

VOL. 3

NO. 37

THIRD SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, MAY 14, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in response to questions in the House regarding salmonella infections, I want to report that today in 1984 there have been a total of 301 cases salmonellosis reported. One hundred and sixty-four of these cases have been in the Central region of the Province; sixty-three in the Eastern region; sixty in the St. John's region; ten in the Western region and four in the Northern region.

In recent years the number of cases reported annually for the Province is 180 or fifteen per month. This year an increase in the number of cases was noted towards the end of March. Currently the number of cases being reported is declining.

Salmonellosis is an acute infectious disease characterized by fever, diarrhoea and vomiting. Its occurrence is worldwide and food is the predominant vehicle of infection. Salmonella germs naturally infect domestic and wild animals, particularly poultry, swine and cattle. By eating food derived from animal sources, particularly poultry and meats, human infections occur. Person with diarrhoea due to salmonella infection may also pass the infection to others through close personal contact.

Each year in Newfoundland there are localized outbreaks of salmonella infections. These ordinarily have been associated with cold plates and turkey dinners. The current increase in the number of

May 14, 1984

Tape No. 1574

SD - 2

DR. COLLINS: salmonella cases in Central and Eastern Newfoundland strongly suggests that food product contaminated with salmonella germs has been widely distributed through the marketplace. Health inspectors have visited the homes of people with the infection to inquire

DR. COLLINS: about food purchased, but to date have not uncovered a common factor. Additionally, a large number of food samples from communities where the cases have occurred have been tested at the Public Health laboratory in St. John's. However, the particular type of salmonella, isolated from humans infected, was not isolated from the products tested. The investigation of these products is ongoing and will continue, particularly in an attempt to determine the incidents of salmonella contamination in meats and other food products of animal origin on the market in the Province. The general public should realize that a certain percentage of these food products do contain salmonella, that is at all times, hence the need to take extra care in the preparation, cooking and storage of the foods.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health will be accelerating its efforts to provide the general public with more information about the prevention of salmonella infections, stressing the importance of thorough cooking of all foods derived from animal sources, particularly poultry, and the importance of sanitizing kitchen surfaces after preparing raw foods and the need to refrigerate prepared foods.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, there is not a great deal that need be said by way of response to the statement, which is not to say that the statement itself is not important, it is simply to say that it is not terribly controversial and does not announce anything approaching a new departure in policy.

MR. ROBERTS: We appreciate the fact the minister has made this statement because there is a great deal of talk and a great deal of concern about what is a very large increase in salmonella, as the statistics show. I think the important point is that the departmental officials, the public health laboratory officials are trying to isolate the source of the infection and that, as I understand the public health game, is really the key move; until you can find out what is causing it, from whence the infection stems, whence

MR. ROBERTS: the epidemic begins, if epidemic is the correct word, until that can be done really not much can be done because you cannot stop it. I have no doubt that the minister will ensure that his officials continue to go at this indefatigably. until they do isolate whatever is the source of the salmonella. I am not sure if it is a virus, the minister calls it an infection; whatever it is anyway it is a bacteria of some sort, it is a very unpleasant little animal. It is one of the hazards of being in public life from time to time, what my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) calls the dreaded purple salad when you have to go to the garden parties. But a little more seriously, there is a lot of concern around the Province. Because of this I hope the minister's statement will allay some of those concerns. Obviously, the matter is not out of hand and is not threatening the health of any except those who are infected. It can be very unpleasant, I understand, if you do get the infection. The officials are doing what they can to try to pin it down. In the meantime, I guess all we can do is heed the minister's admonition to be cautious and to watch, above all, poultry. I do not know what the causes are of this one but poultry is traditionally the source, or the vector, I suppose, to use the correct word, which carries this infection. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we commend the minister for his close attention to detail and we urge him to continue to press ahead with this matter.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, this government recognizes that one of its major responsibilities

DR. COLLINS: involves the development and implementation of an annual expenditure program designed to support the dual objectives of expanding needed public services and of maximizing the employment impact of the public cost in providing them. Our annual budgets have repeatedly reflected this philosophy, which must be particularly responsive in times of economic difficulty.

The federal government, too, must play its proper role for the attainment of these objectives, and government is, therefore, pleased with the recent signing of a new umbrella federal/provincial development agreement, called the Economic and Region Development Agreement, ERDA, from which will flow subsidiary initiatives focused on specific elements of our economy.

DR. COLLINS: Subsidiary agreements have already been signed for regional planning and for mineral development. Very regrettably, two other very important agreements have not yet formally been finalized, both of which would have an appreciable impact on rural employment.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the Rural Development Agreement, and the Primary Highway Strengthening and Improvement Agreement; these and others have been in the hands of the Federal Government for many months. At the time of this year's Budget preparation, it was fully expected that new agreements would be in place covering both these areas, early in the year, so that benefits, especially in terms of rural employment, would be flowing through our economy this Spring and Summer. We remain very optimistic about the prospect of signing both agreements soon, but it now seems unlikely that the major additional stimulus to employment which would have flowed from the Highways Agreement, in particular, will be felt early in this Summer's construction period.

Mr. Speaker, certain other difficulties of an unanticipated nature for the rural areas of our Province have arisen this Spring. Hon. members are fully aware that the unusual weather conditions of recent weeks caused several million dollars' damage to our hydro distribution system, resulting in disruption to commercial and domestic activities. The unusually heavy ice conditions around our coast have caused distressing cut-backs in certain inshore fishing operations, and delays in start-up of others important to rural Newfoundland. Also, the restructured major company segment of the fishing industry has been somewhat slower in exerting beneficial effects than originally expected.

DR. COLLINS: Accordingly, in the interest of assisting local employment, while at the same time having the effect of upgrading important public services, I am announcing today that Government has approved an additional expenditure of \$6.3 million for the re-construction and upgrading of local roads around the Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: - bringing the total budgetary allocations for those programs to a total of \$25.3 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: This additional expenditure will have an impact in a large number of rural areas and will provide employment, on a seasonal basis, to an additional 200 Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, this important new initiative will not negatively impact our current account budgetary position this year, since these expenditures are included in capital account. A Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant will be sought and laid before the House at the appropriate time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the unemployment figures that were released on Friday, we need all the make-work projects that we can get in this Province, but I am afraid that this statement just made by the minister, this \$6.3 million which will create, so we are told by the minister, 200 seasonal jobs, that is over \$30,000 a job, that this is not going to do anything worthwhile to solve the unemployment problem in this Province. It is estimated that somewhere around 90,000 to 100,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are unemployed at the present time.

MR. MORGAN: There are 1.5 million Canadians unemployed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, realistically Newfoundland has somewhere around 90,000 to 100,000 people unemployed and unemployed right at a time when the schools are turning out thousands of graduates - the College of Trades, the College of Fisheries, the vocational schools, the university, Mr. Speaker - turning out thousands who do not have a prayer of finding a job this Summer. Now, Mr. Speaker, the \$6.3 million, I submit, will go up on public

May 14, 1984

Tape No. 1578

MJ - 2

MR. NEARY: tender and the work will be
done by contractors. It is not the kind of money that is
labour intensive,

MR. NEARY: it will only create less than 200 seasonal jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that the best they can do?

And while I am on my feet I might ask the hon. minister if one-forty-fifth of the budget will be going to Terra Nova district? The minister did not give us a list of the projects. He did not tell us for example if the road to Terra Nova, where the member, when he was running, went to the community of Terra Nova - and I was there on the weekend and met with the people, told the people that the road in the community of Terra Nova would be paved even if he had to pay for it out of his own pocket.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, we would like to know from the minister when he will give us a list of the projects -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - they intend to carry out under this \$6.5 million?

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the Leader of the Opposition has expired.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that was an item we intended to deal with during the Question Period today, the unemployment insurance figures that were released on Friday past, which shows that the actual work force - the actual; I am not talking about the seasonally adjusted, and I am directing my question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) the actual figures that I have from Statistics Canada as of noon today indicate that the work force has dropped by 4,000. There are 4,000

MR. NEARY: less in the work force this year than there was last year. Could the hon. gentleman inform the House if that is correct, 1983 the actual figure was 214,000 and this year, up to noon today - excuse me, for April, I checked the figures noon today, for April month, were 210,000, an actual drop in the work force of 4,000. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House why this is happening?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that is a very difficult one to explain. The hon. member got his figures at 12 o'clock noon; I suggest he is a little bit inaccurate. In March of 1984 we had 214,000 and in April we had 210,000, that is a decrease of 4,000.

MR. DINN: In April, 1983, we had 218, 000, which is actually a decrease of 8,000. Basically, what the problem here is is that at this point in time in the year generally we have other things happening that are normal happenings, like the fishery would have been underway now and so on and we would have more people who would not be on unemployment, they would be back in the fishery or something of that nature, and actually be employed or in the labour force looking for work.

We had some down-turns in Newfoundland in 1983 and, of course, we have not gotten back to normal. The Iron Ore Company of Canada, hon. members will know, is down to about a little over 50 per cent production, so that caused quite a drastic decrease in not only the labour force but in the employed sector.

I am pleased to report, however, that Wabush Mines on Friday announced that they will be going back to basically just about full production. It means that instead of 4.8 million tons of product this year they will be producing 5.8 million tons - 6 million tons is the peak capability of Wabush Mines - which also means that we will have out of the total of sixty-six people who are unemployed down there in Wabush Mines, that forty-four at least will be hired back on and maybe that will go back to full employment.

So we are having things turn around in the Province. We have some bright spots on the horizon. The Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) is working with a company from Great Britain called Minworth in the hopes that we get the St. Lawrence flourspar operation back again. The Baie Verte Mines were having some problems in April where they had to announce a quick shutdown, basically the reason for that being that there was a strike in India and they had a down period and they could not ship their product. So that was a natural,

MR. DINN: normal, reasonable thing
for them to do and, of course, they did that. But we
expect that things will pick up in the next few months.

The hon. member did not
say, for example, that the unemployment rate for March 1984
to April 1984 actually went down, or the number of people
unemployed went to 45,000 from 50,000. We think that that
is an improvement. The unemployment

MR. DINN: rate itself went down 2 percentage points from 23.3 per cent down to 21.3 per cent. While that is not good, while we cannot stand in this House and be happy that we have over a 20 per cent unemployment rate, we think that that is an improvement and that improvement should continue over the next few months, especially with the things that we have been doing here in the Province. We have now \$74.7 million in Transportation alone for roads and bridges and the minister announced another \$6.3 million today. That should help the situation somewhat. It is only 200 jobs but every job counts. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), of course, with his loan guarantees to companies have created many jobs in the Province this year. The Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), as I said, is working on the St. Lawrence deal and many other industrial strategies that he has up his sleeve and will be announcing very, very soon, I would anticipate. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) still has something like 8,500 teachers. And we did not throw out anybody in the public service this year. We decided the better route was to see if we could hold wages at the current level so that we would not have to cause more unemployment in the Province.

So I believe the government itself is doing the best it can with the unemployment situation that we have in the Province and we hope to do better as the months go on.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have heard that harangue before. The fact of the matter is that the Newfoundland economy has been on the skids since 1972, since the Tories took over in this Province. And I might point out, for the benefit of hon. gentlemen who just heard the minister manipulate figures over there, that

MR. NEARY: the unemployment figures this month compared to a year ago are up. A year ago, 1983, the official seasonally adjusted figure was 19.4 per cent, this year it is 19.6 per cent. As a matter of fact, Newfoundland has not started to recover from the recession. Every other province is recovering except Newfoundland. Newfoundland is getting worse. The unemployment situation is deteriorating. It is the number one priority. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House if the government, the administration there opposite, will take a leaf out of the book of their Tory buddies in Saskatchewan and implement make-work programmes

MR. NEARY:

that will give young people access to employment such as the two programmes, involving \$4 million or \$5 million, that have been implemented by the Government of Saskatchewan, which will subsidize the employers for hiring young people during the Summer months, Mr. Speaker? Will the hon. gentleman tell the House if the administration there opposite has any ideas along these lines? Or are they just going to rely on private enterprise, as the hon. gentleman indicated a few moments ago, keeping their fingers crossed that something will happen to improve the mining industry and the pulp and paper industry in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, it seems we have heard that same old harangue before. The fact of the matter is I do not know where the hon. gentleman gets the figures, but I will be happy to supply him with the Stats Canada figures. He started out today by saying, "Now I do not want to deal with seasonally adjusted, I want to deal with actual." So when he got to the actual and he found that in March the actual unemployment rate went down, he switched right over then to the seasonally adjusted. He did not want to deal with seasonally adjusted first, but now he wants to deal with seasonally adjusted.

MR. SIMMS: He does not know what he wants.

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate from April of '83 to April of '84 was 20.3 last year, it is 19.6 this year. That is down. That direction is down now you see. Now March '84 was 20.3 and it is 19.6, that is down. So those two figures indicate that there is a downward trend in unemployment. Now what are

MR. DINN: we going to do in this Province?
Well, I just tried to outline to the hon. gentleman what we were doing. We are doing \$25 million in Municipal Affairs. We are doing \$142 million worth of construction in the Department of Public Works and Services. We are doing something like \$74 million and \$6 million, that is \$81 million actually - \$74.7 million, plus \$6.3 million, is \$81 million-in Transportation, that is bridges, roads reconstruction throughout the Province. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), is putting virtually millions of dollars into guranteed loans to keep fish plants open and that will save, we anticipate, about 8,000 jobs in the fisheries. The Department of Social Services,

MR. DINN: last year in the budget process we approved \$6 million for the Department of Social Services on Community Development projects, and we added to that last year. Because the programme was so successful, we added another \$3 million, which totalled \$9 million last year. And this year, we added not \$3 million, not \$10 million, not \$11 million, but we added another \$6 million so that we have \$15 million in the Department of Social Services this year for Community Development projects. The government has no intention of getting into the mining industry, the newsprint industry or the fishing industry if we can help it at all, we think that that is a place for the private sector to operate, but we will do whatever we can to help in the public sector, to help with our programmes, to help with construction, so that we can provide as many jobs as we possibly can for the people of the Province and also maintain the public service at its current rates, Mr. Speaker.

So I think that this government is doing everything within its power to alleviate the very, very serious unemployment rate we have in the Province, and, as I said to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), in case he cannot read, I have the Stats Canada figures here in a larger print and I will be delighted to supply a copy to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition for his use so that he can become a little more accurate and he will not get on with a harangue that is false and misleading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, there is no harm to say, the old saying is so true, that figures do not lie but liars do figure. Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the unemployment situation in this Province is worse now than it was a year ago. The unemployment figures are up, and

MR. NEARY:

we estimate that almost 100,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are unemployed. And young people should be working right at the crucial time of their lives. They have thrown up their arms in despair. There is no hope, Mr. Speaker. Parents, families are heartbroken because their sons and daughters cannot find jobs.

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) I am sure is aware that he is making a speech pertaining to the unemployment in this Province and it is the Question Period.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: It is the number one priority in this Province, Mr. Speaker. I am going to ask the hon. gentleman if the administration there opposite will devote a full day, because the administration are avoiding like the plague talking about the relevant issues in this Province, bread and butter issues that affect the ordinary people, so I am going to ask the hon. gentleman if the administration there opposite will agree before the House rises to set aside a full day for a debate on the tragic unemployment situation in this Province or, Mr. Speaker, do they intend to close the House without debating the real issues that affect the ordinary people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, to be quite honest that question does not really deserve an answer in this House. We have had seventy-five hours of budget debate, we got about two questions on unemployment in that budget debate. We had Thursday Late Shows since this House opened and in the past Thursday, when you get an opportunity for half

MR. DINN: an hour to debate any topic that you want, nobody over in Opposition was unhappy with any answers that we gave and that has been going on for weeks. I do not know if the press will catch this up, but the fact of the matter is it has been going on for weeks where we have had a half an hour every Thursday since this House was -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - opened and the hon. members opposite were happy with every answer that they received. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but nobody over on the opposite side seems to be able to make any recommendations with respect to unemployment. I say to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) \$142 million in construction activity in the Department of Public Works and Services is going to create some jobs. Now, maybe it is quite possible that we could wrench some more money or borrow some more money to put into the Department of Public Works and Services,

MR. DINN: but I think that is quite a sum of money to put into the construction sector of this economy.

MR. NEARY: Make millionaires out of the contractors.

MR. DINN: 'Make millionaires out of contractors!'

We have \$81 million in Transportation, that is going to create some jobs for roads. Now normally we have a \$20 million Transportation or roads programme. This year it was \$20 million, we added \$15 million to that, there was \$39.7 million federal and provincial, and Mr. Speaker, we just added another \$6.3 million to that for \$81 million in transportation.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), in water and sewer this year will be spending \$25.5 million. Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) will be spending \$15 million or \$16 million for Community Works projects. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) with millions of dollars of loan guarantees, Mr. Speaker, is -

MR. NEARY: You said all of that before.

MR. DINN: But it is exactly the same question.

The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) has a programme, federal/provincial, and we thank the federal government when they come through - a federal/provincial programme, Mr. Speaker, I know they do not like to hear all of these statistics, but they are actual. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands is creating thousands of jobs, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), as I said, no cut in staff this year; the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), in Labrador, creating jobs all over.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said we are not getting into the mining industry, we are not getting into the paper industry, but, Mr. Speaker, we are going to leave that to the private sector. We have, on this side, some

MR. DINN: faith in the private sector to bring this around when we get out of this recessionary period, and, Mr. Speaker, we are looking forward to a brighter, an even brighter future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Go 'way.

MR. DINN: The unemployment rate, contrary to what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said, is actually going down. It went down from March to April of this year, it went down from March last year to March this year, and, Mr. Speaker, it will continue to go down. If we could get a deal on the offshore, if hon. members opposite would only get up and support this government in getting a deal in the offshore, we would have more jobs. And the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who gets up here in this House and speaks against the budget, would not have, if the budget were defeated, would not have his \$8 million ice-reinforced ferry to get his constituents back and forth to the Mainland of Newfoundland from the Island of Fogo.

So, Mr. Speaker, they have nothing to add themselves, they have nothing

MR. DINN: that they would like to suggest to government, they know nothing more can be done and, Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to employ people in this Province, we are going to continue to bring the unemployment rate down, contrary to what the hon. members opposite try to intimidate us into doing.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. As we are approaching the first long weekend for this year, I would like to ask the minister a question concerning provincial parks. Could the minister advise the House if all the provincial parks will be opening for the long weekend?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, could the minister advise the House as to which parks will not open?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information at my fingertips, but I will be happy to send a copy of a press release over to the hon. member that was released some time late last week and has already been made public.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister advise us also if this long weekend the parks are open, the minister will ensure the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that there

MR. WARREN: will be adequate staff employed in the parks to prevent occurrences such as those we had last year in Butterpot Park?

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will make every attempt to do just that.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the minister took the stairs from the main floor to the tenth floor so he may be pretty well exhausted. Anyway, I would like to ask the minister another question. Could the minister advise if the fees for entrance to the parks, for vehicles and for staying overnight in the parks, will be the same as last year? If not, if there is an increase, what is the increase?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, generally speaking it is all in the release that has been made public, but there are no increase in fees this year with one exception, the new Grand Codroy Park, and those fees will be announced at the appropriate time and have been, I think, also included in that particular press release. But if it is the wish of the hon. members for me to elaborate and help kill some time in Question Period, I will be happy to mention the fact that we have undertaken to have a training session conducted for parks officers to assist them in determining their authority under the present legislation and also to assist them in dealing with the general public in the area of public relations, a course that was undertaken a week or so ago and I understand was extremely successful in talking to some of the parks officers this morning. Also late last year, following the situation during the long weekend last May, we brought in a number of changes and amendments to the regulations, in consultation with campers and the Provincial Camping Association, all of which were very well accepted by the general public, it appears, and which also were well accepted throughout the rest of the season because the number of difficulties were very, very small in comparison to what happened on that one major weekend. So hopefully those major regulations which will remain in force and remain in effect for this particular camping season will have the same affect, and that is that everybody who wishes to enjoy

MR. SIMMS: a camping experience will be able to do so in the proper manner.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary and I think probably it is best to ask it to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) as it pertains to camping. Could the Minister of the Environment advise if his department will permit side-road camping or gravel pit camping this year? If so, will there be any such thing as garbage containers in the various gravel pits or popular spots throughout Newfoundland where a lot of campers go instead of going to the parks? Could the minister advise if he is going to allow it again this year and if so will there be proper disposal containers available for the campers?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the policy is unchanged. There will be roadside camping permitted as always in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Quite traditional.

MR. ANDREWS: Quite traditional, yes. Regarding the availability of garbage containers and so on, that matter is under discussion right now, as a matter of fact, and we should have some more information on it later.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Deputy Premier (Mr. Marshall). In view of the question I asked the minister the other day, with regards to using the facilities that were used by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro in Point Amour, the local residents, the recreational committee, wanting to use it for an indoor hockey rink, the minister said in his reply that the government would not necessarily accept the lowest tender and advised the residents of that area to make a proposal in writing. In view of that I have had calls and people in the media have asked me questions. I am sure the minister does not want to mislead the House, but is the minister saying that if the residents put in the tender they will get it because of the reason that the government wants to make sure that so much of the money goes back to the people? Or is the minister misleading to the business community by saying, 'Okay, you can go down there, fly down there, you can assess the building and go through all that expense, but it is not going to do you any good because the government is not going to necessarily accept the highest tender, it is going to accept the lowest tender from the residents'? And in that regard, to get rid of this confusion, can the minister undertake not to put it up on tender but to have a private agreement made between the recreational committee and the government of the day to make sure that some benefit of this \$150 million that was wasted in the false start-up that some benefits will go back to the people with the scrapping of their Come By Chance and the scrapping of Gull Island that the people will get something?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked a series of questions and I cannot remember when he started off because he started off seems to be a long, long time ago. But, Mr. Speaker, obviously, in the call of

May 14, 1984

Tape No. 1588

SD - 2

MR. MARSHALL: any tender, and any business person knows it from the way it is advertised, there is always a clause at the bottom of any tender, calling for the advertisement of property, the highest or the lowest of any tender is not necessarily accepted,

MR. MARSHALL: and everybody knows that. And the reason for putting that in is because the government, or whoever is calling the tenders, can then assess the situation. If you do not award it, in the case of sale of a property, to the highest tenderer, you are obligated to explain the reason why, whether the residents of the community the hon. gentleman represents, have a good and sufficient reason as opposed to the bids that may or may not come in is something that I cannot say at this time until we see the nature of the bids and the real purpose and the feasibility for which the community wishes to dedicate the premises if in fact it is successful. And I can say to the hon. gentleman is we are calling tenders in the normal course of events and that decision stands, but I would advise him to see that a tender is put in from the community with the reasons why they wish to get the building, the price they are prepared to offer, and we can assess it in relation at that time. I guarantee him it will be looked upon fairly, but it has to be looked at from the point of view of balancing on the one hand the protection of the public purse, as it were, and, on the other hand, the social needs of the community as well as the feasibility of actually being able to use the facility for the purpose they wish it to be used.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The residents have already made a bid and, in that respect, I hope that the residents of

MR. HISCOCK:

Southern Labrador are considered part of the public.

I have another question for the Minister of Energy. In some eighty-three communities in this Province, over 40,000 people use diesel power, from St. Anthony to Ramea to Burgeo to Coastal Labrador to Fogo to St. Brendan's, Rencontre East, Englee, etc. Those who are connected on interconnected rates, the basic rate is \$9.50 and after that it is .0472 per kilowatt hour and it does not matter how much electricity you consume, that is the rate for those who are interconnected to the power grid. For diesel, the rates go from 1 to 500 kilowatts at .0472; after 500 kilowatts, it jumps to 8.33 per kilowatt hour and over 1,000 kilowatt hours, it jumps to 11.96 per kilowatt hour.

We see a discrepancy in the Province that

MR. HISCOCK: if you are interconnected you have a basic fee, but not if you are on diesel. The average family in this Province normally consumes about 1,000 kilowatt hours, could the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) in this government undertake to review the facts and make sure that the charge of .0472 apply up to 1,000 kilowatt hours and anything over 1,000 would be given a different rate? Because the average family, as I said, Mr. Speaker, consumes around 1,000 kilowatt hours and what we have here is that those that are on the interconnected fee pay only .0472 if they use 1,000, 5,000 or 10,000 kilowatt hours, whereas the other people of these other eighty-three communities, as I mentioned from St. Anthony to Ramea pay a higher rate. What I would like to see, at least to give it a chance, is while the government may not be able to afford to give everybody the same rate of electricity at this moment, it will undertake a review and make sure it raises the rate of 500 kilowatt hours to 1,000 kilowatts at .0472.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the question is rather detailed. The hon. gentleman wants me to give an answer to the effect that we will look into it. To give an undertaking on the floor of this House would mean that the hon. gentleman would then tell his constituents, and it would be publicized, that this is what we will do, and there would be an expectation then immediately created that we are going to do just that with a resultant decrease in rates.

MR. WARREN: Why not? Why not?

MR. MARSHALL: 'Why not?' the hon. gentleman says. Why not is because of the serious problem that we have in finding financing in this Province, to finance all works.

May 14, 1984

Tape No. 1590

MJ - 2

MR. MARSHALL: As the hon. gentleman is well aware, there is a substantial contribution in the budget this year to the tune of about \$20 million by way of subsidization and this will amount to increase subsidization. so I cannot say to the hon. gentleman that, yes, we will

MR. MARSHALL:

definitely do this. We would like to see the rates for these people come down, but the fact of the matter is, we are constrained as a government, as most people are in responding to their own personal needs, by the resources that we have available.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

In view of the answer given by the minister, we have the same sales tax in this Province, we have the same tax on alcohol, we have the same tax on cigarettes, and basically income tax is the same. Why then do we have to have a different rate for electricity in this Province? I would ask the minister not to raise false expectations, but to undertake to give a proper answer. Because we have the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), we have the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), we have the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), we have the member for -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) is proceeding to make a speech and I would suggest that he should ask his question.

MR. HISCOCK:

The question I am asking, Mr. Speaker, many of the people in this Province elected members to the government side, will the government members now do their job instead of having the Opposition get up to make suggestions like this? I suggest that residents of this Province, especially in those eight-three communities, get up a petition and send it to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and we will present the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that was a question or a bad soliloquy. Does the hon. gentleman know what I mean when I say 'soliloquy'? The hon. members he mentioned are quite capable of representing their districts very, very effectively. I get representations from them almost every day.

MR. PATTERSON: Every hour.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, almost every hour on the hour. But the hon. gentlemen have an added string to their bow who represent rural areas over here, areas in the same position as the community the hon. gentleman described in that they have a group of Newfoundlanders over here who realize, Mr. Speaker, that these problems can only be overcome when we get a proper share of fairness and equity from the resources which are presently being creamed off by Central Canada, with the support of the hon. gentleman's party there opposite.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

The time for Question

Period has expired.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to the galleries thirty Grade X students from the Musgrave Harbour School with their teachers, Debbie Fry, Brian Rideout, and Reg Abbott, from the district of Fogo.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, this is answer to Question number 49, Order Paper dated April 16, 1984, asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the question is, one, the number of hospital beds retained by the Workers' Compensation Commission at this time; (a) Health Science Centre, (b) St. Clare's Hospital, (c) Grace Hospital, (d) Waterford Hospital. Eight, and they are all in the Health Sciences. The number of days beds were occupied in the calendar year 1982, '83, and '84; we do not have the stats on that, Mr. Speaker, nor do the hospitals. Cost per bed, well the cost per bed can be gotten at any hospital. April 1, 1982 was \$482 in the Health Sciences, it was \$483 in '83 at the Health Sciences, and was \$507. All the information is here, Mr. Speaker, Total cost to the Workers' Compensation Commission for retaining the beds? The cost of retaining the beds at the Health Sciences Complex is the daily rates for the beds and -

MR. ROBERTS: \$4,000 a day now.

MR. DINN: Well, right now it is about - yes, it is \$507 a day.

MR. ROBERTS: \$4,000 a day comes to \$1.46 million a year.

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, are these beds available to the general public when not occupied? The answer is yes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I give this information to the hon. member.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present to this hon. House what is probably numerically the largest petition ever to appear on the floor of this hon. House. I have the petitions here in front of me, I am not going to present them separately, individually, Mr. Speaker, that would take up a tremendous amount of time, so if hon. gentlemen will agree I will present the petition all at once. They contain 53,609 signatures from every part of the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many?

MR. NEARY: 53,609 from every part of the Province, and every district I believe is included. Two Southwest Coast districts, Grand Bank and Placentia West, topped the fifty-two districts with 2,766 signatures and 2,170 signatures respectively.

The next two districts with the most names are Bonavista South, by the way, and Bonavista North.

MR. ROBERTS: Walter Carter's name leading all the rest.

MR. NEARY: The Premier's own district of Green Bay is fifth overall with a number of signatures, 1,581 signatures.

Mr. Speaker, the petition was prepared by the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees

MR. NEARY: to protest what it considers the administration's total disregard for maintaining a high quality of modern and accessible health care system in this Province.

A few months ago the administration there opposite released a report of the Royal Commission on Hospital and Nursing Home Costs in this Province at a staggering cost of \$1.2 million to the taxpayers of this Province. This report was written by government appointees and, naturally, Mr. Speaker, it told the administration what it wanted to hear with regard to financial restraint and ways of reducing the so-called waste in the health care field. It is this report that the administration will use to hide behind as cutbacks will be made in the hospital and health care system because hospitals will have less money to keep pace with the ever growing cost of hospital expenditure.

Already, Mr. Speaker, we see the handwriting on the wall. As part of their share of the administration's restraint programme, chronic care hospitals in St. John's will be closed this Summer and that minimum Summer relief will be hired to take the place of regular personnel who will be on vacation leave this Summer. An already strained hospital system and staff will be strained even further because of these restraint measures. At the Grace General Hospital, Mr. Speaker, we are told, that twenty-five surgical beds and one operating room

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Fisheries
on a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to follow what the petition is about and the prayer of the petition. After listening for the last five minutes I have yet to hear the prayer of the petition. The hon. gentleman is making a speech on the petition. But I would like to know the prayer of the petition. Normally when a petition is tabled in the House

MR. MORGAN: of Assembly there is a prayer with the petition or of the petition asking the House of Assembly to do something for certain groups or certain people , in this case petitioners. And, Mr. Speaker, up to now there is no indication what the prayer of the petition really is asking the House for.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order.
It is usually a custom, of course, that when somebody is presenting a petition that somewhere within the five minute allocated period the prayer of the petition is mentioned. Normally I suppose it is mentioned at the beginning, but there is certainly nothing in our Standing Orders to indicate that it must be at the beginning.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: All right, Mr. Speaker. As I started to say the hon. gentleman should restraint himself. Twenty-five surgic. and one operating room will be closed from mid-June until Labour Day at the Grace General Hospital for the second year in a row. As the Newfoundland Hospital Association said last Fall in its brief to the Royal Commission, there will be more delays in people receiving elective surgery and waiting lists will get longer and longer than every before. Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the new Federal Health Act this administration would have instituted higher user fees on the people of this Province. And I say, 'Thank God, for the brave and

MR. NEARY:

sane action of the federal government in this matter, otherwise Newfoundlanders and Labradorians would have to pay more than other Canadians. But make no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, this administration will do through the backdoor what it cannot do through the frontdoor and probably find some other way to impose user-pay fees. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the administration's restraint measures are aggravating government employee relations in this Province and are a part of a deliberate effort to weaken public sector unions. We all remember the administration's Draconian legislation a few years ago that forced hospital workers off the picket lines. Mr. Speaker, this administration is not only anti-union but it is unwilling to compromise on the major issues facing the people of this Province today, whether they be bed closures, hospital cutbacks or the offshore. You must do it their way, Mr. Speaker, or stand the possibility of being crushed. I will read the prayer of the petition, 'that cutbacks in health care funding have resulted in the closure of cottage hospitals, the closure of hospital wards, a reduction in the number of hospital beds and a subsequent reduction in staffing levels; ~~and~~ that these cutbacks are seriously affecting the quality of health care in this Province and inflicting undue hardship and suffering on the citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other sections to the petition and hon. gentlemen can read them themselves.

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

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): for the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Neary) has expired.

MR.NEARY: The petition is in order, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the page to come and it on the Table of the House. I will ask a couple or three pages because I doubt very much if one page will be able to carry the petition to the table of the House.

Could we have two or three pages?

DR.COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR.COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support wholeheartedly and without any reservation the prayer of this petition. And in doing so I would like to read the prayer because the hon. Leader of the Opposition neglected to read the prayer of the petition. Now he did at one point in his remarks, his argumentative remarks, his debating-like remarks, and I do not think there is any doubt that he made such remarks - mention somewhere along the line the prayer, I will now read the prayer of the petition which he failed then to do. He read certain things from the preamble to the petition but he failed totally to read the prayer of the petition, so I would like to read the prayer of the petition. It reads, 'And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray'- so now we get into the prayer of the petition, 'that the health care system in this Province be upgraded so that quality, modern, confidential and universally accessible health care be provided for each and every citizen of Newfoundland and Labrador without additional cost to the patient.' And every member on this side of the House fully and irrevocably supports that petition.

May 14, 1984

Tape No. 1594

ah-3

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Hear, hear'

DR.COLLINS:

We are totally in favour of upgrading the quality of health care in this Province. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, our record in that regard speaks for itself.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member of the Opposition mentioned the Royal Commission. Unfortunately, he could not mention the Royal Commission without casting a slur, and I deeply regret this, a slur on the members of this commission. He cast a slur on a former Assistant Administrator of the Grace Hospital, Mr. Orsborn; he cast a slur on Mr. Paul Patey, who is a doctor at the Medical School, and he cast a slur on Mr. Pynn, who is also a member of the university, by saying, and I am editorializing now, but he suggested that these were party hacks who would only put in what the government told them to put in.

Mr. Speaker, these individuals are sincere, independent, public spirited individuals who have every right to be totally resentful, as I am, of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) casting slurs on their character by making such a remark.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, just a few other points before I make another remark. The other member the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, and I am sure he is accurate that there are 53,609 petitioners. I understand that NAPE was looking for 100,000 petitioners. They spent many months trying to get these, they went vastly beyond their deadline, but they could only get about 50 per cent of these.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition also said that government totally disregards health care. I might point out in addition to the Royal Commission, which is a guide and a very well regarded guide, that we have, over the last number of years, and even in the past budget, shown how much we are putting in capital spending to increase the hospital facilities in this Province. We have in the budget the increasing budget every year that we spend on the Medical School in the Province so that

DR. COLLINS: the number of doctors in this Province, compared to when the PC administration took over in this Province, is immeasurably greater. We spend on the nursing schools in this Province so that the number of nurses in this Province and their quality of education and their expertise is immeasurably than when the PC administration took over. And just another point showing how dedicated we are to upgrading the quality of health care in this Province, we have instituted in the hospital budget a special allocation which this year amounts to a full \$5 million in equipment, in new, modern equipment, for hospital care.

So to say that government is totally disregarding the health care of this Province is totally ridiculous, of course.

Mr. Speaker, I do have to mention that I was asked to present this petition to the House. I was asked by the President of NAPE in that regard. And having looked over the petition and having discussed it, I wrote him back and told him why I could not do that. And I told him that I could not do it for the very reasons that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) read out when he purported to be reading out the prayer but in actual fact he read out the preamble. And I told Mr. Fraser March that the preamble contained misstatements, distortions of fact and make assertions which have no validity or have no proof behind them, and for that

DR. COLLINS: reason I could not, in all conscience, put my name to a petition to this hon. House of Assembly which, in fact, did do that type of thing. So I said that, unfortunately, the wording of the petition was such that I could not support it by presenting it in the House, but as I have stated, I wholeheartedly support the prayer if one disregards those preamble remarks.

Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is not going to take very much effort to demolish the minister's arguments because it does not take very long to note that there is simply no merit in them.

If anybody is wondering why 53,000 people felt impelled - 53,000 people is 20 per cent of the electorate in this Province; it about one-tenth, about ten per cent of the total population of the Province - if anybody is wondering why such a large number of people felt impelled to sign a petition protesting this government's approach to health care, all they had to do was to listen to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the acting Minister of Health, when he spoke to the House a moment or so ago. Alligator tears and hypocrisy, which is what we got, are no substitute at all for leadership, no substitute for concern, no substitute for a caring and a proper health care policy.

Let me say that the hon. ladies and gentlemen on the other side can play whatever little games they want. This pussyfooting around, this nicky-nackering, this smither-smathering at which the

MR. ROBERTS: Minister of Finance

(Dr. Collins) is so expert, because, of course, he cannot deal with the matter on its substance, all of that is of no importance. The childish little games he is playing do not address the issues that are in the minds of many thousands of our fellow Newfoundlanders, and if the minister does not know that then I am sorry for him and, if he does know it and still chooses to carry on as he does, then I would say he will get precisely what he deserves when next he and his colleagues face the electorate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The fact remains that there are thousands of people throughout this Province, in every part of the Island and throughout Labrador, who are deeply concerned about the health care situation. They know that the Peckford administration imposed user charges and they know that the only reason those user charges died, as they ought to, in the budget which the Minister of Finance brought in a month or two ago, was that the Government of Canada, through the new Canada Health Act, ordered and forced the government of the Province to do it. Now, maybe we do not like Ottawa forcing us to do anything, that may not be the way to carry on federal/provincial relations, but the fact remains that the provinces, including this Province, under the driving dynamism of the Minister of Finance, that dynamo of activity, that bulldozer of intellectual activity, brought in user fees and we would have Medicare user fees if they had had their way, I have no doubt of that.

MR. ROBERTS: The Parliament of Canada unanimously, at the request of the Government of Canada, ended forever and a day the user-pay fees, the deterrent fees, the participation fees - call them what you want, they are all the same - the direct charges on the consumers of health care. That is one point that should be remembered.

Secondly, I want to say in the very little time that our rules allow for this type of procedure that what is needed in health care now in this Province is some leadership. We have a report of a royal commission, good, bad, or indifferent; and there is some good, some bad, and some indifferent in it, in my opinion. We have a report, the government have had it for several months, it has been made public for several months, but we do not have anything approaching a statement by the government as to what they are going to do about it. They instead seized upon just one item in it, the freeze on hospital expenditures here in St. John's, seized upon it as a crutch upon which to justify a decision they had already taken and that is to freeze hospital care expenditures in St. John's - throughout the Province for the twelve months and St. John's for three years - thus downgrading them.

And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) speaks of demeaning the commission. All I would say to him is that he and his colleagues have demeaned the commission by trying to pervert it to their own partisan purposes, their own grossly partisan purposes. This petition, Sir, has been signed by nigh on 54,000 of our fellow Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. That makes it the largest petition I have seen in my eighteen years now as a member of this House. I say to the minister and to his colleagues that they should heed it, not for partisan reasons, they can cross their own bridge on that, but they should heed it because it is a genuine cry, a cry shared

MR. ROBERTS: by thousands upon more thousands of our fellow Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, because it is a cry that is from the heart and speaks genuinely and with sincerity. I support the petition, Sir, unlike the minister who says he supports it but is so hypocritical that he will not even introduce it into the House. It is a shame, a shame, a shameful act by a shameful government in a shameful way. Thank you, Sir.

ooo

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Before we go on to Orders -

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member risen on a point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I am in the never - never land, if I may for a second. Canada today has a new Governor General, Madam Sauve was sworn in, as I understand it, this morning in Ottawa. I wonder if it might be appropriate, and I forgot to mention this when Your Honour had called the House to order at 3:00 p.m., for the House to unanimously direct the Speaker to send a letter or a resolution, perhaps, to the new Governor General simply welcoming her accession to office and reaffirming our loyalty as members of the House, and speaking for the people of this Province, to the Office of Governor General which, of course, is the Crown's representative in Canada as a whole. If I may make that suggestion, Sir, I would.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: From our point of view that is entirely appropriate and we associate ourselves with any letter going out as a unanimous resolution of this House of Assembly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Motion number 1, which is the Budget debate. It was adjourned last day by the hon. the member for Mount Scio(Mr. Barry), who is not here today, so the Chair is prepared to recognize another hon. member.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know if I have the right notes here or not, but I have a note here which says that the hon.member has spoken to this debate.

MR. HISCOCK: No, I have spoken to the amendment only.

MR. SPEAKER: I will check it out, but that is the note that I have here. I will check it out if somebody else -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. If the hon. gentleman says he has spoken to the amendment, surely Your Honour should accept his word. Now, if Your Honour wishes to,check it later, but if the hon. gentleman says he spoke only on the amendment and not on the main motion, surely he should be allowed to carry on, Your Honour, unless Your Honour was to adjourn the House to check.

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible) a chance to check.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I say to my friend from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), the Speaker is honour bound to accept the word of the member just as each of us is honour bound to accept the word of other members. The Speaker is only a member; he is our first member, but he is only a member.

MR. SIMMS: He is not disputing his word.

MR. ROBERTS: He certainly is.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I have a note here from the Table indicating that the hon. member spoke on Monday, May 7, 1984.

MR. NEARY: On the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: No, on the main motion. The amendment was introduced on May 8, 1984. That is why I mentioned it. I am willing to recess, if that is the wish of the House, or I will recognize another member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Recognize another member.

MR. SPEAKER: I will check it out and advise the hon. member.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak in this budget debate especially since I have some of my young constituents in the galleries. I suppose in leading off this afternoon one could point to many issues that one could make in a budget speech. One could look at, for example, some of the problems that are around this Province in regards to taxes, in regards to roads, in regards to forestry, the development of forestry, the development of fishery, the development of the offshore and

MR. TULK: some of the problems that are related to our public service issues. As I said, Mr. Speaker, if you wanted to talk about roads, for example, in this Province there is no trouble, absolutely no trouble to point to a government that shows a great deal of lack of progress in that area. The roads in this Province are steadily deteriorating. In my own district since this government took office, since 1972, there has been very little effort put into building any roads or upgrading any roads that were formerly there. There is absolutely nothing being done, and this is an important area for the budget because we heard the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) this afternoon talk about all of the things that the present government has been doing in the building of roads this year, not only to create employment, he said, but to build new roads in the Province, well, there has been very little done by this government except in the areas where we have had federal funding. For example, the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) who is always so ready to criticize the federal government, should be very, very glad indeed for the funds that were given to him last year to build a connecting highway to this city from his own district. So, Mr. Speaker, we can certainly point the finger at this government and say perhaps that road conditions in this Province have deteriorated since this government came into power. We did have a fairly good road system and we were making progress in that particular area of the Province, but since this government has taken office very little has happened.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to you can look at the government's budget as a detailed plan of what they intend to do and what they are accomplishing and what they hope to accomplish this year, well, Mr. Speaker, let us

MR. TULK: take a look at our forestry resource and what has happened to it and what does this government intend to do about it. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) a couple of years ago announced a great silviculture programme for this Province to rebuild our forests in the Province so that our children, and indeed some of the people who are sitting in the galleries today, perhaps, could have had a good future in the forest industry, but that is not happening in this Province. Our forest industry, our forests, the raw material, the wood in this Province is fastly becoming depleted and there is very little to look forward to in terms of the forest industry.

MR. TULK: The people of Corner Brook know very well what this government does and what it is doing and the uncertainty that it is leaving for people who live in that city in regard to a pulp and paper industry. And as I suggested to the minister so often in this House, and as I will keep suggesting to him, the real problem with Bowater in Corner Brook, and the real problem that he is going to face with Abitibi-Price in Stephenville and in Grand Falls, while I will not say it has nothing to do, it has little to do with the fact that it needs modernization. The real problem for those people, Mr. Speaker, is a cheap wood supply and it is just not there anymore. And until we reach the stage where we consider the forests to be a farm, to farm it as we would farm land, then I am afraid that our forest industry in this Province is going to deteriorate even further.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see there are very few taxes being added this year and there is a very simple reason for that, and that is that the Government of this Province has taxed just about everything that they can find to tax in Newfoundland. As a matter of fact taxes have risen so high that they are becoming unbearable to most of the people in this Province. They have become the government of the hidden tax. They have taxed everything from skidoos to rabbit licence, to moose licence, everything that they can lay their hands on to tax.

MR. NEARY: Marriage certificates, birth certificates.

MR. TULK: Birth certificates, marriage certificates, name up some more. How many? There must be thousands and thousands of areas almost where this government has increased taxes. They have a floating tax on gasoline, every time the

MR. TULK: price of fuel rises, every time the price of gasoline rises, this government benefits. So they do not need to do any more taxing because they have taxed just about everything there is and in many cases they have hidden taxes that rise when the price of goods rise anyway.

The 12 per cent sales tax, we pointed out to that paragon of economic wisdom, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), we pointed out to him some two years ago that by raising the SSA tax to 12 per cent he had indeed reached a point where he was not going to get any more revenue for the government, where indeed he was going to get less. And he laughed at us. He told us that it was nonsense, that he would get more money. Well, we have seen the result of that 12 per cent sales tax. We have seen a lessening of consumer spending, and we have seen the Minister of Finance not collect as much money as he had hoped he would.

So there you have it, there you have a government that really has laid out no plans. We have a Five Year Plan that was put out in 1979, it is now 1984 and the Minister of Finance still tells us that he is on the first year of that plan, this is year one. Well, I suppose in 1991 it will still be year one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, time is fast running out on me, but one of the areas that is obviously of vital concern to this Province is the fishery. Now we have gone into that in this House, we have debated that and we have made certain points to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and we are glad to see him back from the sunny South, he looks fine and brown, he looks roasted -

MR. NEARY: He is like a brown egg.

MR. TULK: - but we should realize that really the people who are getting roasted in this Province are the inshore fishermen, the people who are being toasted by the policies of the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who spends most of his time gallivanting around the world making us believe that he is selling fish, and, when he is not doing that spending his time down South getting browned up himself. We see a Minister of Fisheries that at the present time

MR. TULK: We see the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) at the present time, has a love affair going-- I suppose that is still going, I am not sure, we are not sure those days whether the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) and the Provincial Minister of Fisheries are still in love with each other. . . .

MR. NEARY: They had a little tiff there a couple of weeks ago.

MR. TULK: We noticed a little tiff when we brought up to the Provincial Minister of Fisheries from this side about the Salmon Management Plan that the federal minister has put into effect.

AN HON. MEMBER: You read about it in The Telegram.

MR. TULK: Well, the Minister of Fisheries has a very peculiar way of doing things. He is a very peculiar chap. He went off to Ottawa, sat down and agreed with the Federal Minister of Fisheries. And when we on this side pointed out to him the inadequacies of that policy on salmon management, then all at once he became concerned, went down and met with the Fishermen's Union, set up this great meeting with his buddy, Mr. De Bane in Ottawa, and then when that meeting did not materialize, he started, of course, with what this government are famous for, and that is negotiating by Telex.

Now, as far as I know the Minister of Fisheries-- and we will get to this tomorrow in Question Period, we had to wait today to see if he was back and to see that he got into his seat and got straightened away, but we will get to this tomorrow in Question Period-- as far as I know the Minister of Fisheries has still not, after three or four weeks, got a reply from the Federal Minister of Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: If he has he is keeping it to himself.

MR. TULK: If he has he is keeping it to himself. Well, he probably has not seen it because I do not think he has been in his office for the last three or four weeks.

MR. NEARY: You cannot get these things in Hawaii, you know.

MR. TULK: Is that where he was? I thought it was the Southwest Pacific or something.

In any case, the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has failed to act on that issue except to send one little Telex to his buddy in Ottawa. And I do not know what connects those two gentlemen, I do not know what it is. Last year this time they were rowing like two dogs, like two roosters. But this year, for the past six or seven months since that restructuring programme was signed, that famous restructuring programme, 'Morgan' and De Bane have been like Siamese twins, and we have seen them do nothing except to agree, the government has done nothing except to agree with the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), many times to the detriment of the Newfoundland fishermen.

We have seen the situation in the last year, and there is nothing in this Budget to indicate that anything is going to be any different, we have seen the situation in the last year where the Provincial Minister of Fisheries has failed, and has failed dismally to do anything for inshore fishermen. We were told last September that when the restructuring deal was signed that everything would be great, everything would be wonderful, everything would be worked out for the Newfoundland fishery. Well, Mr. Speaker, you talk to the inshore fishermen in places like Musgrave Harbour, places like Ladle Cove, and places like Fogo Island, and places like Lumsden, you talk to the inshore fishermen in those areas and they will tell you that they are facing this year certain bankruptcy. There is absolutely no doubt that a lot of those fishermen this year may not be able to put boats in the water.

MR. TULK: And it comes about as a result of a government that in 1980, and I will keep repeating this in this House, appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into what had to be done with the inshore fishery. That Royal Commission made certain recommendations and, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that those recommendations are still gathering dust on the shelf. There has been no action, absolutely no action by this Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) or by this government. And so we see our inshore fishermen still getting the same price, we must keep repeating this, still getting the same price for fish that they got in 1978. As a matter of fact, from 1978 to 1980 they suffered a decrease in the price of fish, lost the two and a half cents subsidy, a two cent subsidy by the federal government and a half cent subsidy by the provincial government was taken away from them.

We have seen them in that situation where in 1981 they were getting less. Now they are back, as of last year, they are back to the same price that they were getting in 1977 and 1978.

MR. TULK: What has happened in the meantime is that we have seen interest rates on loans have risen some 3 per cent, we have seen the cost of gear triple, we have seen the cost of fuel more than double, and yet those people are expected to make a living out of the same price per pound for fish that they got in 1978 and that is an impossible situation.

In the meantime, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), at this time of year in particular when the inshore fishery is about to start, has put no effort into getting fish companies in this Province to negotiate a fair price, has put little effort into marketing. The marketing of fish has not improved substantially in this Province over the last ten years. We are still watching the ticker tape of Fishery Products ticking across the screen, and anybody who loves fish - and I am a lover of fish myself - but if you looked at some of the advertisements and some of the advertising that we do to sell our fishermen's catches, then you would definitely get turned off from eating it.

So, Mr. Speaker, there you have the fisheries policy and the direction that the Throne Speech and this budget have set out for the people of this Province. It is an absolute shame. There has been nothing happening in that area and I suspect there will be nothing happening anyway.

Mr. Speaker, one of the planks of this government, which I understand that today the Premier is quoted in the paper as saying, is that he will stake his political future on what happens with the offshore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need to go into any great detail as to what has happened

MR. TULK: in the offshore. I think it must be said that if there is a legacy that the Premier of this Province is going to leave, a political legacy that he has already left, it is the fact that he has failed to gain anything for Newfoundland in that deal. And I know that hon. gentlemen on the other side, if there is enough life left in the government on the other side, will probably rise up and say, 'Oh, yes, the Liberals gave it all away.' What we have seen develop on that side of the House, particularly with the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), and, I would suggest, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - the rest of them do not have too much to say anyway, they are just told what they should say - but what we have seen develop with those two gentlemen in particular, and, I suggest, the Premier, is paranoia. They are afraid to sit down at a negotiating table, they are afraid to sign a deal, no matter how good a deal looks today, they are afraid to sign a deal lest somewhere down the road, say, ten or fifteen or twenty years down the road, somebody will look back and say, 'That was a bad deal for Newfoundland.' And we agree on this side of the House that if you look back to the 1966 deal that was signed on the Upper Churchill, it was a bad deal, absolutely. But if you look at the price of fuel in 1966, a barrel of fuel in 1966, I think, cost \$2.50, approximately; today, that same barrel of fuel costs something like \$34, and I suggest that nobody could have predicted what was going to happen to fuel. And we know that there is a direct relationship between the cost of fuel and the cost of electricity. As a matter of fact, one other point that should be kept in mind is that whatever legislation was passed in this House on the Churchill Falls

MR. TULK: deal, it was a unanimous decision of both sides of the House and some of the gentlemen who sit on that side sat on this side - and the Opposition at that time was very small, I think there were three of them, three Tory members in this House - but the Opposition, the three of them voted unanimously for whatever legislation the government of the day put forward.

MR. TULK: Be that as it may, what has happened as a result of history in this Province and what has happened to the Premier and what has happened to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) and what has happened to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - those three gentlemen in particular - is that they have become so scared that history will judge them as having done a poor job, that they are afraid to sit down to a negotiating table and work out a deal with anyone. And I suggest to you that no matter what happens politically in this Province, we will see this Premier always looking for the hidden agenda as he looked for in the fisheries restructuring deal. And the Premier will have to pay the political consequences and he will have to pay the consequences in his own mind of what has gone on with the offshore deal. And we know what it is, Mr. Speaker. If the federal government of the day, regardless of whether that federal government is Tory or Liberal, the truth is if the federal government of the day decides that they are going to develop that without coming to Newfoundland at all, if they decided that they wanted to develop it from Halifax, along with the oil companies, as a result of a court decision that was just handed down, the legal truth is they have the right to do that and they can do it. We would hope that they do not. The truth is that the Premier now says he is on his last legs, he has his last straw in trying to go across Canada and convince the rest of Canadians that he is really not a greedy fellow, that he is really not a fellow who likes to fight, he will not pick a fight with anyone. Well, I would suggest to him that after the years that he spent bashing everything in Upper Canada, or bashing anybody he can find except looking at his own government and seeing what the problems are with that, I would suggest to him that really what he is doing is wasting another \$100,000 or \$150,000

MR. TULK: of Newfoundland taxpayers' money. The Premier, by putting the offshore oil issue prematurely in court, lost Newfoundland's greatest chance to perhaps do something in the area of forestry, to do something in the area of the fishery, to do something in the area of education and so on.

Mr. Speaker, let me come back to one other thing, what some people would consider to be a very meager and perhaps not a very exciting idea, and that is the idea of water and sewer systems in this Province, and then perhaps I can get onto some other things. Some of the people who are sitting in the galleries today are now in their thirteenth year trying to get a water and sewer system finished in their community. On Fogo Island studies have been done to show the unhealthy, the unsanitary conditions that exist with drinking water. The government goes out every year to Carmanville and spends thousands and some years hundreds of thousands of dollars to try to drag water around in a truck and really they are only putting good money after bad.

MR. TULK: And I know for a fact, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) has admitted in this House, that she has gone to Cabinet and asked Cabinet - and I would say the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) probably knows this as well - she has gone to Cabinet and asked that funds be approved for those three areas, and, because they are not in a Tory district, because people in this Province have the right to vote the way that they want to vote without expecting punishment and because this government wishes to punish people, as they said to the people of Terra Nova, 'I sit on the government chest', is what this government said to the people of Terra Nova, 'and unless you vote for us you are not getting anything. If you vote for us you are going to get one forty-fifth of the budget.' Now I suppose after the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) has crossed the House, we have done the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) a real favour by saying now he is going to get one forty-fourth. But the Minister of Municipal Affairs I know, being the type of lady that she is - and she is a good lady and a good administrator and a good minister - that minister I know has gone to Cabinet and said, 'Yes, we need to do something in those three or four areas, those three or four communities.' Of course, the rest of the Tory ministers, the people who wish to punish people for the way they want to vote, have said, 'No, sorry, we are going to turn that down.' Now, Mr. Speaker, those people will eventually get what they deserve whether they get it with a Tory government or not.

Now, let us look at one other thing, one other part of the legacy of the Premier, the Upper Churchill contract. As I said before, there is nobody on this side of the House, in hindsight, or nobody on that side will say that that deal, looking at it from hindsight, was not

MR. TULK: a bad deal. It was, But as I said before, we have to remember that everybody in this House at the time, in 1966, thought it was a wonderful deal.

MR. NEARY: They should take the blame for letting it go through without any opposition.

MR. TULK: That is right, That is right.
If we on this side of the House let that kind of deal go through now -

MR. NEARY: We would be just as much to blame as they are.

MR. TULK: - and in five years time were to look back and say it is a terrible deal, well, then we would be to blame as an Opposition for not trying to hold it up -

MR. NEARY: More to blame..

MR. TULK: more to blame than perhaps the government, right. But yet the Opposition party of the day, which is the government, allowed that deal to go through and indeed voted for it.

MR. NEARY: That is exactly right.

MR. TULK: So, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is a list and we have seen a litany of broken promises and broken dreams and failures by this government. When this government came into office on April 6, 1982, I would suggest to you that most Newfoundlanders looked forward to the future with a great deal of hope, and what they have had, as I said before, is despair, that is all they have been given. We have got a Social Services Department and I do not know whether it is the Minister of Social Services' (Mr. Hickey) policy or whether it is the government's Social Services policy but what we are saying to young people and what we are saying to older people in this Province today is criminal. And I am not talking about the freeloaders. I am as much against and would encourage the Minister of Social Services to bring in any type of regulation or legislation against the

May 14, 1984

Tape No. 1603

MJ - 3

MR. TULK: freeloaders as anybody in this House. But when you see senior citizens in this Province being required to support a twenty-one year old son or a twenty-one year old daughter because they cannot find employment! In many cases the youth in this Province, the younger people in this Province cannot find employment. I pity young people, I sympathize with them, and I do not want to lay out gloom and doom to them, but I sympathize with them and I pity them. I sympathize with anybody today who is a young person coming out of school, whether he is coming out of college or coming out of vocational school or coming out of Trades College, Fisheries College or wherever he or she is coming from,

MR. TULK: I pity them having to go out and try to find a job in Newfoundland today because the jobs are just not there. This government has not created the jobs.

How much more time do we have left?

MR. PATTERSON: By leave.

MR. TULK: Oh, I can go on. We saw the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) point out this evening that the unemployment rate has risen tremendously in this Province. If there is one standard of measurement in Newfoundland that should spread shame on the heads of hon. members opposite it is the statement by the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council that not one new job, not one extra job was created in Newfoundland last year.

MR. NEARY: We lost jobs.

MR. TULK: Did you hear that? No, it was equal. It balanced out that there are the same number of jobs in the Newfoundland economy this year as last year, no difference, it balanced out. Now that is a scandal, it is a scandal on this government, it is a scandal on their heads what has happened.

Five minutes and then I am finished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. TULK: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, we should be looking at a blueprint in the budget, we should be looking at a government that is laying out its plans for the coming year, what they are going to do. And if you look at it I think we see the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) putting \$500,000 into the Venture Capital Programme. Now that is a tremendous

MR.TULK: amount of money if you look at what development has to take place in Newfoundland. The minister knows it is a token, it is just something to say that they have a Venture Capital Programme. That is all it is.

MR.NEARY: And then they have the gall to brag about it.

MR.TULK: And then he has the gall when you ask him in this House to look up -

MR.WINDSOR: A half million dollars more than the feds are putting into it.

MR.TULK: - and say, 'Wonderful.' If there was not a job -

MR.NEARY: Who is creating all the jobs in Newfoundland if not the federal government with its make-work projects?

MR.WINDSOR: That is like the philosophy I heard you speak about on the radio over the weekend, any agreement is better than none. You want to give it away again.

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR.TULK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) should not look up and be proud of what his government has done. He should hang his head in shame. And let me tell him this: As I said to the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) the first time, I believe, she spoke in this House, let me say this to him, that while we on this side do not believe that make-work programmes are the answer to Newfoundland's economy, let me say this to him that if you took away the make-work programmes that the federal government are putting in this Province, what my father would call the Dirty 1930s would be clean. There are districts in this Province and there are

MR. TULK: places in this Province that if you did not have those make-work programmes you would have 100 per cent unemployment and 100 per cent welfare. There are places in this Province of that nature, yet he has the gall, as do other members on the opposite side to say.

MR. WINDSOR: You are all for handouts.

MR. TULK: Who is calling them handouts?

MR. WINDSOR: I am.

MR. TULK: I am not. I think they belong to us.

MR. WINDSOR: You are delighted with it.

MR. TULK: I am not delighted with it but I think they belong to us. Do not be so narrow-minded, you should open up your mind.

MR. NEARY: We should be thankful. Do you want to starve the people? That is what they would do, starve the people.

MR. TULK: Sure, that is the policy of a Tory government. It does not matter about people, it only matters that you stand up, wrap yourself in the flag and try to get the nationalistic blood of people in this Province boiling, ~~That~~ is all that matters, so you can win an election.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have only a couple of minutes left so let me say this, that there is nothing in the budget that is absolutely new, there is nothing in this budget that is new at all, there is nothing in this budget that has either bit of creativity in it. It is a tired Tory document, it is mindless, it is uncreative and it is dull. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward): Shall I put the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition(Mr. Neary) on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is Your Honour in a position to rule now whether my colleague will be permitted to speak, or has he spoken?

MR. MARSHALL: It has already been ruled on.

MR. NEARY: He has ruled. Oh, okay. Fair enough. Let her go, what odds.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to accept the said motion? All those in favour 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the 'Ayes' have it. On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

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

On Motion

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

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means have considered the matters to them referred, directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, presently, by leave.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Finance(Dr. Collins) I wish to advise that I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: Please rise for a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor addressed to the hon. the Minister of Finance.

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending the 31st. day of March 1985, by way of further supply and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act of 1867 I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

(sgd)-----
W. Anthony Paddon,
Lieutenant-Governor."

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor together with the amount contained therein be referred to a Committee of Supply.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. the President of
the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I move that
the total amount contained in the message from His Honour
the Lieutenant-Governor(\$1,248,484,500) be carried.

Motion, that the total
of the estimates contained in the message (\$1,248,484,500)
be carried, carried.

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. the member for
Kilbride.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Mr. Speaker, the Committee
of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred,
have passed the amount of (\$1,248,484,500) contained in the
estimates of supply and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received
and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, presently, by
leave.

On motion, that the House
resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the
report of the Committee of Supply with respect to the
estimates for the fiscal year 1984-1985, together with a
resolution and a bill consequent thereto, Mr. Speaker left
the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RESOLUTION

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 1985, the sum of

one billion two hundred and forty-eight million four hundred and eighty-four thousand five hundred dollars (\$1,248,484,500).

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

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. the member for Kilbride.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and report having passed a resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion, report received and adopted, bill ordered read a first, second and third time now, by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Five 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. (Bill No.23)

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain resolution, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Order, please!

We are now discussing a resolution pertaining to Bill No. 26.

RESOLUTION

That it is expedient
to bring in a measure to authorize the raising from time
to time by way of loan on the credit of the Province the
sum of two hundred and twenty million dollars
(\$220,000,000.00) and such additional sum or sums of
money as may be required to retire, repay, renew or
refund securities issued under any Act of the Province.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions I would like to ask the Minister of Finance before this bill passes. It has to do with the cushion that the hon. gentleman keeps telling us about, but before I come to that I would like to ask the hon. gentleman one question in connection with a Ministerial Statement that the hon. gentleman made today when he announced a \$6.3 million additional for local roads. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House where that money is coming from? Do I understand the hon. gentleman, correctly, that that \$6.3 million is coming out of current account? It was not clear in the hon. gentleman's statement, Mr. Chairman, where the money was coming from. If the \$6.3 million is coming out of current account, well then perhaps the hon. gentleman should tell us where he is going to get it. It would be interesting to hear the answer to that, Mr. Speaker, when we have a deficit in current account this last three years, where the hon. gentleman is going to find the money.

And, you know, it is most unusual, Mr. Chairman, very unusual; here we were debating the budget, putting estimates through the House, and the hon. gentleman gets up and announces, before the Budget Speech is finished, that he is going to ask for a Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant for \$6.3 million, right while we are passing estimates in this House. It is unheard of, Mr. Chairman. They just do not know what they are doing. They are fumbling around in the dark, they do not know 'B' from a bull's hoof when it

MR. NEARY: comes to fiscal matters. Here we are passing estimates, debating the budget, and the minister gets up and announces a Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time in the history of this House when the House was sitting, let alone when you were debating estimates, when the House was sitting you were not permitted by law, by the Financial Administration Act, you were not permitted to obtain a Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant. And here we are in the Budget Speech and the minister is up announcing that they are going to ask for a Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant for \$6.3 million to carry out a road programme that was unforeseen. What the minister is saying is this was unforeseen when we brought down the budget, an unforeseen expenditure when we brought down the budget. And what did he blame it on? He blamed it on the sleet storm, because the poles came down, and on the failure in the fishery. That is what the hon. gentleman blamed it on. What a gigantic bluff the hon. gentleman is, He knows as much now about fiscal matters in this Province as my eyeball knows about snipe shooting. The hon. gentleman is a complete and utter ignorant incompetent when it comes to fiscal matters. And, Mr. Chairman, the sooner that the Cabinet shuffle that we are hearing the speculation about, the sooner that happens the better for all concerned. The hon. gentleman is taking Newfoundland and Labrador down the financial tube as fast as he can, Mr. Chairman.

In 1983 the hon. gentleman came into the House and asked us for a \$72.4 million cushion, flexibility. I hope the hon.

MR. NEARY:

gentleman is paying attention to what I am saying. In 1983, the hon. gentleman asked this House for a \$72.4 million cushion. That is a pretty expensive cushion. Flexibility, he calls it. This year he is asking for \$75 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like for the hon. gentleman to give this House an accounting. It is time that the hon. gentleman accounted to this House for that \$72.4 million cushion that he asked for last year, in the fiscal year that ended March 31, 1984. What became of the \$72.4 million? Was it invested? Did we get the interest on it? Or was it used to try to reduce the deficit, as we suspect the hon. gentleman is doing and is going to do with this \$75 million cushion that he is asking for now? These are pretty expensive cushions; \$72.4 million and \$75 million, Mr. Chairman, is a lot of money. As they say in the United States, it ain't hay! It just goes to show how irresponsible the hon. gentleman is in his estimating. He comes into the House and just nonchalantly, in a very casual way, in 1983, 'Give us \$72.4 million for a cushion,' This year it is \$75 million. They do not call it a cushion now, they are calling it flexibility. Well, the hon. gentleman should tell this House what happened to the \$72.4 million cushion that they had last year. Did they indeed borrow that amount of money? If so, was it put in an account? Was it put in trust? Where was it put in trust? How much interest was accumulated on it? Or did they spend any of that money in the last fiscal year? Because what the minister is saying is that the \$75 million cushion that he is asking for will not be spent this year, it is merely a cushion in

MR. NEARY: case the interest rates fall and in case the bond market is receptive.

DR. COLLINS: You know what it is for.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says, 'Well, we will not borrow this.' But I would like to know what happened last year. We happen to think that they are asking for this cushion - a pretty expensive cushion, a little more than a pincushion, I would say.

MR. TULK: Why do you think they are doing it?

MR. NEARY: The reason I think they are doing it is because my hon. colleague raised it when I was out in my district last week. I think they are borrowing this \$75 million because, Mr. Chairman, they are expecting a larger deficit than they forecast, than the minister told us in his Budget Speech that we were going to have in this Province in current account.

MR. TULK: So you can ask yourself the question of where the cushion went last year.

MR. NEARY: That is what I just asked. I just asked the minister. It was \$72.4 million last year. I would say the deficit was more than they projected, and I would suspect, although I will wait for the hon. gentleman's answer, that the cushion, the flexibility they asked for last year, was already used up when this year's budget was brought down in this House.

MR. TULK: Right.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, if that is so, if we are right dead on, then I would suspect the laws of this Province have been broken, annihilated, the House has been misled and the people have been misled, and it is time to get the Comptroller of the Treasury and the Auditor General on to it. It is a very serious matter

May 14, 1984

Tape 1608

EC - 3

MR. NEARY: if that is what happened. But
I will wait for the minister's answer. Maybe we are just
being a little bit too suspicious on this side of the House.

MR. TULK: What if they do not use it?

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what I am asking you, \$72.4 million, what happened to it? The minister told us last year, by the way, that if they did indeed borrow that money that it would be put in a fund, none of it would be spent in the last fiscal year, it would be put in a fund and we would collect the interest on it.

MR. TULK: Ask yourself another question: Did he come into the House and ask for a refund to cover the debt situation?

MR. NEARY: No, he did not. Anyway, we will anxiously wait for the answer. Now, Mr. Chairman, if hon. gentleman gives us a satisfactory answer to that question then, Mr. Chairman, we will all be interested. But if he cannot give us a satisfactory answer, if he cannot tell us what happened to that \$72.4 million that was budgeted for last year for flexibility, for a cushion, then I am afraid they are in serious trouble, Mr. Chairman, and we will have to get on to the Comptroller of the Treasury and the Auditor General and ask them to investigate it because that money was not allocated. All the House did was give the minister the approval to borrow it in case market conditions were favourable and the interest rate was down. They were not authorized to spend one red cent of that \$72.4 million. No more than the minister will have to assure us that they are not going to spend one red cent of the \$75 million, pillow, cushion, or whatever he calls what he is asking for now.

MR. TULK: A feathery pillow, I think.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, there might be a lot of feathers in that pillow.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will take my seat and anxiously await for the hon. gentleman's answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, with regard to asking for interim supply and we find out that because of the international monetary rates are going up the government has now decided to refrain from borrowing and look to the future and hoping in the Fall interest rates will be down. Of course, we all know many of the reasons it is dependent upon is as a result of a federal election in the United States and because of this, of course, what is happening is that spending is getting out of control. The President is trying to get re-elected and he is not carrying out the fiscal policy that he would like to, thereby putting pressure upon the international markets and the Canadian markets and we find ourselves in the same situation.

But in view of the fact what we are finding with this government that it is borrowing, as we said, and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) was quite proud in saying it, \$142 million in capital construction. We find we are taking the money and getting into capital construction and then once the buildings are built we run into great difficulty then of running them, the hospitals, running the museums, running the schools, and we find out then we have to cut back on cleaning from five days a week to three days a week.

MR. HISCOCK: So we have what is called an approach to government that looks to the Band-Aid approach and we go from one crisis to another. Hopefully this government feels that in the future, within the next two or three years, that the economy will be brighter and people's memories will be short and the people who elected the new member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) will hopefully realize, in a couple of years time if the economy is better, they will get some of the benefits and some of the promises that the Deputy Premier made. If the economy keeps going like it is, then I would say there are a lot of members on the government side who are in for an awakening and maybe some on the Opposition side also as a result of people disenchanted with government. What is happening is we find that for the past thirty years or more in Confederation there has always been an attitude in government and the people that you have to have somebody on the government side to get anything. Well, back in 1966 there were thirty-nine on the government side and three on the Opposition and everybody said, 'Well, you have to get on the government side'. Well, they got on the government side and they found out within less than four years the government was overtaken by a new government. And we find out now that with forty-five seats on the government side that when I asked about hydro rates we do not hear the person from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) wanting equalization rates, we do not hear the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews), we do not hear the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and we do not hear the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart); it has to come from an Opposition member. And this is why a lot of these districts in particular elected non-Liberals to these seats so that they could have somebody on the government side and get the facilities. And they found out that once you got on the government side it is like a convention; once you have the convention and once

MR. HISCOCK: you get a committed delegate then you no longer have any manoeuvring power, that they tuck you away in their pocket and then forget about you. And this is like the government; once they have the seat, then you can keep your own seat warm and forget about the people in Bloomfield, forget about the people in Roncontre East, forget about the people in Ramea and Burgeo, forget about the people in other areas of the Province who are on diesel. So we find out that we are borrowing great amounts of money, we have a high rate of taxation, but what are we doing with it? We find out that we have to close down chronic care beds on a scale that was not known in this Province before. And we also find out that we have creation of Grade XII and yet here are the students in Grade XII having to go out on walkatons, having to get into turkey teas, having to get into other fund raising events so that they can raise money for computers for their schools, so they can raise money for typewriters for the schools. All the things that this government was going to do to re-organize Grade XII! It told them to use the gymnasiums told them to use the art rooms, told them to use their home economic rooms, the library rooms and the science rooms for classrooms now and then tell the students, 'Okay, if you want computers in your schools and you want that class, then go out and raise half the money or more yourself'. So we have now, Mr. Chairman, gone from a government that in this Province over fifteen years ago put

MR. HISCOCK: education and health an extremely high priority, to now have a government that is more into giving people the tender for building a convention centre downtown instead of awarding it. So that is the type of attitude we have, Mr. Chairman. We have one that has gone completely to complete private enterprise and forgetting all together the elements of our society that makes a society and that, of course, is one of health, education and social needs.

But on this part we have asked various ministers, and I must say the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has been extremely busy in the past three or four months with the reorganization and the things. We have seen him agree with the Feds, we have seen him disagree, we have seen him agree with his own members and disagree, we have seen him agree with the unions and disagree. And one begins to wonder if he has a schizophrenic personality or if he takes a stand dictated by opportunity at the time, or is he, as the minister says, flexible? But I asked in this House questions about the Northern Development Corporation and I was assured by the Premier himself that everything will be in place by the time the fishing season started. The people on the Labrador Coast still do not know who is going to supply them with gasoline. Who is going to operate their plants? Is there going to be a salmon buyer in place on June 11? These are the questions along the Labrador Coast that are still not answered and these are the questions that the Premier ended up saying would be answered in due time. And people are now wondering whether they should repair their salmon nets and whether they should get into it, in view of the regulations.

MR. HISCOCK: The other part that I have mentioned, and I still say that I do not understand is why in this government we have the same sales tax, we have the same income tax, we have the same tax on gasoline, on fuel, on diesel, on building supplies, etc., and you can go on all through the different taxes, and the same rate on birth certificates. And this was the government, Mr. Chairman, that was not going to raise the taxes since 1979 and as a member of the Government Services Committee I brought up in the Committee and to show you how the backbenchers do not do their job, and not only not do their job but prevent the Opposition from doing its job, I asked in that Committee that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) table a list of rate increases from 1979 to now, in 1984, and what I wanted to do to prove the point was that marriage licences have gone up, Crown lands applications have gone up, we have also had increases in registration of deeds, we have also had increases for the use of parks, and a day rate which was not even there before, and we also find out that last year they brought in that you could get title to your Crown land, instead of paying \$25 a year you could buy it for \$1500, and if you did not buy it last year you would have to pay \$2500 this year. And the other one of course was the birth certificate. The birth certificate has gone up since 1979 to now \$10 for each birth certificate. But at least last year, when they had it for \$5, you could get a laminated birth certificate that could last you approximately, I suppose, as long as you would want it. Now you have a piece of not substandard paper that you have to pay \$10 for, that you have to

MR. HISCOCK: send in
the mail or keep in your wallet. Because one of the things
that we need in this Province - and the Minister of
Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) may find this
rather funny - is if you go to a bank or you want to cash
a cheque, you have to produce IDs, which is why they have
Social Insurance and Medicare cards in plastic and they used to
have laminated birth certificates last year but they do not
have them now, but they ask for two or three pieces of identification.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. member's time
has elapsed.

MR. HISCOCK: In concluding, Mr. Chairman,
I would just like to say that I hope the minister will look
into the problem and reduce some of the taxes.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the
Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked a number of
questions and I think I probably should answer those
first.

Now, the hon. the member for
Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), if I remember correctly, asked
me some questions last day that I did not get an opportunity
to answer. Possibly I might get back to those. But he
is not here so possibly I just could comment on the hon.
the Leader of the Opposition's remarks and respond to his
questions.

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition first asked: Is this new money? and secondly,
Was it on current account? - that is, the \$6.3 million
I announced today as additional to the local roads

DR. COLLINS: programme, if I can use that term, that is, the roads programme that is not a cost-shared programme. The first answer is yes, it is new money because in the budget it was \$19 million point something or other and now it is \$23 million point something or other. So it is new money. It is not, though, on current account, it is on capital account. So the only thing that could have an effect on this year's current account would be any additional interest payments. But we do not anticipate that we will need to actually borrow the money to supply this additional programme until later in the year and then the interest will not be due until next year.

MR. NEARY: Where will you get the money?

DR. COLLINS: Well, it will be an added amount to our borrowing programme, which will be accommodated by this bill. This bill allows us to have a bit of flexibility in case, you know, something comes up that needs to be accommodated, and this is an example of it. So the loan bill will allow us this flexibility and we will therefore be able to borrow that amount within this loan bill if it is passed.

Now, the hon. leader also asked, Why bring up this thing now when we are debating the budget? If there is any additional expenditure to what is indicated in the estimates - and I would remind hon. members, and particularly the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that we have now passed the estimates. As a matter of fact, today we passed the budget itself. But at the time I made the statement, we had passed the estimates. We have not actually adopted the budget, as such, but the estimates were through. So if you bring in any additional expenditure to those that have been

May 14, 1984

Tape 1612

EC - 3

DR. COLLINS: accepted by the House, and the
estimates, of course, are what the House accepted, one
has to bring in a Special Warrant.

DR. COLLINS: Whether you bring it in early or late it does not matter. You have to bring it in some time. We were indicating that we were projecting a need for this extra expenditure and I was indicating that we will have to bring in a special warrant, some time in the not too distant future.

Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) also said, Well, why do it at all? It is very strange to be doing it at this time. The point is that if the need is there you just do not not respond to it because it seems strange or it is not quite according to the usual practice or whatever. If the need is there you have to respond to it and we could clearly see this need, that the conditions now are not the same as when the budget was brought down. There are new conditions, therefore, we have to respond to it. We would be negligent if we did not. We did not know that the ice was going to be such as it has been when the budget came down, we were not anticipating that. This is an unusual year and if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not feel it is an unusual year, I would ask him to go up the Northeast Coast and speak to some fishermen. Perhaps he has never done that, so perhaps he should go up and do that. I doubt if the hon. the member for Fogo has asked the fishermen. He projects himself as a great expert in the fishery, which I doubt, because my district has a very large fishing component to it, I think it is second only to any other district in the Province in terms of fishing components, so I know exactly what the hon. member knows about the fishery and I am not terribly impressed. So I would suggest the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) should go up the Northeast Coast and ask fishermen, ask those fishermen who prosecute the seal fishery,

DR. COLLINS: ask the fishermen who prosecute the lobster fishery and other forms of the fishery that usually start up this time of the year and ask them, 'Has the ice had any effect on you?' and they will get an earful. They will say, 'Yes, it has had a very serious effect and it has diminished the opportunities for employment.' Now, that is one of the things that we had to respond to and we have done so.

MR. HEADY: What happened to the \$72.4 million last year?

DR. COLLINS: Yes, I am going to come to that now.

The hon. member quite correctly pointed out that the loan bill of last year, which was for \$220 million, did have a so-called cushion in it of \$72.4 million. In other words, the projected budgetary requirements announced in the budget were \$72.4 million less than the amount that we actually put in the loan bill. He asked, 'What happened to that difference?' Well, the difference is this, firstly, even though it was in the loan bill, we did not borrow approximately \$19.4 million, so that was unborrowed. We could have borrowed it but we did not, so that diminishes your cushion down to approximately \$53 million. Now the net effect of the increase in the current account deficit, which we projected to be \$24.4 million but in actual fact it turned out to be \$64.7 million, the net effect of that difference in the current account budget and the expenditure in capital account budget, which was \$2.9 million less than we projected, the net difference there is \$39.1 million. So you have to subtract that from the \$53 million and that leaves you an outstanding amount of \$13.9 million. That \$13.9 million is an increase in our cash on hand. In other words, our liquid reserves are increased by that \$13.9 million. Now the hon.

DR. COLLINS: the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary)
asked, 'Well, what happens to it? Is it invested?' Of course
it is invested. Any cash on hand we have except for, shall
we say daily amounts or whatever, we invest. We have
a division in the Department of Finance called the Debt
Management Division and they, taking the advice of fiscal
agencies and so on and so forth and other people, they invest
any extra cash we have at any particular time of the year.
And we do have it, of course, we get peaks of inflow and

DR. COLLINS:

then we get peaks of expenditure and so on and so forth. We often have cash on hand and we invest that. And if hon. members look in the related revenue and consolidated fund they will see there is an item there that relates to earned interest and that is the interest we earn from our short-term investment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just to very quickly respond to some questions that were asked by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) the last day. He said, if we borrow in Canada, where do we borrow from? Who gives us the money? I might say that firstly we borrow a little bit from the federal government. We did not last year actually, I do not think, but we often borrow a little bit from the federal government. There is availability there, just a few million dollars.

Secondly, we borrow from the Canada Pension Fund. Last year we borrowed \$52.7 million from that. This is an amount that is available to us related to the contributions that Newfoundlanders make to the Canada Pension Fund, and, of course, all provinces borrow from the Canada Pension Fund in relation to the amount that their citizens put into the fund, and it came to that amount. Now the remainder, which is the bulk of our borrowing, we borrow from capital markets. Through our borrowing syndicate through our lead managers and our borrowing syndicate we place our bonds and they have various financial institutions take them up. They buy our bonds, in other words, and give us the money. And that is what we do in Canada. And, of course, if we borrow in the European market that is what we do there, if we borrow in the U.S. market, that is we do there.

Just one last word. The hon. member for Port au Port really questioned, why do we not have greater deficits? You know, why all of this concern about the level

DR. COLLINS: of deficit? Why all of this concern about what the credit rating agencies think of us? Well, firstly we do have to pay attention to what the credit rating agencies think of us because if we do not, if we get a downgrading we do not have the same availability of institutions who will make loans to us. Certain institutions cannot lend to people below a certain credit rating, so we would be cutting off a source of lenders if our rating was reduced.

Secondly, of course, if you have a lower credit rating, usually your borrowing costs are higher. The interest you have to pay is higher. So for those two good reasons we want to keep our credit rating up and we want to increase it if we possibly can. Now on the whole question of why not greater deficits, you know, you can only go so far on that because firstly, you have to pay interest on your borrowings. Secondly, we are getting a lot of stimulus now and you cannot go overboard on the thing. And, thirdly, if you get into a situation that you really cannot anticipate yourself managing, you get on this so-called slippery slope and it is very difficult to get off it. And some of our sister provinces found themselves in that position and they are really in a difficult situation and they, indeed, have had their credit rating decreased. So we do not want to get into that situation, that is why we do not borrow more than we possibly need to do so. So I think those were mainly the questions that were asked, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARE: Mr. Chairman, let me say that we on this side of the House are completely shocked and astounded to hear the minister stand in his place in this House and admit that borrowing last year was not \$220 million

May 14, 1984

Tape 1614

PK - 3

MR. NEARY:

but \$292.4 million.

MR. WARREN:

What?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman last year this House approved borrowing to the tune of \$220 million. But now they have a new gimmick, they have a new way now of

MR. NEARY:

establishing a slush fund. I believe what the hon. gentleman is doing is contrary to the Financial Administration Act. And I guarantee you that the first thing tomorrow morning I will be asking the Comptroller of the Public Treasury to look at this procedure. It is a completely new procedure. And I will ask the Auditor General to take a look at it, Mr. Chairman. What the hon. gentleman is doing he is misleading the House and the people of this Province. I will tell you what the hon. gentleman is doing, he is coming in with a loan bill asking the House for \$220 million, Mr. Chairman, and then saying that he needed a cushion of \$72.4 million last year. The total borrowing last year was \$292.4 million.

DR. COLLINS: No, you got it wrong.

MR. NEARY: I got it right, Mr. Chairman, I wrote down what the hon. gentleman said. He said they have \$13.9 million cash on hand.

DR. COLLINS: The \$72.4 million was included in the \$220 million. We did not need the whole \$220 million for our projected requirements. That cushion was already in the \$220 million. It was not additional to the \$220 million it was already in there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is asking for \$220 million again this year of which \$75 million is a cushion. Now, what the hon. gentleman is doing is coming in and asking the House for more money than they have actually budgeted for.

MR. SIMMS: What about last year?

MR. NEARY: Yes, \$72.4 million.

MR. SIMMS: You said he borrowed \$290 million.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, \$220 million of which \$72.4 million was the cushion.

MR. SIMMS: That is not what you said.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the former Speaker, who should know the rules of the House, to button his lip. We are talking about a procedure here that I believe is illegal. I believe it is unconstitutional. The hon. gentleman, last year, asked the House for a slush fund of \$72.4 million that he had no right to spend. Here is where it is illegal and unconstitutional: Nowhere does the hon. gentleman ask the House for authority to spend that money.

DR. COLLINS: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true.

DR. COLLINS: It is not true.

MR. NEARY: Well, show me where it is, show me where the administration asked last year for authority to spend that \$72.4 million. The only thing the hon. gentleman said last year and I will read it out of Hansard, The hon. gentleman said, listen to this, 'The loan bill puts in an amount to give us flexibility. It puts in \$72.4 million to give us flexibility and that flexibility is required because we only have the authority to borrow apart from the loan bill in terms of debt retirement, as those debts are retired. And, of course, the debts are not all retired at the beginning of the year. Some of the debts will not be retired until very late in the year. And if we relied on the additional authority only we might find ourselves in a very tight position at some desirable point in the year when it would be a idea from the Province's point of view to borrow.' So there is that amount put in for flexibility of \$72.4 million.'

Mr. Chairman, today they are asking for \$75 million and today the minister announces that he has already allocated \$6.3 million of that not to take care of debts, not to retire some of our debts, but now, Mr. Chairman, it is developing into a slush fund. It is nothing more than a slush fund.

MR. MARSHALL: No, that is not so.

May 14, 1984

Tape No. 1615

SD - 3

MR. NEARY: It is so. \$72.4 million last year of a slush fund and \$75 million this year of a slush fund. That is the truth of the matter.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member does not understand.

MR. NEARY: I do understand. Mr. Chairman, I understand better than the hon. gentleman. I think it is astonishing, it is unreal, it is unheard of. The hon. gentleman is asking for \$220 million, Mr. Chairman, and attempts to justify it, and then gets up and tells us that \$75 million of it is merely a cushion, "We do not know what we are going to use it for." Well, what they are going to use it for, and let nobody be fooled about this, they are going to use it for the same reason they used it last year and that is to try to cover up the huge deficit. Because that is what they applied a large chunk of last year's \$72.4 million to, it went to keep the deficit down.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure he announced that.

MR. NEARY: He did not announce that. No, Mr. Chairman, it was like extracting teeth, we had to drag that bit of information out of the hon. gentlemen there opposite. I hope the word goes out to the people of this Province today, and to our fiscal agents, what the minister is doing, manipulating the figures and cooking the books. We always knew that the hon. gentleman was bad as a fiscal manager, that he was bad enough, that he was wild and irresponsible in his estimating, but now, Mr. Chairman, now the biggest jolt of all -

DR. COLLINS: If only you had Lalonde here, what a field day you would have then.

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, is deliberately deceiving this House and the people of this Province.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: You know we get used to the hon. gentleman, the way he gets on, but that calls for an immediate retraction. To say that the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is deliberately misleading the House on a matter pertaining to a money bill, you cannot make a more serious accusation. It calls for an immediate retraction. Obviously the hon. gentleman does not know the terms of the Financial Administration Act. What he is talking about is ridiculous and nonsensical. He is allowed to do it because he is an elected member, and that is fine, but he is not allowed, Mr. Chairman, to impute the integrity of the Minister of Finance. It calls for an obvious and immediate retraction by the hon. member, and an apology.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! To that point of order, the hon. member is well aware that it is not permissible for any hon. member to suggest that another member is deliberately misleading the House. I would ask that he withdraw it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw it but, I will tell you, it is the most serious matter to come before this House in recent years. We have seen some moves on the part of the administration there opposite to shift the authority off the floor of this House, we have seen some pretty devious procedures, Mr. Chairman, adopted by hon. gentlemen there opposite to get their little slush funds down on the eighth floor and get the decision making process down on the eighth floor of Confederation Building, but this is the most

MR. NEARY: dastardly and diabolic and
devious of all, this one now, today. Let me tell the
House what else the hon. gentleman said last year when
he asked for the \$72.4 million cushion.

MR. NEARY: I commented on it and the
Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said, 'Yes, he is
quite right. You could look upon the extra amounts
that we have added as somewhat of a cushion. But I
explained, it is to give us the flexibility that we
really do need and also, if circumstances were good,'
the minister said, 'it would allow us to pre-borrow
for next year.' Now, if that is not misleading the
House, I do not know what is. It will allow us to pre-borrow
for next year. The minister told us they would pre-
borrow if market conditions were favourable, if the
interest rates were favourable, they would take the
\$72.4 million and they would put it in a trust fund,
put it in an account and collect the interest. That
is what the hon. gentleman led us to believe was
going to be done last year, and now he is caught.
The hon. gentleman is caught with his hand in the
cookie jar, so to speak. He has misled this House
and the people of this Province -

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

MR. NEARY: - not deliberately, it may
be out of ignorance, in his simplicity.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon.
the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentle-
man has been asked to retract his statement, 'he is

MR. MARSHALL: deliberately misleading the House', he retracts, and immediately, without hardly taking a breath, he accuses the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) of misleading the House. Now, you know, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that that is out of order and calls for a retraction. If the hon. gentleman cannot speak in accordance with the rules of the normal parliamentary practice, he should take his seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): To that point of order, it is generally ruled that an hon. member cannot say 'deliberately misleading the House'. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) did say that he did not mean that the hon. member intentionally misled the House but did it through ignorance.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman in his simplicity and in his ignorance, misled this House and the people of this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I really do have to rise on this, because the hon. the Leader of the Opposition either does not understand the process or he himself is putting about a story that might be looked upon by some people as a true story when it is not, in actual fact, in accordance with the whole situation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the loan bill? Because the hon. the Leader of the Opposition

DR. COLLINS: and they are validated when the public accounts are presented and so on.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we did not exceed the authority to spend when you look at our estimates plus looking at the special warrants, the Lieutenant-Governor's warrants. We would not have the authority to expend and the Comptroller General would not allow us to expend. Our expenditures were within the limits laid down by the estimates that were introduced at budget time and the subsequent special warrants that were tabled in this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said that last year's so-called cushion was used to keep down the deficit. It was not used to keep down the deficit, the deficit is there, you can read it in the revised estimates, the deficit was \$64.7 million or whatever it was. What we used it for was to service the deficit.

MR. NEARY: To reduce the deficit.

DR. COLLINS: No, not reduce the deficit. The deficit was there.

MR. NEARY: No, the deficit (inaudible)

DR. COLLINS: We serviced the deficit by these borrowings and we had the authority to service it coming from this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: How much did it cost to service it?

DR. COLLINS: It cost the difference between what we said the deficit would be, \$24.4 million, and what it turned out to be, \$64.7 million, all reported in this House. The difference is \$40.3 million, so we had to borrow an extra amount of \$40.3 million to service the deficit.

MR. NEARY: To service the deficit of how much?

DR. COLLINS: \$64.7 million.

MR. NEARY: \$64.7 million and you paid \$40.3 million to service it. Do not be so stunned and stupid. You do not know what you are talking about.

DR. COLLINS: Let me go over it again. When we brought in the budget we said we would have a deficit of \$24.4 million and we needed a certain amount of borrowings, some of those borrowings to service that deficit, and the House gave us that authority. Now, as the year went on it was clear that the deficit was going higher than that and ultimately it went up to \$64.7 million, so we had to get additional authority from the House for the difference, that is the difference between what we said the deficit would be and what it would ultimately turn out to be, or \$40.3 million, and the House gave us that authority.

MR. NEARY: When did we give you that?

DR. COLLINS: You gave us authority to borrow for that amount when we passed the loan bill, and you gave us the authority to expend the money when we tabled the special warrants.

MR. NEARY: It is highway robbery what you are doing.

DR. COLLINS: It is not highway robbery it is what every government in the world does. I am going to evolve a little primer, you know, 'Basic Elements in Regard to Government Financial Procedures and I am going to circulate it, I am going to dedicate it, as a matter of fact, to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). I will have it bound in leather, I will have a preamble, you know, honouring my mother and probably

DR. COLLINS: the hon. Leader of the Opposition's mother. I am going to give him this basic little primer and I will also give it to my youngest child who is in about Grade VIII, I think it is, because she might find it interesting, but I am sure she will understand it after half an hour and then throw it away. But I am going to give it to my small daughter and I will also give it to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) so that he can be appraised of how government financial processes work. I will also have a little addendum in it with a bibliography saying, other jurisdictions do these same things, work the same way and then I will have a list of jurisdictions in the bibliography so that he can ring up and ask. He can ring up the Treasurer of Alberta, he can ring up the Finance Minister of Saskatchewan, he can ring up the Finance Minister and Treasurer of Ontario, and say, do you do this sort of thing? They will scratch their heads and hum and haw and say, Surely no one can be asking me this sort of question. I am not understanding it, this is too simple a question to ask. There must be something behind it all. But finally they will understand that this is a simple basic common garden-type everyday procedure and they will say, Of course we do this thing, how else can government operate? I mean, if you have authority to borrow and you have authority to expend and then you get more authority to expend through special warrants. This is all in the packet, this is all quite clear,

DR. COLLINS:

straightforward and common sense. And that is all we did, Mr. Chairman.

Now the last point the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) made, we might pre-borrow. We did not promise, we did not say we would have to or whatever, but he said we might pre-borrow and we did not do so. In actual fact we did. As I mentioned, we increased our cash reserves by \$13.9 million, and that, in fact, was a form of pre-borrowing, and I mentioned what we did with those cash reserves, we invested them. So we pre-borrowed and invested. We pre-borrowed to the extent of \$13.9 million.

I think those were the points covered and I would like to reassure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that these procedures are quite according to Hoyle, quite within the limits of the Financial Administration Act. If they were not we would have the Comptroller General down our necks like a ton of bricks, we would have the Auditor General storming the House of Assembly, but, of course, none of these things have happened.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman gets up and in his ignorance and in his simplicity he just shrugs it all off, casually brushes the whole thing aside. Mr. Chairman, in actual fact this is the most devious and dastardly and diabolical manoeuvre that has ever, I suppose, been undertaken by a Minister of Finance anywhere in the democratic world. The hon. gentleman gets up and distorts the facts, as he is quite capable of doing, Mr. Chairman. Here is what the hon. gentleman is saying, here is what he is saying: 'Last year we only really should have borrowed \$147.6 million, but we came into the House and we asked for \$220 million, a \$72,4 million cushion.'

MR. NEARY: We really did not need it, we wanted it in case the market conditions , the bond markets were favourable. We would borrow \$72.4 million, put it in an account, in a trust fund, and we would collect the interest and in the next fiscal year that would be put away. Now that is what the hon. gentleman led this House to believe last year.

What did the hon. gentleman do with the \$72.4 million? Was it put in a trust fund?

DR. COLLINS: We did not exceed our borrowing.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says, we did not exceed our borrowing. I say to that, so what? The hon. gentleman exceeded his authority because he used the money without approval of the House. The hon. gentleman was authorized to borrow \$220 million including \$72.4 million that was to be put away for the next fiscal year. And the hon. gentleman took that \$72.4 million after grossly misleading the House and used it to service the deficit he tells us. The deficit jumped from \$24.4 million up to \$64.7 million and that deficit last year cost us \$40.3 million. I can hardly believe it, Mr. Chairman, \$40.3 million to service the deficit.

What kind of interest were we paying? Mr. Chairman, how in the name of God would it cost us \$40.3 million to service a \$64.7 million deficit?

Now this year the minister is telling us again we only really need \$145 million to carry out our capital works

MR. NEARY: programmes and to service our loans and our debts and so forth. We only really need \$145 million but we are asking the House for \$220 million.

MR. BUTT: 'Steve', if you do not stop bawling and raving I am going.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is time for you to go when you support an administration that would do the likes of that, unheard of in financial circles, unheard of. And you can only get away with it when you have a majority of forty-four, because it is unconstitutional. The only reason they can get away with it is because they can bulldoze this bill, bully this bill through the House. The hon. gentleman is asking us, why does he not come out man fashion and say what it is? It is a slush fund of \$75 million. Mr. Chairman, let nobody be duped or fooled or hookwinked by this. The hon. gentleman is asking for \$75 million for a slush fund. And we saw an example of that this afternoon when the hon. gentleman said we are going to get a Lieutenant Governor's warrant for \$6.3 million coming out of that \$75 million. It was not budgeted for, and the budget only came down a month ago. How ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, how ridiculous! Last year they only needed \$147.6 million, they borrowed \$220 million, \$72.4 million was used for a slush fund. This year they are borrowing \$220 million of which \$75 million will be used for a slush fund. Mr. Chairman, they should come back to this House and ask for authority never mind trying to cover it up in a loan bill. We do not know how that money is going to be spent, we have no idea. We cannot believe a word the hon. gentleman says. Last year he told us that it was going to be put away in a fund and we would collect the interest off of it. \$75 millions of a slush fund, that is what it is, it is nothing but a slush fund. And the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, should not be given the authority to get it and spend it at the ministers discretion and at the

MR. NEARY: discretion of the Cabinet. That is what they are asking for, they are asking for \$75 million to be spent at the discretion of the gang on the eighth floor, down around the Cabinet table. And hon. gentlemen sit over there like sheep, go to their caucuses, do not open their mouths, sit there like sheep, follow along behind their leader and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) like sheep while the authority is being taken away from this Legislature, the power of the purse being removed from the floor of this House and put down on the eighth floor in the form of a slush fund. And we used to hear the President of the Council, the present Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) when he was over here rant and rave about how the House should control the purse. Now he sits there in an administration that is asking to borrow more money than they actually need to give the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a slush fund so if the deficit goes up this year, and now he is admitting that it it, they will have a slush fund to service this year's deficit and to take care of a few little goodies like road paving and so forth,

MR. NEARY: without getting the authority or the approval of this House. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the truth of the matter. And the hon. gentleman can get up and lecture all he wants, in his ignorance and in his simplicity he does not know any better. I am sure the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, does not believe what he is saying. He does not believe it.

AN HON. MEMBER: And you do not know what you are saying.

MR. NEARY: I certainly do know what I am saying. The hon. gentleman should be ashamed of himself to sit there with an administration that keeps whittling away at this House, taking the authority away from this House. When we started to look at this bill we started to say to ourselves, "What is it they want? Last year they had \$72.4 million, what did they do it for?" And we found out this afternoon what it was used for. It was not used for the purposes for which it was given.

DR. COLLINS: Did you hear that?

MR. MARSHALL: You did not have to have a loan bill when you were in government.

DR. COLLINS: You did not have a loan bill when you were in the government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they can get off with that garbage all they want. There was nothing done when I was on that side of the House without the authority and the approval of this House. This is unheard of I am telling you. I am so angry about this. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the press will record this matter properly. Let the word go out to our fiscal agents that the Minister of Finance is trying to cover up for his mismanagement and his incompetence by asking to borrow more money than we actually need so that they can

MR. NEARY: have a slush fund of \$75 million.
It is hard to understand, it is hard to take, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is hard to take, yes.

MR. NEARY: It certainly is hard to take.
I do not understand the forty point some-odd million dollars to service the debt. The hon. gentleman says it is not to reduce the debt - it is to service the deficit, not the debt.

DR. COLLINS: How do you think 'Marky' baby services his \$30 billion deficit?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let me ask the hon. gentleman, is he saying that it cost the taxpayers of this Province \$40.3 million to service a \$64.7 million deficit last year? Is that what it cost the taxpayers for their mismanagement and their incompetence and their fiscal ignorance and stupidity? Is that what it cost? Absolutely incredible! It is astonishing. I have no intention, Mr. Chairman, of standing here in my place in this House, or anybody else on this hon. side of the House, and letting the likes of this go on, covering up, manipulation, cooking the books.

MR. MARSHALL: You are going to vote against it, obviously.

MR. NEARY: Certainly I am going to vote against it.

DR. COLLINS: How do you cover something up when you have been given authority?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is hanging his hat on the fact that he asked for approval of the House to borrow \$220 million, \$75 million uncommitted, a \$75 million cushion, \$75 million flexibility, and up to today we were led to believe it was to take care of entry

May 14, 1984

Tape 1621

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: into the bond market, to borrow
money for next year that we could put away and get the
interest on. That is where the hon. gentleman duped
and misled

MR. NEARY: the House, Mr. Chairman, and distorted the facts.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I never heard anything like it in my life, to hear the hon. gentleman over there. Now let us talk actualities. First of all it is a fact that we are debating the loan bill here. It is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the requirement to debate before this House the amount of money that was being borrowed in any fiscal year was not brought in until there was a change of government in 1970. It was a change of the Progressive Conservative Party. It needs to be said when we hear the righteous indignation of the hon. gentleman there opposite, that when he was a member of government they had to have no legislative authority and, in fact, never sought it and in fact borrowed wonly and wildly for their twenty years while they were in power, which is one of the real reasons why we are in the fiscal jam that we are in today. And it was this party which brought in a bill to defer to the House so that the people of the Province would know exactly how much was being borrowed and what the purpose was. Now, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has explained quite adequately why the loan bill is \$220 millions and there is this \$70 million cushion. Now, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) sees something sinister with respect to this. What does this cushion amount to? First of all, we cannot borrow any more than \$220 million. We are coming before the House, the people of the Province know through the House of Assembly that this is what we are borrowing. We cannot borrow one more cent than \$220 millions

MR. MARSHALL: this year.

MR. NEARY: You do not need that much.

MR. MARSHALL: We will get to the need in a moment. We cannot borrow more than \$220 millions and I repeat once again, before this bill was brought in any government could borrow billions of dollars if they wished to without reference to the legislature.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. MARSHALL: It is true. Look at the Revenue and Audit Act that the hon. gentlemen operated under when they were in and you will see that they could and they did borrow large amounts of money. So that is the borrowing. The public knows how much is being borrowed.

Now, next we come to the expenditure. As the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has indicated, the expenditure of money can be made in two ways: It can be made through the estimates or it can be made through supplementary supply, all authorized under the Financial Administration Act. Supplementary supply comes from time to time as a result of it being necessary to spend more money in any year than had been voted. And that this administration is sensitive to this House was shown today by the Minister of Finance when he got up in a Ministerial Statement

MR. MARSHALL: and he indicated that there was to be an additional expenditure for the very good and valid reasons that he gave. Now, what we could have done, Mr. Chairman, if we operated like the hon. gentleman there opposite used to operate, or the way in which he is accusing us, is we could have kept very quiet about that, let the House adjourn, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) not say anything about it, get a warrant from the Cabinet, slip in here and slip it in before the House of Assembly resumed in the Fall session. But did he do that? No. What he did was he came out, as this administration does, front and center at all times, and explained to the House why the extra amount of money was being expended. So the hon. gentleman can get up with righteous indignation all he wants to, but this administration has always been sensitive to the right of the people through the House of Assembly to know on all matters pertaining to finances, and the Minister of Finance showed an admirable example of that today, if the hon. gentleman wishes to see.

Now, there is another way, Mr. Chairman, where there can be need for more funds, which is what happened last year. The reason why the Minister of Finance borrowed more money was not because there was a slush fund, as the hon. gentleman would have you believe, and he went on a wild spending spree. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we had to borrow more money last year - use more money last year instead of borrowing, because we did not borrow any more than we were voted, but we had to use more moneys last year than we had anticipated, not because there was increased expenditure. Just look at the way in which the Minister of Finance kept a rein on expenditures in this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: It was a mammoth job in a province of this nature and he is to be highly complimented for the way in which he administered the affairs and held the reins tightly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: One of the reasons why we do not have a reduced credit rating like Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have had is because of the responsible administration of this government through the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

What happened, Mr. Chairman, why we needed more money, was because revenues were down.

MR. NEARY: Why did you not come to the House?

MR. MARSHALL: Revenues were down in large part because the retail sales tax was down. That was one reason. But another even more significant reason was that federal moneys were down. So what do we do then, Mr. Chairman? You cannot come to the House every time the Minister of Finance comes to the Cabinet, as he does regularly, and gives us a picture as to the financial situation. We cannot call the House together because we believe the revenues are going to be down by \$500,000. We have been before the House already, and as long as we did not expend - we are not expending more moneys than we should.

Now, the fact of the matter is, the revenues were down, so what does the government do? Does the government turn around and say to the hospitals, 'You have got to lay off X number of people?' Do they say to the hospitals, 'Well, now, you can only do two or three appendectomies this month, you cannot do your normal compliment'? Do you tell people who are ill that

May 14, 1984

Tape 1623

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL: they cannot get ill this month?
You have to maintain the hospitals, you have to maintain
the schools, you have to maintain the services, and we
maintain them. We maintained them in accordance

MR. MARSHALL:

with the plan that we put before this Assembly and we used that money which we had authorization to borrow for the purpose of being able to keep these very beneficial works ongoing, because our revenues have sunk and through no fault of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), it was because of the economic situation. But the point of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, at all times this House was informed of the amount of money that we were intending to borrow, the maximum amount we were intending to borrow. And we say this year as well that that cushion of \$72 million is borrowed for the purpose, first of all, of giving us flexibility in the financial markets, to be able to borrow if a favourable interest rate turns up, in which case we will take the money, we will invest it and put it into an account and it will be expended next year in accordance with monies voted by this House. Or, Mr. Chairman, it will be used for the purpose of, if it is necessary, we hope it is not, but if it is necessary, if revenues should be down because the federal government has not given us what we expected, or because retail sales tax is down or what have you, it will be used for that purpose because it has to be, otherwise we would have to cut out and cut down services.

So what is all this nonsense and this righteous indication that the hon. gentleman is getting on with in this House when he turns around and says, that this is an outrage and, you know, he gets hot under the collar about it? The fact of the matter is, number one, this House continues year after year to know the amount that the government intends to borrow. Number two, that money is not expended unless in accordance with the Financial Administration Act that we have here and the authority of this House. Number three, in years past

MR. MARSHALL: we have not, particularly this present administration, if you review the financial operations of it, you will find that our expenditures have not been off target and it is the expenditure which is the crucial thing. Fourthly, in the event that we have to expend more money than we anticipate in the budget, we inform the House at the earliest opportunity as witnessed today by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) when he got up on that Ministerial Statement. So what has the hon. gentleman got to say to that? When the hon. gentleman was over here on this side of the House, I have to repeat today, it was, yes, Sir, no, Sir, three bags full, Sir, is there too much of a draught on your back, Sir and what have you. The House of Assembly in this Province was a charade. It was not a House of Assembly, Mr. Chairman, it might just as well have been in Assembly down in one of the banana republics. Because what happened year after year after year was millions and millions of dollars were borrowed by the hon. gentleman there opposite and his friends who are since defeated, some of them gone into the woodwork thank heavens, and some of them worming out occasionally from time to time, but what happened was millions of dollars were borrowed in secret Cabinet session and the people of this Province never knew about it first nor last.

MR. SIMMS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

And that is why we have the debt of billions of dollars today. Mr. Chairman. If we had had a responsible group of people in charge of the operation of the affairs of those days we would not be in the state we are now. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman gets up and he uses such things as innuendo from time to time, and casting aspersions on the

MR. MARSHALL:

government and on people, or what have you, without any foundation, the same way as he did the other day when he was here, with Mr. Roger Pike, when he made the allegation -

MR. NEARY: Anti-union.

MR. MARSHALL: - that when he took over the Piccadilly plant he did not recognize the debts of the former owner and as a result some fishermen lost hundreds and thousands of dollars after the takeover occurred. Do you know what the actuality is, Mr. Speaker? There is no basis for these allegations. Belle Isle Seafoods assumed the lease from the Department of Fisheries on the Piccadilly facility early in 1983. For several years prior to this the plant in question was operated, not owned, by National Sea Products, who elected not to operate the Piccadilly at the end of the '82 season. And we have checked with National Sea officials and they have advised that fishermen and plant workers were not owed any money when the company ceased operations. This being the case, it was impossible for Mr. Pike not to have honoured any outstanding debts.

Now, unfortunately you get that innuendo passed out, you get the Daily News and others in their zeal to try to report this kind of thing and you get a good -

MR. NEARY: Anti-union.

MR. MARSHALL: We are very fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that we have a person like Mr. Pike who has been willing to take on a public responsibility. In the area in which he is, he is up and coming, he is a respected businessman. And when you get the kind of stuff that is slung across the House in public session by the hon. gentleman, how are you ever going to expect to get people of responsibility in this Province to

MR. MARSHALL: undertake public trust and duty? We thank and we appreciate the fact that Mr. Pike is doing it. We similarly appreciate the fact of the Mr. Hickmans, and the Mr. Tilley's and the Mr. Crosbys, who were appointed by the federal government. And there is no need, Mr. Chairman, for this Assembly or Committee to be used for smear tactics against people who are willing, in this Province, to assume public duties of the type that Mr. Pike assumed. If you get that kind of stuff, you are just not going to get any response at all.

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

MR. NEARY: If we ever saw the hon. snake-like tongue at its finest we just saw it now, Mr. Chairman. We just saw it now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Yes, snake-like, rotten, low, the venom and the poison that just came across the House from the hon. gentleman. Now, what does the hon. gentleman resort to, Mr. Chairman? When he is backed into a corner like a coward, what does he do? He then goes on the personal attack. He answered nothing. He answered no questions. He got up then and he started to squirt his venom with his little, sharp snake-like tongue across the House, that the people of this Province have learned to hate so much they feel like driving their boots through the television.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is happening? You got the sheep who go to the caucus meetings, toddling along behind the hon. gentleman, afraid to open their mouths at their caucus meetings. Because hon. gentleman know what we are saying is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman can try all he wants to distract from the real issue. The real issue here, Mr. Chairman, is this, that the administration there opposite have developed a devious, dastardly, diabolical plot to cover up for their fiscal incompetence and ignorance and mismanagement.

MR. NEARY: That is what they are doing.

MR. MARSHALL: Did the hon. gentleman have his distemper shot?

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, they can go onto personal attack all they want. The hon. gentleman talks about innuendo. One thing that I have never gotten in this House is a smack in the face, a punch in the face for insulting a member's mother. The hon. gentleman got a punch in the face a few years ago for insulting a member's mother in this hon. House, Mr. Chairman. Now, the hon. gentleman can shout and roar we are going to have our say about this.

MR. MORGAN: Are you going to apologize to Mr. Pike?

MR. NEARY: No. The statements I made about Mr. Pike the other day are true and correct. The man is anti-union on the Board of Directors of this super company.

MR. MORGAN: That was not the accusation.

MR. NEARY: That was the accusation. Anti-union.

MR. MORGAN: No. You said he owes money.

MR. MARSHALL: You said he owed money to the fisherman and that is a little bit different.

MR. NEARY: That is a little bit different is it? I see.

Now, the hon. gentleman with his Dr. Goebbels eye - you know, Dr. Goebbels looked like he had glass eyes and the hon. gentleman looks exactly like him - he can get up all he wants but we are going to have our say on this bill, Mr. Chairman, because they only need \$145 million. Now today the hon. gentleman told us where \$6.3 million of this slush fund is going to go. What about the other \$68.7 million, where is that going to go?

MR. MARSHALL: I told you.

MR. NEARY: Where?

MR. MARSHALL: I told you.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. You told us in a general kind of a way. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is not good enough. Mr. Chairman, when the administration is in trouble, revenues are not coming in, the Province is on the brink of bankruptcy, call the House back into Session. That is what they should do, call the House back into Session to deal with these matters.

I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House have met and considered the matters to them referred, report some progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 15, 1984, at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

May 14, 1984

QUESTION NO. 49 - ORDER PAPER DATED 16 APRIL, 1984

MR. NEARY (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND MANPOWER TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION;

1. NUMBER OF HOSPITAL BEDS RETAINED BY THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION AT THE;

(A) HEALTH SCIENCES CENTRE	-	8
(B) ST. CLARE'S HOSPITAL;	-	NONE
(C) GRACE GENERAL HOSPITAL	-	NONE
(D) WATERFORD HOSPITAL	-	NONE

2. NUMBER OF DAYS BEDS WERE OCCUPIED IN THE CALENDAR YEARS 1982, 1983 AND 1984 TO DATE;

STATISTICS ARE NOT AVAILABLE SINCE NO SPECIFIC RECORDS ARE KEPT BY THE HOSPITAL OR THE COMMISSION.

3. COST PER BED;

HEALTH SCIENCES COMPLEX -

APRIL 1, 1982 - \$452.00 PER DAY
APRIL 1, 1983 - \$483.00 PER DAY
APRIL 1, 1984 - \$507.00 PER DAY

MILLER CENTRE -

APRIL 1, 1982 - \$285.00 PER DAY
APRIL 1, 1983 - \$307.00 PER DAY
APRIL 1, 1984 - \$322.00 PER DAY

ST. CLARE'S MERCY HOSPITAL -

APRIL 1, 1982 - \$215.00 PER DAY
JUNE 1, 1982 - \$245.00 PER DAY
APRIL 1, 1983 - \$281.00 PER DAY
APRIL 1, 1984 - \$295.00 PER DAY

GRACE GENERAL -

APRIL 1, 1982 - \$254.00 PER DAY
APRIL 1, 1983 - \$280.00 PER DAY
APRIL 1, 1984 - \$294.00 PER DAY

4. TOTAL COST TO THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION FOR RETAINING THESE BEDS;

THE COST OF RETAINING THE BEDS AT THE HEALTH SCIENCES COMPLEX IS THE DAILY RATE ONLY FOR BEDS WHICH ARE OCCUPIED BY WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION CLAIMANTS.

5. ARE THESE BEDS AVAILABLE TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC WHEN NOT OCCUPIED BY A WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION CLIENT?

YES

14 MAY, 1984