

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that there is no heat shield or shock absorber statements today by ministers to try to distract attention from the increase in taxes they brought in in the Ministerial Statement they made last Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back to a matter I raised a few days ago in connection with a \$70.5 million write-off by the Government of Canada, \$70.5 million that was forgiven by the Government of Canada. A piece of information that was withheld from this House by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

Now that the Minister of Finance has had a few days -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: It is not in order, Mr. Speaker, when one is asking questions or in debate to place innuendos on the statements one is making. The hon. gentleman is making a definite innuendo - it might be his impression, but his impression is very much in a minority in this Province when he insinuates that the Minister of Finance was attempting to in effect deceive the people of the Province, giving an impression that was not a true impression. His words are indicative of that and I think they should be withdrawn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: That is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Again I must repeat, as I have done so often in the past number of days, that the Question Period is limited to thirty minutes. And I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the ministers to my left if they would keep their questions very precise and to the point and the answers should be the same.

MR. NEARY: Now that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has had a few days to think about this matter and probably discuss it with his officials could the hon. gentleman now tell the House if indeed there was a \$70.5 million write-off on established programme financing or on equalization payments to this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I first should refer to the economic statement, or one section of it, because the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested that there was something left out of the statement. So with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read just one paragraph on page 2 of the statement. And it says, "It should be noted that the \$19 million negative EPF variance relates to recovery by the federal government of a \$25.4 million overpayment. This overpayment arose because EPF funds had been forwarded to Newfoundland from 1979 to 1981 on the bases of overstated population estimates. The 1981 national census indicated that there was some 18,000 fewer Newfoundlanders than previously thought. Six other provinces were similarly overpaid by the federal government. The Province had reason to expect that the federal government would agree to phase-in recovery of the overpayment over a number of years and accordingly budgeted \$6 million of the amount for 1982-1983 at budget time. Last June,

DR. J. COLLINS: much to our chagrin, the Government of Canada informed us it would be recovering the full \$25.4 million during this fiscal year.¹

So I do not know what the hon. member says is left out. I have just stated in the statement exactly what happened in EPF. That is what I set out to state and I did state it. It is correct. It is accurate. It is precise. So what is left out of it? I am referring to the overpayment in EPF. It is fully in there and that is the end of it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I wonder if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would just permit me to welcome a couple of delegations to the galleries.

MR. NEARY: Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to welcome in the Speaker's Gallery from the Burin Peninsula area a delegation led by Reverend Ross and Father Peddle, with Mayor House, Keith Osbourne, and Andy Moriarity. I welcome you people to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I would also like to welcome to the galleries from Baine Harbour, Mayor Harvey Reid, Fire Chief Robert Butler and past Fire Chief Harry Upshall. I welcome you people to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we will deal with the \$25.4 million a little later but the point that I am making is that the hon. gentleman did not give the House all the information in connection with overpayments to the Government of Canada, which makes it very difficult for us to assess whether or not the drastic action that the government took

MR. NEARY: in increasing taxes and so on is justified, and just precisely what the financial position of the Province is. And what I am asking the hon. gentleman is if there was indeed a write-off. Was there \$70.5 million written off or forgiven by the Government of Canada, which was an overpayment either in the established programme funding or on equalization? That is the question I am asking the hon. gentleman.

The hon. gentleman told us a few days ago he did not hear of that figure until I mentioned it in the House. Now I am asking the hon. gentleman, now that he has had time to think about it, can he now confirm if indeed there was a \$70.5 million write-off on equalization payments to this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that we in our statement had to deal with our expenditures, and the revenues we have to deal with those expenditures. If there was a write-off by the federal government, obviously it was not an expenditure accruing to us. You know, you do not have an expenditure if a person writes off something. The statement merely says that the federal government was asking us to make a payment to them and we had to have the money to make the payment. Now if they had said to us, "No, you do not have to make a payment to us," obviously we would not have to look for revenue to make the payment because we would not have to make the payment.

So, I mean, whether there was a write-off on some other account is no concern of mine in the terms of this economic statement. The statement I made to the House was that we had certain expenditures facing us, we had certain revenues that we could deal with those expenditures, there was a difference between the two and we had to find some ways of meeting the difference.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman laid great emphasis, stressed this point to try to make Ottawa look like it was the bogey man in this particular thing.

MR. NEARY: The reason I am raising it -

MR. MARSHALL: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is true. I am asking the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - if Ottawa had demanded payment of all the overpayments for 1979, 1980 and 1981, if they had asked for repayment of all the overpayments, would there not have been another \$70.5 million on equalization grants that we were overpaid that they forgave, and if they had demanded it it would have driven the Province probably into bankruptcy: Is that not a correct assumption for me to make?

MR. DAWE: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) remark that I was making somebody out a bogey man. I was not making anyone out a bogey man. The individuals on social assistance in this Province require payments from the federal government, but the fact that we had to make the payments, and I indicated and the government indicates in its estimates, is not saying that the social assistance recipients are bogey men or the sick people in this Province demand payments from the provincial government. And in indicating that we have to make these payments we are not making the sick people of this Province out to be bogey people. Similarly, because the federal government sends us a bill I am not making them out to be a bogey man, I am just saying that they sent us a bill and we had to have the money to pay it. That is all.

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

MR.NEARY: Mr Speaker, I am still not sure whether the hon. gentleman is admitting that there was a \$70.5 million overpayment on equalization and if it has been forgiven. Would the hon. gentleman just answer, a simple yes or no answer, does he know if there was a \$70.5 million overpayment on equalization and if so is it forgiven? Is it written off? Yes or no.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr.Speaker, I made some remarks in this regard before and possibly the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Neary) forgot about them. We get projections from the federal government every quarter, and they change. And those projections relate either to the current year or to previous years and sometimes they are up and sometimes they are down. In most instances, fortunately, in the last number of years, they have been up. So the federal government is making repeated adjustments to what is owed us and what is not owed us, and I am absolutely certain, although I do not have the figures in front of me, I am absolutely certain that we got different projections in regard to equalization entitlements from the federal government at a particular time different from another time. I mean, there are variations going on all the time in these projections we get from the federal government. The point I am making, though, is

DR. COLLINS:

that in terms of the EPF, the federal government came to us and said, 'You have got money that we want you to pay back.' That was the particular difference in the whole arrangement under the Fiscal Arrangements Act we had with the federal government. They came to us in a specific instance and said, 'In this specific regard, you have \$25 million that we want you to give back to us.'

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I still did not get my simple yes or no answer, so I presume I cannot ask the hon. gentleman again because I would be ruled out of order by the Chair and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) would leap to his feet and tell me I did not know the rules of the House. So I will just have to continue my research outside the House to find out if indeed there was a write-off of \$70.5 million and under what heading it was written off.

Now, the hon. gentleman keeps referring to \$25.4 million. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House how much of that \$25.4 million is the result of a miscalculation in figures related to the established programmes funding, how much is related to miscalculations and how much is a direct result of the figures on the census being incorrect? There are two different figures, as I understand it. Can the hon. gentleman tell us how much can he associate with miscalculations and how much as a result of the change in the census figures?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: At the present time I think I would not be misleading the House in any way if I said that the bulk of that \$25 million overpayment was related to the census changes. Now, there may be a bit of an adjustment in it in terms of some other factor in regard to prior year adjustments or whatever, but my understanding - and I will get some further information on this if it is available - my understanding is that the main problem causing that overpayment was that there was a census done in 1981 which showed a certain number of Newfoundlanders, and that number of Newfoundlanders was different from the projected number of Newfoundlanders for the years 1979, 1980, 1981, the projections having been based on the previous census which was in 1977.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I thought I understood the hon. gentleman correctly earlier, Mr. Speaker, when he said, and now he has confirmed, that the bulk of the overpayment resulted from payments that were made based on the population figures.

Now, let me ask the hon. gentleman this - I do not want to argue with him at this point in time, I merely want to bounce some figures off the hon. gentleman

MR. S. NEARY: because I am still researching this matter and the hon. gentleman promised the House that he was going to lay some documentation on the table of the House in connection with estimates that were made between the provincial government and Ottawa and the correspondence in connection with established programme funding and so on, equalization payments and so on. Now, has the hon. gentlemen ever heard this figure before: \$11.8 million, under the established programme funding payments, is what the overpayment actually was based on the population figures, and \$13.2 million is the money that the Province was overpaid as result of miscalculations that the Province received actually double payment and now they have to pay it back. Is \$13.2 million the figure as a result of miscalculations and \$11.8 million the result of the population figures not being accurate? Has the hon. gentleman heard these figures? And if so, if he has heard them, how can he say that the bulk of the \$25.4 million is a result of the census figures changing?

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, one correction before I get to the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. S. Neary) main question there. He had indicated that I had promised to lay something on the table, which is quite incorrect. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked me if I would lay some things on the table. I indicated to him I would look into the matter because there could be certain implications arising out of it. I made no promise at the time. He is looking for what were intended to be if not confidential at least private communications between the federal government and the provincial government. He was

DR. J. COLLINS: asking that these be laid on the table and, as I say, there might be implications to that both for the provincial and even for the federal government. So I made no such promise, I just said that I would look into the matter.

In regard to the overpayments, what was the nature of the overpayments, As I have stated many times these calculations are made by the federal government. We do not have any part in making the calculations. We do have a part in advising on the formula on which the calculations are made. The formula is revised ever five years and once that formula is put in place it is in the federal government's hands then to put that formula into actual operation.

DR. COLLINS: All I can say is that my firm understanding is that the vast bulk of that \$25.4 million arose out of a miscalculation based on the population figures. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has had some information from the federal government to the contrary, I think he should spell it out quite clearly, if he is at liberty to do that.

We just have the figures relayed to us on the basis of the federal government calculations, and it was indicated to us that the large bulk of that miscalculation was on the basis of population differences.

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

MR. NEARY: I will spell it out for the hon. gentleman. My understanding is as firm as the hon. gentleman's that only \$11.8 million was the result of changes in population figures; the \$13.2 million, which the hon. gentleman's officials knew about, by the way, was the result of miscalculations, two separate headings altogether.

DR. COLLINS: Is that some official document or something?

MR. NEARY: Well, I am still researching it, but I wanted to get the hon. gentleman to answer some questions for me so I can get it on the record, so I can do a little more research on this matter.

But my understanding is just as firm as the hon. gentleman's right now. But, anyway, we will deal with this matter -

MR. STAGG: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it only goes to show how out of date the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is. Anyway, I will deal with it later.

MR. NEARY: Now I want to come to the current situation, and I want to ask the hon. gentleman in view of the fact now that the feeling throughout the Province is unanimous that a Tory government is no good, that the Tories have to go -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: April 6.

MR. NEARY: - that is the feeling throughout the Province. Mr. Speaker, the Tory times are hard times and a Tory government is no good. Now, in view of the fact that that is unanimous, unanimous throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, and that the hon. gentleman's policies announced last Thursday are negative and will backfire, will the hon. gentleman tell the House -

MR. TOBIN: How many votes did you win by?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, because -

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - because these taxes are going to backfire and have a negative effect, what will happen? Can the hon. gentleman tell the House what will happen if the government does not get the revenue that they are hoping to get from the hot dog tax, from the clothing

MR. NEARY: tax, from the one per cent increase in the sales tax , from the increase in the insurance tax, and so on? If the government does not get the revenue that it expects to get by taxing Christmas shopping what will be the situation as far as the financial picture of this Province is concerned? What will be the consequences if it backfires? If the hon. gentleman's policy and the administration's policy backfires, what will happen?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has got some figures over there, I do not know where he got them. He has come in with these figures and he says that accordingly the Department of Finance is totally out of date. You know, what are the figures? I think the hon. member should put them on the table so we can see if they are some figures that he wrote on the back of an envelope? Are they some figures that he has officially from the federal government? Are they some figures that he has dreamed up in one of the back offices there? What are these figures?

As far as I can see the paper looks as though it was torn out of a scribbler book.

MR. NEARY: My notes are clear and legible.

DR. COLLINS: Oh, I see. But where did they come from? What are those figures? I mean, are they conjectures? What are they?

MR. TOBIN: Where did you get them from?

DR. COLLINS: Well, I mean until the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) says he has some figures that one can put some credibility in, I think we will ignore the figures that he is giving this House. I mean these figures are totally to be ignored because as far as one can see they have

DR. COLLINS: no basis in fact, credulity
or anything else.

Now in regard to the rest of
the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) question;
My understanding is he says that if the Province does not
get the revenues it expects, what is it going to do about it?
Well, what is new in that situation: I mean that has pertained
from year one. If governments do not get the revenues they
expect, what do they do about it? They take action such as
we took the other day. They adjust their expenditure programme.
They look to see where they can get revenues to take care of
their expenditures and so on. I mean, that is not a new situation
I mean that is what the Departments of Finance and budgeting
has been about ever since, I suppose, human being decided
to have a government.

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

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker we saw the hon.

gentleman retreat

MR. NEARY: yesterday from one of his announcements that he made in his Ministerial Statement last week. Now, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he intends to retreat on the commercial heating fuel tax? That tax is likely to have a negative effect and cause small business to go bankrupt. It will have an effect on whether or not a lot of the fish plants survive in this Province. We hear about the one down in Burin now closing down and the government does not seem to be doing anything about that.

MR. TOBIN: It is you crowd that said let them go home. Bar them up. Close them out. Let them go.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the ignoramus from Burin is at it again!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should learn the rules of the House and he must understand that he is not downtown in a bar-room, he is in the people's House, in the House of Assembly, where -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: -he has to abide by the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member must remember that.

MR. TOBIN: You advocated closing up the fish plants in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: He is not down in the Belmont Tavern somewhere. This is the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, what I am asking the hon. gentleman to tell me is if it can be shown - and indeed it is because this also is unanimous - that

MR. NEARY: the heating fuel tax is going to have a devastating effect on small business in this Province and likely to close down a lot of businesses and have a lot of people thrown out of work, become unemployed, will the hon. gentleman retreat from that tax that he announced in the Ministerial Statement last Thursday?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose one will ever change the interpretation the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) puts on things. He talked about a retreat in regard to the tax on adult clothing with the retention of the exemption for children's clothing from retail sales tax. I think in one of the first questions in this hon. House in regard to that, I indicated that we were aware of a number of mechanisms whereby these two things could be differentiated and I indicated that we were using the traditional one, the one that has been used in this Province in the past, but that we were aware of other ones, that we were looking at it, and as soon as we had the full information on it we would come forward with the other one if it was desirable to do so. So that was not a retreat in any way, that was an add on, and I told this hon. House that we were in the process of looking at it and we might come in with an add on.

Now, with regard to the other tax, the tax on heating fuels, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition again says that this will affect fish plants. It will not affect fish plants. Fish plants are not affected by this change in tax. So, you know, he is

DR. COLLINS: inaccurate in that.

Fish plants are not classified as commercial ventures, they are classified as manufacturing enterprises and they do not have anything whatever to do with this tax change.

I also indicated that the nature of this tax change was such that it overcame an anomaly that some

DR. COLLINS: businesses now were having to pay tax on the way they heat their premises, and the way they use fuel for cooking and so on and so forth, because they did it through electricity, and there is retail sales tax attached to electricity. Other businesses were getting away with something, shall we say, or at least they were not subject to the tax that their brother businesses were subject to, and this was the nature of getting rid of that anomaly. I doubt very, very much, and I am not going to categorically say it will not because who can see into the future, but I doubt very, very, very much whether this tax will have any impact whatever in causing a single company to become bankrupt.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Before I recognize the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I would just like to welcome to the galleries, from the Town of Greenspond, Mayor Robert Granter and Deputy Mayor Frazer Harding.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear. hear!

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

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) regarding the government aircraft, sometimes known as Air Force One.

I was just wondering if the -

MR. YOUNG: You were happy enough to ride on her.

MR. HODDER: Yes.

MR. STAGG: How many times?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: - I was just wondering if the plane had been sold.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the King Air or medivac unit that we have been using for the past number of years is being placed at a broker, if it has not already been done today it will be done either tomorrow or early next week, for possible sale.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if the plane will be sold by public tender?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, it will not be a tender as such, It will be given to an agency which is in the business of selling aircraft and will be advertised by them and sold by them for government.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Could the minister name the agency with which it will be placed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: The reason I am not sure whether it has been issued or not, there are a number of such agencies that could be used and until a final decision is made as to who that agency will be then I am not at liberty to inform the House at this time.

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

MR. HODDER: Could the minister tell me what advantage it is to place the plane with an agency rather than to sell it by public tender, or through newspapers throughout the country?

MR. NEARY: Why pay a middle man?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I suppose the same question could be asked of someone who is selling a house, why they do not sell it themselves or go through a real estate agency. With an aircraft, the possibilities of selling the aircraft locally may in fact be limited. People in the aviation

MR. DAWE:

business are familiar with where the markets may be and are in a much better position to locate possible clients to purchase that aircraft not only in this Province or in the country but also in North America.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, even though the hon. gentleman is saying that they are going to farm this out to an agency, could the government not make it one of the conditions of allowing this agency, whichever one it is, to sell the government aircraft, that it be advertised in the magazines and in the newspapers, that it be sold only after a public advertisement appears in the newspapers and in the magazines?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I would be very reluctant to recommend any agency that did not follow those procedures. It would be very difficult to identify all the available clients if you did not advertise it properly.

MR. YOUNG: John C. Doyle might need her.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook) with respect to the reduction in the level of tax incentive grants to municipalities which was going to save the government \$720,000. Today we hear that the City Council here in St. John's, who reluctantly accepted their responsibility in this respect first when the announcement was made assuming that they would lose \$250,000, now are indicating that they are going to lose \$1 million.

MR. LUSH: Could the minister comment on that? Is this the right figure, that whereas previously they thought from the formula announced by the government they were going to lose \$250,000 now they say they are going to lose \$1 million?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to say exactly how much it will lose because it depends clearly on the amount of their collections. But they will lose five cents on every dollar that is eligible for that fifty cent and twenty-five cent grant. The city did get fifty cents up to \$2 million collected in property tax, and then they got twenty-five cents on everything over \$2 million. So that has been reduced by five cents on the dollar now so it could be \$1 million. I would estimate it to be within that vicinity.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Having established then that the St. John's City Council is accurate with respect to that amount, when on first hearing they thought that they would be only losing \$250,000 but because the collections are done quarterly naturally in a year they are going to lose \$1 million, is this

MR. T. LUSH: going to have the same repercussions with other councils throughout the Province?

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they will lose five cents on every dollar that is now eligible for the Property Tax Incentive Grant, but of course they will not lose as much as the city because their revenues are very small compared to the city's revenues.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I think there are approximately 310 municipalities in Newfoundland so the minister has indicated that the St. John's City Council is right in their determination - or pretty accurate - that they will lose \$1 million. Can the minister put an average figure on what other municipalities may lose? I realize that it is difficult in that we have got some large councils but excluding, for example, the urban areas like Corner Brook, Grand Falls and Gander, is the minister able to put an average figure on what other councils may lose?

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to correct the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush). The Property Tax Incentive Grant applies in 1983 to probably a little over ninety municipalities. That is the number of municipalities we have with property tax in place. It does not apply to the general assistance grants whatsoever. So they would lose in the same proportion to their revenues.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: I cannot give you an average figure really, but five cents on one dollar of property tax collected.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

NOTICES OF MOTION

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled:

"An Act To Amend The Insurance Companies Tax Act."

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled:

"An Act To Amend The Department Of Public Works And Services Act, 1973."

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other Notices of Motion.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. WM. MARSHALL: Order 49, Bill No. 66, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 49, Bill No. 66.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting Pensions For The Members Of The Royal Newfoundland Constabulary And The St. John's Fire Department And The Staff Of Her Majesty's Penitentiary". (Bill No. 66).

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Collins: Mr. Speaker, this act, bill 66, is a new act, it is a replacement for the Constabulary Pensions Act. The Constabulary Pensions Act, which although is was named that really applied to all the uniformed services in government employment, was somewhat out of date in many parts. Initially it was thought that the original act could be amended, but when it was gone into it was clear that it was best to rewrite the act and this is what this bill is now doing.

Mr. Speaker, many parts of this new act are very similar to the previous act, but there have been significant changes and I might just run down through some of them. The first section, of course, does change the name. There is nothing very revolutionary about that, but it does change the name, and this new act now, rather than being referred to as the Constabulary Pensions Act is to be referred to as the Uniformed Services Pensions Act.

Section 4 of this new act changes the vesting period, that is the length of time an employee is in government employment after which he does become pensionable. Under the old act the employee had to serve fifteen years. Under this new act, he will now have to serve ten years.

Sections 7 and 8 of the new act ensures that all employees in government service who

DR. COLLINS: And for all other ranks, that is those ranks below commissioned officers, they may now retire at age 55 or after twenty-five years service, whichever is earlier.

MR. NEARY: With full pension, is it?

DR. COLLINS: Yes, full pension.

Section 17 of the new Act brings in new optional retirement ages. These new ages for senior commissioned officers, they may retire at 55 or after thirty years service, and for those below those senior commissioned posts, officers below those posts may retire after twenty-five years service no matter what their age is. They have optional retirement after twenty-five years service irrespective of age and of course receive full pension at that stage.

Section 21 of the new Act refers to deferred pensions. Deferred pensions may be put in place after ten years service. What a deferred pension means is that if someone leaves one of the uniformed services after having been in for ten years, if he has not achieved pensionable age by that time he may leave his contributions in and when he comes to pensionable age he then would be eligible for a pension.

In the intervening years, the same section provides that in the intervening years any pension increases which would accrue to a person who is actually on pension would also accrue to his deferred pension. So that when he finally gets his deferred pension he would have a pension that is increased by the amounts that the actual pensioners have received.

And the final comment I might make at this stage, Mr. Speaker, is Section 25 increases survivor benefits from 50 per cent of the pensioner's entitlement

DR. COLLINS: up to 55 per cent of the pensioner's entitlement.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this new act altogether provides a more up-to-date handling of pensions within the uniformed services of government employees. It updates the acts, and it does, I think, give due benefits to those individuals in the police force and in the fire department and in the penitentiary service who provide of course good services to the people of this Province and indeed without whom we would have great difficulty in discharging our responsibilities as a government.

Hon. members of this House know that these individuals are considered, at least the police and the firemen anyway, so essential that they are provided with binding arbitration in the settlement of wage disputes and employee management difficulties.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 66.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of the

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, that looks like a piece of scribbler paper the hon. gentleman had in his hand, the same as he accused me of having during the Oral Question period today. I am not going to ask the hon. gentleman to table it because I understand it is his own notes, the same as the piece of paper I had in front of me were my notes, but I do not mind tabling them, the writing is clear and the points are there and I have no hesitation if I -

MR. SIMMS:

You are not required to table them.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to support this bill.

At the end there, the hon. gentleman heaped a bit of praise on the uniformed men - forgot to mention the women - in the service of this Province in the Fire Department and in the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. I can echo his sentiments, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure that the uniformed policemen and the firemen in this Province would have much more preferred for the hon. gentleman to tell them that their pension plan was going to be funded rather than heap faint praise on these men and women.

My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that the money collected, the pension contributions made by the men and women of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary and the Fire Department will go into consolidated revenue. Am I correct? This pension plan

MR. NEARY: is not funded, the money goes into consolidated revenue?

DR. COLLINS: I am going to refer to that.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman is going to refer to it. Well, I have the act in front of me so I will have to refer to it myself. It says:
"Employers' contribution - The Government of the province shall pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and pay into the fund a) an amount equal to the employee contributions."

Former contributions credited,
"moneys deducted from the salary of an employee or paid by him under The Pensions (Premiums) Act shall be retained in the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

MR. NEARY: I am assuming, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a funded pension plan. And I am sure that with the shaky financial position of this Province that has been revealed in the last several weeks, that unless a pension plan is funded I would say the members of that pension plan would be very nervous, Mr. Speaker. They would be very nervous indeed in case the provincial government goes into receivership or into bankruptcy, and the government did not have any money to pay their employees pay cheques or issue cheques to pensioners in the event that the government did not have the money to cover these cheques, the retired members of the Newfoundland Constabulary and the fire department would not be able to cash their cheques, because it is not a funded pension plan.

I hope that such drastic incidents never occur in this Province, Mr. Speaker, but they could.

Now steps were taken in the last session of the House of Assembly to fund the public service employees pension plans, and I would say that is costing the provincial government at the moment an arm and a leg to make the contributions into that pension fund. I would like to ask the minister why this plan is not funded, why this is not funded the same as the public service employees pension plan? And I would also like to ask the hon. gentleman when he is on his feet to tell us if there is now any member of the Newfoundland Constabulary, starting at the Chief and working right down to an ordinary constable, if there is anybody receiving full salary waiting for his pension, waiting for his retirement, waiting for his time to come when he can

MR. NEARY: qualify for a full pension? Is there anybody relieved of his duties, of his responsibilities, receiving full salary waiting for a pension, starting from any former chiefs right on down to the constable in the street? If so, could the hon. gentleman give us the number of former members of the Newfoundland Constabulary who are retired on full salary while they are waiting for their pension to come through? I would be interested in hearing the hon. gentleman's answer on that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as the plan itself is concerned, I think it is time that we brought an act in covering pensions for members of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary and the St. John's Fire Department, and the wardens and the staff at Her Majesty's Penitentiary. Because, as hon. members know, it is quite likely in the

MR. NEARY:

foreseeable future that the Newfoundland Constabulary will be expanding throughout Newfoundland and Labrador. The Newfoundland Constabulary, before the cutbacks were announced and before the taxes were increased, we were told that the Newfoundland Constabulary was on the hitch, on the verge of moving into Labrador.

MR. STAGG: You are against that, I suppose.

MR. NEARY: No, I am all for it. As a matter of fact, I would like to see the patch on the Newfoundland Constabulary down near the border in Labrador, down in Wabush and Labrador City, patrolling the border down there, the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, the Royal Newfoundland and Labrador Constabulary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to see that. But in these times of restraint I do not know if the government is going to go ahead with their plans to expand into Labrador this year. But immaterial of whether it is this year or next year -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: In 1985.

MR. NEARY: In 1985 the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) says.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: In 1984.

MR. NEARY: In 1984. The fact of the matter is the point I am making is that the Royal Newfoundland and Labrador Constabulary is expanding and so it is high time that they grew up and they had their own pension plan so I am glad to see it because it is conceivable in the not too distant future that now that the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary are patrolling Mount Pearl and will move into Labrador in 1984, that there may be other areas of the Province that may be covered in the future by the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. If the Minister

MR. NEARY: of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer),
I am sure if he determines that it would cost the taxpayers less to have the Newfoundland Constabulary, the Royal Newfoundland and Labrador Constabulary police Newfoundland, it would cost less than having the RCMP do it, that the hon. gentleman would not hesitate to give jurisdiction outside of St. John's and Mount Pearl and Labrador, to the whole of Newfoundland to the Royal Newfoundland and Labrador Constabulary. So if that happened, Mr. Speaker, they would certainly need their own pension plan so we welcome this. I am concerned about the fact that it is not a funded plan. I would like to hear the hon. gentleman tell me if indeed there are - the Minister of Justice was not in his seat when I asked the question - if there are any members, former members, former chiefs of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary who are retired on full salary - in other words, who are receiving salary while they are waiting for their pension - ranging from former chiefs right on down to constables? I would like for the hon. gentleman to give the House that information, if he has it. So, Mr. Speaker, we are going to support this piece of legislation. We think there is all kinds of room for improvement in it.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I will speak briefly on this. I could add that this particular legislation, which deals with the pensions of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, the St. John's Fire Department and the Newfoundland and Labrador Correction Service - these are the three agencies that are dealt with by this - that this legislation is brought in with the knowledge, and indeed, agreement, of the forces, not only their management but their unions as well. It has been brought in with their knowledge after a large amount of consultation and discussion with what is now called the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary Association - they are not called the Brotherhood anymore because, obviously, there are women in it, it is now called the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary Association - brought in after consultation with them, consultation with the Firefighters Union and consultation with the IIAPE local of which the warders in the various correction centers - the correction officers - are members. So it is done with their knowledge and, indeed, concurrence and they welcome it.

There are certainly no former chiefs of police drawing salary now, only pension, and no former members drawing salary. There may be one or two people on sick leave, but obviously that is a different matter; they are still members of the force. Occasionally there are people on sick leave but that would be the only situation where people would be drawing salary and - well I cannot say not be members of the force because they would be members of the force, but they are on sick leave. That would be the only instance where anybody would be drawing a salary and not doing their assigned work. But certainly there are no former members of the force drawing salary. The only thing they could be drawing would be any pension they would be entitled to.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation actually has been, I think, a couple of years in the making because pension legislation, I understand is quite complex and I know that it will be welcomed by the men and women whom it will affect.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): If the hon. minister now speaks he will close the debate.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) for his support for this bill. I think it is a welcome event in this House to have this bill brought in. I think it was a needed updating of the act that applied to the three divisions that the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) referred to.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition did raise a few questions about funding. Just a little clarification on that, because I think there may be a certain amount of confusion. I think it was in 1980 we brought in a

DR. COLLINS: Pensions Funding Act, and that set up a fund, a pooled fund, and it is out of that pooled fund that all pensions for which government is directly responsible, it is out of that pooled fund that the pensioners get their pensions.

MR. NEARY: But that is not what this act says.

DR. COLLINS: That includes this, yes.
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) referred to section 12, I believe. Section 12 states: 'The Government of the Province shall pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and pay into the fund'. Now, that second fund there refers to the Newfoundland pooled pension fund. So the mechanism is that when an employee makes a contribution out of his salary towards his pension, his contribution goes into that pooled fund.

MR. NEARY: But it is called here Consolidated Revenue Fund.

DR. COLLINS: What that refers to there is that we then match it and we pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund into the pooled fund to -

MR. NEARY: The only fund which has been referred to here is the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

DR. COLLINS: No. No. That is named. The Consolidated Revenue Fund -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is defined in 2(e).

DR. COLLINS: Yes. 'Fund' means Province of Newfoundland Pooled Pension Fund.' That is not the Consolidated Revenue Fund. There is a pooled pension fund set up and the contribution from the employee goes into that fund and the matching payments by the government, which come out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, they also go into that pooled pension fund. And out of that pooled pension

DR. COLLINS: fund the pensions are paid to the general employees of government.

MR. NEARY: That is not what the act says.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Section E, Page 4.

MR. NEARY: Page 4?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Section E.

DR. COLLINS: Yes, under definitions. It defines what 'fund' means.

So out of that pooled fund the general employees of government, the teachers, these particular individuals, the uniformed services people, MHAs, all these pensions do come out of that fund and we match, we match the annual contributions to that fund. And for any group of employees, if their particular fund, or their particular part of the fund, I should say, is in deficit, government makes up that deficit.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman allow me?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition with a question.

MR. NEARY: This fund, this Newfoundland pooled pension fund the hon. gentleman is referring to, is that building up all the time? And can the government use that money for current account? Can they borrow from it? Can they use it at all or is it building up? It is there to take care of pensions only, is that the idea?

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

DR. COLLINS: Yes, it is building up at the present time.

MR. NEARY: How much is in there?

DR. COLLINS: Just let me explain a little bit further on that. You can have a pension fund which

DR. COLLINS:

is totally unfunded, you can have a pension fund which is fully funded, or you can have it partially funded. Now ours is partially funded.

MR. NEARY: So you can use the money?

DR. COLLINS: No. No. Partially funded

in this context means that at some point in time unless you change your policy in terms of contributions or whatever, your fund will actually run out of funds. In other words, it is not fully funded so that forever it will take care of your pension payments, unless you do something.

MR. NEARY: And then you have to make transfers from Consolidated Revenue.

DR. COLLINS: And then you have to make transfers. So if we want at some later stage make sure that this -

MR. NEARY: So I was right then, If the government goes broke there will be no pensions.

DR. COLLINS: Well, you know, I think that is a very unlikely possibility. I do not think any provincial government is likely to go broke, or any government in Canada for that matter. I do not think any municipality -

MR. NEARY: But if the pension plan was funded, then it would not make any difference if the government went broke or not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, the people who funded it could go broke.
DR. COLLINS: That is true.

MR. NEARY: The taxpayers would still get their pensions.

DR. COLLINS: That is true.

MR. NEARY: But under the present arrangement if there is any difficulty with the finances of the Province -

DR. COLLINS: But I might say that there are certain provinces in this country which have made the decision they will not fund their pension plan, even partially, and one of them is Ontario. They feel that this is not the way to go. Now other jurisdictions say, "Yes, this is the way to go." And we have taken the first step, and it was only in 1980, as I have to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and members opposite that there have been pensions for employees of government for many, many years, but it was only when the Peckford Government came in that we started beginning to fund the pension plan and we have not gone the full way but at least we have gone part of the way and as years go on possibly that will be improved upon.

MR. NEARY: Excuse me? Is the pension plan paying its way now or are we transferring funds from Consolidated Revenue?

DR. COLLINS: Overall the pension pool fund is paying its way. In other words, it is building up overall. But there are certain groups within government, for instance, I might indicate that the MHA part of it is not paying its way. In other words, the contributions from the MHAs and the matching contributions by government is not sufficient for that part of the fund to pay its own way, so government has to make up the deficiency. In other words, contributions from other employees are not helping to fund MHAs, the government itself is actually putting contributions in there.

MR. NEARY: I should have left him alone.

DR. COLLINS: This is common knowledge. This has been stated before in this House, so it is nothing that we need to hold back or anything like that. This is well known to all people in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Jack up the contributions.

DR. COLLINS: As time goes on,

DR. COLLINS: this funding will be kept under review. We do have an advisory committee that helps us to keep track of what is happening to our pension fund.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) also asked whether we actually borrow, as a Province, whether we borrow out of the fund? We do not. There are certain rules and regulations -

MR. NEARY: That is a good thing.

DR. COLLINS: - for all registered pension funds that have to be followed, and these are federal regulations and we follow those regulations, there are certain investments that may be made and so on, and we follow those very precisely.

So I think those are most of the questions that have been raised and with those remarks I move the adoption of the bill.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting Pensions For The Members Of The Royal Newfoundland Constabulary And The St. John's Fire Department And The Staff Of Her Majesty's Penitentiary", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 66).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Order 26, Bill 33.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Deferred Pensions Act", (Bill No. 33).

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment, it is just a very brief amendment. The Deferred Pensions Act is an act which was brought in to take care of those situations where an employee of government wished to run for political office, in other words, he gave up his employment in government service, which is required of him if he wish to run for political

DR. COLLINS: office. And this Deferred Pension Act gave him the right to hold his pension benefits in that situation. And I think it was a wise thing to do because no one wants to see any individual in this Province prevented in any way if at all possible of running for public office. So I think that it was a good act to bring in when it was brought in.

However, the act needs now to be updated to make sure that all individuals in public service have the same benefits, and at the present time this Deferred Pension Act is only read with the old Civil Service Act, the Memorial University Pension Act, and The Teachers' Pension Act. It is not read with the new Informed Services Pension Act and it is not read with The Public Service Pension Act itself. So these individuals who have their pensions coming out, for instance, of the Public Service Pensions Act come under that act, they do not have the protection that is given by this Deferred Pension Act and this is what this amendment is all about; it makes sure that this act is read with those other Pension Acts, All that means is that the individuals who get their pensions under those other also get the benefit from this Act.

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

MR. NEARY: I am not quite sure if I understand what the hon. gentleman is saying, Mr. Speaker. He started out by telling us that the government did not want to penalize anybody for running to be a member of the House of Assembly, running for elected office, and, I presume, previous to this act that anybody who ran, his pension was then deferred.

DR. COLLINS: If he did not have enough years in he just had no pension.

MR. NEARY: He had no pension if he did not have the time in.

DR. COLLINS: If he did not have the time in he would not get any pension.

MR. NEARY: Well, that goes without saying; if he did not have the time in, he did not qualify.

DR. COLLINS: Right.

MR. NEARY: Well, then he was not entitled to it. But now when he became a member of the House his pension was deferred.

DR. COLLINS: Right.

MR. NEARY: And he then started to participate in the MHA's pension fund.

DR. COLLINS: Right.

MR. NEARY: Now, does this have anything to do with the act that we brought in last year? We brought in an act last year that will give, for instance, the - take the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) as an example, okay?

DR. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Social Services, under that act that we brought in last year, even though

MR. NEARY: he has less time than I do in the House of Assembly, he has four or five years less than myself -

MR. TULK: Who?

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). He came in in 1966 and I came into the House in 1962. But because of his previous service as a welfare officer, he will get 100 per cent pension, whereas I will only get 75 per cent of my pension.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume what happened was that unless we bring in this amendment, the hon. gentleman when he retires will not qualify for 100 per cent of his pension because the first part, when he worked in the Public Service, was a deferred pension and he would only qualify - unless we pass this act, I presume - he would only qualify for whatever he is entitled to under the MHA pension plan. Is that correct?

DR. COLLINS: Essentially, yes.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

DR. COLLINS: Yes, right.

MR. NEARY: Okay, basically that is what we are doing then. We made an amendment last year to the pension plan legislation, but in order to make it workable I presume now we have to pass this act also.

MR. S. NEARY: I think I would have to agree with the minister that pensions should be portable and should be stacked. The fact that a school teacher, for instance, would have to sacrifice his pension; he would have to think very seriously about whether he is going to run for public office, because they have a very generous pension plan, or at the university or anywhere, and he would not want to have that pension deferred or he would not want to have it disturbed in any way, shape or form if he decided that he wanted to run for elected office. I do not think that should be a deterrent from people making up their minds whether or not they want to become involved in -

MR. T. RIDEOUT: As far as teachers go, do their service stack up?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. RIDEOUT: As far as teachers go, do their pensions stack up?

MR. NEARY: I do not know. But I mean -

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, I had it checked out and the seven years I spent teaching I understand

MR. NEARY: Will now be stacked on your House of Assembly pension.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but that is as a result of amendments that we made before.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, that is what I mean.

MR. NEARY: But now, I think what the minister is saying is that we now have to pass this. There are a number of acts involved and this one is one of the ones that probably escaped their attention at the time. Okay? But it may not, I am just using that as a hypothetical case, it probably applies more to the public service than to the teachers.

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Oh, I agree with you.

MR. S. NEARY:

The point that I am making is that it should not be a deterrent from people making up their minds whether or not they want to run for public office. I think all pensions should be portable and you should be able to stack your pension - you know, it should accumulate - you should be able to stack it onto whatever you are entitled to under the House of Assembly. But there is a little bit of unfairness in it for people who are in the House say for twenty/ twenty-five years. After seventeen years they stop contributing and they can only get a maximum of 75 per cent of their top three years, whereas somebody who has only been in this House, say, a minimum of ten years, who had other service in the public service, could get 100 per cent pension. But, anyway, I just throw that out as a thought and we are going to support the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): If the hon. minister speaks now he will close debate.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader's points, I think, really do not refer directly to this particular act but, you know, what he says is quite correct, that under the MHA pension plan previously if you had prior service of some sort it could be added on and you could actually get over 100 per cent, you would get more than 100 per cent.

MR. NEARY: Correct.

DR. COLLINS: But, you know, that was quite anomalous, I mean, that is nonsensical to do that. The amendment that was brought in last time made the MHA pension plan equivalent to almost all other pension plans, that is where you do not really get a pension equivalent to your full salary, you get it equivalent to a percentage of salary and it is usually around 75 per cent. And that is what that amendment to the MHA pension plan did, it allowed individuals who had fulfilled the vesting qualifications to get 75 per cent of their best three years, if I remember correctly, either their last three years or their best three years, I think it was the best three years, the average of their best three years to get a maximum pension of 75 per cent.

This particular act is somewhat different in that it just permits individuals who run for public office, who, if this act was not there, would not be eligible for a deferred pension, that is they would have pensionable service in but they would lose that. They would get back their contributions but they would not have a pension coming into them when they finally retired. This allows such individuals to still keep their contributions in there and when they get to retirement age they are eligible

DR. COLLINS: for a deferred pension.
And until this amendment, if the House accepts this amendment, this deferred pension arrangement will apply to all employees in government service who run for political office, not just to some which is what is the case at this moment in time.

MR. NEARY: Now all we have to do is to allow the public employees to run. This government frowns on anybody offering themselves.

DR. COLLINS: Well, that is another matter too. I mean, at the present time if you run for public office you do have to resign from your employment in public service.

MR. NEARY: That is right. So all we have to do is change that.

DR. COLLINS: So at least this gives the protection that if that does happen, if you do resign or forego your employment in the public service so as to run for public office, at least now your pension benefits remain in place.

DR. COLLINS: So I would move second reading on this act.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Deferred Pensions Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Order 47, Bill No. 58. Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Pension (Auditor General) Act, 1968." (Bill No. 58).

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there is just one purpose to this amendment. The widow of a former Auditor General is now receiving a pension of a certain amount. In The Pension (Auditor General) Act, 1968, it is stated what that amount is. Now, that amount when it was set was probably a reasonable amount, but at this point in time it is not a reasonable amount. What this amendment does is it allows the survivor of that individual, that former Auditor General, to get 55 per cent of what he would be eligible for, and that is consistent now throughout the Public Service. In other words, survivor benefits are 55 per cent of the non-surviving pensioner's benefits, and it clearly would not be correct for this particular survivor not to get what every other surviving beneficiary would get. So this amendment just rights an anomaly and allows her to also get 55 per cent of the benefit.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: That is fine with us, Mr. Speaker.

If we cannot look after the Auditor General, who is a

MR. NEARY: servant of this House, well, nobody can. But I am wondering, I am just sort of thinking out loud here, we only have three servants of this House, the Auditor General, the Comptroller of the Treasury and the Ombudsman.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they are servants of this House, all three.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not so.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not so.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir. The Ombudsman is set up under an act of this Legislature and answers to the House of Assembly through the Minister of Justice. So we have three. Why, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). can they not be included in the House of Assembly? Could they not be included in the MHAs' pension plan, in the pension plan that covers the members of the House? Would that not be a good place to include these three servants of the House? What about the other staff of the House?

MR. MARSHALL: They are paid by a special act.

MR. NEARY: Paid by a special act. Well, would it not be better, more orderly and cleaner to put them in with the House of Assembly pension plan? I just draw that out as a thought, that is all.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not think it

MR. MARSHALL: can be, because it is paid out of Consolidated Revenue Fund.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it would be very awkward to do that because the qualifications for an MHA plan means that you would have to be elected twice and you have to have so many years service and all that sort of thing. And obviously the Auditor General is never elected, so it would be very difficult for him to fall under that.

Now, I have an hour's speech to give in the final moving of this motion, but I will forego that hour's speech and I will move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Pension (Auditor General) Act, 1968", (Bill No.58), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 2, Bill No. 63.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: A message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to the hon. the Minister of Finance dated November 25, 1982.

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit supplementary estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending the 31st. day of March 1982, by way of Supplementary Supply and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act 1867, as amended, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

(Sgd) _____
Lieutenant-Governor."

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the message be referred to the Committee of Supply.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, if I just may before the minister gets up, the Standing Orders in the House with respect to committees of this nature normally give fifteen minutes/fifteen minutes, ten and ten and then the members get up from time to time. You know, they can get up again and again. I would suggest that this be the procedure by which we be governed. There is a certain question in the act, whether the rules of the House apply, where it is a half hour and a half hour, but I think it has been proven that the best way to handle supply and estimates is the same way as in the Estimates Committee, if the hon. gentlemen will agree. I think that is the way we did it before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed to handle the supply

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): estimates as we do the regular estimates?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, as we are in Committee on Supplementary Supply we are actually debating a resolution and the resolution reads: "That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1982, the sum of thirty-four million seven hundred and one thousand dollars (\$34,701,000)." But it is the rules of this House that whilst we are debating the resolution we include at this stage of the bill - or during the debate on the resolution we actually cover the bill itself and that is what we will be doing at this time.

The bill itself refers to Supplementary Supply for the last fiscal year and it was required, of course, to bring in this bill because during 1981-82 certain special warrants had to be tabled in this House to cover expenditures which had not been provided for in the estimates that were brought down in the budget in the earlier part of this year. These were necessary government expenditures to provide public services, the special warrants were brought into the House and now this bill, the Supplementary Supply Bill, ratifies or gives permission by this hon. House of Assembly for those expenditures to have been made. Now all these sums, of course, were laid out at budget time, too, because we brought in the revised estimates when we brought in the budget for this current fiscal year. So these sums were included in those revised figures which were stated to apply to the previous fiscal year. I do not know if there is any question about any of

DR. COLLINS: them, I have given the total amount . The amount that was required for Executive Council was \$500,000, for Finance was \$6.6 million. The one for Finance was a rather large amount, but that referred particularly to the Burgeo sea plant and also to an amount that had to be supplied for the Lake group of companies. We will be getting into another bill shortly whereby the amount given there will also be brought out. The amount for the Department of Development was \$1.3 million and that again was another aspect of the Burgeo sea plant situation. And Education was also - I missed Transportation, \$1.6 million for Transportation. That had to do with road maintenance , Winter road maintenance essentially. We had extra heavy snowfalls that year. The Department of Education was over \$8 million

DR. COLLINS: and I have the breakdown on that if hon. members wish to see it.

Social Services \$800,000;

Health was \$8.9 million, I have a breakdown on that, if required; Municipal Affairs was \$2.3 million approximately; Culture, Recreation and Youth just over \$400,000; and Justice was \$3.5 million. But I would reiterate that these figures were included in the revised estimates which were supplied with the estimates given for this current fiscal year. So we are really just going through the necessary procedure but we are not really in many respects bringing new information into the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, as the minister has made clear this is pretty stale potatoes as far as legislation goes. It is a commentary, I guess, on the way in which this House is run, not a commentary on the system but a commentary on the way in which this House is run. And here we are near enough to the end of November being asked to approve expenditures which were incurred in the financial year which ended on 31 March, and that is-what?-eight months ago now.

It is not a commentary on the system because even with the best will in the world and with the most skillful estimating in the world the government's estimates of expenditure for a financial year which are tabled either before that year begins or very early in the year, those estimates are only estimates and they can only be as good as estimates can be. Nobody ever expects them to be perfect.

So the idea of supplementary supply in theory is not in itself a bad one or a wrong one or an offensive one. What is offensive is that the House is being asked now, eight or nine months after the end of the

MR. ROBERTS: fiscal year , seven or eight months after the accounts for the fiscal year have been closed. A month or two or three, whatever it may be, before the Auditor General's report on the fiscal year which ended 31 March 1982 is tabled and made public, here we are being asked at this stage to ratify \$34.7 million. Now if that does not make a mockery of the whole principle that this House controls the purse, if this does not make a mockery of the principle the government can spend only what the House authorizes them to spend, then I do not know how there could be a mockery of anything or how there could be a falling away from any principle greater than that.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no real point debating it. You know I thought at first when I heard the minister speak that perhaps we should ask him to give us details of the three, six, nine heads of expenditure which are listed here as wanting supplementary supply. He quite rightly points out that the estimates for the '82-'83 year which were tabled by him at the time of his budget presentation at the end of May, the end of the second month of the fiscal year, that those budget estimates for the current year had appended to them the revised estimates for the year ending 31 March 1981, the year in respect of which supplementary supply is now sought.

That is true. But I would suggest to the minister that if he genuinely wants the House to have information, and I accept that he does genuinely want the House to have information, it might be much more helpful if there was tabled, or at least made available to members, a breakdown of the \$34.7 million assigned to subheads. Because as the House is well aware, the Committee are well aware, our estimates are grouped into heads and then divided into subheads. Not a bad way at all to do it. Here we only have a head of expenditure. We know that an extra \$8.953 million has been spent within the head, Head XV, the Department of Health. But unless one was to go through each of the 30 or 40 individual subheads, and the 300 or 400 individual items which taken together make up those subheads in Head XV, we have no way to know where the money is being spent, or where the money has been spent, to be more precise.

So really what we are being asked to do is to ratify now a \$34.7 million overrun without the

MR. ROBERTS: least idea in the world of how it has been incurred, or where it has been spent except in the very most general ways. We know that Health over-spent by \$8.953 million. We do not know whether it is good, bad or indifferent. We do not know on what it is spent. It would really be a very difficult task for anybody with the information publicly available, to find out that information. I am not even sure you could. But if you could it would take a very great deal of time to do it.

So I suggest to the minister that if he genuinely wants the House to have information, and I believe he does although at times his conduct belies that, but I believe he does want the House to have information, the people of the Province, and I am sure that his soul mate, the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), wants the public to have information because he tells us so so often.

MR. NEARY: And because he felt that it is true.

MR. ROBERTS: It is so. If I say it is so, it is so, as the gentleman from St. John's East would say. And, of course, we will have to let the actions speak for themselves. They do speak louder than words. So the real question is whether the minister -

MR. NEARY: He told us yesterday the Premier was leading a delegation to Europe and that was not true. He made a statement prepared by the propogandists down on the eighth floor.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the Premier may think he is leading a delegation to Europe. I mean, I say to my friend from LaPoile, the Opposition Leader (Mr. Neary), that

MR. E. ROBERTS: the Premier may believe he is leading a delegation to Europe, and Napoleon also believed he won the Battle of Waterloo. I have no idea what passes in the Premier's mind. The Premier may well have believed that. I heard the member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. H. Andrews), the Minister of Environment stand up yesterday and prattle on about protocol. I do not know where he gets his information, but he does not get it from protocol officers. The Premier of a province, the member of an executive council of any province has no standing in precedence outside that province. The Premier may have standing outside the Province as a Privy Councillor of Canada and he is a Privy Councillor of Canada. He is a member of the Queen's Privy Council, he is entitled to be called hon. for life and he has the precedence to which that entitles him. In this Province it puts him behind the hon. W. J. Browne, the hon. Charles R. Granger, the hon. Donald Jamieson, the hon. John Crosbie, the hon. James McGrath, and well behind the hon. Joseph R. Smallwood, all of whom are members of the Privy Council of Canada, all of whom are senior in the Privy Council to the present Premier of the Province. But if the Premier has any precedence on this junket overseas - and, by the way, I think it is a trip that had to be made, I am not sure it had to be made in quite the style it is being made but I think it is a trip that had to be made, let me make that clear.

MR. L. HEARN: They are flying.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry!

MR. HEARN: They are flying.

MR. ROBERTS: They are flying. I hope they are flying. My Lord, it is bad enough having them gone for ten days on the junket, but if they went by boat it would take them weeks to row across the Atlantic.

MR. F. STAGG: (Inaudible) row?

MR. E. ROBERTS: I am surprised that the gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. F. Stag) does not believe the Premier would walk across. Shall I will leave it at that? My friend from Grand Falls (Mr. L. Simms) and the member from Naskaupi (Mr. J. Goudie) have got the point unlike the gentleman from Stephenville who has a pronounced ability to miss the point of any witticism that catches him where he sits.

Now, Mr. Chairman,
let me come back, you know -

MR. J. MCLENNON: I must write that down, that is nice.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Sir, they are at it again now. Look, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is not here and we have a few trying to rise to his level and the gentleman - where is he from? - it is the first time I have heard from him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Winsor-Buchans?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MCLENNON: You are not here long enough to know where I am from.

MR. ROBERTS: What was that?

MR. MCLENNON: You are not here long enough or often enough to know where I am from.

MR. ROBERTS: Not only am I not here long enough or often enough to know where the hon. gentleman is from, I would venture that none of his constituents know where he is from but they know where he is going, and we will see that in the next election.

MR. MCLENNON: They will know, I will be here.

MR. ROBERTS:

The hon. gentleman from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. McLennon), let me give him a word of advice now, he may not want to take it, he is going to be one of the original one-term members in this House, so let him ride along and enjoy it for what it is worth, let him do what good he can do and let him emulate his friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird), who is a shrewd, dedicated public servant, wily, wiry, competent, dedicated.

MR. SIMMS: He sure is wily.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Grand Falls says the gentleman from Humber West is wily. They do not know how wily he is. I will tell you, one of the joys of my life, one of the educational experiences of my short but not uncrowded career has been my association with the gentleman from Humber West. I learn from him daily, good things and some other things as well. I tell you, the story of the trip to Victoria is one of the great ones.

MR. SIMMS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: No, it was perfectly genuine in every sense of the word. We attended the meetings and we learned and I think the Public Accounts Committee have benefited from it. Would my friend from Humber West not agree?

MR. BAIRD: That is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: We are as one, heart to heart, soul to soul, cheek to cheek -

MR. NEARY: You have never gone on a Mockey Night with him, have you?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I have never gone on a Mockey Night.

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: What was that? - some witticism?

MR. SIMMS: You tell him the story,
'Steve'.

MR. STAGG: Lounge to lounge.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is another story.

MR. ROBERTS: Lounge to lounge? No, I have never travelled with my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), he will tell me about that. But Mockey Nights, no, the only Mockey Nights I see are some of the debates that we have been subjected to in here.

Mr. Chairman, I stray somewhat.

I realize that Supply is -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: There is some money here for the Executive Council and that does include, presumably, our Premier's world travels, North European division. But, you know, a little more seriously, if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - this is the point I was making - and his soul mate, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), his intellectual life's mate, his helpmate, his friend - bosom, they -

MR. SIMMS: Bum to bum.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no! Lord Durham once said, 'Two nations warring in the bosom of a single state', this is two states warring in the bosom of a single nation, the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins). They are separated by the Narrows physically, but the gulf between them intellectually, Sir, is not as wide as the Narrows and the Narrows are very narrow indeed, as Your Honour, being from Kilbride and being a surveyor, is well aware. And they may be separated physically by the Narrows, but intellectually and emotionally and down where it counts,

MR. ROBERTS: they are not separated even by a jot or a tittle or an iota.

MR. BAIRD: Relevancy, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I will say it is relevant, Mr. Speaker - Mr. Chairman. I am sorry. My friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird) does not even know that this is the Committee. He has forgotten his days of glory and of power, raw and naked power, when he sat in the Chair as an adornment to the parliamentary tradition going back to Simon de Montfort's parliament, as he does, as he does.

Mr. Chairman, I think my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who has now returned wants to say a few thousand well chosen words. I have covered all the points I want to make. Look, seriously, Mr. Chairman, this bill is a mockery. It really is. You know, it will be passed. It is a mockery of what is going on in this Province today. Nine months after the fiscal year ends we are being asked to approve money that has been spent, we are being given no explanations. We can stand here and scream and shout, it is not going to get us anywhere. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), if he genuinely wants to improve the quality of public life in this Province insofar as it lies within his department and ministerial responsibilities, let him from now on - I do not mind the idea of supplementary supply, that has always been and doubtless always will be, but let him provide the people of this Province with some meaningful operation. And, Mr. Chairman, having said that I will sit down. If anybody on the other side provokes me mercilessly

MR. ROBERTS: as they went to do on occasion
I shall -

MR. NEARY: We are going to go into
Committee of the Whole now, are we?

MR. ROBERTS: We are in Committee of the
Whole. We can speak more than once as long as we are
relevant to the subject of the Supply Bill, and there
is no way to be irrelevant to the topic of Supplementary
Supply, Mr. Chairman. I do not think Your Honour with
Your Honour's wide knowledge of the parliamentary
rules could find anything irrelevant to this Supplementary
Supply Bill.

MR. STAGG: Needless repetition. That
is the only way to get you there.

MR. ROBERTS: Needless repetition. Well,
they wrote that rule, you know, to try to get me. I
think my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) was in
the Chair then, I think he was in the Chair then.

MR. STAGG: It was not you. It was the
former member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. ROBERTS: The former member for Burgeo-
Bay d'Espoir has gone on to greater heights and is
still climbing. I assure you that my former colleague,
my friend from Burgeo Bay d'Espoir is but paused on
the way up. What was it Disraeli called it? The
greasy pole, was it not? Disraeli called it the
greasy pole.

DR. COLLINS: Headed for outer space.

MR. ROBERTS: Headed for outer space.

No I do not think so. I think he is headed for the summits,
he is headed for heights that the Minister of Finance
(Dr. Collins) can but dimly perceive.

MR. STAGG: Headed for the Annieopsquotch
Mountains.

MR. ROBERTS: Headed for the Annieopsquotch Mountains. Well they are probably in his constituency, are they not? Are they not in part in his constituency and part in St. George's? Does St. George's include Annieopsquotch? I guess it is a large polling area in the Annieopsquotch Mountains, is it not? It is like Northeast Crouse.

Well we will see about that.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is a mockery. We can make the point, we have made it, so I will not weary Your Honour any further. If the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has anything worthwhile to say we will respond to it. If not we might as well put this through the resolution stage. That is the end of

MR. ROBERTS: the debate because, of course, under the rules of the House the bill is then given all three readings. Let us get on to something more worthwhile. Perhaps we could have another go at exposing the conduct of the ministry with respect to this year's budget while there is still some hope of trying to bring them to their senses.

On motion, resolution carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 3, Bill No. 67.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957". (Bill No. 67).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

The hon. the Minister of

Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, we again are -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Marvellous! Marvellous!

Thank you. Thank you.

MR. NEARY:

What happened? What happened?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, we are again

debating a resolution and the resolution is:

"It is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957, the Act No. 70 of 1957, to provide for the advance of loans to and the guarantee of the repayment of bonds or debentures issued by or loans advanced to certain corporations".

Mr. Chairman, what this - and as in the Supplementary Supply Bill, we debate in Committee not only the resolution but also the bill itself. The bill is to amend the schedule to the Act as is required, and it means that we have to update the House of Assembly on any loans and guarantees that were given by government since the last amendment to this Act.

Now, the bill before the House has rather extensive explanatory notes attached to it laying out what all the loans and guarantees were all about.

DR. COLLINS: I think that is really as much as I need to say at this stage. If there are any questions about any particular one I will be glad to try to supply any answers that are required.

I move the resolution.

On motion, resolution carried.

DR. COLLINS: Order 4, Bill No. 68.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957". (Bill No. 68).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, this resolution is:

"That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957, to provide for the guarantee of the repayment of loans made to, and the advance of loans to certain Local Authorities."

It is very similar to the last bill.

DR. COLLINS: This is to update the House on the new schedule attached to this Act.

MR. NEARY: What is the number of the bill?

DR. COLLINS: This is Bill 68. The schedule shows the local authorities which have been given loans or guarantees since the last amendment was brought into this House. I might say that the vast majority of these loans and guarantees were for water and sewer services, some of them for roads but the vast majority for water services, or sewer services.

Just in case the House needs reminding, what happens in these instances is that local authority will borrow money to bring these capital works on stream and the government guarantees the loan which the municipality obtains from the bank. And that guarantee stays in place until the NMFC, the Newfoundland Municipal Finance Corporation borrows on the Province's credit an amount of money with which to repay the loan to the bank and then the guarantee, of course, comes off. The responsibility is then upon the municipality to repay the bond or the amount of the bond to NMFC, and if that is not done by the municipality the Department of Municipal Affairs picks up the responsibility.

So with those words I move the resolution.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are not going to prolong the debate on this bill. This is standard procedure, to bring into the House a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act." These guarantees have already been given, now they have to be endorsed and approved by the House. Because we are supporting the bill, or not voting against the bill, I suppose, does not necessarily mean that we agree with all the loans and guarantees that have been given out for water and sewerage and for municipal road paving and so forth. We have

MR. NEARY: argued in this House, Mr. Chairman, time and time again that a list should be tabled at the time the Budget is brought down, when the estimates are being debated in this House, that a list of all water and sewer projects for the current fiscal year be laid on the table of this House. There is too much politics involved in the selection of communities for water and sewerage. And there is too much waste of taxpayer money, Mr. Chairman, too much waste.

MR. TOBIN: How?

MR. NEARY: I will tell the hon. gentleman how. Right down in the hon. gentleman's own district there is a bit of waste -

MR. TOBIN: Where?

MR. NEARY: - in connection with a sewer outlet that was put in in the Burin, I forget what they call it now, the Burin -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Burin Bay Arm.

MR. NEARY: Burin Bay Arm.

MR. TOBIN: Ha, ha. That was before you were you were born.

MR. NEARY: Oh, before I was born, I see. Well, it is there. It was put their by the Tories.

MR. TOBIN: Burin Bay Arm?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was doing some research a couple of years ago on that particular project and we have - the hon. gentleman -

MR. TOBIN: You are mixed up.

MR. NEARY: I am not mixed up. The hon. gentleman should be aware that we have water and sewer projects that have been completed, that the sewerage is in the ground and I do not believe - well, maybe in the last several months, I have not checked on it lately -

MR. SIMMS: You are talking about Winter Works projects.

MR. NEARY: No, not Winter Works projects, projects that are being funded under The Municipal Guarantee Act. A flushing toilet has not gone through it yet, just laying there, it was installed incorrectly, wrong.

MR. TOBIN: Not in my district.

MR. NEARY: Not in the hon. gentleman's district. The hon. gentleman is only a Johnnie Come Lately, and he does not understand, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman made a complete fool of himself in front of a delegation from his district today, they saw the hon. gentleman for what he is. Now, if I were the hon. gentleman I would go look for a hole to crawl in and then I would take the hole with me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TOBIN: There are not too many holes left that you are not after being in.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that the list should be tabled in this House. There is too much politics involved in determining what communities should get water and sewerage and municipal paving and so on. And we have an awful lot of waste.

MR. NEARY: We had a case on the Great Northern Peninsula, we had a case in Placentia. Perhaps the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) can tell us if the sewer is now flowing through the sewer lines in Southeast Placentia. In Placentia, a sewer system that was put in the ground, that was poorly planned, and if anybody - Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman should be an expert on sewers. If there is a member of this House who is an expert on sewers I am sure it is the hon. member for Placentia. And can he tell us now if the sewer lines are carrying the -

MR. PATTERSON: You are the only bit of sewage that I know of. And it will not be completed until you are flushed through.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: If you decide to run against me that will do it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I knew I would wake the hon. gentleman up.

MR. PATTERSON: I am sorry. I was dreaming.

MR. NEARY: I knew I would wake him up. It is the first reaction we have gotten from the hon. gentleman since the House resumed sitting.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is researching. Boy!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I was beginning to wonder for a while if the hon. gentleman was awake or asleep. The hon. gentleman is the Whip, he is the Whip, he should be very alert.

But, Mr. Chairman, all these projects have been bought and paid for. There was one on the Great Northern Peninsula. There was one in Placentia. There was one

MR. NEARY: in Burin Bay Arm. They are all over the place - in Torbay and Pouch Cove where they had to call the bonds.

MR. SIMMS: They would have been undertaken in Liberal times.

MR. NEARY: Pouch Cove and Torbay.

MR. DINN: If they do not perform they call the bond.

MR. NEARY: They call the bond if they do not perform. But how much did it cost the taxpayers? So, Mr. Chairman, we are not getting enough information on these projects. If we had the list tabled in the House we could have a thorough debate at the time that we are passing the estimates

MR. NEARY: and then when the Local Authority Guarantee Act came into the House we would be briefed right up to date on what was happening. So, Mr. Chairman, I understand that one of my other colleagues, our spokesman on Municipal Affairs, is going to have a few words on this, but I do not think there is any need for a prolonged debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I simply want to endorse some of the words and some of the statements made by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), particularly -

MR. TOBIN: You are the type of man to endorse the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. LUSH: Yes, and do so proudly. And, Mr. Chairman, although we will not hold up this particular bill, the point needs to be made, and made again and again re the politics involved in terms of the water and sewer and particularly roads. We have requested on many, many occasions that the government table the list, Mr. Chairman, of the projects to be undertaken. We have not yet had the list for road projects in this Province in the last year although we have been told by the minister that he was going to table the list. We are still waiting for the list and except for what I see when I am driving by a few of the hon. members' districts opposite, I would not know if there was any paving going on. But I happen to drive by a few of the districts and see the paving going on from time to time. And I am sure that many of my constituents, if they knew that I was approving these loan guarantees, that they would be

Mr. T. LUSH: to get an equal share of the public dollars of this Province. But they keep waiting, Mr. Chairman. There is not a member, Mr. Chairman, and I have something to say on that, because again that is the political level coming in - there is not a member that has made more approaches in terms of delegations, in writing letters to ministers. As a matter of fact, the minister might hear about it very shortly because I have been maligned in this respect and I am doing my research and I have come up -

AN HON. MEMBER: How many letters have you written?

MR. LUSH: How many letters?

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: There is not one minister in my research, there is not one minister in Transportation whom I have not contacted over the years. And I do not know the numbers of -

MR. L. SIMMS: How many do you want? Do you want public radio monitored positions and (inaudible)?

MR. LUSH: Yes. I have no idea, I expect they are coming. And there will be more.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am presently doing some research now and there is not a minister out of the five that we have had since I have been in this House that I have not made representation to in terms of letters, or gone to see them, brought in delegations and presented petitions. Not one minister. The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) now, I had gone to see him when he was Minister of Transportation, I have gone to see the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) when he was Minister of Transportation, I have gone to see the member for Trinity North (Mr. C. Brett) when he was Minister of Transportation and I have letters all documenting it. So,

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I am not ashamed of the representation that I have made to this government in terms of trying to get roads paved in the Terra Nova district. And I would expect there is not a member present in this House, on either side, who has made more representation. There is not one. But, Mr. Chairman, the letters will come from my constituents make no doubt about it. But they would be very aggravated and very angry today if they knew that I was standing here and supporting this measure today, of course, without giving these few remarks and talking about

MR. LUSH: the water and sewer in somewhere.
But, Mr. Chairman, certainly as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said, we should have tabled in this House a list of all the water and sewer projects in this Province, and additionally we should have a list of all the roads that are going to be paved, or upgraded, reconstructed whatever the situation is, all of the capital expenditures for roads in this Province. And we certainly did not get that list. We asked for it. The minister gave us an understaking that he was going to table the list but it has not been tabled at this point in time.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly advise this government if they are going to treat the people of this Province fairly, if they are going to treat the people of this Province justly, certainly to do so, to spend the

MR. LUSH:

public dollars of this Province equally and fairly and justly in all of the areas of this Province. Mr. Chairman, I am amused when I read back over past documents by the government. First when this hon. crowd got in they came in with some great documents, with some great plans. And one of their documents relating to transportation was that road construction, upgrading and paving in the Province was going to be contingent upon resource development. Well, Mr. Chairman, one can go around this Province and see where they have paved roads in the last few years and not a resource there, Mr. Chairman, not a resource. It is happening all the time. They make those rules, they never subscribe to them but it sounds nice, it is motherhood stuff, these pious platitudes that the roads are going to be paved in areas based on resource development. I have got a fish plant, Mr. Chairman, one of the most prosperous fish plants in the Province, in the community of Salvage. Seven miles of pavement is all we need from Eastport to Salvage. And, Mr. Chairman, I have been requesting that for eight years now and no response.

AN HON. MEMBER: What do you think (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: I will call him, he is a good man. I will be there in a few moments.

So, Mr. Chairman, the people of my district would be very unhappy, very disenchanted, very disgruntled, very upset, very aggravated, to know that I would be supporting measures for the guaranteeing of loans for which, of course, they get no benefits, for which their tax dollars are used to pay off these loans, to meet the commitments. But they get no benefits in terms of roads, Mr. Chairman, in terms of water and sewer. Why, Mr. Chairman?

MR. NEARY: Well, turn it down.

MR. LUSH: Again my constituents would

MR. LUSH: understand, they would know why we are not getting any roads because they know these people, that the hon. members opposite are not one bit interested. But, Mr. Chairman, the day will come, I am afraid, when they will have to reckon with these people.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. NEARY: By leave! By leave!

MR. LUSH: Oh, by golly. Sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Sorry! Sorry!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

It being almost five o'clock now

I wish to bring to the attention of the House that the Chair has received two questions for debate on the Late Show, one from the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), and one from the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) for the Minister of Rural and Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie).

MR. NEARY: What are the questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The questions are, to the Minister of Transportation regarding savings connected with snow and ice control this Winter as compared with last Winter, under Section 31. And the one from the member for

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), he is not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), re federal/provincial nature funding.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Native! Native!

MR. SPEAKER:

Oh, native, is it? Excuse me!

Native funding, I could not make out the writing.

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Chairman, just a few comments and I will try to keep them as non-controversial as I can, and I will do it very, very quietly, but I hope the House would understand it was necessary for me to get to my feet and respond to the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), who indicated that this Province somehow was derelict in its responsibilities to the people of his particular district or, in fact, some other districts around the Province as it relates to the capital expenditure on roads.

I have heard the hon. member quote from time to time that not one five cents has been spent in his district and that the people of his district are being denied their just rewards as it relates to this important facet of Newfoundland life. I would just like to indicate to this hon. House and for the information of the hon. member for Terra Nova some of the facts since 1976. In 1975-1976 there were \$194,244 spent on capital works in Terra Nova district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

In 1976-1977 there were \$964,265, almost a million dollars, Mr. Chairman, spent in the hon. member's district on roads, on capital works.

MR. SIMMS:

A Liberal district

MR. DAWE: In 1977-1978 there was another \$30,000 spent on capital works .

MR. NEARY: Liberal money.

MR. DAWE: No, provincial money.

All provincial money so far, every cent provincial money. Every single cent that I have mentioned so far is provincial money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: In 1977-1978 another \$46,000 spent on capital works in the hon. member's district, again all provincial funding. In 1979-1980 another \$56,000 spent on capital works, all provincial money again in the hon. member's district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: In 1980-1981, Mr. Chairman, more recently than the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) wishes to go back, \$2,808,000 spent in the hon. member's district, 50/50 cost shared with the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: \$1,400,000 of completely provincial funding in that particular amount.

MR. TOBIN: In a Liberal district?

MR. SIMMS: All that money in a Liberal district? The minister should resign.

MR. DAWE: In 1981 - 1982, Mr. Chairman, another \$40,000 in Capital Works spent in the hon. member's district; in this particular year alone, Mr. Chairman, in related projects in the member's district, another \$604,000 for asphalt, guardrails, guide rails, calcium chloride and other miscellaneous items spent in the hon. member's district.

MR. SIMMS: A Liberal district. Resign, boy! Resign!

MR. DAWE: I would like to indicate to this hon. House that this government, Mr. Chairman, takes its responsibility in ensuring that the Province has adequate roads not only in good Tory districts but also it takes care of the people who are unfortunate enough to be represented by members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

Before we go on to the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I wish to clarify the question for the Late Show from the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). I was handed the wrong question. His question is to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) concerning the tax on commercial fuel.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, it is after 5:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: No, that was handed to the Chair yesterday but I was given the wrong one.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I just wanted to say a few words, Mr.Chairman, about a particular situation in my own district, but before I do that I would like to say to the minister, I do not know what he has been doing for the district of Terra Nova but I will say that I would like him to read out figures like that for the district of Port au Port. Because, Mr.Chairman, the only time that this government has ever done anything for Port au Port was when a road was crumbling away because the action of the sea had been eating away the cliff underneath the road and the road was about to collapse, and I think I got something like 200 feet of pavement one time back in 1978, but except for that, nothing but maintenance funds, although I do notice that over in the member's district which adjoins mine, every little cow path, every little road, even Black Duck Siding which has Summer cottages, the whole works, Mr. Chairman, have been paved. And not only would I tell the hon. members opposite that while I live in a district which has received no funds for some seven or eight years, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has -

AN HON. MEMBER: How about bilingual signs?

MR. HODDER: Yes, bilingual signs we certainly would like. We have been promised those for quite a long time too. We have never received the bilingual signs. We were promised by the former minister, now Senator Doody, who was then Minister of Transportation, that we would get bilingual signs and we were promised by the now Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who was then Minister of Transportation and Communications that we would get bilingual signs. We have been promised bilingual signs

MR. HODDER: for the past seven or eight years, and that is a little expenditure which would cost perhaps \$10,000 - \$5,000 or \$6,000 or \$7,000 - which would recognize the fact that there is a French culture in this Province.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. HODDER: I would say this: That the hon. member also made representation to his own government, because I have seen letters that he wrote, and he was unsuccessful in getting road signs as well.

MR. STAGG: Why not let the architect?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It was vetoed by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, since the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) brought up bilingual road signs -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: If hon. members opposite would tone down, Mr. Chairman, I could be heard in silence - the Minister of Justice just reminded me of something that I feel is very important, that we do have a French minority in this Province, and while the federal government has made it an official bilingual district, that means, Mr. Chairman, they use bilingual policemen in that area, that all federal services to that district now call for bilingual personnel; while the Province, on the other hand, has never recognized officially that it is a bilingual district, and, Mr. Chairman, on a number of occasions - and I will refer to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), who used to be the member for Port au Port prior to 1975 when I became the member - and I have over the years on a number of occasions asked for bilingual road signs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bilingual roads.

MR. HODDER: If the member would just keep his yap shut so I could get my point across.

MR. G. WARREN:

Bilingual road signs.

MR. HODDER:

Bilingual road signs. Yes, that is what I am saying, if members opposite would let me speak.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have on a number of occasions asked for bilingual road signs and I believe that it would be not only a recognition of the fact that the majority of people in a number of communities on the Port au Port Peninsula are French speaking, not only will it recognize that fact, but it would also make it more visible, because we do

MR. HODDER:

get an awful lot of tourists from the Province of Quebec, we get visitors from the Magdalen Islands, we get visitors from New Brunswick, we get visitors from Nova Scotia who are French speaking. And we also receive visitors from St. Pierre where there are some family ties. And I believe it would be fitting, and I would ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) again, who I see is writing and taking notes as I speak -

MR. NEARY: He is going to try to give you a flick now. He thinks he got something there now.

MR. HODDER: I would ask the minister, and I do not believe I have forwarded my request to this particular minister although I have asked his immediate predecessor, the two previous to that, I have made the request on a number of occasions and I understand that the associations in the district have made requests on a number of occasions, We have always been told yes, but the signs are not there. And I would suggest now, and I would not have spoken on this when I got up but the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) reminded me of it, I would suggest now quite sincerely and with no partisan intent in view whatsoever, I would ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) if he would indeed be the minister of the four I have asked, and I now ask him, if he would indeed provide bilingual road signs for the areas?

MR. NEARY: None down there at all now?

MR. HODDER: Not one.

It is more than just recognizing the unique Newfoundland culture. The French in the Port au Port area, some of the families arrived there from Acadia, some of them came from St. Pierre via

MR. HODDER: Red Island, which was a fishing station when that was the French Shore of the Province, and particularly the people of Mainland, which is Le Grand Pierre, Red Island was off Mainland and they used to come over to the Great Land, and there are some very interesting stories. I have read reports from people in the time of Napoleon who came over - which have been written up in historical magazines - who came over and that was one of the major fishing stations. That is how the French became so prominent in Port au Port. They were first established there in the 1700s by the French fishing fleets and Red Island, Isle Rouge, was the place where they landed.

But, Mr. Chairman, this area of the Province has a very unique history, and has a very unique population and they are a cultural group who are struggling very much to save their cultural identity, and I believe it would be fitting to place these bilingual road signs down there as has been asked.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about one particular problem which, when I looked at the Loan and Guarantee Act, came to my mind. I have no quarrel with the fact that the Town of St. Georges in the Minister of Transportation's (Mr. Dawe) district received \$400,000 last year for

MR. HODDER: \$400,000 last year for the water and sewer and \$510,000 for the second phase this year. I have no quarrel with that, nor do I have a quarrel with the fact that the town of Stephenville Crossing is receiving \$425,000 over twenty years, no quarrel whatsoever. I believe that those two areas should have received this funding. However, Mr. Speaker, there is a community in my district which is basically a dormitory town for the town of Stephenville, it is one of the fastest growing areas - and I would submit the fastest growing town perhaps outside of Pasadena although Pasadena has sort of reached a certain stage in its growth now-but Kippens has become the area for growth outside of Stephenville. This growth started with the opening of the linerboard mill but it accelerated, I would say, in about 1974 or 1975.

It was a small rural community, but because of the characteristics of the land there and because of the richness of the soil, I suppose, it was the natural area if you fly over Bay St. George or anywhere on the West Coast, it was the area for growth near Stephenville. And I think hon. member might have heard controversies in this House regarding Area 13. This is an area in the town of Stephenville which was developed by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing ten years ago and was ready for occupancy some four or five years ago.

But to this date, although there are a few lots being built on now, to this date people have not moved to this particular area. It is a beautiful area of Stephenville but because the natural area for growth was in the Kippens area and while construction has been booming in Kippens-

MR. HODDER: it has become the Pasadena,
I suppose, of Bay St. George - Area 13 has remained
unused. Now back in 1976 people were having problems
with their water and sewerage because Kippens and
Stephenville have become one town. There is no
difference. Any hon. members who happen to be driving
through Stephenville, when you arrive in my district and
you pass the Kippens

MR. HODDER: my district, you pass the Kippens Bridge you will not know the difference. It is all one town. However, while the town of Stephenville has adequate water and sewerage facilities, the town of Kippens does not. The community council came to me in 1976 -

MR. STAGG: It has something to do with the fact that Stephenville was incorporated in 1952.

MR. HODDER: I do not know why the hon. member is so touchy. I totally agree with the hon. member that the town of Stephenville has been incorporated for a long time. What I am pointing out, if the hon. member would still his tongue and listen-

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

I have to inform the hon. member his time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave!

MR. HODDER: By leave, Mr. Chairman?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Leave has been denied. The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member spoke for a long period of time in the debate and he talked about bilinqual signs. You know, it is not covered in this bill but I would like to, for the hon. member's benefit, just go through the list that is presented in the bill that we are discussing here now. Mr. Chairman, it is quite significant. One would wonder really where the hon. members are getting their arguments from. As hon. members know, when this work was done, we are talking about prior to April 1, 1981, and at that point in time we had, for example, the town of Badger's Quay - Valleyfield - Pool's Island

MR. DINN: represented by the former Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ANDREWS: Liberal?

MR. DINN: Yes.

MR. ANDREWS: A Liberal district?

MR. DINN: One hundred and ten thousand dollars.

MR. STAGG: Can I put an amendment? Can we take that back?

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, the town of Bay de Verde, it was Liberal at that point in time, \$675,000. The town of Burnt Islands, \$20,000. Cartwright, \$850,000. Campbellton, formerly represented by the hon. Mr. Rompkey's now executive assistant or press aid, \$500,000. And, Mr. Chairman, if one goes through the list one would wonder where the hon. members opposite are coming from. Have they read any bill that has been presented to this House of Assembly this session? One would think that they have not read a single solitary bill. The town of Durrell, as hon. members will know, before the election last year, when the people decided that because of what -

MR. SIMMS: Represented then by the former, former, former, former Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DINN: Former, former, former, former Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Chairman, the people wised up. They said, 'Well this government is relatively fair', the town of Durrell, \$82,500. Eastport- where is Eastport, Mr. Chairman? - \$34,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

Is that in Terra Nova district?

The town of Gambo, represented by the former Leader of the Opposition, \$700,000. How much fairer, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) be to lash out the money left, right and centre every year for the people of Newfoundland, not because they are P.C., not because they were so unfortunate in previous years -

MRS. NEWHOOK:

What about what we spent for Happy Adventure this year?

MR. DINN:

\$410,000 for Happy Adventure.

Where is Happy Adventure, I ask hon. members opposite, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SIMMS:

The minister should resign.

MR. DINN:

The town of Hare Bay, represented by the former Leader of the Opposition when he was in this House, the town of Hare Bay, \$320,000, As the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) just said, the minister may have read her instructions wrong. But this minister -

MR. SIMMS:

Too much politics.

MR. DINN:

- is doing what she can, not because a person votes P.C. or Liberal but because she is a fair and decent and honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SIMMS:

Hear, hear! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who just spoke, I could go through this whole bill, millions and millions of dollars - I have gone through two pages, I believe, of the bill and I have totalled up \$4,802,500; I have not gotten

MR. DINN: near the end of the bill yet,
Mr. Chairman, that is as it relates to the bill.

The hon. member for Port au
Port (Mr. Hodder), who just stood and said that his top
priority are bilingual signs, and it has a priority, but his
top priority is bilingual signs in his district, I would like
to go through over the past few years -

MR. STAGG: The hon. member cannot read them.

MR. DINN: That is true, the hon. member
cannot read them.

MR. SIMMS: Oh, he took a French course.

MR. DINN: But the hon. member got up right
after the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) sat down, and
said, 'Well, yes, okay, so you spent some money in the hon.
member for Terra Nova's district as you just outlined in
detail to the House of Assembly, but what have you spent in
Port au Port?'

MR. SIMMS: Tell him the hon. the member for
Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) is not in favour of bilingual signs.

MR. HODDER: Yes, what have they spent in
Port au Port?

MR. DINN: What have they spent in Port au
Port? For 1975 -1976, for example, one year, \$1,209,984,
1975-1976.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: 1976-1977 -

MR. SIMMS: Who sat for there then?

MR. DINN: I am not going to get into who was
representing the district.

MR. SIMMS: It must have been the member for
Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) in 1975-76.

MR. STAGG: Oh, 1975-76. That was left over
from my days.

MR. DINN: Well, that is okay, they must have
gotten good representation. 1976-77, \$402,078; 1977-78

MR. DINN: \$22,898, Would the hon. member like to know what it was spent on? I mean I can give the hon. member the details. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) could probably do a lot better job than I could because I have not completed all the research on it, but in 1978-1979, \$13,320 in the district of Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Beat that!

MR. DINN: In 1979-1980, \$151,734, Mr. Chairman, reconstruction and paving through Felix Cove, etc. Mr. Chairman.

MR. DINN: In 1980-1981, \$34,204 to construct a bypass in Felix Cove in the hon. member's district. And in 1981-1982, \$40,000 for chip seal, Mr. Chairman. Hon. members on this side of the House, if I go on with the litany of all the works that have been done in the hon. member's districts, I will upset the members on this side.

MR. STAGG: He has not been to Point au Mal, he does not know it is there.

MR. DINN: He does not know where Point au Mal is, he was never there.

MR. STAGG: I know where it is.

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) will attempt, will do everything in his power to spend more money next year and probably may even try to get some bilingual signs. The hon. member will not be able to read them, but the Minister of Transportation may even get some.

MR. SIMMS: Is it any wonder that kind of logic would come from a man who wanted to close down a private elevator to save money.

MR. DINN: And I would like to inform the hon. House and put that on the record again, the hon. member's total contribution to the debate here on the Province's trying to save \$70 million and going through wrenching times in every department and cutting back here and cutting back there, the hon. member's total contribution was, 'Well, maybe what we should do is close down the private elevator.' So we did some research on that. I believe the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) researched the saving involved in shutting down the private elevator and it comes to something like \$320,46 for the whole year, including electricity. Now, I do not know if that is significant in a \$70 million thing, but the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) obviously feels it is

DR. COLLINS: That is spread over eighteen months.

MR. DINN: And that is spread over eighteen months, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) tells me. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was his total contribution to how the government should go about cutting down on a current account deficit of something like \$70 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not read this bill. The hon. member should have read the bill before he stood in his place and made a fool of himself. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a requirement of members of this House if they want to stand up in this House of Assembly and speak on -

MR. STAGG: The hon. member was a little bit weak but he did not make a fool of himself.

MR. DINN: A little bit weak. Okay, Well, I retract that, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member may have been a little bit weak. He may not have read the bill entirely. He may have only read the first thing, the town of Appleton, and he never got beyond the A's. His research may have been a little bit suspect.

MR. HODDER: Is not his time up, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DINN: No, his time is not up yet.

Just to point out a few of the things that are happening in this bill, Mr. Chairman, I thought I would get up and point out to hon. members opposite that their allegations are unfounded. We have touched on two of the hon. members who spoke, two of their districts. I am sure the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has the information on other members' districts. If they so desire to receive that information they can write him or they can ask him. I am sure he would be only too willing to provide the information. In this bill, I am sure if I had finished all the pages of the bill and gone right through to the end it would be much more than \$4 million, but just the first couple of pages of the bill accounted for \$4,802,000. If you go to the next page, \$1 million, I believe. Mr. Chairman, another \$1 million, for example, the Town of Nain, the hon. member might be interested in knowing, the Town of Nain, \$1 million.

MR. WARREN: 90 per cent of that came from Ottawa.

MR. DINN: That may or may not have been 90 per cent federal money, but I can tell you right now, Mr. Chairman, that the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation has borrowed \$1 million for Nain over a 20 year period.

MR. WARREN: 90 per cent of that is federal money.

MR. DINN: I will check on that! We always have to put the money up front.

MR. DINN: Parkers Cove was a Liberal district before the last election. Before the last election, Mr. Chairman, they were represented by a Liberal. We went down and we spent \$200,000 on a water and sewerage system down in Parkers Cove on the Burin Peninsula, and the people said, "Well, this is a fair, reasonable, responsible government. Let us vote in a guy who is going to represent us," Mr. Chairman, and as a result we got the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) in the House of Assembly and doing a fine job, Mr. Chairman, as indicated last week in his speech and reported all throughout his district, the magnificent speech the hon. member made on the fisheries in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. DINN: Oh, Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate. I am sure hon. members would want me to go on.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the hon. member speaks, I wish to bring to his attention that at five-twenty-nine the Committee will rise because of the Late Show.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member opposite, it just goes to show that when you try to make some good, solid points here in the House, and you try to bring out a problem in a non-partisan way, what comes back from the other side?

MR. NEARY:

Arrogance.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Chairman, arrogance, and

not only that but a certain childishness, Mr. Chairman. I would point out again that this particular bill which we are debating, the point which I am making concerns the town of Kippens. There are no expenditures for the district of Port au Port in this particular bill. However, to continue where I left off, the town of Kippens is a dormitory town for the town of Stephenville. It is a growth area. In 1976 a number of people came to me and asked me if I would attend a meeting on their behalf and from there they started to lobby government in a strenuous manner to try and get water for their community.

The town of Kippens was a very rural town which very quickly became a very large town within two or three years. The town of Kippens had not had the same type of development plan that other communities experienced, some of the larger communities. It was an example of a community that grew very rapidly and the need for water became apparent very quickly. There was no water in the community whatsoever. After that time there was a grant of \$150,000 for the first phase of the water system. They hooked onto Stephenville. The first phase of that water system did the areas where there was really no need for water. Now there was a reason for that - they had to start somewhere. But it was the central part of the community where there was a crying need for water, where you had one house behind another and you had shallow wells and no water or sewerage whatsoever.

MR. HODDER: Now this matter, by the way, has been the subject of an editorial in the West Coast newspaper, The Western Star, recently when they talked about the frustrations that had been experienced by the community of Kippens in trying to get the second phase of water.

Now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that what has happened in Kippens is a series of delaying tactics by the Department of Municipal Affairs. I have spoken to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) on a number of occasions concerning Kippens. For the last two years, three years, they have been denied their grant. Kippens was a very responsible community. They were told by the minister in the first instance that you must institute property tax; if you institute property tax in this community then you will have a better chance of getting water. With that the council - even though communities all around who had received water systems under the old plan did not have property tax: many of the communities decided not to take property tax - they opted for the property tax and there is now

MR. J. HODDER:

property tax in existence. I realize I have very little time, Mr. Chairman, but I will sum up my remarks. I would like to speak further on this matter and will speak further on this matter. But I will say that because of environmental studies and because of this, that and the other thing, the water system has not gone ahead. The council is convinced, as I am, that there have been delaying tactics. However, Mr. Chairman, in the last minute that I have, I would ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. H. Newhook), who is now in her seat, and tell her, that if the second phase of the water system is not instituted very quickly, I fear for the people of that community because we have a potentially serious health problem developing in that area.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Are you going to adjourn the debate until tomorrow?

MR. NEARY:

I will move the adjournment then because I want to get some figures. Just to put the smile on the other side of members' faces on the other side, I am adding up the amount that was spent in Tory districts compared to the amounts spent for water and sewage in Liberal districts. That will put the tune on the other side of their faces.

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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

The hon. member for Kilbride,
MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of

Supply and the Committee of the Whole House has considered the matters to them referred, has directed me to report that it has passed certain resolutions and recommends that Bills 63 and 67 be introduced to give effect to the same, and has also made progress on another resolution and ask

November 25, 1982

Tape No. 2743

MJ - 2

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted.

On motion, resolution for Bill No. 63 read a first and second time.

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-Two And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service", read a first, second and third time ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957," (Bill No. 67), read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports they have considered the matters to them referred, have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted. Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: It being Thursday, it is deemed that a motion to adjourn has been made and there are two items for debate under this motion. The first one is by the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) with regard to the question asked the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) a couple of days ago.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the five minutes that I have, I want to start off by asking the minister a question which actually was not debated or brought up a couple of days ago but it is pertinent, I believe. It has to do with saving some tax dollars and that is what we were on to; saving a couple of hundred thousand dollars is what the minister is scraping off of his department to try to fix this \$61 million deficit. I was asking the minister if he was going to cut back in other areas. He explained that that was in overtime alone because this year instead of finishing at 2:00 - they will be starting at 6:00 in the morning instead of 5:00, and finishing at 3:00 P.M. That, of course, makes a lot of sense. Perhaps it should be moved up another hour, Mr. Speaker. It is quite simple to see why the extra overtime would be between

MR. CALLAN: the hours of 2:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. because it is around about school closing time in the afternoon for a lot of students. And naturally the highways operators and so on want to make sure that the roads and streets or whatever are in good condition for the school buses and the students who travel on them.

But anyway, Mr. Sreaker, I want to ask the minister about the list of capital construction projects. I did him the courtesy of sending him

MR. CALLAN: a couple of hours ago a copy of Hansard, where on June 22nd. the minister said, and I quote the minister: "Mr. Speaker, a number of weeks ago in this hon. House I was asked a question about the tabling of a list of capital construction projects, and I indicated at that time that that list was in the process of being finalized and as soon as it was finalized it would be presented to this hon. House as has been the practice last year, the year before, and the year before that. And it will continue to be the practice, Mr. Speaker" - I am quoting the minister - "and as soon as that list has been finalized - there are a number of extenuating circumstances that would not have the list finalized at this point in time, one of the things being", and so on, "but as soon as the list is finalized I will be tabling it in the House". Anyway, that was the 22nd. of June. That is five months ago, just over five months ago and that list, Mr. Speaker, still has not been tabled. So I would ask the minister when he replies is he going to table that list or when and why was it not tabled before.

Now, getting back to the other questions, of course, that were asked a couple of days ago about how the Department of Transportation can cut back and save not only \$200,000 since last year they overspent by over \$2.5 million, I was asking the minister were there any plans to cut back in that area and he responded by saying that most of that \$2.5 million was in equipment rental. Does that mean to say that the Department of Highways does not have enough equipment themselves or is it so dilapidated that it cannot do the work? You know, what is the reason? Perhaps the best way I can illustrate the point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, is to read a letter to the editor from one of the papers. And it says:

MR. CALLAN: "It seems so easy to blame your mismanagement on someone else. Every government department seems to have mismanagement and waste, but, more than any other, the Department of Transportation seems to lead the way. Here in district 4, the West Coast"- this letter comes from Deer Lake, a Tory district - "Here in district 4, the West Coast, the Northern Peninsula and Labrador the Transportation Department is mismanaged and wasteful. In Deer Lake we have a shop supervisor, three shop foremen and a district equipment superintendent who spends a good deal of his time on the shop floor in Deer Lake. Can you guess how many mechanics we have? Sixteen, up by six. That is a pretty good ratio, do you not think? In this district we always had a district manager and a superintendent of operations. Now we have a district manager and two superintendents of operations. The district did not grow in size and more roads are paved so there is less work. Why waste an extra \$30,000 per year? We have road foremen"- listen to this one - "we have road foremen who report to an assistant superintendent who report to a superintendent of operations who then reports to the district manager. It

MR. CALLAN: "It seems we just have too many \$30,000 a year people passing along messages.

"Then we have the government auction. We seen cars and pickups sold when for a very small price and with sixteen mechanics they could be used for a couple of more years. Parts are auctioned off when we have machines that they will fit, and the mechanics there to repair the machines. Collins can call it loss of revenue and short-fall in transfer payments, but I think this it is still government waste." So I ask the minister again where is that list? Secondly, is he going to make any other cuts besides the \$200,000 that he mentioned to save the taxpayers of this Province some extra dollars so that we can try to fix the bad, bad state that this government has put this Province in?

MR. BAIRD: If I could make any cuts I know what district I would make them in.

MR. CALLAN: Not your own for sure.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Again today, Mr. Speaker, I am having great difficulty in trying to decipher a question. I would very much like to be able to formulate an answer that could answer perhaps what the hon. member is trying to ask. But I will attempt, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member himself, and a number of members of this hon. House of Assembly on both sides, asked this government a number of years ago if it would try and change its tendering practices so that the capital works in this Province would not have to wait until the Budget came down before contractors, before individual districts and, essentially, before people knew that the road work was going to go ahead. And when that did happen and the Budget was late coming down, some of the work did not get done. Well, my department as well as a number of other government departments

MR. DAWE: involved in capital works got into a programme of early tendering last year. By doing that we spread the tenders out over a period of time and by so doing we were able to take advantage of the competitive bidding that was going on in the construction industry and therefore were able to do more projects in some cases that we had intended to do with the kind of listing that had gone on in previous years.

MR. DAWE: So by having to do some changing as it related to different tender bids we were able to do essentially more work last year that did not necessarily agree as in other years with a list that had been brought down. Mr. Speaker, the construction industry and the communities that benefited favourably from this particular practice were so enthused by it that they again have requested the government, and the government really did not need a request, but we have gone ahead and not only are going to do the same kind of early tendering for provincial projects this year but are going to go ahead, as I indicated in a Ministerial Statement a couple of days ago, and tender immediately for some of the Trans-Canada Highway work around the Province. And this is being met very, very favourably.

As it relates, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman in his questions a couple of days ago somehow talked about the \$200,000 that the department had indicated that it would save through its Winter maintenance programme and then somehow reverted back to last year, some question about the two crew system and tried to tie in the overexpenditure that the department had to make last year because of equipment rental with the overtime pay. I will have the hon. gentleman know, and I would like to inform this hon. House, that last year the Department of Transportation's salary estimates, the salary estimates of the Department of Transportation, were \$1,236,000 under, Mr. Speaker. Actual expenditure on salaries was \$1,236,000 under what the estimates said. We saved a considerable amount of taxpayers' dollars on overtime and salary expenditures last year, Mr. Speaker. The only overrun related - the hon. member tries to infer, I think, that perhaps the staff of the Department

MR. DAWE: of Transportation somehow is inadequate in maintaining department equipment. I will have the hon. member know that this is not the case. The Department of Transportation staff, I will match them up against anyone anywhere in the country for their efficiency and their capable work in the area of equipment maintenance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Not true! Not true!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, let it be known that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) says that that is not true. Mr. Speaker, another slur on the Department of Transportation's staff, another slur! Mr. Speaker, everyone in Newfoundland and Labrador knows that last Winter was an unusual Winter. We had a vast amount of snow dumped on this Province, all over this Province, in a very short period of time. It was not a matter of the equipment not being available nor adequate to do a normal amount of maintenance work. It was a matter of having a vast amount of snow when extra equipment, over and beyond what the department had normally required in any other year, had to be rented and this amounted to the overrun in equipment hire only.

If the hon. members opposite did not have a newspaper to refer to they would have great difficulty asking a question. They not only do not check their own sources but they do not check the sources of the pieces of information they are reading from newspapers. I will have the hon. member know that the district of Deer Lake, being the largest transportation district in the Province, has not only taken on additional roads, as the article indicates that it has not, but the Burgeo Road has come on stream, Mr. Speaker,

MR. DAWE: ninety-five miles of road that before that period of time had not been snow cleared. A great expenditure of not only federal but provincial dollars on the Straits Road and in Labrador, Mr. Speaker, an area that is responsible to District 4. We have done a vast amount of improvements to the road between Goose Bay and Churchill Falls trying to bring that road in line, hundreds of thousands of dollars over the past two years.

MR. WARREN: What! Tell us some more lies. Tell us (Inaudible).

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

MR. SIMMS: Settle down, settle down, settle down, 'Garfield'!

MR. DAWE: If the hon. gentleman would care to check his facts he will find out that that is true, very true, Mr. Speaker. All these additional miles of road, all these additional responsibilities, dumped on the District 4 office only go to prove that the amount of staff there, and not only that but the efficient way in which they handle their responsibilities is a credit to this government as well as any other.

MR. CALLAN: Where is the list? Where is the list?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The second question was asked by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains to the hon. Minister of Finance and it pertains to the commercial fuel tax.

I recognize the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I asked the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if there would be any repercussions from the dropping of the extension from the commercial fuel tax. However, the

MR. WARREN: minister said, I think, to quote him, that they always take everything into consideration then they are bringing in taxes. Now I believe that the minister maybe did not mislead the House, but I do not think the minister has really told all of the truth.

Mr. Speaker, because if the minister really took into consideration when he removed this exemption from the commercial fuel tax, the minister would have realized there could be as high as thirty or forty, at least thirty or forty, small businesses that will go bankrupt within the next three or four years.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker. Just today, Mr. Speaker, I had a call from an average sized business in this Province. This business - I just did some calculations, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. members on the other side because I do not think their math is that good - so, Mr. Speaker, this individual last year used -

MR. TOBIN: Which district?

MR. WARREN: In the district of Naskaupi. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wishes to know the name I could tell the hon. member, and he is a good Tory, by the way.

MR. CALLAN: A bad Tory, boy, There is no such thing as a good one.

MR. WARREN: He was a good Tory. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, last year this business used 5,112 gallons of heating fuel.

MR. BAIRD: How many gallons a month?

divided over twelve months that averages out to 426 gallons a month - that is for the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird). Now, Mr. Speaker, taking this commercial fuel increase into consideration - we are talking about removing the exemption on commercial fuel now, Mr. Speaker - it works out to \$1,225.76 that this business has to pay back to the provincial government. And already this individual business is paying in excess of \$5,000 to the provincial government at the present time. Now they want to get another \$1,225 from that individual business. And, Mr. Speaker, that individual guy said to me, 'Look, it means that it is going to cause my company to probably go under. Or I have another choice, what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) wants me to do, I will pass that along to the consumer, to the guy who is coming into my store and buying a tin of milk or buying a pair of boots and paying taxes on his boots. I will add some more on to that pair of boots.' So, this is what is happening. And all of the sudden the consumer will say, "The business has put up their prices". But it is because of the callous way that this minister has approached this tax increase.

Let me give you another example, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: He might (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Would the rabbit man shut up. You are all full of rabbits, boy, shut up. For example, Mr. Speaker, there is a little small truck company of only twelve small trucks that go around the city of St. John's - what would you call it? -

I guess catering to the individual, a sort of a concession to the individuals around town. And what happens, Mr. Speaker? He has twelve trucks on the go at the

MR. WARREN: present time. There yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman had made a decision. What decision? He has to, within the next three or four weeks, take six of his small trucks and park them in his backyard. Why? Because now when this truck pulls up in front of Westburns or Heap-Nosworthy or anything like that and blinks his horn for the people to come out and get their coffee and so on -

AN HON. MEMBER: Blinks his horn?

MR. WARREN: - now they come out and instead of paying forty cents for their coffee because of the minister's tax on anything below three dollars - and it is called a coffee tax or the hamburger tax or the hot dog tax - now the people are saying, "No, we are not going to come out. We are not going to buy from you now". You know why? Because, Mr. Speaker, of this tax. It is all tied together. And, Mr. Speaker, it means the same individual -

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. WARREN: Too bad, Mr. Speaker. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should get up and say that he is going to rescind the commercial tax. Surely goodness he must be.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have to get to my feet to defend myself against that vicious attack. I mean, it was the most disgraceful sort of performance I have ever seen in this House. It can only be, as my friend, the hon. minister says, it can only come from the world according to Garfield to make such remarks.

Now, like the hon. member opposite, and all hon. members in this House, I do not like taxes and I wish we had no taxes in this Province.

MR. WARREN: Waste, waste!

MR. DAWE: A waste of money, he said. Spending money on the people of Labrador is a waste of money. That is the kind of representation they have.

DR. COLLINS: He cannot mean that. He cannot mean that. I mean, there are reporters present. I mean, do you want that to go up to Labrador, that you feel we should not spend money on those individuals?

MR. WARREN: No, I do not.

MR. DAWE: Let us just say that he misrepresented what he said.

DR. COLLINS: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend to follow all the arguments brought forward by the hon. member. One thing he said is there is one individual who is now paying for all his fuel bills, I gather, \$426 a month -

MR. WARREN: Gallons! Gallons!

DR. COLLINS: Four hundred and twenty-six

DR. COLLINS: gallons a month.

MR. WARREN: Right.

DR. COLLINS: And we are now going to tax him so that he is now going to pay how much extra tax?

MR. WARREN: On a whole year, \$1,225.

DR. COLLINS: So he is going to spend an extra \$1,200 a year in fuel tax. In other words that is \$100 a month. Now, Mr. Speaker, if a business is dependent on \$100 a month for its survival, if it is dependent on that I do not think that this government can be blamed if that business does not survive. I mean, that must be a most marginal business. And if a businessman cannot accommodate to \$100 a month extra costs in this time of great economic difficulty -

MR. WARREN: Typical answer! Typical answer!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - he is not going to survive anyway.

MR. WARREN: Your answer is useless to this, sure.

DR. COLLINS: On the other example, he said that coffee cost forty cents a cup before the tax, but he did not say how much it is going to cost afterwards, But if it is going to cost any appreciable amount, you know, he must be using larger cups or whatever. I would suggest that he use smaller cups. He probably could still charge forty cents. I have a suggestion for your businessman friend. I think the hon. member has as his acquaintances very marginal, very non-innovative type of businessmen.

But, Mr. Speaker, this tax that we have put on commercial fuel -

MR. WARREN: You are short a couple of gallons too, eh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - this tax merely evens out the load on commercial firms. It evens out the load. There was an unfairness before we put on this tax. Some commercial firms were in actual fact having an unfair advantage on those with which they were in competition in business. It was quite an unfair thing. So, again one does not want to put on taxes unnecessarily and we certainly did not do so. But in actual fact if there was any benefit out of it other than to the provincial government it really evened up the competitiveness within the commercial field of activity.

Mr. Speaker, the last point I would like to make is that in this respect, we put on taxes and it was not our doing that caused us to put on taxes. Most of the problem that we are facing at the present time is related to economic downturn. Economic downturn is the essential nature of the problem. And who is responsible for the economic welfare of this country? It is not this Province. We are a small, small Province. Anything we can do is fairly minimal in terms of handling the economy of this country. It has to be done by someone else, to turn this economy around. But we will do our part. But we often suffer the consequences if others do not do their part. This is the position we found ourselves in.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has expired.

It has been moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn until three o'clock tomorrow, Thursday. Those in favour "Aye", those against "Nay".
Carried.

November 25, 1982

Tape No. 2751

IB-2

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): I do now leave the Chair
until three of the clock tomorrow, Thursday.