is the policy and if my hon. friend ever becomes Premier I hope he does not copy the hon. gentleman. And not only that, Mr. Chairman, but if you are going to have your picture taken, especially if it is live television, then make sure you are waving your arms like a Frenchman or you look wild-eyed and sincere. That is what you have to do if you are Premier of this Province today, make sure that you can rant and rave and wave your arms and look wild-eyed and then if you can imitate René Levesque and Peter Lougheed, you got her made. The Premier is so preoccupied with looking for issues, grasping at straws, tilting at windmills, chasing after rainbows to create issues so he can have his picture taken, that nothing is happening in the Province. And the press love it, of course, because they get copy to fill up the space in their newspapers and they get a thirty minute squib for television and radio and they love it, especially the ones who hope to get on the government payroll some time, they love it. And they will stick a microphone in front of the Premier any time, or a minister, in anticipation of favours in the future, get on the government payroll and get retired.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of a Premier we have today, that is what we are paying out this salary for. But I want to come to something now a little more serious. We had a Premier in this Province for seven years - the hon. gentleman succeeded -

MR. NEARY:

who in my opinion was a very corrupt individual, a notorious liar in this House, lied deliberately to this House on a number of occasions. But when the hon. gentleman went out - well, I will not call him honourable - when Mr. Frank Moores went out and the hon. gentleman succeeded him, the present Premier of this Province, one of the first things that happened was that the Premier had a phone call, the present Premier had a phone call from the Bank of Nova Scotia saying, "Mr. Premier, there is a little matter here of \$700,000, three quarters of a million dollars, just a trifling sum. What are you going to do about it?" And the present Premier told them to go straight you-know-where. He was not doing anything, he was not even acknowledging it. Now I want the Premier of this Province to tell me and tell the members of this House and tell the people of this Province-if that was a campaign fund, well and good, I will just forget the matter and forget I ever brought it up, but if it was a slush fund for the previous Premier, then the hon. gentleman should tell us because I would be interested in knowing who were the donors to that slush fund, what it was used for - called Confederation Trust, that is the name of the fund down at the Bank of Nova Scotia - what the fund was used for, who were the donors and what did they get in return for their donations. I want the Premier to tell us. If the Premier stands in his place and says Confederation Trust was a campaign fund set up by Mr. Moores the same as other parties have, then I will accept that and that will be the end of it; but if it was a slush fund for the Premier while he was in office, writing cheques without any other signature on these cheques, without any signing officer of the P.C. Association, one signature, Frank D. Moores, on the cheques that went to the bank for \$700,000, if it was a slush fund then it is a different matter.

MR. S. NEARY:

I want the Premier to straighten this out because this is the talk of the town. Three quarters of a million dollars is a lot of money. The Premier has not acknowledged it, has told the bank 'No, we know nothing about it. We are having nothing to do with it.' When a leader takes over, Mr. Chairman, whether it is in the Liberal Party or in the Tory Party, if there is a debt - and there was a debt in this party when the new leader took over and he had to acknowledge that and carry it on and try to pay it off the best way he can; we acknowledged our debts. But if it is not a party debt you just say, 'No, sorry, we are having nothing to do with it.' And that is what has happened in this case, the Premier has not acknowledged it. So I can only assume from the information that I have that it was a slush fund, and if it was, then let us have an exposé and tell us what it was used for and who the donors were and what favours they received in return for these donations.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Under the deal with Subhead 302, Premier's Office and to give sort of a run-down from last year as to what has been happening, I think last year in the Summer when we brought the Budget down and we went through the Estimates, a number of people in the Opposition were asking about the number of Premier's Offices around the Province and so on. And at that point in time there had been four, I think, Premier's Offices outside the one in the Confederation Building where my office literally is. There is one in Grand Falls, one in Botwood, one in Corner Brook and one in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. I had indicated at that time that it was my desire and intention to reduce the number of offices and I want to report now, Mr. Chairman, that I have reduced the number of offices. The Happy Valley - Goose Bay office has been closed out and the Botwood office has been closed out and there are two offices now serving the Province, the office in Grand Falls, dealing with

PREMIER PECKFORD: Central Newfoundland, and the office in Corner Brook, dealing with Western Newfoundland and Labrador, and there are two special assistants - two ladies, as a matter of fact - special assistants of mine in both those locations, Mrs. Jean Shea in Grand Falls and Mrs. Anita Allen in Corner Brook. And they seem like they are serving a fairly useful purpose now in the establishment of meetings and so on when Cabinet ministers and members go there and for myself when I spent part of last week, as a matter of fact, in the Grand Falls office and spent a fair amount of time in Corner Brook. It does help cut through a lot of red tape and we are keeping, as a matter of fact, available for hon. members if they want - I have instituted a weekly report. The special assistants must make out a weekly report in which they detail the phone calls that came in and the phone calls that went out, the letters that came in and the letters that went out, and sign their names to it and put dates on it so that we have a running record to indicate whether these offices are justified or not. Up to now it seems to be working fairly well.

So that is the story there. We are trying to cut costs and trying to save where we can and not get involved in too much expenditure and yet provide a service to the people and provide a place for Cabinet and the Premier when he or they travel to that area and also to cut red tape and establish meetings for delegations and people in those regions of the Province when the Cabinet goes out there or when groups of people come in here.

The other area - I think there was something in the paper today about it. It had to do with grants to former Premiers, which comes under 302-03.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was an editorial.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, it was an editorial, it was in the paper. And I do not know - I think last year we went through it or I made an announcement on it because there were some discrepancies in Mr. Smallwood and Mr. Moores, and just to read into the record so there is no misunderstanding on what that is about: "With effect from the day following resignation as Premier, either for political or personal reasons, a private secretary

PREMIER PECKFORD: provided with remuneration to be on the salary scale applicable to the position of Secretary to Premier for a period not exceeding three years. In lieu of providing a secretary, the former Premier be provided with an annual grant in the amount equivalent to the salary and related fringe benefits of the position of Secretary to Premier, such grant to be used only for the purpose of engaging secretarial assistance." And secondly, "Office accommodation: Department of Public Works and Services to provide and furnish on the scale applicable to ministers, a maximum of 500 square feet of office space within existing facilities for a period not exceeding three years with effect from the day following

PREMIER PECKFORD:

resignation. In the event suitable office space is unavailable within existing facilities, an annual grant of \$8,000 to be escalated in each subsequent year by 10 per cent be provided the former Premier, such a grant to be used only for the purpose of obtaining furnished office space, ordered further that such policy is applicable to Mr. Moores and to Mr. Smallwood and so on. That is the reading of the exact situation as it affects and the policy as it affects former Premiers and therefore it applies the same way to Mr. Smallwood and to Mr. Moores. Really, that is all that is in that heading outside that I wanted to mention. There is travelling money there and office and so on. There is a - I will get it prehaps tomorrow and just make it available to the members of the House - there is a voluminous amount of mail both in Corner Brook and Grand Falls and here. Now I do not know what we are running at this past three or four weeks but we are running close to 1,000 letters a month, just a tremendous amount of mail coming in and phone calls are running at, you know, well over 100 a day. And it is just incredible to try to keep the paper moving. I will tell you talking about the red tape it is a human's effort to try to keep the whole thing moving within existing staff and that, of course, we are trying to do.

Just a couple of comments on what the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had to say. One that the government is really not doing anything and the Premier is not doing anything, you know, I will just tell the hon. member that the unemployment rate in Newfoundland in March, 1979 was twenty point one, in March, 1980 it is fifteen point seven. That speaks for itself, speaks volumes more than I can get into. I wanted to go into a whole lot of things on that but this is not the place to do it I do not think under the heading of the Premier's Office but if any member wants this, of course, feel free to do so.

The other thing is, the hon. member for LaPoile is raising the issue of a bank account or something dealing with the former Premier. The hon. member for LaPoile will have to deal

PREMIER PECKFORD:

with the former Premier on that. That is no concern of mine and no interest of mine and that is a problem that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has with the former Premier and I would call upon him to work that out with the former Premier if he has a problem with him. So it has nothing to do with me and I am not familiar with -

MR. NEARY:

But you do know about Confederation Fund.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

(Inaudible) any time.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

I am not sure if this is the appropriate head but I am not one to be a stickler for those specifics. I have a question for the Premier or an observation which is very much a problem, I think an increasing problem, with regard to governments sources of information, acquisition of information by the public and the like. I am not, by the way, one who believes in being niggardly in terms of administrative support and the like. I think it is to be, as my friend from LaPoile calls it, "Penny wise and pound foolish". I have had a worry - it is not a serious thing if you wish at the moment - but I am wondering if the Premier has had an opportunity to figure out to what extent either either (a) public servants in the exact meaning of the word, that is civil servants, people who are hired by the Civil Service Commission or special advisors, people of that kind, to what extent they ought to be free in making declarations. I hope that this will be taken in the spirit in which it is meant. I

MR. JAMIESON:

refer very specifically to the recent Law of the Sea Conference when, before there was an opportunity for us in Opposition or for me as Leader of the Opposition to question the government in the House or to question the Premier in the House, his special advisor, in this case Mr. Cabot Martin, was giving what was to me a surprise interview, both as to the timing and the content, on television. There have been other cases, and again I say not all of them are grounds for being critical and I realize there is a thin line between passing on information and commenting on government policy. Is there a document in place, or is there likely to be, in terms of the Premier's approach to government which indicates what the role may be? May I use another example, once again purely as an example, that there was a series of programmes over a period of weeks with regard to something I know something about the Monkstown Road, I am sure the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) will have it carved on his heart like Mary Queen of Scots or whatever it was.

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible)

MR. D. JAMIESON:

That is right, that is right, but it was the Deputy Minister who was on the air explaining what was happening and it became, it seemed to me, something of an embarrassment, if you wish, because the hold build-up of the series had been that in some way or other the government had not done what it ought to have done. Now I am not interested in that at the moment, but on this overall question which is of increasing complexity, I think, in all jurisdictions, what is the Premier's position with regard to these people in the Estimates who are attached to his office, for instance?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is a very good point and we have talked about it somewhat in Cabinet, a number of colleagues have and I have, and we have not really written anything down. I guess we should. There has been sort of a standing policy that no public servant or even advisor is free to make any comments unless they have the prior approval of the minister or the Premier, whichever is applicable. In the two cases that the hon. Leader of the Opposition cites, I know - and it is interesting he should cite them - I know that both individuals had the approval because as a matter of fact in the case of the deputy minister of the Department of Transportation and Communications the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) had come to me and said that they needed the film or something that day or whatever and he would not be around and was it okay for the deputy minister to go ahead. No problem, I accepted it. And the same way with Mr. Martin. The problem with Mr. Martin's comments at the time might have been that the Opposition were not fully - we were sort of caught because it had been brought to us that it was a radical departure and we wanted to see what was said and get in there quickly before any further movement towards that so-called philosophy at the Law of the Sea became entrenched in the Canadian Delegation so that therefore what came out at the end might somehow be less than what we could accept. But in both cases the approval was sought and granted by the respective minister, and Premier in this case of Mr. Martin. That notwithstanding, those examples notwithstanding, I think the Leader of the Opposition only used them as examples and he is interested more in the whole business of the principle, I believe that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition in his tone is correct in that there should be some written procedure for public servants and special advisors, special assistants or whatever, civil servants - people who do

PREMIER PECKFORD: not go through the Public Service Commission who are appointed, political appointments of whatever sort. And it is just one area where I have not, if you would, gotten around to putting something in writing and a procedure in place. I think it is necessary and I would like to move towards doing that. I do not know what other jurisdictions had in place. I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition could not enlighten the committee on what the Federal Government did during his ten years there or what other provincial administrations had. I firmly believe -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Just prior authorization.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just prior authorization?

MR. D. JAMIESON: Generally ministerial authorization.

PREMIER PECKFORD: But there is nothing in writing?

There is no procedure manual or anything that you know of?

MR. D. JAMIESON: Yes, there is something.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There is some kind of a manual.

That is what I am talking about. I think that needs to be circulated and discussed and done. That is what I would like to see happen.

While I am on my feet, if I may,
why I was not listening when the 302

PREMIER PECKFORD: was called because I was trying to read a telegram. Yesterday, if the Committee does not mind, I had announced that the four premiers were about to send off a telegram on EPA. Well, the telegram is here now, and I just enlighten hon. members that it has gone to the Prime Minister, and it does what the Leader of the Opposition sort of indicated yesterday, that the appeal is through the Cabinet and through the political arm rather than back to the CRTC and it goes through the, you know, the decision ignored the vital importance of EPA to the economic activity of the Atlantic Provinces, and that EPA is an Atlantic regional carrier that needs the long haul to subsidize the short hauls. Eastern Provincial took a considered opinion and went, and our opinion has now been ignored by CRTC, and so on. We want it reassessed and changed to allow EPA to have that kind of service. That is, essentially, what the telegram says. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that some kind of manual of procedures that relates to the statements of public servants should be put in place, both of those who are legitimate public servants and otherwise.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, earlier in the Premier's remarks he mentioned that he was taking out some of his offices around the Province, but in particular he mentioned that the one in Happy Valley-Goose Bay has been phased out or within a matter days will be. I am just a little bit curious that, you know, you have an office in Grand Falls, you have one in Corner Brook, but anyway that big land mass up in Labrador. I understand in the past it was functioning fairly well and been receiving quite a few calls, and I thought, you know, it was working to the satisfaction of Labradorians and probably to the government in particular. Has the Premier some other avenue that he is going through other than the Premier offices, in particular?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, primarily, it is that the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) has sort of taken over the space and set it up through his ministry rather than as a Premier's office, so that -

MR. WARREN: It is still functioning?

PREMIER PECKFORD: - yes, so it is still functioning in that sense, but it is not a fullfledged Premier's office in the sense of Grand Falls or Corner Brook. Now, it might be that sometime down the road you will need to re-establish it, but I was mainly involved in trying to cut some costs because some of them really were not working. I mean, Botwood was not necessary, given the Grand Falls situation. With the member for that area being in the Cabinet and having that kind of responsibility for Labrador, he was much better able to handle it than was a Premier's office, feeding in to me; he would be much more on top of it than a Premier's office would be.

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

MR. HISCOCK: I would just like to ask the Premier on that where it is saving money and cutting it back, does the Premier perceive, probably within the next two, three or four years, of reinstating some of these offices again or will he go and use the other channel of using some other directive as he is using with the Minister of Rural Development?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, right, I would rather keep at the level of that now and not increase it and do it through some other way that might prove to be a real need, and you would be responding to it more directly than doing it that indirect way which I thought it was. That would be the way I would like to go on it rather than any other way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise the matter of the Premier's senior advisor. He has so much power, so much authority, that he may as well be sitting here in the House, and he tried to get in and I saw to it that he could not get in here. But he may as well be here because his presence is felt here. The hon. gentleman may as well be on the Muppet Show, the way that Mr. Cabot Martin manipulates the hon. gentleman. The real Premier is down on the eighth floor and not in this House. We have had occasions in this Province in the last several weeks when the Premier's senior advisor, who receives an annual salary of - what? - \$50,000 -

AN HON. MEMBER: \$50,000.

MR. NEARY: \$50,000 plus fringe benefits, we have had occasions when Mr. Martin was out enunciating -

AN HON. MEMBER: On television.

MR. NEARY: - on television government policy. It is unheard of, Mr. Chairman. In the British parliamentary system, it is unheard of for a hired gun to be out announcing government policy, enunciating, pioneering government policy. That is a job

MR. S. NEARY: for the Premier and for the elected representatives of the people of this Province. On three or four occasions I saw Mr. Martin on television taking the Government of Canada to task on matters and issues that should have been dealt with by the Premier and by the Cabinet. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a great principle involved here, a great principle involved, and I would like to ask the Premier now, if this is going to be the policy in the future, that Mr. Martin is going to announce policy and then the Premier is going to parrot it, the Premier is merely going to be like one of the moppets or a parrot, he is going to parrot what Mr. Martin says. Is that going to be the way that this Province is run? I would like for the Premier to tell us if he has silenced Mr. Martin or if he is going to allow him - give him a wide berth and let him go ahead and make announcements on policy all over the countryside. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how much authority this senior adviser has in dealing with the Government of Canada on our offshore resources. Is he the chief spokesman? Does he not put the words in the Premier's mouth? If he does, Mr. Chairman, then I am afraid the people of this Province are going to be in for an awful rude awakening one of these days. With the kind of separatist attitude that we have seen on the part of this particular gentleman, this particular individual who is so close to the Premier, I am told they meet down in the Chateau Park here in Mount Pearl. Occasionally they hire a suite down there and three or four of them go down to discuss serious problems dealing with this Province that should be debated, discussed, either on the eighth floor of Confederation Building or here in this House and not in smoke-filled secret rendezvous down at the Chateau Park down in Mount Pearl. What kind of a way to run a Province, Mr. Chairman? What kind of a way is this to run the Province? And the message is beginning to filter through and I would say that Mr. Martin is probably the one responsible for telling the Premier that he got to have his picture taken at least ten times a day, that he has got to get his name in the paper forty or fifty times a week, he has got to get in Oil Week, he has got to

MR. S. NEARY: go off and speak to the Empire Club up in Toronto, he has got to go over to P.E.I. and make a fool of himself. Mr. Martin is the one who is pulling all the strings, planning the strategy. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the Premier's comment on what I have just said but I want to come back to a matter I raised a few minutes ago which in my opinion cannot be brushed aside and that is the matter of Confederation Trust, a trust fund set up by the former Premier down in the Bank of Nova Scotia. The Premier when he took his seat admitted that he knew about Confederation Trust. I am going to ask the Premier now to tell the House if it is true that the Bank of Nova Scotia - if I can get the hon. gentleman's attention, I am talking about a very serious matter here, a very serious matter and it is pure ignorance, Sir, when I am directing a question, a very serious question to an hon. gentleman and he is not listening and some other hon. gentleman is over on bended knees, genuflecting, carrying on a discussion they should go out in the corridor or out in the office somewhere if they want to have their little private meeting - but the Premier more or less confirmed when he sat down that he knew about Confederation Trust. Well, I am going to ask the Premier now if the Bank of Nova Scotia, where this trust fund is established called up the hon. gentleman and asked him what he is going to do about Confederation Trust. And if they did call him up, how can the hon. gentleman brush it off by saying to me "Why do you not go and ask the former Premier, your problem is with the former Premier and not with me". Well that trust fund was established when that man was Premier of this Province -

MR. S. NEARY: - \$700,000, \$750,000 is not something that you go down and get a personal loan for - it was gotten while he was premier, for official business. And if the Premier cannot brush it aside he should instruct the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) to find out about Confederation Trust, who the donors were. Or did the Bank of Nova Scotia just give a personal loan? Because that same gentleman was the same gentleman who signed the note for Sealand Helicopters at the Bank of Nova Scotia, and I want to find out if there was any connection there while he was premier. So it cannot be brushed aside. If it was a PC campaign fund, fine! Tell us, and, as I said, I will forget it. Nothing illegal about that. But there is something illegal about setting up a slush fund for a man while he is premier to pay out to either himself or former ministers or ministers sitting in the administration. That is a pretty serious matter, pretty serious indeed, and it cannot be brushed aside and there will be an exposé on it and the Premier cannot hide it. The Premier is having a couple of rough days in this House as far as honesty and integrity are concerned. Now he is setting standards. He tells us he is going to be completely open and honest and going to run a government of integrity, but then he sets the standards himself. I am going to ask the hon. gentleman again, did he get a call from the Bank of Nova Scotia saying, "Mr. Premier, we have an account here for \$700,000."

MR. JAMIESON: In debt.

MR. S. NEARY: In debt.

"Your predecessor signed cheques to the tune of \$700,000 in the name of Confederation Trust which we were led to believe was a PC fund. What are you going to do about it?" And the Premier said, "You can go jump in the lake. That is a personal thing; I am having

MR. S. NEARY: nothing to do with it." And the question I am asking, was it personal? Mr. Chairman, there were donors. The money was paid out to somebody.

MR. JAMIESON: There must be more than \$700,000 in some (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon.

MR. JAMIESON: There must have been more in it in some statements.

MR. NEARY: Oh, absolutely! Confederation Trust. It would be worth the Minister of Justice's (Mr. Ottenheimer) while taking a look at it. It is not going to go away unless the bank decides to write it off, which I doubt they are going to do.

MR. D. JAMIESON: They might write it off to management.

MR. NEARY: Well, they might. That account was opened in good faith, as they thought, in the name of the PC party and now they discover that the successor to the premier will not acknowledge that this money was used for PC party business. So let us find out, let us have it out now. Put it on the table. Do not set standards, do not have double standards. Do not say one day we are going to be honest and open and a government of integrity and then the next day try to cover up something, try to hide something. Let it all hang out. And tell us about Confederation Trust, and tell us who the recipients were. Tell us who the donors were. Was it payola? Was it a slush fund set up for Mr. Moores when he was Premier of this Province to look after his buddies, ministers that had been flicked out of the Cabinet who had no income? Is that what it was set up for? If so, the Minister of Justice had better

April 15, 1980

Tape 791

MB - 3

MR. S. NEARY: take a look at the Criminal Code of Canada. And so should Mr. Clean, the President of the Council, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who comes in here telling us how sanctimonious and pure he is, Mr. Clean himself.

MR. S. NEARY: Is he going to sit there and have the finger pointed at the PC party, or is he going to try and sweep this matter under the rug, the same as they tried to sweep matters under the rug for the last several years in this Province? So, Mr. Chairman, if I do not get the answer from the Premier, I will get up and ask him again. And I will keep at it, the same as I am going to keep at Labrador Linerboard, until the whole matter is straightened out. We cannot just blot out of the Newfoundland history, we cannot eliminate, we cannot just say it did not happen, it was a bad dream forget about it; we cannot wipe out, blot out of the Newfoundland history seven years of corruption. \$700,000 a personal loan. Who is the Premier trying to kid? A personal thing! Let us not kid ourselves and get up and tell the truth for a change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, on what the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) is talking about: The member for Lapoile can bring it up as often as he wants. I could ask the same question about the party opposite. When the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) was the leader of the party -

MR. ROBERTS: I will answer (inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, no. Well, you might know something about -

MR. ROBERTS: I know about the affairs of the Liberal party while I was leader.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I know about the affairs of the Conservative party while I was leader.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. And was there (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well I can get into asking questions about -

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) Order, please.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - whether there was a call here or a call there on this. That is neither here nor there. That is none of the hon. member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) business. I am not going to ask you about the telephone calls you get or any other member has. That is crazy.

MR. ROBERTS: Never had any problems like that. Never had any money.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is foolishness. I deal as leader of the party, the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland, from the day I became leader and then on. That is what I am responsible for, the same way as the member for the Strait of Bell Isle (Mr. Roberts) is responsible for his tenure as leader of his party and that is where it ends. Now, if I want to go back to the leader of the Liberal Party, of Mr. Smallwood when he was leader, and donors that were there and how that affected what contracts were awarded before the Public Tendering Act was around when there were members, perhaps, opposite who were connected with the Liberal party at that time, did they have something to answer for, does the member for La Poile have something to answer for when he was in the Cabinet of Mr. Smallwood at that time when there was a lot of money put into the Liberal chest and certain contracts were awarded, not even awarded, certain jobs given. There is a long road that does not have a turn on that one. All that I can tell the member for LaPoile is that while I am leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the operation of the party, the organization of the party will be completely open to anybody from here to Timbuktu to see. If he wants to ask about the operations of the party before I became Leader and about a certain bank

PREMIER PECKFORD: account and about all the rest, then he has to deal with somebody else he does not deal with me. I am responsible from when I became leader and I have nothing more to do with it. That is none of my affair at all; it has nothing to do with me. So the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is just flogging a dead horse as far as I am concerned when it comes to that. I will deal with what I do and what I do not do when I am responsible and that is the end of that. And I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is the same way and the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) as is the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) and the other leaders over there. If the member for LaPoile -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed to speak in silence?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the hon. member for LaPoile has an issue or thinks he has an issue he can ask me questions all day long. I will just give exactly the same answer; I am responsible for the party since I became leader. And it is none of the hon. member for LaPoile's business who I get telephone calls from. I am not in a court of law.

MR. NEARY: Springdale calls me up all the time.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If you had the telegrams I got from Port aux Basques - Channel in the last twelve months, the hon. member for LaPoile would have another paper mill on Cape Ray. It is just incredible and I wish the hon. member for LaPoile would get down there more often, especially to those smaller communities because I am drove crazy. Get down and do your homework. I am driven right around the bend. So many people seeking advice, asking, "Where is the member? Where is he? Where can I find him?" And I say, "Look, just turn on your

April 15, 1980

Tape 792

MB - 4

PREMIER PECKFORD: radio you will find him. But
do not ever think he is going to turn up." The runaway member.

MR. NEARY: Did Cabot tell you that?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cabot Martin, as all members of this House know, is a very honourable, competent Newfoundlander who does a good job for his Province and does a good job for the government of this Province and any time he speaks he has approval to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I make no apologies. If the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had one thousandth the common sense and knowledge that Mr. Martin has, holy smoke, what a man he would be, what a member he would be.

MR. NEARY:

I have more principle.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So I make no apologies for Mr. Martin. Mr. Martin is a very competent Newfoundlander who is doing a good job for his Province in the role that he is now performing for me and for the government of this Province. And anybody who knows Mr. Martin knows that to be true and that he is a man of principle and a man of integrity and a man of sound ideas and good common sense who does a good day's work. There is no two ways about that. I think those are the only two points that the hon. member for LaPoile had to make at that time and there are the answers.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

I am going to confine myself to the second part of the Premier's intervention because here once again I suggest to him that I am coming back to the point I made earlier, that it may be - and, incidentally, I think I have had one or maybe two conversations with Mr. Martin in my entire career, so I will accept his word for his competence and talent and all the other things that go with it. If he had had only one thousandth the success, however, that the member for LaPoile has had in getting into this House, we might have an opportunity to question him. What really does concern me when the Premier makes the statement he just made - and I call it to his attention as the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs - is that it is, it seems to me, extremely important that when we are dealing in such conflicts and highly volatile

MR. JAMIESON:

issues as are bound to arise in federal-provincial relations, for example, where I gather that this is one of his main areas of responsibility, that one or two things - and by the way I think the Premier has his option here; I do not deny that - that if he wishes that Mr. Martin or anyone else in that kind of position is going to be up front as a spokesman, then I think he can do that. But at the same time it seems to me that he has also got to put Mr. Martin in a position where he is questioned by people other than merely those in the media.

Now let me say that I have a very solid - I see the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) mulling this over in his mind - but there is a very solid basis and I can refer him back to, I can think of at least five or six letters - perhaps he was not in the ministry at that time. Perhaps that was the time when he agreed with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and did not feel that he ought to sit with that particular group - but the head of the GATT negotiations, there is on the record, and I am not revealing any Privy Council oaths when I say it, a minimum of half a dozen objections from the Government of Newfoundland that this official, not, by the way, a public servant, a person, as I recall it, either assigned to External Affairs or to the Prime Minister's office was making statements of policy and that, unfortunately, the Newfoundland Government, for instance, said, "We are not in a position to get any answers from you". Now this is the kind of situation in which I see a real danger occurring. I can see - and I hope I will be believed when I say this, I say it in the kindest way to the Premier - that unless he wants every second day in the future to have someone rising in this House and saying, "Was Mr. Joe Blow" - or whoever the gentleman happens to be - stating government policy when he made such a statement?". And then having to say, well which ones he was making it on with regard to government policy and which ones he was not, or if he has got carte blanche then I ask in all sincerity - I mean, what is

MR. D. JAMIESON:

the percentage in having ministers of the Crown to do the negotiation and the like? Surely, this is a perfectly sane and sensible kind of approach. Now, I think the Premier, before he got a bit carried away, was more on the right track initially when he said that there should be some guidelines or something of that nature spelled out. But I say to him that if we are going to have one or more - and I suppose it could equally happen in, I do not know which departments, but the Department of Finance and so on. And, by the way, while I am on the subject, let me say that in all of my career in terms of dealing with the Newfoundland Government, I have found 99 per cent of the gentlemen who worked on the 8th Floor impeccable in terms of what they themselves would get themselves involved in. I am thinking about gentlemen like Mr. Abery and others -

MR. S. NEARY:

Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON:

- who did a first-class job and who would not be caught dead in front of the television cameras, who literally would be sure that -

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Victor Young, who (inaudible).

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Or I guess Mr. Vic Young is another gentleman who preceeded him.

So the point I am making and I consider it important enough to make is that I think we should know what the role of this gentleman or whoever his successor is - I am not, again, talking about the person - but if we are going to have people who are classified as being contract employees or something of this nature, then surely, it is consistent with every pattern of parliamentary procedure and parliamentary operations that there be some limitation, some constraint. And if the Premier feels that - I think he was the one, after all, who made reference to the gentleman by name - but if his present advisor, he has such confidence in him, then we should know that anything that this man says can be deemed to have come, in effect, from the Premier himself. If that is the case then

MR. D. JAMIESON: we will know that that is so.

If it is not so, then I think we are on a very slippery slope unless we can identify those places where he is voicing government policy and where he is not.

MR. S. NEARY: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I was not getting carried away before, I was answering questions from another hon. member in the Opposition, and I think that should be made clear. I was not getting carried away. It was just that the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) had asked a question about Mr. Martin and asked a question about another matter which was completely irrelevant to the subhead and to the House. I had to answer those questions since he asked them, I guess.

In most cases, you know, like I said earlier, like when the Deputy Minister of Transportation and Communications or in a couple of cases when Mr. Martin or Mr. Young or so on, they always get the approval of their political superior, whoever that may be, whatever minister it is or whether it is the Premier - the same is true for Mr. Martin. And very often most of the comments that Mr. Martin has been making over the last number of months on different issues has been elaboration rather than the establishment of a policy. The policy has usually been before that time announced or said by some other minister of the Crown or by me. So in most cases it has not been new policy, it has been -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Controversial, surely.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, it might be controversial. Obviously, the Northern cod is controversial because I do not think there is unanimity in this House on the position of the government on that - there are some members opposite who are in favour of it and there are some who are half in favour and all the rest of it. The same way with the ownership of offshore and control and so on. So there are controversial issues on the public carpet right now. And from time to time, statements will be made

PREMIER PECKFORD: by this or that about it and they are controversial. Very often the statements that Mr. Martin has been making are statements of clarification of our positions and so on or given side part to it.

MR. D. JAMIESON: You cannot denounce Beesley (inaudible) Cabot Martin.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, I was not denouncing Beesley, I was denouncing what Beesley said, not his right to say it.

MR. D. JAMIESON: No, that -

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is the whole point.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I did not mean to interrupt, I am sorry.

PREMIER PECKFORD: All I was arguing with was the views, the ideas that were being announced. I do not care what his name is or what his position was.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Surely, he should not have been speaking at all, this is my point.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, every circumstance is different and, as I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition, at that point in time we had on paper a lot of the comments that Mr. Beesley made in his television interview and we were very concerned that day about, you know, the repercussions and how that kind of trend could be continued because we knew pretty well some of the other individuals who were making a lot of noise in the Cameroons and - not Tibet but a couple of other landlocked countries and they were having a lot of -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Nepal.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is right. And they were having a lot of influence,

PREMIER PECKFORD: and little things were going on down there that we did not like. Besides, we did not know what the U.S. was playing and, of course, they were playing another game altogether. Besides which, the Sudbury nickel thing, there was some chance of some hypocrisy on the Canadian delegation's part on the one hand being all things to all men as related to our oil in Newfoundland so-called as opposed to being not all things to all men when it came to nickel because they wanted to protect Sudbury. So there were whole things going on at play and we wanted to get on the record and there was a physical kind of thing happen there which I approved then, statements being made. But to come back to the original point, which is simply that I think some procedure some written procedure or manual as it relates to statements of public policy should be implemented and should be part of it and we will try to do that so that it becomes a written, concrete, physical document.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT) The hon. the member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I think what the Premier says is welcome as far as it goes, but I am not so sure it goes far enough. First of all let me dispose of a very minor aspect of it. I am pleased to hear the Premier tell us that every time Mr. Martin, and since the Premier first raised the gentleman's name, I think, but I do not care if it is Mr. Martin or anybody else, this special adviser or this policy by whatever the gentleman's title is, that every time he makes a public statement it has been cleared with the Premier and I simply want to say I was quite amused one day to be told - I did not hear it, because I do work, which means I do not listen to the open line shows - Mr. Martin, special policy adviser, had the time one day to pick the phone and call one of these open line shows and unburden himself of an attack on me and I was amused at that because it is cowardly, base, low, and scurrilous. At least the gentleman from St. John's North (J. Carter)

MR. E. ROBERTS: had the courage to say what he said in House where he got what he deserved. But I would simply say to the Premier that I do not think it helps the quality of public discussion in this Province - and the Premier prates at great length and, I have no doubt, believes what he says when he talks of improving the quality of public life, well, it do not improve the quality in the least when a public servant who was not able to persuade the electorate in the district of his choice to elect him, when that public servant chooses to use the open line shows. Now I could have responded, I have no doubt, but there is an old line which says you do not get into a urination contest with a certain kind of animal and I have no desire to get involved with Mr. Policy Advisor in that kind of thing; I do not intend to. I will deal with the Premier or his colleagues because they speak with a mandate. The policy advisor was not able to persuade the people in his own native district, who perhaps know him best, that he ought to speak in the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is nasty.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not nasty, it is quite true. The hon. gentleman, I am sorry, the policy advisor choose to run in a constituency that he boasted was his native constituency and the fact remains he was not able to persuade those people, the majority of them, to elect him to speak in the House of Assembly. And that is a fact whether the Premier likes it or does not like it; that is a fact.

MR. STAGG: He (inaudible) playing cards.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry.

MR. STAGG: Did not have any playing cards in particular.

MR. ROBERTS: I have no idea what cards he had or not. The hon. gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) might recall that the policy advisor has played many cards that he did not have and that is probably the problem here today.

MR. ROBERTS: And I only got into the situation on the LaPoile issue because, after all, it was the Premier who first of all raised that subject. Heavens alone knows, and the world is witness, that the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and I have had any number of differences over the years on any number of points, and doubtless we will have them again, but the fact remains that the people of LaPoile district elected the gentleman for LaPoile in quite an overwhelming manner and, you know, that really ought to take care of that.

But I am concerned about a far greater principle, one which has been raised by my friend from LaPoile and has been given point by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson), and that is this question, this new phenomenon, because I think it is fair to say that until the Premier's administration until the advent of the Premier's administration, we have not had the spectacle of public servants engaging in political debate. Now we have had in this Province in the past, quite properly, any number of public servants who have had immense influence within the administration, men and women - I think most of them tended to be men because there were more men than women in the public service in those days - but, you know, men of integrity, character and influence. You know, Mr. James Channing who served as Clerk of the Cabinet, and Mr. Victor Young, who was Secretary of the Treasury Board and I believe was a special advisor to Mr. Moores when Mr. Moores was Premier, and I could name many others. And these were men of very great influence and any of us who were involved in any way with public life, Mr. Chairman, was well aware that these men

MR. ROBERTS: having a row with Lord Beaverbrook and Lord Rothermere, as I remember it. The Premier is an avid reader of history. I am sure he is familiar with it, but let me pass it along. Your Honour may not have recently had the opportunity to read too much of Rothermere and Beaverbrook and their row with the man who afterwards became Earl Baldwood of Budley, should Your Honour wish to check it out. That is that Lord Baldwin said that power without responsibility down through the ages used to be the traditional prerogative of the harlot. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, he said it was the responsibility of the newspaper proprietors. Well, I think that we are in danger in this Province of getting into that very unhappy situation. I have no quarrel with all the advice in the world being given to the Premier and let him seek it where he wishes.

MR. JAMIESON: He is entitled to it.

MR. ROBERTS: He is entitled to it, as my friend, the Leader of the Opposition says, and let him seek it where he wishes. I have no quarrel with that. If he wishes to pay, I have no quarrel with the public chest paying any reasonable sum, and I do not consider the amount of money paid to this gentleman to be unreasonable in the circumstances. I have no quarrel with that. But, Mr. Chairman, we cannot have it both ways. The Premier tells us that he personally approves everything. I find that fine, but I will say to him that the statements made by this gentleman, in my opinion, go far, far beyond simple explanation. We have the spectacle of this gentleman engaging in public controversy with an official of the Government of Canada. I have no quarrels with the views, but I have every quarrel with the forum in which they were being expressed, and I think it is a very, very dangerous practice. I know the Premier has a high regard for the constitutional conventions, and I believe the Premier has an equally high regard for integrity, integrity in administration, integrity in the process of government, and I would say to him quite simply that applying those principles to this situation would lead, inevitably, in my view, and inexorably, to a situation where the policy

MR. ROBERTS: and women exercised influence, their judgement was brought to bear, their advice was sought and very often acted upon. Some of them were public servants in the sense in which that term is used. Others of them were not so-called public servants, and one that comes to mind from the recent past is Dr. Stuart Peters who for, I believe, a year or perhaps a little more was - I think his title was Chief Executive Advisor to Mr. Moores when Mr. Moores was Premier. I forget the precise title, but anyway he had some similar title. Nothing wrong with that. That will go on and I think I said in the Committee last year that the Premier had every right to retain an individual as policy advisor, if he so wished, and there was some criticism from some of my colleagues about the salary, and I said that - I forget the words - but something like anything that could be spent to give the advice the Premier needs, given the difficulties with which the Premier must, by nature, deal. I mean, being Premier of this Province is not always an easy job. It is an onerous task. I do not begrudge the Premier any advice and any reasonable amount that has to be spent to get that advice. I do think we are heading into a very dangerous situation where a gentleman, without any responsibility, a gentleman who answers to nobody other than the Premier, and that is not to say the Premier is a nobody, but it is to say that the gentleman does not answer to the House, can breach the constitutional proprieties and conventions which have grown up over a couple of hundred years, because the principle is startlingly simple. Either you are a public servant or you are a public figure, a political figure. If you are a political figure, well and good: You take your chances with the electorate, you take the rough and tumble of the House if you are lucky enough to be elected, or fortunate enough or smart enough or whatever you want to be elected, but you do not fatten on the public payroll, you do not do that, at the same time as you claim to be political.

MR. JAMIESON: Have your cake and eat it, too.

MR. ROBERTS: You cannot have your cake and eat it, too. You know, I think it was Stanley Baldwin, the Premier of England who came up with a very phrase. He applied it to newspaper proprietors. He was

MR. ROBERTS: advisor is told to keep his policy advice within the confines that have grown up over the centuries. You know, he and the Premier may be friends, I am told they are alter egos, that they are bosom buddies, that they are intimate friends, and I have no quarrel with that either. But, Sir, friendship ought not to be allowed to get in the way of constitutional conventions and, above all, it ought not to be allowed to get in the way of what I shall suggest and submit are the proprieties. It is a very dangerous thing, the very fact that the

MR. ROBERTS:

House of Assembly is engaged in this sort of discussion as it had to be, given the actions of this gentleman who of his own accord chooses to raise it. That in itself shows the kind of dangers that we are going to get into. But I know I am close to my minute, Sir, and I shall draw to a close but, you know, we are very close to the situation that we must at all points try to avoid, and that is where the conduct of public servants is being debated here in the House. That is not the function of the House. The ministers answer for the conduct of their public servants. But when you get a public servant, a person on the public payroll, inserting himself into the public debate then, Sir, his conduct is going to become the subject of partisan controversy in the House and that is improper. Further, Sir, it is dangerous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Just a few words, Mr. Chairman, in response to what the hon. member said. I am not going to get into debate with him about the constitutional niceties of it except to say that I thoroughly disagree with each and every word he said. Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member opened his speech he made reference to Mr. Martin and that Mr. Martin was defeated. He implied in his own inimitable way that this was because the people in his home district knew him and consequently he was defeated for that reason. I wonder, as I look across the House myself, what would be the results if the hon. members there opposite, most of whom, I gainsay, about 90 per cent of whom are parachute candidates, they do not run in their home districts, if they ran in their home districts what the result would be. I dare say that they would lose their nomination fee or you would probably end up with about two or three seats on that side of the House instead of the five or six that they might squeak out of the general populace during the next general election.

MR. ROBERTS:

Bellevue, is he?

The Premier is going to run in

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Five different ones.

MR. ROBERTS:

The Premier is going in five

places at once.

MR. MARSHALL:

So having said that -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We are a little bit different than

you.

MR. MARSHALL:

Most of the members here represent -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A little bit different.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well that is fine (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:

- districts, Mr. Chairman, where

they live and sleep and have their being. The hon. gentlemen there opposite come from ethereal airs and parachute into their districts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

The parachute Opposition. Look

at the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary); he is the escapist member. He just escaped from Bell Island. He went over to LaPoile. Now he is going to be chased off the Island in the next election.

Mr. Chairman, with these words of wisdom I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed Head 1, Consolidated Fund Services and Head 2, Legislative, have made progress on Head 3, the Executive Council and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the debate I might indicate to the House, for the information of the House, that the Social Services Committee, which by the way has already had one meeting and in its continuing wisdom has elected the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) as its Chairman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - that particular Committee will be the first one off the mark and will be meeting at the Legislative Chamber of the Colonial Building from 7:00 to 8:30 P.M. tonight and will be considering the head of estimates to be reviewed, Education. That is the first meeting and it occurs tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put the motion, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I simply want to ask the President of the Council if he could indicate what the government will be doing calling its business on Thursday. Are we carrying on with this jollity on the estimates?

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

MR. MARSHALL: We will be carrying on on Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, with the indepth and perceptive examination of the estimates in Committee of the Whole.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three of the clock.