

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I wish to welcome on behalf of all hon. members to the Gallery today Mayor Phil Grandy and Councillor Phil Gould from the Town Council of Belloram, in the district of Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to apologize as I already did to my colleague, the spokesman for fisheries on the Opposition that I do not have a prepared statement but I wish to inform the House that I came from a meeting a few seconds ago with the Fishermen's Union for the last hour or so and the matter discussed was the pricing of lobsters in our Province and attempts we are making jointly to stabilize the prices paid to fishermen in our Province.

First of all, may I say there has been no application sent out to date to the buyers who were buying lobsters last year primarily because of the fact I wanted to get ratification from my colleagues in Cabinet and of course, consultation with the Fishermen's Union to be able to issue to buyers and processors in the Province, for the first time, conditional licences, conditional permits and licences to buyers to buy lobsters or any other fish species. In this case, we are talking about lobsters and applications will now be forwarded, within the next few days, to all buyers who bought lobsters last year, but indicating to them that this year, for the first time, we will be stipulating conditions or a condition to that buyer's licence.

That condition will be relayed to them at a later date, approximately the middle of April. prior

MR. J. MORGAN: to the opening of the lobster fishing season, which opens the 20th of April and that condition involves pricing - prices paid to fishermen.

In the meantime, the Union has agreed to carry out their work, which is their responsibility, in connection with this aspect, and I am not going to disclose what their intentions are, and the Union has agreed they will not disclose their intentions until they meet again with me on April the 15th to relay at that time the results of their work for the next two weeks.

But the objective of government is to get a stabilized price and a fair price to all fishermen around the Province this year with regards to the lobster species. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult to respond to a ministerial statement that there was not a printed copy of. I can only say this, that we agree in principle with any stabilizing of prices that would be in the best interests of the lobster fishermen of this Province, presumably a stabilized and fair price throughout the Province. The minister said that there will be conditional licenses issued this year and he said the conditions related to price, but there was no indication exactly as to what the price will be and therein lies a possible problem with respect to the selling of lobsters when the lobster season opens. For example, if we have a situation where the prices are set at such a price that the buyers will refuse to buy, we would have a situation on our hands where the fishermen may be forced to hold their lobsters. In the event of storms or heavy rainfall, the minister well knows that an awful lot of these lobsters may, in fact, be lost. So there is one problem that may result if, in fact, the price is set at such a level that the buyers themselves refuse to buy. On the other hand if conditional licenses are being issued, obviously this means that in some cases the minister may not, in fact, issue licenses to certain buyers and therefore you will have exactly the same problem existing where the fishermen are forced into holding the lobsters with the possibility of losing these lobsters until such time as the buyers do in fact decide to buy. So I would just like to point out these couple of dangers with respect to the announcement, but we do welcome the fact that prices will hopefully be fair and stabilized throughout the Province,

MR. F. ROWE: probably point out one other thing and that is the situation which, I understand, exists on the West coast where companies from outside of Newfoundland come in and buy lobsters from the fishermen on the West coast, take it to the mainland and hold it in holding units until such time as the prices jump up.

MR. HODDER: Until Christmas for the U.K. and European markets.

MR. F. ROWE: Until Christmas, my hon. friend points out to me. And I feel obviously something should be done to stop that kind of a situation and obviously we probably need to look at the possibility of having larger holding units or lobster ponds in this Province similar to what they have in the other Maritime Provinces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. STIRLING: (Inaudible) completely by leave to the concerns -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. SPEAKER: I understand leave has not been granted.

MR. STIRLING: By leave, Mr. Speaker - the concerns expressed -

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. J. MORGAN: The concerns expressed by the spokesman for fisheries of the Opposition are very real because they were the concerns that were discussed at some length with the Fishermen's Union and that is the main reason we are meeting again on the 15th. to make sure these pitfalls are overcome.

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief statement which relates to the municipal status of the town of North West River. The municipality of North West River was established in 1968 and comprised the North side of the area formerly incorporated under a community council, and the South side of the area inhabited by residents mainly of Indian ancestry. The municipality was administered by a board of trustees representing the municipality

MR. WINDSOR: at large but of which only one member was a resident of the southside area of the municipality. Because of considerable dissatisfaction and apathy created among the residents, the status of the area was changed in 1973 to a town with an elected town council using the ward system to ensure equal representation from both areas of the town. While for the most part there was good will between the two areas of the municipality, because of geographical and etnical factors the relationship between the two areas of the municipality with regard to municipal matters slowly deteriorated to the point where the town council could not function effectively in providing normal municipal services.

The Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing received petitions from both areas of the municipality showing that a substantial majority of the taxpayers in each area favoured separate municipal structures for both areas of the municipality. After a thorough evaluation of local governments in the area, the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing recommended to Cabinet that the town of North West River, as it presently exists, be disbanded in favour of separate jurisdictions for both areas of the municipality. Approval has now been given for the northside area to continue as a town with an elected town council.

The order reducing the boundary of the town to comprise only the northside area will come into effect on April 1st. of 1980. The Department of Municipal Affairs will now take the necessary action to provide for the election of a new town council for the northside. In order that residents of the southside may be provided with essential municipal services, such as water and sewer, fire protection, garbage and waste dispoals, consideration will be given for the establishment of a local service district as provided for under the provisions of the new Municipalities Act.

MR. WINDSOR: Just to expand very briefly on that, Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is that the town on the northside shall continue as a town council. We shall have an election in the near future to elect a town council of seven persons to represent the northside of the municipality and they shall continue on. As it relates to the southside of the community, mainly comprised of native peoples, we have had numerous meetings, my colleague, the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and I have had discussions, of course, with both sides, both with the representatives of the North and the southside, and we are in agreement whereby the northside shall continue in this manner. And because of the type of structure that is proposed under the new Municipalities Act, approved by this House in the last session, providing for a form of local government known as a local service district, we see it now as possible and we will be having further discussions to iron out the details with the southside to create a local service district there, whereas the local band

MR. WINDSOR:

council can be the same one and the same as the Local Service District Committee which we see as giving a measure of control to the Native Band Councils allowing them to operate the municipality in a manner which is consistent with their traditions and their culture and their heritage. We see it as a major step forward and one which we hope will be beneficial to both sides of the community and which will allow a measure of local government to the Southside and yet allow them to live a lifestyle to which they are accustomed.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. HOLLETT:

Mr. Speaker, having had the privilege to visit this area on three occasions in the last five or six years, I can say I can readily understand the petitions from the people and possibly the actions taken by the department. I personally think it is a retrograde step in relation to the municipal movement in the Province. It is most unfortunate that what was an average size town in Newfoundland now has to be split. From the administration point of view certainly in my opinion, one side will certainly hurt more than the other and if you project that into the future what we are saying in essence now is that a segment of the municipality has a right to opt out and this was a very difficult thing to do before. And if we look further into the future, and I am sure we are all looking forward to the day when Happy Valley-Goose Bay becomes a very thriving and vibrant community as a shipping port and other matters, certainly this area would then be considered, I assume, by the department as an ideal place for a regional form of government. And if the communities in that area have the right to opt out now, then I would assume they will also have the right to opt out of a regional form of government later on. I am not disagreeing with the action the minister has taken, I know that he had no choice, but I am just saying I think it is most unfortunate that this step had to be taken.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I have a further brief statement relating to the City of St. John's, a request by a citizen's group for a Commission of Enquiry.

The petition presented to the hon. House of Assembly on behalf of certain residents of the City of St. John's, requesting that a Commission of Enquiry be appointed under Section 320 of the City of St. John's Act, has been thoroughly investigated by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

It appears that the petition was motivated mainly because of the conditions of city streets and sidewalks and the council's policy in relation to water and sewer affairs and hook-ups by private contractors. Through investigation of these allegations there does not appear to be sufficient evidence of gross improprieties and mismanagement to warrant the type of investigation through a Commission of Enquiry as envisaged by Section 320 of the City of St. John's Act. The policy of City Council with respect to water and sewer repairs and hook-ups has been reversed to its original policy and matters

MR. N. WINDSOR: relating to snow clearing from city streets and sidewalks, and conditions which confront other municipal authorities throughout the Province. The City Council is autonomous in the management of the city and any Commission of Enquiry appointed under Section 320 of the said act could be considered as unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of the Council. Having considered all of these factors, I was unable to recommend to Cabinet, and Cabinet agreed, that the Commission of Enquiry should not be appointed in this particular instance.

I apologize to the hon. member for not having a copy. Oh, he did get it later.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a series of questions for the Government House Leader and President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) relating to television coverage of the House.

In view of the fact that the Opposition has reluctantly given the House or the T.V. cameras permission to come in and record the Budget and to carry the Budget Speech tomorrow live on television, I am wondering if the government will give unanimous consent for the cameras to come back in when the Budget debate starts so that the lead-off speaker for the Opposition can be covered as the Budget will be covered?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I could respond to this by saying first of all that the proceedings of the Budget will be covered tomorrow, Budget day tomorrow, will be exactly the same as it has been since the proceedings of this House have been televised. The Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) will deliver his speech and the normal proceedings will go through.

I have to answer the hon. member by saying that really what he is asking for is that the proceedings of the House be

MR. W. MARSHALL: televised - in other words, to enlarge further the television of the proceedings of this House. Traditionally, it has only been on Budget day and on the day of the Throne Speech, and at the present time, as far as television is concerned, the whole matter of television of the House proceedings is a matter that has been taken under advisement. It has many pros and it has many cons, but it is not going to be, as far as the government is concerned, while there is no intention or desire whatsoever to stifle the Opposition in their comments, which I would assume and I know will have to be positive comments on the Budget which will be rendered tomorrow, in any particular way, unanimous consent to a measure such as that would have far-reaching implications which I suggest would not be in the long range and long-term benefits of the proceedings of this House to make just immediately and say yes to, but rather it is something that requires sober and deep reflection before one decides upon it. And if, in fact, one should decide upon it, then certain ground rules would have to be laid down.

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

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) has been saying for quite some time that the government has it under advisement. Back in 1977 this report was prepared by the then Speaker, who is now the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer), detailing

MR. F. WHITE: television coverage throughout Canada. I wonder if the minister would tell the House how he proposes, or the government proposes, to proceed to study this issue and whether or not he would agree to the appointment of a committee of members of the House to bring in recommendations with respect to television coverage?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the government has this under advisement, as I said; they have a number of matters under advisement. And I do not propose in the Question Period to get into a debate with the hon. member on either the pros and the cons of television production.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I am just saying that, you know, the hon. member has asked a question which invites debate and I am saying I do not propose to get into a debate with him as to the pros and cons of the television. But the fact of the matter is that the government has taken it under advisement. I think there is a motion on the Order Paper right now in the name of the hon. member, I believe, with respect to the televising of debates. And this is on Private Member's Day and we will certainly be debating it when this comes up with a great deal of interest.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) that in view of the fact that television coverage of the House concerns all members of the House and not just the government members, would he not consult with his colleagues and agree to the appointment of a Select Committee to study television coverage in view of the fact that it has to do with all members of the House and not just the government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

March 27, 1980

Tape No. 685

SD - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, any advent of television in this House would involve all members of this House because it involves the privilege of this House and whatever the government decides or whatever a committee may decide sometime in the future it would have to be subject to the sanction of all and each individual member of this House because the rules are set down and in order to bring the television into the Chamber it would require the unanimous consent of all members. So all members are obviously going to be involved in it and, you know, this is the situation.

Now, the hon. member himself is sold on television coming into the House. There are varying views and this is one of the hon. member's main opinions that he advances from time to time. Some of the arguments he makes are very well taken but I would suggest to the hon. member that all the arguments do not come down on his side entirely. There are arguments on the other side as well and it is a matter that the government has the responsibility of balancing these out before you come to a decision.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I expect that we will see a whole rash of statements, spur of the moment, and dealing with fisheries. While the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) wishes to avoid the question that was asked two days ago, I would like to get the balance of the information because he may have been cut off yesterday. I think we have now established from the Minister of Fisheries that the fishermen who ran the Fisheries Loan Board had

MR. L. STIRLING: their term expire July 1st and yesterday he said but they continued to meet until some time in September. I would like to ask the minister by what authority then, the loans were approved that he mentioned here in the House if a Board that did not have the authority to meet was continuing to meet?

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman keeps on twisting information that I give to the House of Assembly, and whether it is intentional I do not know, but I hope it is not intentional, because yesterday I did say that there were no meetings after August 1979. Now he is saying the meeting was held in September of 1979. I said yesterday in the House that the fishermen who were appointed to the Fisheries Loan Board were appointed by a Minute of Council and it was a Cabinet decision in July of 1978. They were appointed for a one year term, the term was to expire July 1, 1979. Now, that is hopefully quite clear. I cannot give it any more simple than that for the hon. gentleman from Bonavista North.

They were appointed for a one year term and their term expired on July 1st. At that time, the Minister of Fisheries did not re-appoint any new fishermen and I said yesterday that the fishermen were asked to attend the meetings that were held, two of them, in July and August, whereby there were forty-four loans dealt with at one meeting and fifty loans at the other meeting, a total of ninety-four loans, as given to the House yesterday.

These fishermen were asked by the then chairman of the board, Mr. Gerry George, who since that time has resigned, as we all know, they were asked by the chairman to sit in on these meetings and to carry on as part of the Loan Board because the then Minister of Fisheries had not at that time

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: What we have now gathered is that there was a Fisheries Loan Board which consisted of directors who were fishermen. We have gathered that their term expired the 1st. of July, and there was a new board appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council in October.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The Question Period, I would submit, is for the purpose of answering questions, not for the purpose of the hon. member making his speech as to what he gathers the import of the answers to questions have been.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: In response, Mr. Speaker, surely goodness the member is entitled to lay the groundwork for his question. We listened to the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who went on at some considerable length, chronicling a whole series of events.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. JAMIESON: I suggest, Sir, that it is not out of order. What the hon. member has been saying is not out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I think the Standing Orders are quite clear to everybody. The preamble should be as brief as possible and so should the answers, of course, to questions. I would ask the member for Bonavista North to direct his question, please.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) would get together on the information there would be no need to ask these questions.

MR. STIRLING: The question is, Mr. Speaker, again, there was a period from July 1st. until October, when a new board was appointed, in which there was no legal board in effect, by what authority were these loans approved?

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary question.

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

MR. JAMIESON: To the President of the Privy Council, who I presume is Government Leader in the House, not only in the House but, I imagine in the absence of the Premier, is the appropriate person to ask; has legal advice been sought as to whether or not a board which by Minute-in-Council ceased to have authority as of a given date, namely, I believe the hon. member said either the 1st. of July or somewhere in that vicinity, that that board could properly function with those members sitting, in the absence of a further Minute-in-Council reappointing them even for a relatively short period of time?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that I think has already been given. There is no legal advice being sought to this end because, as far as I can determine, from the tenor of questions that have come from the Leader of the Opposition's colleague, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), the need of such an opinion arises really from the point of view of statements made from assumptions which the hon. member is making, which I feel and think are patently and obviously unfounded. And I can only refer, in answer to the hon. Leader's question,

MR. MARSHALL:

I can say, no, no such advice has been sought and no such advice is thought necessary. And I think really that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan) has quite admirably and adequately answered the position with respect to the position the government finds itself in.

MR. STIRLING:

A supplementary.

MR.SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition yields for the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING:

I would like to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan) refused to answer my question and he -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon.member should be aware of course that Standing Orders provide for that to happen. It is quite clear that Standing Order 31(e) states that a minister may in his discretion decline to answer any question. I do not think that is debatable.

Now the member for Bonavista North

(Mr. Stirling) with his supplementary.

MR. STIRLING:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not question the minister's right, but I think it is the first time in the history of the House that that particular minister was found speechless when asked a question.

MR. NEARY:

But he has his TV interview all arranged.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I think we will now see one of the reasons why the people in this House, on this side, would like to see television so the people can see the truth. Last night -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has a supplementary?

MR. STIRLING:

Yes, I have a question. Last night on television in front of the whole country the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan) made a comment that the board went bankrupt in September. This is the first time that I knew that the minister had made that assertion. Would he now confirm to the House that the board

March 27, 1980

Tape No. 688

AH-2

MR. STIRLING: did in fact go bankrupt in September?

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

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). Although it is outside the jurisdiction of the government, I believe we do have a tremendous interest in this matter. It has to do with the two ferries that are stuck in the ice off North Sydney. I would like to ask the minister if he has been in consultation with CN or indeed the Department of Transport in connection with the Frederick Carter and the Atlantica that are jammed in the ice over off North Sydney and the back up of tractor trailers and trucks in North Sydney that are trying to get across here. Has the minister had any discussion with CN over the possibility of working up some alternative to try to get these tractor trailers to Newfoundland that have perishables on board of them, some fresh fruit and vegetables and so forth on the way to this Province?

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

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker. To this date we have not been in touch with MOT nor they with us.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are CN ferries in Port aux Basques that could possibly get to alternative ports on the Mainland, namely Mulgrave, would the hon. gentleman undertake to enter into discussions with CN or the Department of Transport to try and arrange to have the ferries in Port aux Basques, that are tied up at Port aux Basques, to go to an alternate port so that the trucks and tractor trailers in North Sydney, 200 of them,

MR. S. NEARY: that have fresh fruit and vegetables and meat and so forth on can go to the alternate ports and be brought to Port aux Basques by one of the ferries that is now tied up at Port aux Basques? Would the hon. gentleman undertake to look into that matter?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. minister.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is assuming that CN is not doing everything possible to alleviate the situation, I am sure that they are. As I indicated in answer to your first question, they have not been in touch with me and I have not seen the necessity to interfere. I am sure that CN is doing everything they can and if what the hon. member suggests is an alternative, then no doubt they will work towards that end.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the message is not getting through to the hon. gentleman. I do not know why he should sulk and be so stubborn about it. I am merely asking the hon. gentleman if he would approach CN with a suggestion from this House, from members of this House or from the government, asking that the ferry that is tied up in Port aux Basques, if it is possible to send her to an alternate port, namely Mulgrave, and divert the traffic from the North Sydney to Mulgrave, bring it back to Port aux Basques because these trucks have perishables on board for Newfoundland businessmen and some of them are Newfoundland trucks that are now in North Sydney and have not been able to move for days and this is a very serious situation. The hon. gentleman has a responsibility to the people, the business people, the consumers of this Province to make that suggestion to CN if he thinks it is a good

MR. S. NEARY: suggestion. If he does not think it is a good suggestion, well let him get up and say so. But I think it is a pretty good suggestion as an alternative to the situation. They are trying to get to North Sydney, these two ferries, but they have a ferry out in Port aux Basques tied up that could be used in an alternate port. That is all I am asking the hon. gentleman to look into the possibility of having that done.

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat and I assume that the CN is doing everything that they can to alleviate the situation and I am not going to take on the responsibility of the CN.

MR. S. NEARY: The next time you start criticising CN we will remember that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Windsor -
Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power). He has not been on television for a while so I figured we should ask him a question to get on television as often as the rest of the ministers to whom we ask questions. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House some of the aspects of that woodcutting programme that we had for selling firewood off the wood lots to the general public. The indication in the news was, and coming out of the minister's office, was that the programme had been shut-down and that all of the aspects of that particular programme were being considered by the department with a few of them making a decision whether it would be an ongoing programme or not. Would the minister comment on that?

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

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has more great concerns before Budget day than whether I get on television or not.

MR. S. NEARY: We are all worried about you, boy!

MR. G. FLIGHT: We are worried about you, nobody asking you any questions.

MR. J. MORGAN: No, you are worried about your leader according to yesterday's threat here in the House, threatening not to have television come in the House and (inaudible) on T.V. You are the one that is worried.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, with regard to -

MR. J. MORGAN: Blackmail, yesterday in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. D. JAMIESON: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is a normal amount of interplay that goes back and forth across this House. Yesterday before strangers were admitted we had a discussion in this House,

MR. JAMIESON: which I assume was before strangers were admitted on the grounds that there were certain matters which members discuss among themselves. Now the hon. gentleman unmistakably, and I hope that this will be recorded in Hansard, I raised a certain particular point yesterday and I thought I did it in a fair and reasonable manner and I felt that today, having given due consideration to it, that we gave a reasoned response. The hon. gentleman has accused me, twice I heard him, of blackmail; he said, "The Leader of the Opposition was trying to pay blackmail with this House."

MR. NEARY: Withdraw!

MR. JAMIESON: Now, Sir, if you did not hear it, then I am quite content to see as to whether it is on the record or not. But the hon. gentleman has been heard by a lot of people here in this House to say it and I ask him now to withdraw what is unquestionably and undoubtedly a scandalously unparliamentary kind of claim and one that is blatantly untrue.

MR. NEARY: Very low class. Very low.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Apologize.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order.

MR. MORGAN: I will gladly speak to the point of order,
Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: - and the questions today in the House clearly indicated what the Opposition were up to, and that is they were demanding yesterday in private session, and again today in the Question Period, to have the cameras brought into the House to give the Opposition Leader (Mr. Jamieson) a chance to have a say on the budget, for the first time in the history of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Not so. Not so.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, and because the Opposition members yesterday they wanted to say no to having TV coverage of the House unless their Leader could get on TV the same time as the Minister of Finance. Now that to me in my view is almost blackmail. I did not say the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) was blackmailing anybody -

MR. NEARY: Sit down and apologize.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - but in my view, Mr. Speaker, that kind of tactic -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that kind of tactic on the part of the Opposition, having the nerve to come in and try to break the traditions of the House by demanding that the government yield -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: If I could continue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: What I am saying is, and I repeat, if that kind of a tactic and the people are talking about in the Opposition, the last questioner, and the questioner before, oh if he asks the minister a question he gets on TV, you know. Yesterday the complaint was the Opposition Leader was not getting on TV, and he came in demanding - the Opposition in general did, saying, "Unless you give us a chance to have the Opposition Leader on TV replying to the budget we want to stop the TV people filming the budget." Let us be open about it. Why not?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Blackmail.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

With respect to the point of order,
I understand it was with reference to the term "blackmail", The rest
of the debate perhaps was interesting but not too useful in helping
me make a decision but to certainly clarify the matter and dispose
of it I would ask the hon. minister to simply withdraw the terminology
"blackmail", and then we can get on with the Question Period.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will always obey the
Speaker's ruling. I withdraw the word "blackmail", but my own view
still stands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Any further questions?

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member
for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: He has no question.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. THOMS: Yes, the -

MR. STAGG: The hon. gentleman has no questions.

MR. WHITE: Withdraw unequivocally.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: You are pretty low class, do you know that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, you, as Speaker of this House, asked the minister to withdraw the word that he used. I do not think that he did withdraw the word that he used. And I think that he should have to do it. I do not think that qualifies as an apology.

MR. F. WHITE: Unequivocably.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council to the point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Just a few words on that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) unequivocally withdrew the word that Your Honour asked him to withdraw. I have heard on dozens of occasions, on scores of occasions the same type of retraction being made from members on the opposite side of the House and it has perfectly been acceptable to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I would rule there is no point of order. The hon. minister, I understood, withdrew the term and I believe that should dispose of the matter.

Further questions?

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

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

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask Your Honour for a ruling on - I presume when these matters are discussed, before Your Honour admits strangers, that there is a specific reason for doing that, I am not sure of what the reason is, Is it in private because you want a private session, is it confidentiality? What is the reason for discussing these matters in private session? Because now the hon. gentleman - can anybody now come out of the private session, come into the House and discuss and debate what has been said in private session? Is that the situation in the House now, Your Honour?

March 27, 1980

Tape No. 690

NM - 5

MR. NEARY: Or should we have private -

AN HON. MEMBER: You should have asked a question.

You should have asked the question.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Should we have private sessions at all or is that a breach of confidence of the private session that we had? I would just like Your Honour to give a ruling on it?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I would like to respond to that, Mr. Speaker. There is obviously no point of order or point of privilege. Your Honour cannot be asked a hypothetical question. It ill behooves me to make a suggestion to the Opposition, but if they wish to take up their time in Question Period by spurious points of order, they so may, but they are -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, once again I have to say that I would like - not necessarily now - to have this matter dealt with with regard to the so-called period before the admission of strangers, because in fact, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan), whether he did it intentionally or not, I give him all the benefit of the doubt that he did it unintentionally, but the truth of the matter is that those who were present yesterday will know that I did not, as he suggested, suggest that it should be the Leader of the Opposition. I said, 'a spokesman for this side of the House.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: And I think anybody who was here yesterday will recall that. And the fact that it is not in Hansard makes it impossible to refute other than on the good will of hon. members opposite who will remember that that is what I said, that I did not seek and was not looking for with the implication being that it ought to have been me for I said 'any member who is speaking for this side.'

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I believe I have heard enough debate. I thank hon. members for their contributions. I will take the matter under advisement and make a comment at a later date.

Any further questions?

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to also ask Your Honour in considering this to consider whether or not there has been a breach of the privilege of the House by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) relating to this whole subject not on a question simply of a point of order but on the question of the privilege of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. F. STAGG: On that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of privilege, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: I think you have already dealt with it, but I think we should also note that here today there have only been two questions asked by the Opposition, a couple of supplementaries. My friend from Humber West (Mr. R. Baird) and I have on occasion asked questions and we are quite prepared to ask meaningful questions of the administration as this goes on if the Opposition is not prepared to ask questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of privilege raised by the hon. the member for Bonavista North, I will take that, too, under advisement and give a ruling on it at a later time.

The hon. the Mister of Lands and Forests (Mr. C. Power) was responding.

MR. C. POWER: I understand that there is a question standing which relates to the woodlot project. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, earlier on this year in response to some very decent public outcries to supply an alternate and fairly cheap source of energy to the people of Newfoundland, we, as government, initiated a programme in conjunction with my department and the Department of Social Services particularly, and also with the full support and knowledge of the Department of Mines and Energy to try to harvest some spruce budworm damaged wood in the Avalon area close to St. John's to see if there were a market for that wood. We did find that there was a very adequate market for that wood. The project has now been terminated because it was simply an experimental project for twelve weeks.

MR. C. POWER: As a result of that experimental project, we did have several private entrepreneurs who are interested now in setting up their own private woodlots around the Avalon part of the Province and we are glad to say that it was such a good success.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: There is not much time, so, Mr. Speaker, I will ask a couple of supplementary questions.

Would the minister confirm that when the general public wanted to get to the woodlots to buy the wood that, number one, they had to use four wheel drives; number two, that there was nothing near the wood that was required; and number three, is the public reception right that this programme of the minister's was a case of the very poor - people coming off welfare - selling wood to the very rich or relatively rich and that wood was subsidized by this Province up to the tune of \$60 per cord? In other words, it cost roughly \$80 a cord to produce and was sold for \$20 a cord to people who could well afford to pay more.

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

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in response to the first question, obviously the member did not visit the woodlot area that we had set up behind the Ruby Line. It was quite accessible to anyone who was going there to pick up wood, whether it be by truck or car, pickup truck or a four wheel drive. Certainly it was not required to have a four wheel drive to pick up the wood.

With regard to the third part of the question, which is the most important part, as to whether we as a government were subsidizing the affluent of St. John's to get wood at a reduced rate, that is so ridiculous as to almost be unworthy of comment, Mr. Speaker. We, as a government, decided to have a make work project that took into account the fact that certain persons on social assistance -

MR. G. FLIGHT: What about the subsidy?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

March 27, 1980

Tape 691

EC - 4

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. C. POWER:

- we as a government decided to have
a make work project to put them out harvesting wood which was dying and
dead anyway-

MR. C. POWER: because of the spruce budworm. We then took this wood and sold it to the general public of Newfoundland and anybody who wanted to go there. If you call that subsidizing wood for the affluent, Mr. Speaker, then I think the former speaker should examine the programme in detail.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the financial statements for the year ending March 31, 1979 for the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, this particular question is so outdated now, and it came from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), I am not really sure if I can legally answer it or not but it dealt with the total cost of maintaining livestock inspectors in North Sydney which was asked a considerable time ago.

MR. S. NEARY: They are still over there.

MR. J. GOUDIE: I realize they are still over there and there are going to be more there this year as well.

The answers, Mr. Speaker, to the question are, part (a), office facilities are rented on an annual basis from CN. The cost is established in advance, at least in the agreement signed. The total cost is \$1,200 per year; part (b), two permanent employees are stationed in North Sydney to provide

MR. J. GOUDIE: inspection service. The salary cost is approximately \$28,000 per year; part (c), two temporary seasonal employees are employed yearly for a period of six to seven months. The salary cost is approximately \$15,000 per year; and part (d), one of the permanent employees is a Newfoundlander, a person from this Province, and the other is from Nova Scotia. The temporary employees have, in the past been from both this Province and from Nova Scotia. Very often these Summer employees are university students. In some cases Newfoundlanders have been offered employment but because of the added cost of board and lodging in North Sydney, they have chosen not to accept.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Any further answers?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, a question asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) several days ago with respect to the decision of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court ruling that information sworn out pursuant to a search warrant could be made public. Actually, that decision has been appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada so we obviously have to await the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further answers to questions?
The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) with some additional information I undertook to get for him a few days ago regarding assistance to senior citizens living in institutions.

He raised a question as to whether or not the Province intended to pass on any increase that might come about to senior citizens. I can tell him that we did so last year. The federal government agreed and to my knowledge and based on the records of the department that was the first time that there had been an agreement that the allowance be passed on. I can inform him that the full allowance was not passed on to senior citizens living in institutions. It was to people outside.

MR. T. HICKEY: And the reason for that was that there would be a two level system of allowances if we had done that, because we do not have the money in the budget to provide the same kind of increase for all the other residents.

We are undertaking now to take a look at that to see if in fact there should be a two level system or a two-tier system of personal care and pocket allowances. There is a strong argument in favour of it and I am looking at it to see if we can not institute that.

The other thing I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that I was unclear, based on the Leader of the Opposition's question, as to whether he was referring to the quarterly indexing which form a small relief -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. T. HICKEY: Right. But the present Prime Minister also alluded to, in the recent election, a thirty dollar increase. Now, if that comes then certainly we will deal with it at that time. But certainly we are in favour of what the hon. gentleman refers to.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further answers to questions?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port followed by the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of twenty-seven householders from the community of Piccadilly Slant. The prayer of the petition is, "That we, the undersigned residents of Piccadilly Slant, petition the government to provide our Water Committee with funds so that we may be able to start work on our water system this year. Our committee was formed last year and we have carried out all procedures required by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Studies done by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Department of Health have shown our water to be highly contaminated and we urge

MR. J. HODDER:

you to help us this year."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the third petition which I have delivered in this House on behalf of the residents of this particular area. Last year, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has received quite a bit of correspondence including a personal appeal from myself asking him to take a personal interest in this particular matter because about three years ago, Mr. Speaker, a number of parents from that particular area came to me complaining that their children were sick and that they were having

MR. J. HODDER:

stomach sickness, etc. and I asked, at that time, asked the Department of Health would they go down and check the shallow wells in this particular area. Now, at that time, and I tabled those results in the House of Assembly one time last year, at that time, the level of contamination over which water is unfit to drink is .4 milligrams or millilitres of coliform, per 100 millilitres of water, .4. And the lowest was 26 and the highest was 140, which is highly contaminated water.

After that time, and some months later, a water committee was formed there with officials present of the Department of Municipal Affairs and under the Act for Water Committees for unincorporated communities. And under this act the residents put a certain sum of money in and the government matches that sum of money.

Now all those residents, Mr. Speaker, have pledged their money and have carried everything out to the letter of the law. After that time, a study was done by the Department of Municipal Affairs to see what type of water system would go there and cost and that sort of thing. After this time, once the word was out that their water was contaminated, Mr. Speaker, they started to use a nearby brook of fairly quickly running water and I have here, Mr. Speaker, which I propose to table, the results after their wells were found to be contaminated and they went to what they thought was a good source of water, I thought that maybe we had better get the brook, the source of water checked.

Now, while .4, Mr. Speaker, if over .4 is contaminated, downstream from the bridge was 114 and upstream was 95 counts of coliform per millilitre of water. And I propose to table these, Mr. Speaker, so that all members of this House of Assembly can see just how the people of this area have to live and

MR. J. HODDER:

what type of water they have.

In order to get water, you know, their own water is contaminated, in order to go to the nearest source of available water, it is contaminated - they bring their water to their homes by truck. They have to boil, they have to chlorinate; you know, even with chlorination, the water is still unacceptable for drinking. The health of their children is threatened, the health of the older people there is threatened. It is a terrible, terrible way for people to have to live, Mr. Speaker.

The issue was sent right across this Province a year ago. It was played on Here and Now right across the Province. It is a shame. It is a blot on this government's record. These people should not have to live in conditions like this and I would ask the minister, and by the way, this petition was signed by twenty-seven people; that represents twenty-seven householders, just not one person from each house. There are thirty families affected, one from each house signed this, and I would ask the minister to look at this problem because when the budget comes down in a few weeks time, Mr. Speaker, if this particular area is not looked after in the Province, I am afraid that very serious effects can happen here.

The community of Piccadilly, not only this area that is petitioning at the time, there are two water committees there, one in the community of Piccadilly Slant, one in the community of Piccadilly Head. And those two communities have totally, absolutely contaminated water. It has been proved by the Department of Health, it has been proved by the Department of Municipal Affairs, it has been ongoing for three and a half years and I would ask the minister to stand up and tell me now - Are you going to give these people a decent drinking water or not?

MR. J. HODDER: And, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say and I ask that the petition be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate my colleague for an excellent presentation that he just made on behalf of twenty-seven householders in Piccadilly Slant. I am sure that most hon. members of this House do not even know, or did not know before the hon. gentleman presented the petition, that there was such a place in Newfoundland as Piccadilly Slant.

I would assume that twenty-seven householders represent- What? 120,130 people. Well, if you take an average of five per family,

MR. NEARY: you might say that there are about 135 people who live in that community. And I cannot blame the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) for getting dramatic and emotional about this matter. This is the third time, the third time that the hon. gentleman has been forced to bring a petition into this House on behalf of his constituents in that community to try and get a drop of drinking water, something that most places in Newfoundland take for granted, that is, Mr. Speaker, most places that have water and sewerage, proper drinking water. But there are a number of places in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, like Piccadilly Slant and like Petites down in my own district, that do not have drinking water and these people must become awfully discouraged and awfully disillusioned, Mr. Speaker, with the government and with the elected representatives of the people here in this House when they hear us discussing Arts Council bills, spending days at that sort of foolish nonsense, when we should be spending our time trying to find solutions to people's problems like the people in Piccadilly Slant. The people must get awfully discouraged when they hear about things like Bob Cole's contract, like -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I know you cannot debate, Your Honour. I am well aware of that.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe it is irrelevant.

MR. NEARY: I wish I could get embroiled in debate on this petition because it really tugs at my heartstrings, Mr. Speaker, when I realize that here you have people down in Piccadilly Slant who do not have a drop of drinking water and here we are here in this House talking about rip-offs on communications contracts and paying for films for filming a Tory convention in Gander. But we are not allowed to debate, we are not allowed to talk about these things, Mr. Speaker, but the point I am making is that it must become awfully discouraging for people when they hear that out there, out in the boondocks, when they hear about these things, when they hear about the things that are being discussed.

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

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

MR. STAGG: I represented that district at one time and I certainly resent it ever being called the boondocks and I ask the hon. member to withdraw such an aspersion on the people.

MR. SPEAKER: Does anybody wish to speak to the point of order?

MR. THOMS: What point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I am prepared to make a ruling. There is no point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well, anyway, Sir, just to clue up, it must be awfully, awfully discouraging for these people when they turn on their television and turn on their radio and they hear about the entertainment and the Norma and Gladys going all over Europe and the West Indies, and these people have to haul water in their trucks. I think, Sir, that is terrible, it is typical of a government that represents townies, that represents mainly St. John's, a St. John's based government representing townies who have no concern or no regard for the people out there in the rural parts of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: To the petition, the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister is going to speak.

MR. STAGG: The minister is going to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member for Stephenville has been recognized.

MR. STAGG: I have the floor, have I not, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, you do.

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly I support the request of the prayer of this petition as put so emotionally by my colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). He has been there now for five years and this has been one of his consuming interests. I would suggest that one of the things that he might look at now, because evidently these water committees are not working out successfully even though they are legally constituted and so on, would be to look at part 6 of the new

MR. STAGG: Municipalities Act for local service districts and it has all the jurisdictional things that are necessary for the establishment of a quasi-municipality in an area such as that and obviously where people have that type of problem, this would be an ideal place for it, so it would be an idea for him to get out there among his constituents and bring forward to them the possibility of their being a local service district in the Piccadilly area because I certainly know that they have this problem there. It has been well publicized, my hon. friend has had lots of publicity out of it and he is getting more out of it today. I support the prayer of the petition but he might try an end-around on this one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Further petitions?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the community of Frederickton and the 149 voters of Frederickton who have signed the petition. And the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is 'We, the undersigned voters of Frederickton, in conjunction with the Gander Bay - Hamilton Sound Development Association, request that immediate action be taken to alleviate the water shortage at Frederickton. Our petition at this time is that two or three artesian wells be drilled in this area so that people will not have to travel five or six miles for water.' Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I want to point out to this hon. House that the problem that I am bringing before them, and that the people of Frederickton is bringing before them, is not a new problem; it has been with the community of Frederickton for fifteen years. And like my friend for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I think there have been numerous petitions presented in this House before. I know that the Local Improvement Committee of Frederickton has made numerous attempts to have this problem alleviated but their pleas and their cries for help seemed to have fallen on deaf ears.

MR. S. NEARY:

Down there in your district if you are not a Tory, if you do not write the Tory Association -

MR. B. TULK:

You have to write the Tory Association to get anywhere; the PC Association looks after your problems.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I have already called order, so if I could just have a moment. The hon. member, I believe, is beginning to enter into debate rather than speaking to the prayer of the petition.

MR. S. NEARY: That is my fault, Your Honour, I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask you to continue. Did the minister wish to raise a further point of order?

MR. J. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: - because the hon. gentleman is really misleading the House. Now whether he is doing it intentionally or not is another question, but to get up in the House and say that nothing can be done for Fogo district and any problems down there without having to go through the Progressive Conservation Party Association is totally inaccurate and incorrect. And to leave the impression with members of the House that this is correct is really misleading the House of Assembly, because I know I have had representations from numerous fishermen over the past two or three weeks from Fogo district and I have been doing everything possible to help them. In fact, so far I have resolved many of their problems. So it is not correct to say that to get things done in Fogo district you have to go to the PC Association executive, That is totally wrong.

MR. F. ROWE: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order whatsoever. The most it can be is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. And if anything is out of order, Mr. Speaker, it is the hon. minister himself in accusing my colleague of misleading the House; that is out of order. So I submit that he does not have a point of order but he is out of order by suggesting that my colleague is misleading the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! With respect to the point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and I understand that is the only one that we are debating at this particular point in time, I would rule that there is no point of order and there is a difference of opinion between hon. members. I would ask the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) to continue.

MR. B. TULK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The problem, Mr. Speaker, if I might continue, is a shortage of water that occurs in Frederickton both in the dry season that occurs in all parts of Newfoundland in the Summer, and in the Winter. But, Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out in this House that 75 per cent of the people of Frederickton have to drive five or six miles to another community to get water. What water there is in Frederickton is contaminated and it is contaminated for two reasons: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation and Communications in their desire to keep the roads solid in that community have spoiled many of the wells that lie by the side of it. Mr. Speaker, one resident of that community got \$200 for his well and a new well cost him \$3,200 and the water that he is getting is still not fit to drink. If one looks at the geography of Frederickton, Mr. Speaker, it is easy to see why indeed that community has contaminated wells as well,

MR. B. TULK: and this is the second reason for the contamination. Like most outport communities in this Province the sewer systems in Frederickton are made of septic tanks since there is no town sewer system. And you have one person living back of the other and Frederickton is a community that drains away to the sea. So as a consequence to that, Mr. Speaker, there is drainage into your neighbour's well. The Department of Health, Mr. Speaker, has examined some of the wells in Frederickton and six out of seven of the wells in that community were found to be contaminated. They have been told to go to

MR. B. TULK: Canada Works, DREE, and under Canada Works in the community like Fredericton, little can be done and they are not eligible for DREE grants anyway.

Mr. Speaker,

the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing of this government has a Water Service Division. Last year I believe the budget for that division was approximately \$600,000 and if you consider that it takes \$2,000 to put water and sewerage into one home, that means that the Province last year, I believe, serviced 300 families.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to this House that that is a mere pittance compared to what is needed. And obviously the people of Fredericton recognize the likelihood of getting water in their community under this program and they are now reduced to asking for two or three artesian wells.

I would like to ask the minister, given these facts, to rise in his place and support the petition and I ask that this petition be placed on the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on another petition.

Do you want to speak on the same petition?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia-West.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the hon. member for Fogo (B. Tulk) in his petition, I would like to make a couple of comments. First, personally I find it very disturbing to hear the member from Fogo present a petition with the obvious implications and importance, and the minister, or the department to which it is directed, to be absent from the House. I also detect, somewhat, over that last several months, that the presentation of petitions

MR. D. HOLLETT: that it has not been taken as seriously by members as, in my opinion, I feel it should be. Because petitions are a traditional way in our Province for people with needs to bring them to the floor of the House.

It is not a political ploy. I myself presented a petition for 1.8 miles of road recently and I can assure you those people worked hard and they had meetings, they decided what they wanted to do, how best to approach it. They worded the petition, they went door to door and explained it and I presented it to this House. And I think that the petition, to those people, is a very real and, in most cases, last ditch effort to get some basic services.

So, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that petitions be taken very seriously. It is the genuine intent of the people and it is not for any partisan, political ambitions. I can add very little to the petition as outlined. My friend and colleague did a very detailed synopsis of the problem and a very specific request.

We do have several places in this Province with like problems, there are two today. I am sure there are a lot more and I also know that the Department of Municipal Affairs try to do their best to accommodate but I am not sure if their priorities are going in the right place because certainly in this day and age, one of the first priorities to a healthy population has to be adequate and decent water for human consumption and use. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to use this period to present a petition from my district of Bonavista South. It is a petition requesting the upgrading and paving of a road leading

MR. J. MORGAN: from Sweet Bay to Charleston. I met yesterday out in the area with a delegation of the residents of Sweet Bay. The road is in very bad condition at the present time and is practically impassible. However, the residents do recognize that little can be done at this time of the year by the Department of Transportation and Communications, by my colleague, because of the environmental conditions with the frost coming out of the road, etc.

But the residents are simply requesting that the department look at the possibility of carrying out some upgrading on that road this summer. It is a three mile stretch of road leading from Sweet Bay to the town of Charleston and, of course, at Charleston, the last couple of years, we have seen a major expansion whereby approximately \$4,000,000 has been invested by the Nickerson's Company of Halifax into a fish plant facility at Charleston and the majority of the able-bodied people at Sweet Bay, the residents, practically all of them, are working at the fishplant in Charleston during the fishing season

MR. MORGAN: and, therefore, they commute back and forth daily. So based on that, Mr. Speaker, I will table the petition in this hon. House and have it referred to the department to which it relates in the hope that it will be given every consideration for the coming year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Sir, it is a pleasure to stand and support the request of the citizens who are in a very similar position to many citizens throughout the Province. A three mile stretch of road - it requires the government to focus on the needs of the people in the area. Obviously, the people in the area that the member refers to feel that the only way they are going to get attention is if they take up a petition and bring it to the attention of this House. And so it should be, Mr. Speaker, and I would encourage the support of this petition and that it be given the same consideration as petitions presented by this side of the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 4.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a Bill entitles, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act". (Bill No. 34), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 34 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Bill No. 33. Shall
Head III carry?

The hon. the member for
Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, yesterday
I gave notice of, in discussing with the Minister of
Finance (Dr. Collins), what appeared to me to be a
fundamental change in the government's approach toward
expropriation and suggested that the Minister of
Finance think about it overnight and see whether or not
he wished to clarify the position that he made yesterday.
I wonder if the Minister of Finance has had any second
thoughts about it?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the
best way I can clarify the situation would be to refer
to a press release made by the hon. the Minister of
Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) on February 8. I think
this pretty well lays out what I was referring to
yesterday. This was a press release at the time of the
announcement in regard to the setting up of the Offshore
Petroleum Impact Committee. I will just read parts of it
that I think apply, particularly to the issue that we
are discussing here. So this is just in part. In part
it says: "It is the intention of government that
development shall take place in a controlled and planned
manner. We are determined that speculation and
property values will not be allowed to run rampant.
Government is prepared to introduce

DR. COLLINS: measures to control development by designating preferred development areas within which oil related activities can take place."

Further on, Mr. Chairman, "Government will play a major role in defining locations at which supply and service bases can be constructed. Such industrial location decisions will not be influenced by speculative land acquisitions. I want to emphasize that those who buy or sell real estate in anticipation of a commercial discovery offshore are doing so at their own risk. I am now putting speculative purchasers on notice that government is moving forward with zoning regulations to control development."

A little bit further down, Mr. Chairman, "If necessary, government will not hesitate to introduce legislative or regulatory measures with retroactive affect to prevent unfettered development from seizing control."

And a little further down, Mr. Chairman, "The interests of the people of this Province will be dominant in everything that is allowed to take place. We do not underestimate the strength of the forces with which we contend. It will take a strong resolve on our part to effectively control the explosive economic and social energies which we brought to bear."

I do not want to labour this, Mr. Chairman, but I think I should read all the relevant little bits here. There are not too many more. It goes on, "If we are to minimize social disruption we must make it clear that speculative forces will not control the pace and quality of development."

And a little further on in referring to one of the committees set up as part of the overall OPIC, or Offshore Petroleum Impact Committee, one of the committees, it refers to the Development Planning Committee and it says,

DR. COLLINS: "The role of this group is to consider measures which government can implement to control land speculation." And referring to one of the other committees, that is one of the committees set up for social and cultural purposes, it says, "This Committee is charged with considering the implications of petroleum development on all aspects of the social fibre of the Province."

And a little bit further on again, the minister made this point. He said, "It is my hope that in stating our policy some of the speculative fever which seems to exist at the moment will be dampened." That I think gives the import of the remarks I made. Now I did refer to a commitment that the hon. the Premier made in the House and I have endeavoured to find those remarks in Hansard but up to the moment I just have not been able to find exactly the comments in Hansard, but I will continue to look for those and at a later opportunity perhaps I will be able to bring them to the attention of the House, or if I cannot find them I will just report to the House to that effect.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the operative word in that whole thing is hope. I think the minister would agree that, as of that statement, he talked about what would be done in the future and there was a hope that it would dampen speculation. Now the speculators, and the professionals in the field, know that in every jurisdiction in Canada, and I am told as a result of my research since yesterday that there was an actual case where a government attempted to not pay a fair value and that was overturned. Yet the professionals know that what the minister just read as a release is just a hope to dampen speculation, because the actual situation, as it exists right now, the present Expropriation Act, and this is what I am concerned about, Mr. Chairman, either the minister and the Premier, through an absolute lack of knowledge, either through a lack of knowledge or a pious hope or a belief that just because somebody says it is so makes it so, are going to disarm a lot of the

MR. STIRLING: people in Newfoundland and it is the people who are going to be hurt are the people who do not know the difference, because the present act, the present Expropriation Act that sets up the right, as the minister said, the Crown has the right to take the land. A fellow can have a farm and a fishing stage and that sort of thing, and the Crown has the right to take the land. At the present time,

MR. L. STIRLING: that person has to be compensated and the act is very clear: 'The compensation shall be an amount based on the fair market value of the land and existing use value at the time of the commencement of expropriation proceedings.' So, Mr. Chairman, that is the very problem. The problem is - it is even more basic if the minister and the Premier really think that anything was done by making that press release. The minister and the Premier have every right to write to the civil servants and tell the civil servants, 'You are not allowed to speculate in the stock market.' That is an honourable thing and he has some control over them and he can tell them that. But he has absolutely no control over, for example - the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) I used as an example yesterday of a private citizen.

MR. J. CARTER: Use somebody else today (inaudible).

MR. L. STIRLING: Would you like to make a suggestion?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. L. STIRLING: The member for Exploits (Dr. H. Twomey).

The member for Exploits is one of the people who may have some of the property very close to the area around Botwood where it may be decided to put in a development. Now, what the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) said yesterday and what he said today, of course, were two different things, and that is not unusual. What he said yesterday - and I would like to read part of it - 'However offshore hydrocarbons do come ashore, whether it is in tankers or whether it is in pipelines or however it will be, there will have to be a terminal of some description in the Province, clearly, to accept it.' Well, if there is speculation, buying up land around the terminal, or if he says that people have owned the land, which will ultimately be decided, that speculation will not prevail. That is the essence of the Premier's commitment, I think. That would mean, of course, that the terminal would become essentially the property, either directly or whatever, of the Government of the Province. That is what the minister said yesterday.

DR. J. COLLINS: I think that is brilliant (inaudible).

MR. L. STIRLING: And you agree that that is what you said yesterday.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Brilliant! Absolutely brilliant!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, brilliant.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Oh, no, I accept that the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) really believes what he said yesterday and he really believes that it is brilliant. You will notice that I read it and he agrees that it is brilliant. And it says under that basis the land would be owned by the government and the terminal would be for the benefit of the government, except that he does not check another act, the Petroleum And Natural Gas Act, which was part of the checking I did last night because I could not believe what the minister was saying. And I do not think many members opposite will sleep after I read this, because of the brilliant statement made by the Minister of Finance, who really believes that is going to be the property of the government. Just listen to this: "If any lessee' - and lessee is defined earlier, say, as an oil company, Mobil Oil or somebody like that - "If any lessee' - just listen to this, Mr. Minister of Finance, 'is desirous at any time of acquiring private land or any rights therein or thereof reasonably necessary for any of the purposes' - and I will read the purposes in a couple of minutes - 'the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall acquire such lands or rights by purchase, expropriation under the Expropriation Act' - that I just read to you and the one that you are talking about changing - 'as now or hereafter amended or otherwise, and the mode of acquisition shall be determined by mutual agreement and shall' - listen to the operative words. The brilliant thing that the Minister of Finance commented on would be owned by the Province. Listen to these words:- 'and shall transfer title and possession of such lands or rights to the lessee at cost,' - to Mobil Oil. That is under the Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) can.

MR. L. STIRLING:

No, no, not 'can' - 'shall'. Read the act.

DR. J. COLLINS:

No, it is imperative (inaudible).

MR. L. STIRLING:

The brilliant speech by the Minister of Finance said one thing, that the fishermen, the farmers, the people living in that area cannot get market value. This is one of the things that they are talking about changing.

March 27, 1980

Tape 699

EC - 3

MR. L. STIRLING:

The government has the right to change, by this wonderful statement that was just made, that brilliant statement yesterday - the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins)

MR. L. STIRLING:

is saying that when we want to acquire land, regardless of the rights of the individual, we are going to set what the value is going to be, and there is a threat there to people that they can set the value. The existing Expropriation Act says, "fair market value", but they are going to change that. And now, under the act that is in existence, if any lessee requires any of this land for the construction of all the things that he talked about -

DR. COLLINS: Read the first part of it.

MR. L. STIRLING: Do you want me to read the first part? Okay.

DR. J. COLLINS: It is quite clear.

MR. L. STIRLING: Okay, let me read it.

DR. J. COLLINS: (Inaudible) mixed us so far.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THOMS: No, no, the hon. minister is mixed up.

MR. L. STIRLING: Okay, I accept the invitation. Listen, "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall assure to any lessee from time to time such surface Crown lands in the Province as may be reasonably necessary in connection with the production of petroleum," the same situation you described yesterday, "by that person, including without limitation, such lands as may be reasonably necessary for right-of-way, telegraphs, telephones, electric power transmission, railways, tramways, roads, waste dump areas," even if they wanted to dump, "or sites for mills works, factories, warehouses, town sites, wharves, piers, docks or other shipping facilities for the purpose of the efficient construction, maintenance or operation of the production of petroleum pursuant to this Act." And it goes on and on and on, completely contradictory to what the minister said yesterday - that brilliant statement the minister made yesterday.

DR. COLLINS: Point out the compensation.

March 27, 1980

Tape No. 700

SD - 2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. L. STIRLING:

The one per cent Finance Minister!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. L. STIRLING:

When something went from 2 per cent to 3 per cent he said that is a one per cent increase.

Yesterday, in a brilliant speech by his own definition, he said "We are going to acquire the land at any price that we want," completely contrary to the Expropriation Act -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. L. STIRLING:

- and then said "This is the essence of the Premier's commitment," and that would mean of course that the terminal would become essentially the property of the government, essentially the property of the government, and this act, the act that he is living under- and that is the difference, Mr. Speaker. Everything in this House - There is a wide difference between what the Premier and his government would like to have, would hope to have, And they make a statement saying "We hope that that is going to be the case," and they expect that that is what it is, but the fact of the matter is they have taken no action since February 8th to freeze any land, to establish any of these development areas. They have taken no action to make changes to say that this control that the lessee has -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

Order, please.

The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. STIRLING:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please.

I have a rather pleasant duty to perform before I recognize the next speaker. I would like to welcome to our hon. House today, on behalf of all hon. members, a group of students from St. Leonard and their teacher, Mr. Clarke. I trust that your visit with us will be informative.

March 27, 1980

Tape No. 700

MB - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt)

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to labour this issue but the hon. member from Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), even when he has things right in front of him he cannot keep them straight, but that is not my problem that is his problem. He ascribed to me certain remarks and then he puts his own interpretation on them and then he says "this is the case" and then he reads out something in the act and he looks up and puts his own interpretation on that and says, "That is the case, therefore - this is contrary to that," and so on and so forth. I just do not see that there is much point in going on with it. I would just like to inform the House that subsequent to the press release that I just read, the committees named in the release were actually drawn up, they were given these terms of reference to investigate the best means of controlling these speculative forces which, undoubtedly, will come to play in our society and which would be rampant if government did not take warning and do something about it, that these committees were set up and they were given those terms of reference.

DR. COLLINS: One of the committees subsequently struck a subcommittee on which there were knowledgeable people outside government appointed and this subcommittee has been working very assiduously in this particular area, directly related to land speculation, and they have not only reviewed all the acts in this Legislature and this jurisdiction but they have also looked up how things have been handled in Scotland, and they looked up how things have been handled in Norway, and they looked up how things have been handled in Alberta, and gathered information from other like areas where like developments have gone on.

And this very hard-working committee, composed of prominent local citizens knowledgeable in the various fields, will be reporting very, very shortly now, I think within a matter of days, to the major committee set up under OPIC and then that major committee set up under OPIC will then report to the minister and when the minister has studied these recommendations coming forward from that very knowledgeable subcommittee, the minister will present those to the Cabinet and the Cabinet will consider them and then will offer its advice to the hon. the Premier, as the Cabinet has responsibility of doing, and then the hon. the Premier, no doubt, will announce government policy.

So, Mr. Chairman, these matters are entrain. The very important subject of this whole discussion just now is going forward and preparations are being made and I have no doubt that when the time comes, and the time is not now right, but when the time comes the hon. House will be informed of the ways that this problem is going to be handled to the best interest of the people of this Province.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman.
MR. CHAIRMAN(Baird): The hon. the member for Bonavista North.
MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, I realize that we made a commitment to conclude this today, and there are many other important headings -
MR. NEARY: Who made it? Did you make a commitment?
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
MR. STIRLING: Well, I expected that there was.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have only opened up the subject, and we will discuss it some more. We will leave the subject for now. There are many more points that I could make but I will leave this subject because there are other points that other colleagues wish to make. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On motion, Head III, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Baird): Shall Head IV, carry?
MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman. I just want to have a few words on Head IV before we let it carry. This has to do with the Finance Department, this is the minister's own department. I want to ask the minister if all the loopholes in his department - incidentally, I might say, if the students who were in the gallery are still within listening distance of this Chamber, that I believe they are from St. Lunaire and not St. Leonards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
MR. NEARY: St. Lunaire.
MR. JAMIESON: St. Lunaire is right.
MR. NEARY: St. Lunaire. And I am glad to be able - I do not mean to embarrass the Chair.

MR. NEARY: or to correct the Chair, but it is St. Lunaire and I blame it on the hon. gentleman's handwriting. But we are glad to see them here. No matter where they are from we are glad they are here. They have come a long way to the people's House. And this is the people's House and I am only sorry that they could not stay around for another ten minutes when I get in full flight, when I cut the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to ribbons, when I make mincemeat out of the Minister of Finance.

MR. THOMS: Well, that will be no feather in your cap. It will be no feather in you cap.

MR. NEARY: That would not take much trouble, by the way. That would not be very much trouble because he may be pretty good at looking at babies bottoms, he is a pediatrician by profession, but very weak-kneed as the Minister of Finance, very weak-kneed indeed. And I want to find out now from the hon. gentleman what steps have been taken to stop misuse and abuse of the public treasury. We have had so much misuse and abuse over the past seven or eight year, and now we have no Comptroller of the treasury, no Deputy Minister of Finance - that authority - and that is the highest civil servant in this land, appointed under the Great Seal of this Province. The Comptroller of the treasury is the man responsible for every, every penny that is taken in. He has to see that it goes into the public treasury and that it is properly spent. He is next to the Minister of Finance. And that raises some very interesting questions, Mr. Chairman, as to how money could have been spent out of the public treasury on the authorization, on the signature of the Premier of this Province.

MR. NEARY: There are procedures, under the Financial Administration Act of this Province, there are procedures whereby money is paid out of the public treasury, and the signature of a minister or the signature of the Premier is not sufficient to pay public money out of the public treasury. It has to be approved in the proper manner. But in the case that we have before us now, when the Director of the Action Group refused to sign the invoice, it was sent off to the Department of Finance, 'Okay, F.D.M.' or Frank D. Moores. That is what was on the invoice, okay to be paid. Now, hon. members should know, especially the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) knows, I do not know if hon. gentlemen are aware of it, that not even the Premier of this Province can okay, can send something to the Department of Finance to be paid. There is a procedure you have to go through and, in this particular instance, the procedure was not followed, which raises some very interesting questions. The Minister of Finance of that day is now a judge of the Supreme Court. The Minister of Finance was responsible for the running of that department and, also, Minister of Justice at that particular moment. He served in two capacities. He was Minister of Justice and Attorney General, giving advice to the Premier and to the government, and Minister of Finance, and, if hon. members will recall, in this House I said that was wrong.

MR. THOMS: He is talking about graft and corruption and all that sort of stuff.

MR. NEARY: I said that was wrong, that he could not serve two masters. He was either Minister of Finance or Minister of Justice. He could not serve two masters.

MR. CARTER: How come you serve John Doyle and the Liberal Party?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour heard that remark and that will have to be withdrawn, of course, right off the bat or the hon. gentleman named and sent back to his savoury patch. Mr. Chairman, that remark has to be withdrawn.

MR. JAMIESON: It is unparliamentary.

MR. CARTER: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) I think there has been no point of order to take.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am asking did Your Honour hear the remark?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird)

I did not hear any point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Well, you do not have to hear a point of order. Your Honour is running this House. Your Honour is enforcing the rules of this House, and Your Honour does not have to have a point of order raised if he heard something that was unparliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I am aware of that, I am aware of that.

MR. NEARY:

Well, did Your Honour hear the remark?

DR. COLLINS:

Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member is harassing the Chair, and I do not think that should take place in the House. I think the hon. member opposite should apologize to the Chair for undertaking remarks implying that the Chair is not capable of conducting the business of this Committee.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to, indeed, maintain the decorum of the House, it is very difficult, and I have every sympathy and every respect, of course, for the Chairman, but the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) sat here yesterday and, on repeated occasions, talked about and used, in fact, expressions which I was surprised to see today, like 'slimy' with reference to comments made on this side of the House. He throws in another aside now, which I suggest was quite improper and quite unparliamentary, and I suggest that the hon. member for Lapoile is quite right when he says that it should be withdrawn, that the remark was unparliamentary and was quite improper. He was the one yesterday, incidentally, who was talking about naming names and talking about innuendo and all of these other and related questions. There are one or two members opposite here who are doing more than all the rest of us put together, we are trying very hard to get through the business of the House, to expedite the business of the House, to raise reasonable points, and this is the kind of thing that is exemplary of what is happening to bring down the whole tone and the whole level of the Legislature. Now, for goodness sake, either keep quiet in terms of

MR. JAMIESON: the asides or get up and make your speech and be done with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) There is no point of order, but I might point out it is improper to signify that a member may be representing anywhere or anybody but his district.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: - I hope -

AN HON. MEMBER: He has to withdraw.

MR. NEARY: No, he does not. No. He said there is no point of order. He does not have to withdraw it, that is what Your Honour is saying, or does he have to withdraw it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was no point of order, and I did not say anything about withdrawing.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that that

MR. NEARY: situation will never arise in this Province again where we have one gentleman heading up the Finance Department and the same gentleman heading up the Justice Department. But it still raises some very interesting questions that could be awfully embarrassing to the minister of that day. That gentleman is now a judge of the Supreme Court. Will that gentleman be subpoenaed, will he be invited, will he be asked to appear before the Public Accounts Committee? Will he be involved in the police investigation? Because, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), whether the hon. House Leader likes it or not, he was Minister of Finance at that time, he was responsible for the running of the Department of Finance, he was responsible for every cent that went in and went out of the public treasury, he was Minister of Justice. Was he asked for any advice? Did the Comptroller of the treasury, for instance, who was very concerned about paying this money out under false pretences, did he discuss it with the Minister of Finance? Did he discuss it with the Minister of Justice?

MR. MARSHALL: What is the hon. member talking about?

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the money that was paid out for doing a film of the Tory Convention in Gander and the money that was paid out to Devine Advertising for doing a political poll. The Comptroller of the treasury was very, very concerned about this situation. Now, did he discuss it with his minister? The minister happened to be the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice, the one and the same person.

MR. JAMIESON: Very poor arrangement.

MR. NEARY: Very poor arrangement, very sloppy and could only lead to abuse, abuse of the public treasury, leaving it wide open for abuse as it was laid wide open for abuse. But it would seem to me that the minister of that day will have to be called to give evidence. Was he aware of it? Did he sit back and allow money to be paid out of the public treasury under false pretences?

AN HON. MEMBER: How is he going to get a judge of the Supreme Court to give evidence?

MR. NEARY: How is he going to get a judge of the Supreme Court to give evidence? Well, I do not know, that is what I am asking.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) out of order.

MR. NEARY: That is what I am asking. The minister of that day, who happens to be now the judge of the Supreme Court, will obviously be involved in this investigation. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, if he is not involved in the police investigation, then under the Financial Administration Act, which lays a very heavy responsibility on the shoulders of the Minister of Finance and on the Comptroller of the treasury, which makes it a crime punishable by law, by an act of this Province, the minister or the Comptroller of the treasury could be prosecuted under the Financial Administration Act for allowing the public treasury to be looted the way that it was, the Financial Administration Act which is the Bible of the Finance Department for protecting the public treasury. But the minister of that day, by allowing the public treasury to be looted and the Comptroller of the treasury allowing it to be looted, lay themselves open to charges if not the subject of a police investigation, certainly under the Financial Administration Act. And I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if he has consulted with his colleague, the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) to see if charges should be laid under the Financial Administration Act, charges that if sustained, if an indictment were recorded, these people could be subject to six months' imprisonment, I am sorry, two, they could be subject to heavy fines, they would be responsible for the money that was paid out, they would have to pay it back themselves or a year imprisonment.

MR. JAMIESON: Or all three.

MR. NEARY: Or all three and we just -

MR. CARTER: Do not be criticizing a judge.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not criticizing a judge I am just pointing out to the House that the Financial Administration Act of this Province cannot be brushed aside in this particular matter. And I want to find out from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) what steps have been taken to determine whether there have been breaches of this act, "An Act To Amend, Revise And Consolidate The General Law Relating To Public Revenue, The Raising Of Certain Loans Authorized By The Legislature And The Auditing Of Public Accounts". What steps have been taken to see if the Minister of Finance of that day, the Comptroller of the treasury or any officer in the Department of Finance violated the Financial Administration Act and what steps will be taken to lay charges against these individuals? No matter how high up they are, they were in the government and they were responsible for these matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time has expired. The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, just to make some response to the hon. member. I think the first point he made is there is no

DR. J. COLLINS: Comptroller. I am sure the hon. member did not in any way mean it this way, but I think that might be misconstrued to say that the functions of the Comptroller are not being performed, and I would like to assure the hon. House that that is not so. I would like to just refer to the section 21 of the Financial Administration Act - and I do not exactly have the words here, perhaps the hon. does - I am pretty certain it is section 21. But that section says that if there is no Comptroller, an Assistant Deputy Minister or other such official designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall perform the duties. And the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has indeed designated an Assistant Deputy Minister to carry on the duties of Comptroller in absence of or subsequent to the resignation of the former Comptroller. So in actual fact we do have an Acting, if you want to put it in that term, we do have an Acting Comptroller in place and the duties of the Comptroller are being discharged. Just on that point.

The hon. member did say, over a particular matter that he was discussing there at some length, he said that a matter had come to the attention of the Comptroller and he was very concerned about it and then the hon. member speculated that certain things happened after that. I have no knowledge to that effect and I would appreciate it if the hon. member does have facts along those lines that he thinks should be the subject of some internal departmental investigation, I would appreciate receiving them and I can assure him that I will carry them out.

MR. S. NEARY: Have no what?

DR. J. COLLINS: I have no knowledge that a matter was brought to the attention of the Comptroller at that time -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) you have no knowledge that the Auditor General brought us the matter.

DR. J. COLLINS: - and at that time the Comptroller was very concerned and that, as the hon. member speculated, he did something after that. I think the hon. member suggested he went to the minister after that -

MR. S. NEARY: No, I did not, that is what I am asking.

DR. J. COLLINS: Well, if the hon. member has facts along those lines, if he wishes me to look into it I would be glad to do it.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has it in his own files.

DR. J. COLLINS: I have no knowledge that such a course of actions followed one another. But I will look into it if the hon. member will give me some facts to go on there.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, indeed I will give you some facts to go on.

DR. J. COLLINS: The hon. member asked if there were any matters carried out in the department subsequent to the Auditor General's report on this matter. I can assure the hon. member that matters were, we did review procedures to see if there was any gaps, if there was any deficiency if there was any better way of doing things, to handle invoices that related to Cabinet directives. And I point out that that is what happened, there was a Cabinet directive to do a certain thing. Subsequently, an invoice was submitted to the Department of Finance and there was a processing going on and then there was a payment made. So we reviewed these procedures to see if there was anything that happened

DR. J. COLLINS: as a result of this particular happening that needed to be changed to improve our procedures. We carried out that investigation.

But I just would like to finish by saying that this whole matter, I understand, is a subject of an inquiry and I presume findings will come out of this.

MR. S. NEARY: This department or the Department of Justice?

DR. J. COLLINS: Well, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has made an announcement along those lines.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, but involving the Financial Administration Act?

DR. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. JAMIESON: In connection with the review process, I might regale the House very briefly from my own experience by explaining where there can be the kinds of conflicts that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has talked about. I recall that on the last day that I was in a particular portfolio, I wrote to the then minister in another portfolio insisting on a particular course of action. The following day I found myself the recipient of my own letter and wrote back and said that the whole thing was crazy and for that reason, therefore, I wonder if, in the review that the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is talking about, whether consideration has been given to separating the functions of Comptroller and Deputy Minister of Finance. It seems to me that there are very serious potential -

DR. COLLINS: Could the hon. gentleman repeat that again for me.

MR. JAMIESON:

Yes, I was asking if in the review, and given the obvious increases in the size of the monies in the transactions and the like, and hopefully even bigger ones to come on the budgetary inside in any event and therefore expenditure, has the hon. minister considered at any time separating the functions of Comptroller from those of Deputy Minister of Finance. I know again from my experience that there has been a good deal of examination of this in various jurisdictions and the like where it has been concluded that it is a wise course to establish a Comptroller who is separate and independant and who can exercise his function without having any potential conflict with the clear and unmistakable **role that** the Deputy Minister has to carry out.

MR. NEARY:

Before the hon. gentleman answers that,

let me -

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

- have another go at the minister.

I wish the kids were here from St. Lunaire now to hear what the hon. gentleman said a few minutes ago in reply to my statement that the Comptroller of the Treasury was aware, it was brought to his attention by various and sundry officials in the Department of Finance, especially by the Auditor General - **the** hon. gentleman is not listening. The hon. gentleman told the House in a very **flippant** manner and a very casual way that we have carried out an investigation. "I have reviewed", he said, "the procedures in these matters in the Department of Finance and I find offensive the statements made by the hon. member for LaPoile and all he has got to do is provide the documentation that the Comptroller knew about it." Well, I am asking the minister now, 'Did he ask the Comptroller if he knew about? Did he search the records of his office to see if the Comptroller was aware of it, if the Comptroller was concerned about these monies that he was being asked to pay out? Was it brought to his attention by anybody in the department and did he go to the Minister?' Because, Mr. Chairman, I have a strong feeling that the Auditor General, through one of his men who was doing an audit, picked

MR. NEARY:

up this matter and brought it to the attention of the Comptroller of the Treasury, the Deputy Minister of Finance. I have a strong feeling that did happen and the minister is now pleading ignorance and says he knows nothing about it. What kind of information are we getting in this House, Mr. Chairman, what kind of double talk are we getting from the minister, especially a minister as senior as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Who enforces the Financial Administration Act?

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

A point of order. The hon.

Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I think in the heat of debate things might be said that are not meant. The hon. member suggested through the use of the word 'double talk' that I was trying to mislead the House. I think that is the implication there. I would like the hon. member to withdraw that word.

MR. NEARY:

That is not a point of order. It is not a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To the point of order, I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the term.

MR. NEARY:

To withdraw what?

DR. COLLINS:

'Double talk.'

MR. NEARY:

On what grounds? Because the minister wants me to withdraw it? Your Honour has to check Beauchesne and tell me what section of Beauchesne Your Honour has determined that the remarks made were unparliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Chair asks you to withdraw the term 'double talk'.

MR. NEARY:

Well, I withdraw it but I would like for Your Honour to give me an explanation. I mean, you just cannot get up and tell members in this House to withdraw things just because a minister does not like it. I mean, what kind of a dictatorship are we setting up here?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY: There is such a thing as freedom of speech in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please!
It was what 'double talk' implied, that is why I ruled on it as such.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will not argue with Your Honour about it but I hope on reflection, when Your Honour goes to Hansard and checks it out, that you will see that it was perfectly parliamentary. What are we turning this place into, a dictatorship?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Not because the hon. gentleman does not like my remarks, my wording, Sir, that he can get up any time he wants to and say, 'withdraw it'.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) challenging the Chair.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not challenging the Chair.
I am just -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order. The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Chairman, I had the honour of being Chairman of Committees here for a number of years and the very thing that the hon. member is doing now is what he did during those years. He would on the one hand say, "Yes, I accept Your Honour's ruling" and then proceed to lambaste the Chair and try to ridicule the Chair and try, in effect, to put the Chair into such a position that he would never interrupt again. Now, Mr. Chairman, I never fell for that when I was Chairman and I am sure you are not going to either. This type of criticism of the Chair is very destructive to the whole institution, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman,

MR. F. STAGG:

that you cannot let it go unchallenged. The hon. member is up to his old tactics here.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

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

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I assure Your Honour there is no intention on my part to embarrass the Chair. I just want to say to the hon. gentleman that when he did occupy the Chair, it was generally known in this Province that he was partisan in every way, shape and form and that is why he did not get the job back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY:

I am sure Your Honour is not in that category. I have no intention of embarrassing Your Honour, but I am sure that my remarks will not be taken very lightly.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To the point of order, I would rule that the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) does not have a point of order.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, now if I can proceed with my few remarks to the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), Sir: This is a very serious matter. This is one of the rare occasions in political history when you have a blatant abuse and misuse of public funds contrary to the Financial Administration Act. It is one of the unique occasions in political history when you have a cut and dried case of an abuse of the Financial Administration Act. And I am asking the minister questions about it, and in my opinion I am not getting what I can consider to be straight answers. The minister puts the responsibility on me to produce the evidence. Well, if the hon. gentleman will let me go down in his department tomorrow morning, I will produce all the evidence the hon. gentleman wants, but I do not have the information at my fingertips because I am not an official in that department and I am not authorized to go into the department. But if the hon. gentleman would authorize me to go in, I will get the information.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

I have to recess momentarily.

The hon. the Speaker has to make an announcement.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

It being 5:00 P.M., I can inform the House now that I have received notice of no matters for debate at 5:30 P.M., but a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House at that time.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

His Honour leaves the Chair.

I had indicated earlier, of course, that we would, indeed, conclude on this matter today and the Opposition had given that undertaking. Perhaps the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) in the absence of the House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) might know, we might make some arrangement as to - I gather that it is the wish of the government to have His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor this afternoon. Is that the situation? So perhaps in the event that we have not had any notice of any private members' matters - I am sure the hon. House Leader got the gist of what I was saying - since there are no private members' motions, he might indicate at what stage, immediately before 6:00 P.M. or whatever, to have His Honour come in for the conclusion of this matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I could say, Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the fact that there would be a Late Show today, I had informed His Honour that we would anticipate, other things being equal, that we would request his presence for between 5:15 P.M. and 5:30 P.M., but if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Opposition would prefer, I am sure His Honour would not really mind. But I would not particularly wish to inconvenience him because he has already set his time. However, if hon. members wish to go to 6:00 P.M., I am quite sure that -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

No, Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to co-operate and I would only ask that in the circumstances that the sundry and largely irrelevant points of order and the like be kept - that some

MR. D. JAMIESON: members opposite be constrained, at least, and let us get as much as we can into the time we have remaining to us. And I would like personally to get on to a couple of what are just factual questions with regard to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett).

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: If I could just also point out too, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain other procedures that, albeit they will not take long, the Resolution has to be reported back to the House and there has to be first, second and third reading of the bill. But

MR. MARSHALL: I am quite sure within the time but then again, of course, as we all know, the Leader of the Opposition certainly knows, but, you know, I say this and repeat it again so that it would be fully understood. I mean, this matter will really come up for debate again and in much more detail in the committees on the Main Estimates to which the Interim Supply relates anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) For clarification then for the Chair, the motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House still at 5:30 and then extended by leave if appropriate at that time. Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) Order, please! Head 4, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, just a very brief comment. The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked if there had been any thought given to separating the functions of the Comptroller and Deputy Minister. Hon. members will recall that the government has been going through a five-year plan exercise, a development plan, and in this all departments were asked to project their image of things for the five years ahead and make any suggestions that they might think appropriate, including the structures of their departments and so on and so forth. I might say that during the exercise in Finance, this was one of the areas that we covered in our thoughts.

MR. STAGG: Have you reached a conclusion?

DR. COLLINS: All these matters have not been finalized by Cabinet yet.

On motion, Heads 4 and 5 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Head 6 carry?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member from Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a couple of questions concerning this particular subhead. One particular aspect is the announced intention last year of the government to go ahead with the Grade 12 program. Now, prior to the closing of the House last year, the minister was travelling the Province. There was quite a bit of publicity about the Grade 12

MR. HODDER: program until such time as she announced that it would be delayed for one year, and I think that was rightly so. Mr. Chairman, since that time, and I might add that one year is not a very long time in which to prepare for a program of the immensity of Grade 12 and the impact it will have on our schools. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to ask the minister is is this a deliberate attempt, is the government now trying to withdraw from Grade 12? Are the committees going full tilt and, if so, if the committees are still considering implementing Grade 12 in our schools - Grade 12 cannot be implemented until such time as we have upgrading of facilities in our schools, and the minister knows of which I speak. You know, the problem with Grade 12 was in the rural areas of this Province, in particular, and in many of the urban areas where there were inadequate library facilities and where there was inadequate classroom space to put on the program. I, myself, just recently visited the school on Bell Island, a very large school - the name escapes me at the moment - and we were taken into the library. You know, the library just had a few books which looked like they had been brought along by some students, and the facilities were not there to have a Grade 12. Now if Grade 12 is coming into this Province, if it has been delayed for a year, what are we doing to upgrade facilities in the Province? What are we doing as far as resource centres are concerned in the rural areas? In looking at the report from the Curriculum Committee, we were talking about programs which needed - by implication of that program and the types of programs - which needed a great deal of resource material and a great amount of expenditures in the Province. I would ask the minister, you know, to inform the House just where we are moving on it, because if we do not start putting the money in right now and start upgrading the schools so that they are capable of doing Grade 12, or the students can take Grade 12 in those particular schools, then we may as well put it off for another ten years.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, government reaffirmed its commitment to improve senior high school, to reorganize the grades from ten on and to add another grade, grade twelve.

The implementation of this improved senior high school programme was delayed for one year beyond what was originally announced in the Throne Speech of December 1978. The present plan then is to phase in the reorganized programme beginning at grade ten, starting September 1981, with the first class of grade twelves happening in the school year 1983-84 so that the first students who will take part in the improved senior high school programme are those now studying grade eight.

When this decision was made shortly before Christmas, and announced, the committees which had been working for some nine months prior to that were given a renewed mandate to continue their work with this new timetable. In fact, the Steering Committee and the Subcommittees have been going full tilt, to quote the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), in the three months since then.

Taking them one by one: The Subcommittee on curriculum reorganization, which published a curriculum proposal in September inviting input from interested people, has, over the past couple of months been evaluating the excellent response which it received. There were many critiques suggestions received from educators and others across the Province and those are now been evaluated and where feasible the suggestions received are being accommodated through refinements in the original proposals.

MS VERGE: The Subcommittee on cost estimates and facilities is also refining its documentation through close consultation with each school board in the Province.

The other Subcommittees, including the ones on student evaluation, post-secondary implications, personnel and in-service and public relations are also continuing.

Also, I personally, and officials of the department, have been responding to indications from groups across the Province to discuss with them the planning process for the reorganized senior high school programme.

I personally met with the Parent/Teacher Association of Marystown Central High School this week past and I had a full discussion about the planning process.

As for the need to upgrade school buildings across the Province, government is meeting this need. The hon. member will recall that shortly before Christmas government authorized the financing by the Denominational Education Committees of \$12 million worth of new school construction. This was over and above what had been provided for in the budget of last Summer, and those efforts will be continued.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am aware, as the minister has pointed out, that the Committees are working, they are moving along with their planning, but I do not know if the minister realizes - and I am sure she has travelled the Province - if she realizes the

MR. HODDER: massive amounts of money that have to be put into some of our rural schools in this Province in order to bring that programme in.

And when the minister talks about the \$12 million which was given the school boards, I am told by the school boards that that amount of money just saved their bacon; that they still cannot keep up with the normal cost of maintenance and repair even with that \$12 million. So that really,

MR. J. HODDER:

you know, the minister

cannot really say that that \$12 million will be used for improvement. And why is it, Mr. Chairman, that we are not seeing in the Province any moves by the various school boards around the Province to put physical structures in place? In my district, anywhere you want to go, there are just no moves being made and this is going to cost money, more than planning. And I would say that the committees themselves have done an excellent job and the recommendations that I have seen that some of the committees have come up with have been good ones and I am sure that they are dedicated individuals who are doing a good job. But, Mr. Chairman, we are looking at a massive amount of money to put the rural schools in this Province in a position to be able to offer Grade XII to students and I just do not think that that type of infrastructural planning, if that is a word, is going on in the Province at this time. Mr. Chairman, be that as it may, I would also like to speak about another problem, as I see it, in our vocational and technical schools in the Province. Now, the minister the other day, in response to a question I asked about new courses that were coming in as far as oil related, hydro related or resource related jobs for the future, what moves were being made by the department, came out and gave a list of courses that were being implemented, and some of them very good ones I might add, in some of the schools across the Province. But, Mr. Chairman, and I am trying to get some research done on it now, but when I look at the number of students that will be trained in some of those courses, say for offshore for next year, I cannot see how we will be training any more than 200 students in the Province. And here we are in a Province where, if you look at the manpower studies, the occupational studies, you will see, and they have one, it is called an Occupational Imbalance Study which they did for all the provinces in Canada, we are not the only Province in this position. But we find that we are turning out students in this Province for which there are no jobs and a lot of students in the Province for which there are no jobs. I do not have the study in front of me but it has been made public. We have infrastructures in place across the Province, we have

MR. J. HODDER: courses in place where you have instructors , where you have massive equipment sort of thing, and classrooms set up and with all the training materials but we are turning our students for which there are no jobs. I can find in my district all kinds of people who are unemployed but yet they have a skill, they have a trade, some of them have two or three. It is no sense to be turning people out of our vocational school system unless there are jobs for them afterwards. And the alarming thing, Mr. Chairman, is that when you look at the occupational imbalance study across Canada, some of the students that we are turning out here in this Province cannot find jobs in other provinces as well. Not only are there not enough openings for them in this Province, the classes we are turning out, they cannot find jobs in other provinces as well and I find this to be very alarming, because if we are going to correct some of the unemployment problems we have in this Province we have got to start redirecting our training. Now, I know the minister is moving in that direction but I think that we have to start looking at some of the courses that we are now offering, a small change, yes, but much more is needed. Mr. Chairman, since I realize there are other members here who may want to speak, or I may be coming to the end of my time, I would like to ask the minister to tell me what happened to the films that were made by McConnell Advertising that were commissioned, I think, by the former Premier (Mr. Moores) and foisted of on the Department of Education and then sent out to the libraries, the schools or whatever? What happened to those? I have asked the minister the question before but I have never found out what happened to them, I know that the Department of Education did not request them, but they were sent down to the Department of Education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Maybe before the minister rises to answer I would just like to make a comment on something raised by the hon. member - it is in keeping with his, and if not I will wait until the Minister responds because I intend -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. the minister wish to yield to the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans?

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

March 27, 1980

Tape No. 709

MB - 3

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to mention a point brought up by my hon. colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and I do not know really where the responsibility lies, whether it is with the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) or the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn)

MR. FLIGHT:

but here we are on the verge of all kinds of potential for jobs in offshore. Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister might know there are 5,700 young Newfoundlanders registered with the government's representative where young people who want to work in offshore -

MR. DINN: Over 6,000.

MR. FLIGHT: Over 6,000 and I am told, Mr. Chairman, that that 6,000 is made up of two groups, one predominantly labour, no skills at all, just labour, right out of the labour force and the next biggest group of that 6,000 are young Newfoundlanders who have indeed come out of our trade school system, cannot find jobs in the trades that they have studied for and have gone and registered with government in the hope of getting into offshore.

Now we have a great preferential clause in this Province . The Province has indicated that we are going to give preference to Newfoundlanders. Well, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, the fact of the matter is that the offshore companies want people with expertise in some given field and preferential treatment or no preferential treatment, they are not going to say, "All right we will hire Newfoundlanders who have no skills, who are trained to be a carpenters when we need a man with specific training and we can get that man in Nova Scotia or Saskatchewan or Alberta." And I submit to the minister that we are not even looking at - and I am not sure which minister is responsible - we are not looking at training our young Newfoundlanders for those jobs. We are told we are the verge, we are told that in the next year or so, the production end of offshore and indeed the development end will require all kinds of manpower. And the minister - it was raised in the House the other day - is aware that the only trade school in Newfoundland today, with all the trades schools we have around this Province, the only trade school offering courses that are in any way related to the requirements of the offshore companies is The College of Trades and Technology in St. John's and there are only twenty seats.

MR. NEARY: Power engineering.

MR. FLIGHT: Power engineering, for instance, one of the most sought after courses can only be obtained in St. John's. If a young man from the minister's district wants to get into that course he has got to compete with every young man in Newfoundland, or woman in Newfoundland, for one of twenty seats in St. John's. And then we try to give the people of this Province the impression that we are preparing for and we are ready to take our place and be involved in offshore. What a lot of nonsense! And, Mr. Chairman, instead of the minister concentrating on Grade XII and talking about all that Grade XII is going to mean, she should be looking at preparing our young people and making sure that they are equipped to get jobs in the great bonanza that we are told is going to come in. Because right now we are not even close to getting a job and right now, if that offshore development comes in within the next couple of years, the minister or the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) will not have time to get the courses in place that will qualify them to take those jobs.

So, Mr. Minister, I would think one of the priorities of the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) as of this day and should have been a year or two ago when it became obvious what was going to happen, was to get the vocational school system in this Province geared up to get courses in place that would make it possible for our young Newfoundlanders to study and take the kinds of trades that are going to be required out there because that is the only way we are going to get them. Having preferential treatment for Newfoundlanders is not going to guarantee Newfoundlanders jobs in that oil related industry or oil related economy if they have not got the skills that the companies require.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): The hon. Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: Mr. Chairman, it appears that the hon. members who just spoke do not quite have their acts together. The first member talked about the lack of public information recently about

MS. VERGE:

Grade XII and the member for Buchans (Mr. Flight) talked about how I am putting undue emphasis on Grade XII. The fact of the matter is that the Education Department has responsibility for many areas and levels of education ranging from Kindergarten to Primary through Senior High School, post-secondary, the vocational system, the colleges and university, adult and continuing education and also education for the handicapped. I do not think it is fair to say that one level should be given more emphasis than any other level. They are all important.

The department for the past year, in co-operation with the Department of Labour and Manpower, has been making an intensive effort to gear our training programmes to meet the need that exists now and that is anticipated for the future related to offshore exploration and resource development generally.

MS. VERGE: I made a statement recently listing relevant courses which are planned for our colleges and vocational systems for the next year or so. As I mentioned then, all the post secondary sector is being reviewed. Representatives from all the post secondary institutions have recently held meetings to look at how post secondary can be better co-ordinated. This includes the question raised by the member from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) about the imbalance of courses in terms of where they are offered in the Province. When it comes to matching students with courses, a number of considerations have to be borne in mind. One that is very important, of course, is the demand from employers, from industry and business. I do not want to minimize the importance of that, and I think that consideration can be better communicated to students through an improved career guidance program at the high school level and even the junior high school level. A committee in the department is now looking at making improvements to our career guidance programs. The other consideration is freedom of choice for students, and I think the fact that a job in welding might not exist should not bar the right of a young person in our Province to choose to take a course in welding.

MR. FLIGHT: If they have the ability **and if the facility** is in place, which it is not in Newfoundland.

MS. VERGE: The point I am making is that students should have freedom of choice in signing up for vocational school courses, despite the fact that there may not be guaranteed jobs when they complete the courses. Some of our students who train in Newfoundland look further afield for employment eventually, and that is their right and they should be able to have that choice.

Finally, in response to the hon. member from Port au Port's question about the McConnell films, there were two series of films. One is called The Heritage Series, about famous Newfoundlanders, including Sir Wilfred Grenfell and Nurse Southcott. The other series is a How-To series on giving young people inspiration for developing entrepreneurial spirit. Those two series of films have been distributed to some school boards in the Province on a pilot

March 27, 1980

Tape No. 711

GH-2

MS. VERGE: project basis, and we are now getting
input on those two series of films.

On motion, Heads 8 through to 19, carried.

On motion, Resolution carried.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and
ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER(Sinms): The hon. the member
for Conception Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): Mr. Speaker, the Committee
of Supply has considered the resolution for Interim
Supply to it referred, and the Interim Supply Bill
consequent thereto and directs me to report that it
has adopted the resolution and recommends that a bill
be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion, report
received and adopted, resolution ordered read a first
time.

On motion, resolution
read a first and second time.

Motion, the hon. the
Minister of Finance to introduce a bill entitled,
"The Interim Supply Act, 1980-81", carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It being five-thirty
is it agreed to, with respect to the motion, stop
the clock -

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I
think His Honour will be here very shortly if he is
not here now.

MR. SPEAKER: - momentarily by leave?
Agreed.

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

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Admit His Honour The
Lieutenant-Governor.

It is my agreeable
duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal
subjects, Her faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to
present to Your Honour a bill for the appropriation
of Interim Supply granted in the present session.

HON. GORDON A. WINTER(Lieutenant-Governor): In Her
Majesty's name I thank Her loyal subjects, I accept
their benevolence and I assent to this bill.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, pursuant
to motion, I believe, I do not need to propose the
motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that this
House do now adjourn. Those in favour 'aye', contrary
'nay', carried.

This House stands
adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 28, 1980, at
3:00 p.m.