



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 12

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Monday

14 April 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, I would like to refer briefly to the point of privilege raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I said I would have another look at it and have a final word today. I would refer the hon. Leader of the Opposition to my reply of Tuesday last on a very similar thing. I quoted Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, that the Speaker would not give a decision upon a constitutional question nor decide a question of law, so there is no prima facie case.

#### Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a brief statement in response to the matter raised by the hon. member from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) on April 10, 1986, during which he informed the House of information he possessed with respect to sanitation and health safety areas at Exon House. Subsequent to his comments, I have had this matter checked as follows:

(1) The administration at Exon House has no information either indicating that any report exists by an outside agency or, in fact, that any such assessment was commissioned over the past two to three years.

(2) The nursing department at Exon House has been contacted with respect to any information of this

nature and has stated that no record of any such assessment or report exists.

(3) The Director of Health Inspections in the Department of Health has indicated that regular health inspections are carried out with regard to food processing procedures. The most recent was carried out on March 5, 1986, and previously in October, 1985, and that no irregularities were identified.

(4) The Department of Health has no record of any study of this nature being carried out at Exon House over the last year.

I have been advised, Mr. Speaker, that early in 1984 there was an investigation of a suspected food related illness which was extremely thorough and revealed no irregularities in any of the food preparation process except for the temperature level in one of the food distribution carts. The cart was supposed to maintain a temperature level of 140 degrees Fahrenheit, but on testing it was found that the temperature level was 130 degrees Fahrenheit. On the assumption that this may have contributed to the problem, the food carts were subsequently replaced.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that matters of sanitation are the regular subject of health inspections by appropriate officials in the Department of Health and by our own nursing department at Exon House. We have, Mr. Speaker, a Director of Nursing and eight nurses. An attending physician visits on a regular basis, at least two half days per week. All acceptable and reasonable precautions are taken against any possible health

related problems which are subject to occasional occurrences in institutions. Also worthy of note is that there are policies and procedures in place with regard to hygienic environmental control in each unit at Exon House. This would include two shifts of housecleaning staff to implement these procedures. However, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member who has raised this matter has information beyond that which I have been able to obtain, I would expect that the responsible thing for him to do is to bring it forward to me. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be irresponsible for him or any other person to have such information and not bring it forward. One would have to question the motives of anyone concealing such information. I assure you that I will have any such issue dealt with forthwith.

There is one further matter on which I feel obliged to make a comment. This relates to the issue of staffing. Hon. members are aware that the government has embarked upon a programme of deinstitutionalization with corresponding development of community residential services, particularly group homes and foster homes. This has resulted in the population at Exon House being reduced from 215 in 1978 to the present 55. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, no permanent child therapist staff have been recruited for Exon House for some time. I am, nevertheless, tabling a copy of the position description of Child Therapist I which would be used as the basis for recruitment of any permanent staff by the Public Service Commission. The few staff members who were referred to by the hon. member as being recently employed are

temporary call-in staff for weekends and other necessary type staffing requirements. These people applied and were individually assessed prior to their names being placed on the call-in list. They have varying levels of experience and education. Indeed, two have university degrees and all work under the direction of seasoned and experienced supervisors. I feel that the manner in which these individuals were referred to was somewhat derogatory and demeaning and, therefore, I felt it necessary to clarify this point.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister of Social Services for giving me a copy of his statement in advance so I could read it over. I find it rather obvious that he did decide to present this statement to the House today. It was only on Friday, during Question Period, that I asked for an independent public enquiry into the matters at Exon House and he did not even answer the question during Question Period. He gave another answer that was in no way related to the question whatsoever. He now comes back and puts a statement before this hon. House and tells us that everything at Exon House is okay.

Recently we had a number of things concerning a lot of other problems: fire regulations and unsanitary problems; staff members are given a very brief orientation; A lack of support

from the administration, and a definite lack of hygienic supplies.

MR. BRETT:  
Table that.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, in his statement here today there is not one thing in reference to these problems. What he is saying is there are absolutely no problems at Exon House at all when people have had to resign their positions. People who were formerly staff of Exon House are coming out in public exposing the problems that are there. He is expecting, just because he puts a statement before this House, that there are no problems at Exon House.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell the Minister of Social Services that I am not satisfied with this, that I will still be asking for a public enquiry. I asked the minister on Friday were their problems there. He said there were not. But when I get a copy of the report I will table it in the House and I will put it before the Minister of Social Services. I do not believe for one second that people are making these accusations when these fifty-five children are at Exon House. There is nobody trying to make accusations that the problems are not there. The problems obviously are there when people have to resign their jobs. I will continue to ask the questions as long as I am on this side of the House. If I were on the other side of the House, I would do a lot better job than the Minister of Social Services is doing. I would not be asking for information, I would be seeking it

myself.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, one other thing, as far as the people who are being hired on a part-time basis and not trained properly are concerned, he is saying it is because when Exon House closes out those people will be no longer needed. I do not agree with that. When those people go out into group homes and they are placed in that situation there, they are going to still need professional training. They are still going to need people to visit those homes, people with a knowledge of how to deal with those children and how to handle them in the proper manner. So, therefore, if the people are not trained, how do you expect them to handle it when they are put into group homes?

So I would ask the Minister of Social Services to take seriously his position and to take those children to heart and not try to get a political argument going back and forth this House to try to prove his own personal points but take a very serious look at it and set up a public enquiry immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

#### Oral Questions

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), but in his absence

I will ask it of the Premier. It concerns the negotiations, or lack of them, between the Government and the St. John's firefighters, and the firefighters have just carried out a protest march concerning their collective agreement. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the firefighters have been attempting to meet with the President of Treasury Board who said if he had a few minutes later on, maybe he would. I would ask the Premier now, if he would give his assurance to this House that either the President of Treasury Board or the Minister of Labour - perhaps the President of Treasury Board could answer it himself, he just came in - that the President of Treasury Board will indeed meet with the firefighters not later than this afternoon?

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand there was a request to my office for a meeting with me a little while ago, while I was involved with other members of Treasury Board in a regular Treasury Board meeting. I indicated through my staff that I had to complete that meeting, obviously, we just finished a few moments ago, and that I then had to come here to the House of Assembly, but I would make myself available tomorrow morning, or if possible later on this afternoon, depending on, obviously, my requirements here in the House of Assembly.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, in view of what has gone on in the last little while, this is another dangerous situation that we are presently facing. I would ask the President of Treasury Board to tell us what specifically is government doing to put an end to a potentially very dangerous situation? If the walkout of MOS employees was considered hazardous, does not militant action by firemen constitute a situation of serious public danger? I would ask him what is the government doing to see that that does not take place?

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite might like to try to portray it as a militant action. What I see this afternoon are a bunch of firemen demonstrating, but I do not think it is militant. I have not seen any militancy. I see them coming in here in a demonstration of concern which we accept and which is their right and privilege to do. We will certainly meet with them and deal with them as quickly and as reasonably as possible.

MR. TULK:  
A supplementary to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that labour relations in this Province have spun out of control. Could the Minister of Labour inform this House what is going on in this Province when every day it seems that we see a new group being driven to some sort of public protest to deal with the arrogance of the government of which he is Minister of Labour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Fogo is obviously referring to the firefighters' negotiations since this is what he is talking about today. He ought to know that we have not had any dealings with this particular set of negotiations, Mr. Speaker, since they negotiate under the their own specific act, The Firefighters Act. They have arbitration, and I think they have been through the arbitration process. And consequently I would like to tell them that we have not been involved in that process as yet with the firefighters.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say this to the Minister of Labour, that he has been involved in very few labour relations

problems in this Province until they have gotten out of hand. He has not lived up to his reputation. I would ask him to assure this House that in view of what we have just seen go on with the NAPE workers, can we now expect to see another all out battle of media advertising in this case, the Premier on television, brochures, probably video kits, pamphlets, handouts and all the force of the government's propaganda machine brought to bear on those people, or will we see some really meaningful negotiations carried out with them? Or will we see the arrogance that we have seen coming from that side in the case of the NAPE workers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Fogo is demonstrating what we have seen from that side of the House all along. I think he is worried, he is concerned, that we may be approaching a settlement with some of those groups. He knows full well that negotiations are going on again tomorrow. We will be starting again tomorrow with NAPE and MOS, since you made reference to these. As far as I personally am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I have been behind the scenes in all of the sets of negotiations that have taken place. I have been in my office, I have been available and I have, in fact, had two visits from the President of NAPE while negotiations were going on, and we had cordial discussions, Mr. Speaker. So, I do not know what he wants me to do, whether he

wants me to jump up and shout about it like they do over there.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Labour to answer my question. Will he assure, as a person who is supposed to be the great conciliator, the great mediator in this Province, the firemen of this Province that they will not be treated to the same type of arrogant propaganda that was put out by the government in the case of the NAPE workers? Will he assure them that that will be the case?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much clearer we can make it for the hon. member. The President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), my colleague, has just informed the House that he plans to meet either later today or at the latest tomorrow morning with the firefighters' representatives and if it means anything to him, I think the firefighters know their business. They have not made contract with me on this. They have made contact with the department which looks after their negotiations and they did not contact me.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the acting Minister of Energy. Mr. Crosbie announced a three member committee to suggest legislation for the offshore with emphasis on safety. The question I have for the minister is, is there any replacement for the Voyageur helicopters in regard to this legislation and what representation has the Province made to this committee or to Mr. Crosbie?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. gentleman is directing the question to me. As Mr. Crosbie indicated today, some \$70 million have already been spent on the upgrading of those machines and a special committee of the federal Cabinet has been struck to monitor the whole basis of search and rescue in Canada, with particular reference to this Province on the offshore, and they are going to continue to monitor it as it proceeds.

MR. HISCOCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Is the Acting Minister of Energy satisfied that \$70 million is enough to provide proper evacuation of the offshore? Is part of this \$70 million upgrading programme to be used to move the

Air/Sea Rescue Centre from Gander to St. John's to ensure the safety of the offshore?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I should tell the hon. member, and this should not be interpreted as a threat, if he keeps calling me the 'acting minister' I will start referring to him as the acting member.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is that the federal government has addressed the Ocean Ranger recommendations and it has adopted in whole or in part 85 per cent of them, which is a pretty good track record. The remainder of the recommendations are presently under study by some people who are very well versed in matters relating to offshore safety and I am sure that it will be responded to. With respect to Gander, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has had an opportunity to review the whole statement, but he is referring to Gander and Gander's weather station has been upgraded from a centre to a full fledged office which is going to make it better able to predict the weather situation on the offshore. And I can state as well, because I am sure the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) will be interested in this as well, but it had been proposed by bureaucrats in the federal government that the weather office be removed to either Halifax or St. John's, but under the pressure of Mr. Crosbie it remained in Gander, with the accretion of some thirty jobs to Gander itself. So the federal government, Mr. Speaker, has operated in a very forthcoming way in respect to

these. If the hon. gentleman were more versed in the statement I think I could reply more specifically to his questions.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

We know the weather station has been upgraded there, and that bureaucrats have suggested moving the Air/Sea Rescue Centre from Gander to St. John's. The question I asked the minister was is this move to St. John's part of that \$70 million programme?

The other thing I want to ask him is did this government have any input as to whom these three members of the Committee would be? Also, did they make representation that there should be a person on it from the Province, particularly from the Ocean Ranger Foundation, which is no longer in existence? Since eighty-four men were lost, it would be a token to them to elect a representative from the former Ocean Ranger Foundation, as a representative on the committee. If the minister is not going to recommend that a member from that foundation be on the committee, will he undertake that a representative from the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs or the Department of Justice of this Province will also have input into the setting up of this committee on safety?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the



Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I really would like to be able to respond to the hon. gentleman's questions but they really do appear to be rather convoluted and it is hard to determine what he is trying to determine. With respect to Air/Aea Rescue the fact of the matter is that the main headquarters on the Atlantic Seaboard is not in Gander but really in Halifax, as the hon. gentleman knows. As the hon. gentleman will appreciate as well, as a result of pressure from this government and co-operation from the Mulroney administration, after it was elected, we have had a dedicated fixed-wing aircraft stationed in Torbay during the critical Winter drilling season, and we have had a search and rescue helicopter, manned by competent, trained search and rescue personnel, and that is going to continue. That is a real marked improvement and should very much enhance confidence in offshore operations in that critical time, which is the Winter season.

With respect to the membership of the new committee that has been placed there, as far as the government of the Province of Newfoundland is concerned the people who have been put on it are people who are very, very well versed in the matter that they will be seized with. They are highly professional people. Admiral Maingay is one of them and there is another gentleman whose name escapes me but who has had some forty years experience in this area. We feel that the committee that has been struck is technically a competent one and it is technical competence that we

need with respect to these issues. We cannot be playing politics with the safety of lives of people working offshore.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and it concerns some of the recommendations contained in the Nielsen study on the economy. One of the options, Mr. Speaker, has got to do with imposing a user fee for all users of small craft harbours and facilities, and space used in small craft harbours. Can the minister tell the House if that fee will be imposed this year on fish buyers and on fishermen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, in the preamble to this question, made reference to the recommendations of the Nielsen Task Force. There are certain of the recommendations, which I believe were in various departments, which were referred to in the Budget. There are other references, as it relates to fisheries, that we have been studying since the documents were made available to us a few weeks ago, and we have followed up with the federal minister and requested further discussion on some of those items. There was, I believe, and I am just going from memory now, some indication as a result of the budgetary process that there would be some increase for berthage fees for vessels, I believe, over forty-five feet in

length. Of course, in Newfoundland, 90- odd per cent of all the vessels in this Province are forty-five feet or below, so that any increase in fees for vessels over forty-five feet would not apply to a very large sector of the fishing vessels in our Province.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I wonder is the minister aware of the fact that this morning certain fish buyers were notified by his federal counterpart that this year the user fee recommended in the task force would be imposed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Fish buyers, Mr. Speaker? The honest answer is no.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

This issue is important, is vital to the fishing industry. Today, Mr. Speaker, buyers were notified and again, without the minister being notified on this very important issue.

MR. RIDEOUT:

What was the notice?

MR. W. CARTER:

The notice was, I believe, so much per hundred square feet of the

wharf top used by the buyers. Can the minister tell the House is he aware of any such move now to impose a similar fee, for example, on fishermen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. gentleman that I am aware that there has been a notification forwarded on berthage fees for vessels over forty-five feet. I have just indicated that to him. I have been honest, open and frank that I cannot indicate to him of any increase in fees for the buyers using federal wharf facilities. I would say to him as well, Mr. Speaker, that my department operates various facilities in this Province on which we increase or decrease fees from time to time - our marine service centers, our fish holding sheds, baited trawl units and so on - and I do not consult with the federal minister on whether I should raise or lower those fees.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate. This is the final supplementary for this.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the question of imposing a user fee on facilities is a new departure. Surely the Minister of Fisheries is not suggesting that he does not deserve to be consulted under this new arrangement that we have, this new programme that we have. Will the minister undertake, then, to contact his federal counterpart and to find out from him what his plans are? Will the notices sent

out this morning be sent to all fish buyers? Will there be similar notices maybe in a day or two or a week's time sent out to fishermen? Will he undertake to find out?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there are an awful lot of 'wills' in there. If I could stare into a crystal ball I might be able to answer some of those 'wills'. I have already indicated to the hon. gentleman that we have already made contact with the federal Minister of Fisheries and indicated to him that there are a number of concerns in the Nielsen Task Force report that we want to address with him on a priority basis.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We saw the minister get up in the House last week and admit that he was not informed of the decision not to implement the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation and the loss of \$15 million to the Newfoundland fishery that that entailed. Now is the minister saying that he was not aware of the fact that notification is going out to fish buyers that they would have to pay \$100 for 200 square feet of wharfage around this Province?

There was no reference in the minister's first answer to the fact that, yes, he was aware that that had gone out to vessels over

forty-five feet. He said that was referred to in the Nielsen Task Force Report. Was he aware that that notification had gone out to forty-five foot vessels? Is he aware of any other recommendations that have been implemented from the Nielsen Task Force Report?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I will not have the hon. the Leader of the Opposition misquote me or put words in my mouth. What I said last week about NFDC was the truth. There has not been any decision made on NFDC, I told him that. I told the House at that time and that was a fact. I can say to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that we were informed that the federal government intended to put on a user fee for vessels over forty-five feet using federal facilities in this Province. I indicated that to the hon. gentleman. I have equally been honest and frank in saying to the hon. gentleman from Twillingate, and now to the Leader of the Opposition, that in terms of user fees for buyers spaces, space on federal wharves, I personally have not been informed.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). Last week we presented documentation showing that there was a considerable bias towards PC districts in regard to water and sewerage loans that were

approved. We indicated at that time we wanted to look into the municipal 60/40 paving programme and I have some statistics here from that programme and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister to comment on them. At the time he indicated that once we looked at all these programmes we will see how everything sort of evened out in the end. Unfortunately, we cannot figure where the evening is coming. Under this programme we have found that there are fifty-four 60/40 government loans and grants that have been approved. Of those fifty-four, a full fifty-two have been in PC districts and only two in Liberal districts. My question to the minister is can you explain, if fifty-two of the grants and loans have gone to PC districts and only two to Liberal and NDP districts, how that indicates it is evening out?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, again I say to the hon. gentleman that he is zeroing in on one little programme of the department and he is not taking the overall capital programme that we did approve last year. I indicated to him last week as well that we had anywhere from twenty-six to thirty different communities that are represented by gentlemen opposite, and I have a list of these if he would like to hear them, Mr. Speaker. We have Appleton, for instance, which got \$100,000 approved last year, Badger's Quay got \$250,000 approved in a Liberal district, and Bay Roberts in the district of Port de Grave got \$460,000 approved, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

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

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, if he is going to read out a list of twenty-six items, I would appreciate it if he would table it, we could get the information and we would not waste Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

There is no point of order. The hon. gentleman got up and asked a question, and he got a certain amount of publicity in cooperation with certain people who support him and, Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is giving the information, I think that we are entitled to hear the true facts and hopefully they will get the same headlines.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. I would ask the minister if he has a long list if he would table the list rather than read it because we are trying to have short questions and short answers.

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the hon. gentleman some time ago when

I gave him a list that we do not discriminate in any way, shape or form against municipalities in this Province. As I said, out in Gander last year we funded water and sewer, in Badger's Quay we funded to the tune of \$250,000, Mr. Speaker, down in Port de Grave, we gave \$500,000 last year for water and sewer projects, out in the hon. member's district of Twillingate -

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

As pursuant to the rules, we ask that that list be tabled, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, the Leader of the Opposition might read when he is looking up at the sky, but I saw the Minister of Municipal Affairs was looking up in the direction of our great Maker. He was not reading, Mr. Speaker, at all. The fact of the matter is none of the Opposition, either the official Opposition or the unofficial Opposition, Mr. Speaker, want to hear the facts. The whole facts and the truth are that the monies in this Province are distributed to all districts equally.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. I would ask the hon. the minister to keep his answer as short as he can.

MR. DOYLE:

Again, Mr. Speaker, when I contacted the hon. member for Menihek last week, I indicated to him as well that out in Windsor - Buchans we gave \$500,000 last year. Over in Wesleyville, in the district of the hon. member for Twillingate, we gave \$200,000 for a water and sewer project. Also, Mr. Speaker, over in Fortune - Hermitage and St. Bernard's we funded that district as well last year and we gave them \$500,000. Over in Norman's Cove - Long Cove we gave that district well over \$300,000 for water and sewer. Over in Hermitage - Sandyville it was \$350,000 for water and sewer, and I can go on and on, Mr. Speaker, but obviously hon. gentlemen opposite do not want me to. But I have a list of districts that were funded last year that are represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. It indicates beyond any shadow of a doubt that there is no discrimination whatsoever practiced in the Department of Municipal Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek, a final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs is this: I am talking about the 60/40

Government Guaranteed Municipal Paving programme, where the province pays 60 per cent and the 40 per cent is borne by the municipality and the loan is guaranteed by the provincial government. Would he tell me whether my figures are correct when we estimate that of the \$10.8 million spent last year in this programme, only \$400,000, or somewhere around 4 per cent was spent in Opposition districts? Could you either confirm or deny that statement for me?

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, again the hon. gentleman is trying to distort the facts because we do not separate paving programmes from water and sewer. It is a lump of funding that we make available to municipalities each year. It could very well happen in certain areas of our Province that some times Liberal districts get more money than PC districts might get on the water and sewer end of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? What!? What?

MR. DOYLE:

Or it might happen, Mr. Speaker, that districts represented by PCs in other sectors of the Province might get more paving done under the Municipal Roads programme. So what the hon. gentleman is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is distort the facts, just zero in on one little programme. I have a list here, and I can go on and on and on, of monies that were approved in the Department of Municipal Affairs

going to districts represented by Liberals, and that includes the firefighting programme, the community water service vote, water and sewer and municipal paving as well, Mr. Speaker. But just because a certain programme does not meet with the hon. gentleman's approval, I make no apologies to him whatsoever, because we have proven, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the Department of Municipal Affairs does not discriminate against any community in this Province, and I think our last year's capital programme will bear that out.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My final supplementary is this. Since I have the list here, it is I think appropriate at this time that I table the list. Will the Minister of Municipal Affairs go over the list this evening, come back to the House tomorrow and tell me whether these figures are substantively correct or not on this paving programme? Will the minister agree to do that for me please?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I am very well aware of what the list contains, just as well aware as the hon. gentleman, because I think he got that from my department. We provided the hon. gentleman with a list of water and sewer projects, and I believe the paving projects as well. Again, I make no apologies

to him for what is contained in that list because I think on a percentage basis, when you consider the number of seats on this side, as compared to the number on that side, it bears out very well that hon. gentlemen opposite got quite a chunk of funding out of our Municipal Capital Works Programme.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:  
A question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins,) Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister is aware of the results of a study done for the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment indicating that big business and small business view the policy of the provincial government to be detrimental and indeed devastating to the growth and expansion of business big and small in this Province?

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I really am not aware of that. I would like to see it. It must be some sort of fairy tale, so I would like to see the report if the hon. minister has it there. Now it may be that the hon. member has put his own interpretation on a report. Certainly there has been no official report to my knowledge released to this government or to the public.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:  
Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister will be surprised, because there is a study done and the results will be known shortly. In any event, Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is that in view of the fact that the study indicates that the business community of this Province are disturbed, they are upset with respect to the high taxes imposed by this government, and they are also upset by the bureaucratic attitude and by the unhelpful policies of this government - these are quotations - in view of these remarks coming from the study, will the minister undertake to correct this situation and start by reducing the retail sales tax in this Province?

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on an unofficial report - I presume it is an unofficial report, or the report of an unofficial report, or the report of a report of an unofficial report - read by an obviously biased observer. I mean, how can you comment on something that may not exist and if it does exist, is probably interpreted in a somewhat one-sided manner?

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question

to the Premier. In light of the fact that obviously some of the recommendations of the Nielsen Task Force Report are already being implemented without his knowledge, in a telex to me a short while ago the Premier stated that the Nielsen Task Force Report is not federal government policy and indicated he would not do anything about a particular recommendation until it became government policy I now ask the Premier, what is he going to do about all those recommendations in the Nielsen Report? Does he still stand by his position of a week ago that he would do nothing about them until they became formal government policy?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We have a letter from the federal government, from Mr. Nielsen and from other ministers in the federal government, that a given policy that is in the Nielsen Task Force Report, which they are seriously considering that affects a given province, they will come and talk to us about it first.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Will the Premier please indicate to the House and to the people of Newfoundland which of these recommendations are being considered? Because if they are carried through in total it will be devastating to rural Newfoundland. Will the Premier inform us which of these recommendations are being taken

seriously, which are going before the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet which, by the way, have already been approved by the Planning and Priorities Committee? Will the Premier please tell us that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to indicate to the hon. member if we have something before our Cabinet right now that has not been approved by our Cabinet or considered by our Cabinet here as to what we are going to do about it. As the Nielsen Task Force Report gets filtered into the various federal departments, and these federal departments then start to seriously consider those items, then that federal department gets hold of the similar provincial department and then the minister of that department here provincially brings it to Cabinet. So I cannot indicate to the hon. member things that could be considered by the provincial Cabinet until they are so considered. Then, after they are considered, we will be able to inform the hon. member and all the people of Newfoundland what our position is on that issue.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

In light of that process that the Premier just outlined, if all this consultation has been going on and if it has been considered by the provincial cabinet before the federal cabinet okays it and so



on, how come the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) did not know about this fee? Explain that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Because, Mr. Speaker, as I understand what the Minister of Fisheries said, it was fees that are levied against federal property in the Province and not provincial property.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

MR. BRETT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 10 the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) stood in this House. I am quoting from Hansard, Mr. Speaker. He said, "I have a report here in my hand, which I have had about two to three weeks, concerning the very serious problems at Exon House." Then, in the next question, he repeats himself. He says, "And I have a report here in front of me where I have at least eight to ten incidents." Today, Mr. Speaker, when he was replying to my Ministerial Statement, he said: "But when I get a copy of the report, I will table it in the House."

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that the hon. member is deliberately misleading this House. I know that I am not

permitted to say that and I do not think the hon. member would do it but, he is certainly confusing the issue when twice on Thursday he said he had the report and today he says he will table it when he gets it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave, to that point of order.

MR. EFFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can understand why Exon House is in the situation it is because, obviously, the minister cannot think, he cannot hear and he certainly cannot read.

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, I have here, as I indicated to the Minister of Social Services and to this hon. House, a report which was submitted dealing with eight different problems at Exon House. I also referred to information I had received concerning the high bacteria count. That is 'the report.' When I get it and photocopy it, I will table it. This one deals with eight entirely different matters and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), unless he is blatantly stupid, should know that answer. Also, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services last week said he had a copy of this report.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

## Notices of Motion

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act To Amend The Farm Development Loan Act."

## Petitions

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I will read the prayer of the petition. It is from the people who are looking on in the gallery. It is a little bit repetitive but, unfortunately, I was not able to do what I wanted to do in Question Period so I am using this vehicle in order to introduce it. "We, the undersigned, the firefighters of Newfoundland, petition the House of Assembly to urge the President of Treasury Board to meet with us as soon as possible."

Mr. Speaker, it is again a reinforcement of it. I see the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) is no longer here but I am assuming that he will meet with the firefighters quite quickly.

There is one comment in that whole dispute that I find particularly interesting and it is in the release put out by the firefighters where they indicate that they have the right to arbitration in order to resolve the disputes because, obviously, they are not allowed to go on strike. The interesting thing is it seems that eight items were taken to arbitration and, normally, in an arbitration procedure you would find that those items would be ruled on by the arbitration board, either they would give the government its position or they give the union its position or modify in between it somewhere but, ironically, two of the items have been returned to the two teams concerned without any resolution whatsoever. They were told to keep on working on them. I would like to know if someone on that side wishes to respond to it, either the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) or the President of Treasury Board. Could he indicate what is going on here? Do we have arbitration in this particular instance or are we really talking here about an arbitration cum conciliation process in which the whole process seems to be degenerating down to something less than the right to have an arbitrator rule on which of the items are most appropriate?

So I enter the petition into the records and I hope there is some response from the other side.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

I rise just to speak very briefly

to the petition. I did not hear the prayer of the petition exactly or verbatim but I understand that it basically calls for me to meet with the firefighters, if that is correct. Obviously, I have already answered that in the Question Period. I will be only too happy to meet with them, as I have in the past, quite extensively, met with the negotiating team from the firefighters on two if not three occasions, I think, during the first round of negotiations. Prior to going to arbitration, which we have already done, we have been negotiating an extended contract and the firefighters do indeed have the right to binding arbitration, not conciliation, but binding arbitration is provided there. That is an option that is open to them. I would hope that we do not have to come to that. I would hope that we have an opportunity to negotiate an agreement which is agreeable to both sides.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
To that petition, Mr. Speaker, obviously when we have members of the firefighters feeling it necessary to come to the Confederation Building and demonstrate their concern, this is an indication that the negotiating process is breaking down. We have seen it break down before, most recently in the NAPE negotiations but, not only in the NAPE negotiations. We have regularly over the last several years seen the breakdown of negotiations when it comes to public employees,

firemen, policemen, teachers and others trying to deal with this administration. Now, it is an indication that there is something fundamentally wrong with the approach of members opposite. You only have to go back and look at the way in which the wage freeze was brought in two years ago, no consultation, totally arrogant, totally contemptuous of anybody working for government, you only have to look at the arrogant fashion in which government has been operating to understand why the negotiating process is breaking down.

The minister has had to back off in the case of NAPE. He had to back water like a squid there because he backed himself in after a couple of days. When he finally realized that he was not going to be able to arrest every public employee who went on the picket line, he finally had to back off. Now, will he take a look at the problems that relate to the firefighters of this Province and not box himself in and get back to the bargaining table and give direction to the negotiators that are at the bargaining table for government and make sure that they are dealing fairly and reasonably with people who are just looking for a fair and decent wage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:  
I have a petition on behalf of thirty-five residents of the town of Englee. The prayer of the

petition is: "We, the residents of Englee, hereby petition the hon. Ron Dawe, Minister of the Department of Transportation for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and the hon. Don Mazankowski, Minister of Transport Canada, to take immediate steps to have a federal - provincial roads agreement signed and funds made available for the completion of the upgrading and paving of the Cross Country Road and of the roads that come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation within our town so that we can enjoy the most basic of road conditions that have been experienced by residents of all similar town and communities in this Province for many years, that of pavement."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to stand up today and support that petition. This is the fifth time that I have brought word from different people concerning that same road. The strategy that the people in the area are using, Mr. Speaker, does not involve going out and tearing this society to pieces. They are not law-breakers. They are not breaking rules. They still, I believe, Mr. Speaker, have a belief in the political process. They are making their views known in a way which is reasonable, in a way which they believe it will come to the attention of this government.

The people of Englee, Mr. Speaker, are not asking that all the roads be done immediately. Neither are they asking that the Province would undergo the full responsibility for paving this thirty-five miles of Route 432. They realize, they have listened to the propaganda, I suppose, which the Minister of

Transportation has put out, the propaganda which seems to throw large figures at people. They were told at one time that it would cost \$55 million to upgrade and pave all the roads in that area. The figures which the Minister of Transportation put forward are so frightening and so startling that the citizens are asking that this government enter into a secondary roads agreement, so that the Cross Country Road can be paved.

But also right in the prayer of the petition, they are also referring to their own roads around Englee. Mr. Speaker, a portion of the roads around Englee are owned by the Department of Transportation. Even though they are inside the boundaries of the Town of Englee, the road belongs to the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation has to upgrade and maintain this road, they have to do the snowclearing on it in the Winter months, Mr. Speaker, and they have to put the calcium chloride on it in the Summer and so on. The people of Englee are asking that the minister would find some money to go in there and pave those roads.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1972 or 1973, I was the Mayor of the Town of Roddickton. At that time, I met with a former Deputy Minister of Highways for the Province of Newfoundland. This was shortly after the Moores Administration had taken over. It was shortly after the Tory Administration had relieved Newfoundland of all the injustices that we had known down through the years and had relieved Newfoundland of all these sporadic attempts at road building, pork barrelling and all this foolish.

So, the Tory Government, Mr. Speaker, came up with a five year roads plan, so that at any given time any person in Newfoundland could know where the paving was going to be done in year one, year two, year three. It was an extremely good plan, Mr. Speaker.

The announcement was made by the former Premier at the Mayors and Municipalities Conference, which I attended. After that announcement was made public at the convention, I came to the Deputy Minister of Transportation of Highways and asked them where the Englee Road fitted in, in this five year plan? The deputy minister said, "which five year plan are you talking about?" Well, I said, "the five year plan that the Premier announced."

"No," he said, "which one are you talking about, the first one or the second one?" "Well," I said, "the government has only been changed a little over a year. There could not have been two. Oh, yes," he said, laughingly and mockingly, "there are really two five year plans." He made a complete farce of the whole concept of a five year plan but he did walk to the glass cage which most of our offices have, and he pulled out a bond booklet, Mr. Speaker, and he leafed through it and he said, "okay, in the year 1973 the road around Englee is going to be paved" or the road in that area. He did not specifically say Englee, Mr. Speaker. I will not be misquoting the hon. gentleman.

But he did say that in the year 1973 paving will be done in that area, 1973. I was feeling very happy over this. But the gentleman did give me a bit of advice, he said, "Now, Mr. Decker,

do not hold your breath because there is only a by-election on the South Coast or to be some other event which will take place in this Province, and you will lose your pavement." Sure enough, true to his word, there was a by-election somewhere on the South Coast at the time. I understand that some cars came near to being run over by paving equipment and we lost our road. But today, the people of Englee are asking again that this government take a rational approach and endeavour to pave Route 432, as well as the Department of Transportation road around the town of Englee.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker, it seems that members opposite are not interested in paving the unpaved portions of our Province so I stand and support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) for thirty-five people from the community of Englee. It seems to me to be a crime in this twentieth century when we have to stand here in the House of Assembly and beg to have parts of a road paved in Newfoundland. To think that after the time that we have been in Confederation as a Province of Canada, where the rest of the provinces seem to have done very well with their roads, we have to stand in the House of Assembly and present petitions on behalf of people living in certain areas of Newfoundland to have their roads paved.

It was only a couple of weeks ago

that I heard the President of the Newfoundland Road Builders Association say in an interview with CBC Radio that in order for the Newfoundland roads to be up to the standard of the rest of the provinces in Canada, that instead of the \$180 million which the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) so proudly talked about signing last year over a five year period, he said in order for the roads in this Province to be brought to any standard near to that enjoyed by the rest of the people living in other provinces of Canada, they would have to spend \$180 million a year for the next five years. When you hear the experts that are involved in road building in Newfoundland stand and make statements like this in public forums, there certainly is a problem in the Strait of Belle Isle but there is also a problem in many districts in Newfoundland.

The district that I happen to represent, the district of Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, the lifeline to the communities of Burgeo, Ramea, Francois and Grey River is connected to the heart of Newfoundland or to the rest of Newfoundland by a ninety mile stretch of road that has not been paved. The road was put there with federal money signed by that other government in Ottawa, that Liberal government that we do not hear much about right now and the same provincial government that is there right now. The second five year agreement that we heard talk about was signed and has now expired but, we still have a stretch of about seventy miles of dirt road connecting this very important part of Newfoundland. There are two fish plants involved right there in the district, three actually now, because the

fishermen of Burgeo now sell their fish to the fish plant in St. George's where the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has his district. It would seem to me that he would be interested in getting that road paved to improve the quality of fish that is going over it. What has happened now, because this road was not paved, we have heard the people of Burgeo, Ramea, Francois and Grey River, in their petitions to the minister and to the federal member for that area, talk about the condition of the fish that is shipped over that road and talk about the added cost that is involved to the fish plants. I think it costs the Burgeo plant somewhere around \$150,000 a year and a like amount for the plant in Ramea. Now, the plant in the minister's district that is buying fish from Burgeo right now is no doubt involved in a quality product and, if the road was paved, this product would be much better and would, as the people pointed out in the petition, employ more people if they could ship a different product instead of the frozen cod blocks which they have to ship out of this area right now.

So the secondary roads agreement between the federal government, which was signed when the Liberals were in Ottawa and the same members were over there, has now expired. There has been no attempt to sign a secondary roads agreement, so the road to Burgeo, like the one on the Great Northern Peninsula that my colleague referred to are left with no plans made to pave them. We did not see anything in the good news budget saying there was going to anything paved.

So what I am saying is there have

been petitions made by me in this House on behalf of the residents in Burgeo, Ramea, Francois, Grey River and I have written the minister asking what he plans to do about it, if he intends to do anything about the upgrading and the paving of the secondary roads. An indication of what I am talking about now is the Burgeo Road. This is not a secondary road. This should be a main road. It is the only connection that those people have to the mainstream of Newfoundland.

So I support this petition and ask the minister to contact this federal friends in Ottawa and see if he can get a secondary agreement signed so that not only with the people of the Great Northern Peninsula and the people of Burgeo have a road but the rest of the people in Newfoundland who have not got paved roads. Let us have the Province of Newfoundland's roads brought up to the standard of the rest of provinces of Canada.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of some 330 people in the Gander Bay region, 330 students and 20 teachers as a matter of fact, of Centennial Central High School. Mr. Speaker, I could have presented two but in the interest of time I present them as one. The prayer of the petition reads:

"We, the undersigned, teaching staff of Centennial Central High School," and of course the students in the second one,

"hereby petition the provincial government to meet a delegation from the communities of Port Albert, Stoneville, Horwood, Rogers Cove, Victoria Cove, Wings Point, Clarke's Head in Gander Bay South with a view to giving them a concrete decision for the upgrading and paving of the Boyd's Cove, Rogers Cove, Port Albert Road and the Horwood Branch. This decision should be forthcoming within the next two weeks."

Mr. Speaker, the people of Gander Bay have waited and waited and waited I believe since the days of the Moores' Administration when they were told then by that administration that this road be upgraded and paved at the same time as the Bonavista North Loop Road, which is paved by the federal government, of course.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note too that when the government does spend money on that road, where it spends it. As a matter of fact, I think it is spending something over \$1 million this year on one end of the road but it is on the end of the road that has the least amount of traffic and it is in a Tory district. Well, of course! We accept that but we think that is a little bit of poor planning on the part of the government because really, the road in question that those people are concerned about, the end that has the most traffic on is the end that is in the great and historic district of Fogo. That is the end of the road of course and it leads from Farewell Head to Rogers Cove and, of course, there is a school on that road called Centennial High School. Those are the people who are petitioning the government here and that is where the greatest amount of traffic is. But the government, for some

strange reason, has chosen to spend their money in the great and historic district of Lewisporte which, I suppose, is as far as their planning goes, their party politics.

MR. SIMMS:

So there is never any money spent in Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I did not say never any. We get the scattered little crumb.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the government to consider this petition in view of the fact - well I only have a couple of more minutes left so I am not going to go at the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) - I would urge the government to look at where the traffic is and where it is coming and I say to them that most of it comes over that section of the road which those people are petitioning to have done and that is where the priorities should be, from Port Albert, Farewell Head, to Rogers Cove. I am sure that the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) will agree that that is the area where there is the most traffic because you get most of the traffic that is coming from Fogo, most of the traffic still goes toward Gander, and, of course, you get the people from Gander Bay who have to travel to Centennial High to school.

Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting to note that every organization, even the Lewisporte Chamber of Commerce, the Gander Chamber of Commerce, and every organization in the four districts of Lewisporte, Twillingate, Fogo and Gander have said that this should be the road that has top priority on the Northeast Coast of the Province. The Minister of

Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) may want to speak to this. I believe that they have urged the provincial government to sign a secondary roads agreement and when it signs a secondary roads agreement to make that one of its top priorities. Every association, the Fogo Island Development Association, the Gander Bay - Hamilton Sound Development Association, the Lewisporte Chamber of Commerce, the Twillingate - New World Island Development Association and so on, have asked for this.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and to the government that they should heed this petition. The people of Gander Bay are a very patient people, make no mistake about that. But I was at a public meeting on Friday night where those frustrations are fast coming to a boil and unless - I have to warn the government, I think it is fair warning - unless something is done this year to see that that road is upgraded and paved, then the member for Lewisporte (Mr. Russell) and the member for Fogo can make up their minds that in that part of the district which use those roads, we are going to have a very hot Summer. I am not talking about the sun shining on us. I know that that is the case, Mr. Speaker.

I ask that the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) use every ounce of influence that he has got on the Premier and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to see that that road is upgraded and paved, that it is included in a secondary roads agreement and that we get a written commitment from the government that that will be the case.



Mr. Speaker, I ask that the petition be laid upon the table of the House and that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

I, unfortunately, was not in my place at the beginning of the hon. member for Fogo's (Mr. Tulk) presentation but I am assuming, correct me if I am wrong, that he was presenting a petition from the people in his district for some work to be done on what we commonly refer to as the Gander Bay Road.

I certainly have no problem in supporting a petition for work on that road, particularly the part of it that pertains to my own district. Most of it, I think, is in my district. I do not intend to speak long to this petition except to say that I certainly support the prayer of the petition and the facts and the information that the hon. member for Fogo mentioned in terms of support by the Lewisporte Chamber of Commerce, for example, and others has been there. I sure the member will recall a meeting that both he and I attended in Gander, I think it was in November sometime or whenever, where there were representatives for practically all of those areas present and that was the reason for the meeting, to talk about that particular piece of road. If I remember, again, correctly out of that meeting I think it was suggested that a committee get together and put together their

priorities as they saw them for that particular piece of road. There was suppose to have been another meeting just prior to Christmas but I think for some reason or other -

MR. TULK:

A storm.

MR. RUSSELL:

Because of a storm that got postponed.

I have made some representation to my colleague, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and I have subsequently made a press release. There has been a tender call go out, and I do not know the date that tenders will close, but very shortly, to do a fairly substantial amount of reconstruction and upgrading on that road. I am serious. The tenders will close very shortly. That is taking nothing away from the need for that road to be done. There is a very high volume of traffic over that road because the ferry terminal at Farewell brings in traffic from Fogo Island and Change Islands, which are in my district.

Certainly, I have made sincere representation, I am sure the hon. member has, to the Minister of Transportation and I am pleased, at least, that there will be some work done on that road this summer and a beginning will be made on it.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to very, very strongly support the petition presented by the hon. the member for Fogo. I know the section of road rather well. For quite some time now it has been the only section of road in that area, extending from Twillingate to Lewisporte to Gander, that has not been paved. It is around, I think, ten miles or in that vicinity and the road is in very bad condition for most of the Summer, simply because of the type of base that is on the road. I understand there is a lot of upgrading that needs to be done on it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a decision has been made then to start doing something with that road. The Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr Russell) has pointed that out and tenders have been called. But it is rather interesting to look at the process by which they decide which part of that road gets started first, and which gets upgraded and which gets paved first. Now, if I were looking at it, I would first of all say, and I assume this is normal procedure with the Department of Highways, they would first of all put a few things across the road to see where most of the traffic is. Then they would look at things like social convenience and so on before they decide where to spend the money. It so happens that the money is now going to be spent not on the area of road that contains a school, that the school bus traffic is continually going back and forth over, not on that part of the road. It is not on the part of the road that potentially has a lot of traffic from the point of view of fresh fish coming from Fogo and going into Gander, using Gander as a transshipment port to be shipped to markets in

the Eastern United States and overseas, it is not that part of the road at all. It is not the part of the road that most of the traffic is on.

The money is going to be spent on the part of the road that is least used and for some reason, you know, you wonder why that is the way that is done, until you look at a map and you find that the division line between provincial districts goes right through that section of road. The Minister of Consumer Affairs is quite right that most of that road is in his district.

I think that the area that is going to be upgraded coincides almost exactly with the boundary line between the provincial districts. I have not gone out and actually measured it, Mr. Speaker, but I think that is a fairly close estimate as to where the work is going to be done. It makes one wonder on what basis decisions are being made.

I know that in the plans for the further development of Gander Airport were quite close to getting a chill freeze unit. That chill freeze unit, according to the Fogo Island Co-op, would be of tremendous benefit to them in keeping their fish plant open for longer hours, running three shifts instead of two, and this kind of thing during the Summer. The markets can be developed and, in fact, have been developed for the shipment of fresh fish. In order to get to Gander, they have to come into Farewell and then travel, not the section of the road towards Lewisporte, but the section of the road towards Gander which is not going to be done. We have no indication that is ever going to be done.

MR. TULK:

It is a strange world.

MR. BAKER:

There is no indication at all. All we are told is that the section of road that happens to be in the Lewisporte district is going to be upgraded this year. I suspect next year hon. gentlemen opposite will come up with some money to pave it and they will leave this two or three mile section where the school is, where most of the traffic is sitting there until the next election, then it can be used, Mr. Speaker, as an election plum.

I would suggest that these people, the people of Twillingate Island and New World Island that would like to come to Gander, the people of Fogo getting off the ferry and wanting to come to Gander for some reason or other, I think these people, Mr. Speaker, have waited long enough. I think that it is a real shame that crass politics can be played with a little tiny section of road. There are times, Mr. Speaker, when paving machines and road equipment blossomed, the Caterpillars come out. We all heard speeches about that in the past, about the Caterpillars blooming just before elections. And I suspect very strongly that rather than doing the road in a logical pattern, where the traffic is, where the school is and so on, that this is a deliberate ploy so that now we will have about three miles left when the next election rolls around and then the politicians go out and say, "Boy, we will promise this. This is a magnificent promise during the next election and if the people go along with us, then boy will they ever be happy to get their three or four kilometer stretch of road paved."

Mr. Speaker, I very strongly support this petition, not only from the point of view of the airport business in Gander and the fresh fish that could travel along that route but, on behalf of the people in that area, who have put up with the dust for long enough and really do not want to put up with the political considerations and political ways of doing things in that area any longer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

#### Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion one, Interim Supply.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the last day when we were considering this resolution - I should say resolution because I am going to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and, if memory serves me, he referred to the Interim Supply Bill and the Supplementary Supply Bill as - certainly the Interim Supply Bill, I think he mentioned Supplementary Supply, too - some sort of plague that has suddenly descended on the Province.

MR. TULK:

Quorum call, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is a quorum present.

DR. COLLINS:

Where was I? I have lost the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). There he is over there, communing with the member for Gander (Mr. Baker). The hon. member for Bonavista North seemed to indicate that because there are interim supply bills or supplementary supply bills before the House this is some sort of plague, and the imputation was that this is something new, you know, plagues are not something you have time and time again. So he was indicating - I am just paraphrasing my memory of his speech - that the Interim Supply Bill was some new ploy that this government has played on the House. Of course that is ridiculous, as members know. We regularly bring in an interim supply bill, we regularly bring in a supplementary supply bill, other jurisdictions regularly bring in interim supply bills and regularly bring in supplementary supply bills. So there is nothing new, weird or wonderful about it, it is normal annual procedure. And the reason why it is normal annual procedure is that these particular bills are necessary to carry out the duties of government and serve the people of this Province.

Now, the hon. member opposite, I do not know if it was Friday he argued this, but he seemed to argue that there is something wrong about Interim Supply Bills. His argument went that this House has not given an appropriation for

certain funding, therefore, when government goes for an Interim Supply Bill, it is not acting on the basis of an appropriation from this House because, obviously, if there was an appropriation there you would not need it. If this House had said, 'You can spend \$100 on such and such a service or such and such a packet of goods,' we would not need to go and get Interim Supply to get \$100 to pay for it.

The reason why you go for Interim Supply is that you need \$100 worth of goods and you do not have the appropriation for it, i.e. the House has not given its agreement to spend that \$100 on that packet of goods, so we, then, go and get an Interim Supply Bill. An Interim Supply Bill is done on the basis that we have not got the permission of the Legislature to spend that money. So there is nothing wrong about that. It is done every year. It is done by all jurisdictions.

Now, the one caveat put on that is that once we take that action it is understood, and we have to stand by it - as a matter of fact, the Financial Administration makes us stand by it - that we have to then inform the House. So when we get this money in Interim Supply, or in Supplementary Supply, we are doing it on the understanding that it is proper as long as we then come back to the House and report on this and then the House, in a vote, agrees with it. Because it is a money bill and it is a serious matter, if government cannot get it through the House government falls and there has to be an election, I presume. But as long as a report is made to the House and as long as the House validates the Interim Supply, there is no problem.

Now, I am not certain what the hon. member was bellyaching about, because this is what we did. There was an urgent need for funds. Hon. members opposite stymied the House, prevented the House from giving its prior approval. They got up and thumped the desk and said, 'You will never get Interim Supply through this House except under certain circumstances.' You had to believe them. They are hon. members. I presume they speak from conviction. So we had to take their word that we would never get an Interim Supply Bill through this House. So we were cut off from getting prior approval.

All we could do then was get the money and get approval afterwards, as we do every year, year after year. Other jurisdictions do it. The federal government does it. You do it only when you are driven to it, and we were driven to it in this case.

I think that was the main point the hon. member made and it was a very poor point, it had no weight or validity. I think he is ashamed of it. He seems to have run out of the House. I would not like to leave that in Hansard. I would like to underline that there was absolutely no weight, no substance, there were no facts behind the hon. member's argument in contention and it should be, therefore, totally disregarded and, indeed, thrown into the ash can.

I am sure other people want to speak on this resolution, and I think I have said as much as I wish at this time.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, for some time now, we have been pointing out that the administration has been involved in illegal activity, when it brought forth Special Warrants when the House could have been open to approve the expenditures for which the minister and the administration were seeking these. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have a lot of other business to get on with and we have to get on with other matters. We do not intend to prolong debate on this point. We will, however, be voting against the Interim Supply Bill, because any members who vote now for this bill will be voting to ratify illegal activity, will be voting to approve the action which government has taken which was illegal, which was contrary to the Financial Administration Act. The House does not need to accept the views of the Opposition as to whether or not it was illegal, the House can look at the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice who said it was illegal, and the opinion of the Auditor General who said it was illegal.

Mr. Chairman, the words of the Financial Administration Act are clear in themselves. There is no question that government was breaking the act when it sought Special Warrants in this case. I think our point has been made and I think it is a point that is going to come back to haunt this administration, is going to come back to haunt members opposite as they try and ask others to respect the laws of this Province when they have shown, themselves, that they are not prepared to respect

the Statutes which have been passed by this House.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very sad day for democracy in Newfoundland; it is a day where we will see a majority opposite stand up and ratify illegal activity; it is a day when they will stand up and ratify the taking away of power from this house to approve expenditures, the control over the public purse which is the very essence and basis of parliamentary democracy. Mr. Chairman, we hope members are going to be suitably ashamed of themselves when they stand up to ratify such an illegal act.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond briefly to the comments by the Leader of the Opposition. It cannot be left said that the government acted in some sort of illegal way because it did not. That fact has been pointed out on numerous occasions by the President of the Council, by the Minister of Finance, and by other members on this side. The fact of the matter is, what took place in terms of the action is provided for. Treasury Board is permitted to overrule any objections by the Comptroller General and, in this particular case, Treasury Board did just that. So it is not an illegal act. Hon. members opposite would like to have the public believe it was an illegal act, but it is not and was not an illegal act.

What we have to remember, of

course, is what got us into this process in the beginning. Let us not forget what transpired and what took place. Hon. members opposite had occasion to debate for three or four days before the House closed for the normal Easter recess, the total amount of Interim Supply, which was somewhere in the area of \$700 million only, compared to the fact that the entire federal budget of \$109 billion is debated in six days. And remember, also, that Interim Supply, in any event, will be included in the Budget Debate, because it is the same monies over again. So hon. members opposite would have plenty of time to debate that. When we were put in the position, Mr. Chairman, of being held up to ransom by members opposite, this government acted in the best interests of the people of the Province and will continue to do so.

I pointed out the other day, Mr. Chairman, that the Warrant was required in order to get funds to pay the salaries of those people who were still working, to pay provision to people who are on social assistance, for other kinds of commitments for various types of contracts that are ongoing and need to be entered into early in the fiscal year and, also, Mr. Chairman, with respect to contract funding for firefighting, for example, contracts which have to be entered into in the new fiscal year, early in April.

So, Mr. Chairman, there were a number of funds required under that Special Warrant in Interim Supply which we had to get in order to carry on for the benefit of the people of the Province. Mr. Chairman, I think hon. members opposite should use a bit of common sense now for once in their

lives and get on with this particular debate, get it out of the way, and let us get on to the full budget estimates where, if they are sensible at all, they will have a chance to get into the meat of the full budget. They have wasted ten or twelve days on Interim Supply, have not asked one question on millions of dollars that have been expended, and they should be ashamed of themselves. I beg them, plead with them, to conclude the debate on Interim Supply now, use their common sense and let us get on with the next course of action.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Shall the resolution carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall section 1 carry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Nay.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall section 2 carry?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Division.

MR. BARRY:  
The 'nays' have it, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
The 'nays' had it.

MR. YOUNG:  
Have a division. Have a division.

MR. SIMMS:  
Call in the members.

MR. BARRY:  
It is carried.

MR. TULK:  
You lost the vote.

MR. BARRY:  
It is all over. Good bye, Interim Supply. You did not have enough members. Too bad!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
We have had a vote and the 'nays' had it, so what is the procedure now? How many times are we going to go through this? There was a vote taken and there were more members on this side of the House saying 'nay' than there were on the other side saying 'yea' and that is the way the process works.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Who said the 'nays' had it?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
A vote was called for and members in the House, as is their right, asked for a Division.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Who? Who?

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TULK:

There was no Division asked for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, there was.

MR. TULK:

There was a half-hearted attempt; they got up and they sat down. The truth of the matter is, as the Leader of the Opposition said, when the vote was called, every member who is now on this side of the House was here and there were six on that side.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, not true. There were fourteen over here.

MR. BARRY:

There were six.

MR. TULK:

There were six. The 'nays' had it and there was no Division called. Obviously, the motion was defeated. We know they are smarting because they cannot keep their members in the House, but that is the name of the game. You have to keep your members in the House when there is going to be a vote and in this case, there were six sitting on that side of the House and ten on this side.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I will take that point of order under advisement and we will recess for a couple of minutes.

### Recess

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

I apologize for the delay. We had to listen to the Tapes of today's Hansard. I did say the resolution carried. Following that the Clerk called Section 1. Then there was a point of order by the Leader of the Opposition, which was actually

no point of order, and then the Government House Leader called for a division. If you wish to proceed with that division, you may do so.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, 82 (e) says: 'The same procedure for a division in the House shall be followed in Committee of the Whole', which we are now in.

MR. TULK:

A division was not asked for.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, I called for a division.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Call in the members.

### Division

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Those in favour of the motion, please stand: The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Culture Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister



of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), Mr. Patterson, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Tobin, the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt), Mr. Hodder, Mr. Warren, Mr. Woodford.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Those against the motion, please stand: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Efford, Mr. Baker, Mr. Furey, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Decker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I declare the motion carried.

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, 1987, the sum of seven hundred and fifteen million three hundred and thirty thousand nine hundred dollars (\$715,330,900).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and has directed me to report that it has adopted a certain resolution and recommends that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on Interim Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report that they have adopted a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to same.

On motion, resolution read a first time.

MR. BARRY:

Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Division. Call in the members.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour, please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr.

Ottenheimer), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Ms Verge), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), Mr. Greening, Mr. Patterson, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Tobin, the hon. the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), Mr. Hodder, Mr. Warren, Mr. Woodford.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, please stand.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Efford, Mr. Baker, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Decker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The 'Ayes' have it.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I notice that the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) did not rise in his seat either for or against which is, I guess, understandable seeing the party that he represents. I know that is his business, but your attention to Standing Order 83: "On a division every member present in his place in the House when the question is put shall be required to vote." I would ask you to require the member for Menihek to vote. It is unfortunate that we have to require the member for Menihek to vote.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The Leader of the Opposition is completely correct, 83 reads as such. The purpose of calling members in for a division is to assure that there is a vote, The requirement is quite clear; it has always been clear in parliamentary precedents, that anyone in the Chamber has to vote.

MR. J. CARTER:

Name him, Mr. Speaker, and fire him out.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That is what we are sent here for.

MR. BARRY:

That is exactly why.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I call on the hon. member for Menihek to vote on this resolution.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, to vote for it is to vote for an illegal act on the part of the government, to vote against it is to vote for these shenanigans. What is a person to do?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is our Standing Order, number 83.

MR. FENWICK:

In that case, Mr. Speaker, I think what I will have to do is leave

the Chamber while you are recording the vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

It is too late.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, what are you going to do? I mean, this is illegal and this is foolish. What side am I going to go with?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

If the gentleman finds that the responsibility is too much, he can always resign.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

If the member for Menihek wishes to have a few moments recess so he can make a few calls to the union leaders of the Province, to select union bosses, we would be happy to adjourn to permit him to do that.

MR. TULK:

Perhaps he wants to go over and talk to 'Bill'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Our Standing Order 83 is quite clear. "On a division every member present in his place in the House

when the question is put shall be required to vote." So the hon. member is required to vote.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a heck of a Hobson's choice we have here, but if I have to choose the illegal bunch on that side or the foolish bunch on this side, I choose the illegal bunch of brigands on that side and I vote accordingly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, resolution read a second time.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Seven 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. 18)

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

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Head 1, Consolidated Fund Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 1.1.01 carry?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise on this head because the objective of now starting this debate in Committee is to give Supply to Her Majesty, and the reason we give Supply to Her Majesty is to serve the people of this Province.

Now, members opposite do not want to give Supply to Her Majesty, they voted against it - in fact, we had to have two divisions on it - therefore, they do not want to give funding for the services of people in this Province. So you wonder why we had to go into this debate; they have already stated their attitude toward serving the people of this Province.

We, on this side, 100 percent, want to supply services and goods to the people of this Province. We know that hon. members opposite, with the single exception of the member for Menihek, and even he was of two minds on the matter, do not want to supply services and funds to the people of this Province, otherwise, how could they have voted against the Interim Supply Bill, which is an integral part of main supply? It is a strange situation to be in.

However, just to maintain the order of events, I certainly would advocate that we do vote, for a change, to fund Consolidated Fund Services. The total amount is \$460 million, although we only vote a very small proportion of that because most of the items are statutory in nature and they do not need to be voted in Committee or subsequently in the House. As

a matter of fact, I think the total amount we do have to vote is \$2.1 million, and that relates to ex gratia payments, all the rest is statutory.

Just a word on Consolidated Fund Services, because there has been some question raised in debate as to how we handle consolidated fund. There have been a number of suggestions that we should dedicate some of our revenues for specific purposes. Mr. Chairman, we do not do that, of course, nor do jurisdictions in Canada and, I believe, in the UK. Now, I am not too sure about the US, there may be certain revenues dedicated to particular activities but we do not do that. Revenues go into the consolidated fund and, then, out of our consolidated fund we fund particular programmes and particular projects. I would just like to make that point. It is important from government's point of view that that be so. If it were not so, I think we would get into a great deal of difficulty.

For instance, if we had our retail sales tax dedicated to health it could mean, firstly, that there was not sufficient funding for health, even though health needed extra funding, because you would be limited to RST. On the other hand, it could be that health would be well and sufficiently funded, because it is getting all the revenues from RST, whereas other urgent services, perhaps social assistance, or education, or any service you might need is underfunded. Because, in normal events, you might want to take some money from RST and put it into that other activity but, by having a dedication of funding, you would be precluded from doing that. So I think it is a much better way of organizing our

affairs, to have the single consolidated fund; all revenues go into it, and then government can recommend how those funds be spent and then the House can finally vote on how they should be spent. It leaves control to the Parliament, on the recommendation of government, without any other, shall we say, mechanical aspect of things coming in that might give undue rigidity or lack of flexibility to the system.

The amount in Consolidated Fund Services is for the purposes of managing the public debt, which is fairly heavy and, also, it is for the purpose of funding our pension plans for government and government agency employees. Hon. members of the Committee will remember that a number of years ago, I think it was in 1980, we began to fund the commitment to our pension plan. It is not a fully funded plan. Prior to 1980, there was no funding for the pension plan, the pension distributions were totally dependent on the Consolidated Fund Service; there were no funds set up specifically for that purpose. But a number of years ago, in 1980 I think it was, we decided to lay aside some monies out of Consolidated Fund each year for the purpose of our later obligations, and what we decided to put aside was the amount in the current year coming in by way of contributions. So that means that past service was not funded but, on an ongoing basis, we were more or less not letting things get any worse.

Now, the servicing of the public debt is a responsibility of every jurisdiction, of every government, and it is a statutory responsibility, as I have already mentioned. If we fall behind,

obviously, in servicing our public debt, we would have difficulty in getting people to take up our bonds. So we are very concerned that there not be any doubt that we are attuned and we are alert to the need to have our credit rating upheld in the financial markets of the world and that this never be brought into question in any smallest way. If it were questioned in any way not only would our reputation suffer but certainly there might well be some difficulty in disposing, at a proper rate of interest and that type of thing, of our provincial issues.

This is why this government was so incensed, in a way, when, in the last Auditor General's Report, there was an oblique suggestion that we were not maintaining our financial affairs in a proper order, in such a way that perhaps the people who would take up our bonds might question whether we were following normal procedures in reporting our debts, in reporting our financial activities. One does not have any problem whatever if there is a question raised as to, shall we say, the specifics of the method and that sort of thing, but to suggest in any way that we were putting out misleading information, that would be as serious, in my view, as our saying we do not have sufficient monies to pay the interest on our debt, or have sufficient funds to redeem our debentures as they become due.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure certain other hon. members of Committee will want to comment on this particular head. It is not a head that usually engenders a great deal of debate per se, that is related to what expenditures have to go out under this head. There

often is a fair bit of debate that arises on the level of our public debt, on its rate of accumulation, on how we will finally dispose of it, whether we are engaging in too much public debt in relation, shall we say, to current account. I do not think anyone questions the approach we take in funding our capital accounts out of borrowings. That is like a person, say, building a house: You do not wait until you get all the money in your hand before you go out and buy a house, what you do is you say "A House is something useful I should have. It is something I will possess over twenty-five or thirty-odd years, therefore I will pay it off over twenty-five or thirty years." Well, it is the same way with our capital account items, our roads, our schools, our hospitals, and that sort of thing. They will be of use to us over an extended period of time, so it is only right and proper that we should pay for them over an extended period of time and that is what we do out of our capital account.

The question then arises about current account. Current account is something that only deals with a particular year's operating expenses and our approach has always been in normal times to balance our current account. In the last few years, we have not balanced our current account and I think if an excuse were needed for that - and I am not certain that an excuse is needed - but if an excuse were needed for that, we would have to say that if our revenues go down, as they did during the recession for a number of reasons, the only way to keep things in balance would be to not employ the people we should employ and not to continue to exhibit the

public services such as health, education, social assistance, consumer affairs, justice, whatever, that should continue to exhibit. So we take the view that this is a temporary state of affairs, this deficit on current account that we have to fund out of borrowings. It is not something that is in our long term plan. It is only related to the particular circumstances that arose during the recessionary years. So with those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I move this head.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:  
The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), when he spoke, did indeed allude to comments over the years made by the Auditor General with respect to the Province's management of the finances of this Province and, naturally, we are going to want to put some of these questions to the minister on those items, specifically, that the Auditor General raised.

Before getting into some of these points, I want to make a few general remarks and, by way of making these general remarks, I want to talk about the public debt. The minister, no doubt, wants to avoid talking about the public debt. The public debt of this Province, both direct and indirect at this moment, is around the incomprehensible figure for most ordinary people and I suppose for many, many people, of \$4.2 billion. That is the public debt, \$4.2 billion, both direct and indirect. I want hon. members to note the adjective that I used,

the incomprehensible figure of \$4.2 billion. Most of us normal human beings cannot understand a million. We really cannot appreciate the significance and the enormity of \$1 million. When we look at \$4.2 billion -

MR. SIMMS:

That is right out of your league.

MR. LUSH:

I make no apologies to tell the hon. the minister that that is certainly out of this member's league to talk in terms of \$4.2 billion. I do have some feeling and I do have some understanding of what that means to the public debt of this Province. I also know that in the past four years we have been averaging, while putting this Province in debt on a yearly basis, somewhere close to \$250 million, on an average. If we look at 1982 the public debt was somewhere around \$3 million and today it is at \$4.2 billion and that works out adding to the public debt by \$250 million a year.

MR. TULK:

Have you worked out how much that is for every man, woman and child?

MR. LUSH:

No, I have not, but that could be easily done.

I think a matter that needs to be pointed out is when we talk about trying to cut down on the deficit, or trying to balance the budget, that a lot of people do not understand that that does not relate to the public debt whatsoever. For example, the minister talked about this year by aiming towards a deficit of somewhere around \$49 million, \$2 million better than last year, but that is not to address - and we are just approaching balancing the

budget. The minister has no idea when that is, when he is going to arrive there. He did give some long term solution. Next year he was going to reduce it by another few million but it is going to be a long time before we get into balancing the budget. Even in this year when he trims the deficit by some \$2 million or brings it down to \$49 million, by the same token our public debt increases by \$250 million, putting us to the \$4.2 billion.

So, Mr. Chairman, when we look at that we can see what an economic mess this Province is in and no wonder from time to time the Auditor General makes some unfavourable comments about the financial affairs of this Province. It is certainly a matter that hon. members have to address seriously, this enormous public debt that the people of this Province face.

The other peculiar matter, Mr. Chairman, is this: One could tolerate the escalating public debt if, for example, we saw that we were getting employment in this Province. Even though in the period that I talked about, 1982 to 1986 when we have added \$1 billion to the public debt, one could tolerate this if there was an increasing proportionate rise in employment in the Province. But it is, actually it has worked in the other way; as we have increased the public debt, we have raised the level of unemployment in the Province. So that again illustrates the seriousness of our public debt. Even though we are adding approximately, on the yearly average, \$250 million to our public debt, we are actually increasing unemployment, decreasing employment. In that same period of time when we

increased the public debt by \$1 billion from \$3 billion to \$4.2 billion, at the same time we lost somewhere around 4,000 jobs in that same period. So the point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that we could tolerate this level of public debt if we were generating employment but we are not. We are increasing the public debt and also doing nothing with respect to creating employment. Of course, if we were creating employment, the potential of the Province in terms of paying the public debt would look much better. But of course as employment goes down naturally, how can we ever expect to be able to deal with this enormous public debt that is presently hanging over the heads of every person in this Province, every man, woman and child in this Province.

What would prove to be an interesting activity or project for newer members in particular would be to read the budget debates back in the early sixties when many of the members who are now on that side of the House were on this side of the House, talking in the early sixties. What would be interesting probably for all members for that matter, what would be interesting I have said for newer members, and maybe for all members, to look at the budget debates back in the sixties when some of the members on that side of the House were then on this side of the House. To hear them talk about the enormity of public debt, Mr. Chairman, it would just boggle the mind to hear these hon. gentlemen! They were talking about the Province in the state of bankruptcy, that we were going to have to be bailed out by the federal government.

MR. TULK:

How much debt were we in then?

MR. LUSH:

I do not know what we were in, but we -

MR. TULK:

It was not a billion.

MR. LUSH:

Yes, I was going to say, we were not cost to a billion. Today, here we are at \$4.2 billion and what do these same hon. gentlemen say about the public debt? They do not want to hear the word mentioned at all. They do not want to hear it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible.)

MR. LUSH:

What percentage? Again we are talking just about a half billion to service our public debt right now. What the percentage was, Mr. Chairman, will come out a little later as we look into it. But the

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, we cannot over emphasize the enormity of the public debt and where this is taking us. The fact, again, that we are adding to it on the average some \$250 million yearly, makes matters worse. Then the minister gets up here and boasts by saying that he is going to be cutting the deficit this year by some \$2 million. Then how does he choose to get that deficit? That is another very important matter to the people of this Province? It is a difficult job by all



governments in the Western World today to try and cut its deficit. There are many economists that disagree. There is no uniform way of going about it. You cannot go to any particular school of economics and say, "this is the way we are going to go." There seems to be different views on how we cut the deficit.

However, having said that, there does seem to be a preponderance of thought which said that we cut the deficit by cutting government expenditures. That is how we go about it. There are two ways naturally we do it, one is through cutting expenditures, the other is through revenues, mainly through taxation, increasing taxation in the various fees that people have to pay government. As I said, there is a preponderance of thought today which says that the way that government should cut their deficit is to cut their expenditures.

How do we think the minister arrived at cutting the deficit by \$2 million? Was it by cutting expenditures? Was it by reducing expenditures in the various government departments? Or was it through raising taxes?

MR. TULK:

Raising taxes.

MR. LUSH:

Raising taxes, and that is the most undesirable because, of course, because by raising taxes we cut into the money that people have. It gives them less money to circulate into the economy. Thus, it has a negative effect, proven and borne out by the study that I questioned the minister on today. I am looking forward to that study because I believe that there are going to be some things in that

study that the government are not going to like. One of them that I alluded to today was the study done for the Commission. The Commission did not do the study. It was done for them. They hired somebody to find out what things were aggravating to businesspeople and what things they thought that government should be doing.

The biggest problem identified by these businesspeople who were questioned in this study or whatever the nature of the study was, the big complaint that came back was that they thought that the policy of this government with respect to high tax, retail sales tax, particularly, that 12 per cent sales tax was negatively affecting business in this Province. It was styming economic growth and economic expansion. Now we have said that for years, that the taxes in this Province are too high yet the government ignores it. They have done nothing. This should be proof positive to the government that the business people of this Province find that the taxes administered by the government are playing havoc with the development and expansion of business.

Another point they mentioned - I want the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) to listen to this - they talked about bureaucratic red tape. Now, maybe the minister can allude to that too. There must be something we can do to make the bureaucracy less offensive and to make it less burdensome. I, in talking to businessmen, have found out from them that this is a complaint they have. The bureaucratic red tape that small business and big business have to go through to maintain a business in this Province is a problem. I harp on that because the minister

has said time and time again that private enterprise is the engine that stimulates economic growth in this Province. If that is what this government believes, if that is their policy - and that naturally is Tory policy, it is the main tenant of Tory policy, the private sector, that we must do everything we can to be able to generate the economy, to make the economy move, to make it grow - yet we find business people complaining, saying that the climate, that the rules and regulations under which they operate are not right in this Province. Mr. Chairman, this is what we hear and the study seems to have revealed that.

So, what did we find in this budget for businessmen? What did we find for the businesses of this Province? I think there were basically two initiatives and both were related. One was increasing the Rural Development ceiling for loans to \$50,000. I forget what it came from to what but it was put to \$50,000. They also increased the level of loans from the Department of Agriculture. Now, that is not a move to be condemned, Mr. Chairman, but we wonder if we could not work in other areas to make it easy to carry on a business in this Province. If, for example, we could not look at the system of taxation. It is commendable to raise the ceiling for loans in all of the areas.

I would also hope that we open up the area a little more. It seems to be too restricted right now. But, there are other moves we can take. I am not sure that the answer always to business expansion and development is found in loans. Many businesses do not want loans.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I would like to have a few words on this Consolidated Fund Services. It is a great opportunity for the Opposition to demonstrate the ultimate in hypocrisy, Mr. Chairman, because they can isolate themselves when they get up in the House on petitions and talk about how come this road is not done and this water and sewer is not in. Each one of them over there is hammering for more and more for their constituency with their blinkers on and with tunnel vision so that they get more and more. There is never any question in the petitions when they are presented by the Opposition that somehow we must relate this to the public debt. Therefore, whilst we do support it, we must be very careful because we know we are going to be saying in Consolidated Fund Services that the government is spending itself into all kinds of miserable debt. We find here, Mr. Chairman, every year when this comes up, an Opposition which is completely and totally irresponsible because when they get into education, health, roads and tourism and all the other aspects of government expenditure, they say "spend more, more, more" but, when we get into Consolidated Fund Services, somehow or other they are able to twist their narrow minds around to say "you are spending too much, too much, too

much."

It has never been demonstrated, Mr. Chairman, that what the hon. member, the Finance critic for the Opposition who has suddenly come from Labor into Finance, it has never been demonstrated that if you look at the amount of money that we - and the Leader of the Opposition knows this only too well but he thinks somehow it is popular, although the majority of people, when they think about it, know the difference - if you look at the amount that comes in, or we are predicting to come in this year in Retail Sales Tax, \$412 million, I think, is the amount estimated for 1986 and 1987, there is no way that you can put a viable creditable argument to any financial expert or economist worth his salt, or her salt, to say that somehow you will generate by that 1 per cent reduction in Retail Sales Tax revenue to the government directly to replace that \$32 million that you will lose. You will be money out and we have done studies over the years and we have watched what has happened in other jurisdictions. There is no creditable way that you can argue that we will get back directly, because we are losing it directly, not indirectly, that is no good. You will be money out in your budget the next year in revenue. There is no question about that.

I challenge the member opposite, who just took his place as the Finance critic (Mr. Lush), to place on the table of this House before the debate is over on Consolidated Fund Services some creditable scenario that he has to show that if we reduce various taxes like they say, which they want reduced, that they can show us how we can directly get next

year as much revenue as we lost in the reduction. Now, if that can be done, then the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is a much better member as the member for Bonavista North than he was when he was the member for Terra Nova. I can tell him that.

Now, the member cannot have it both ways. I know he is a Finance critic but he cannot have it both ways. While his leader and all his colleagues on the opposite side hound for more and more, to spend more money on this, spend more money on that, spend more money on something else, then they turn around and suddenly accuse the government of mismanaging the affairs of this Province because we are in a current account deficit situation. You cannot have it both ways. If you are going to be a responsible opposition and, as you like to call yourselves, the alternative government, it will not wash with anybody who has either bit of grey matter between their ears if you try to have it both ways. You remain this kind of critical, "Oh, you know, they are going to say that because they are members of the Opposition." It would be much better if, like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) the other day, it would be much better for this so-called alternative government over there, it might be replaced next time by another party who will be the alternative government. It is not out of the question at all if one looks at what is happening in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not out of the question at all that this party across from me is going to be replaced and be down there where the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is and his party is going to be the official opposition. You are going to be down there with one or two if you see what is happening in the Province today.

Look at the other side of it. The hon. member says "We have done nothing on the expenditure side." We only had a wage freeze for two years, which the hon. member attacked. That is trying to restrict expenditures. The largest expenditure of government is the salary bill. We had a wage freeze and before that we had four, five and six and five, six and seven as a wage restraint programme. We put freezes on positions in the public service and we have restricted services.

It is the hon. Opposition opposite who have attacked us when we tried to bring some sanity and some care into our health service sector which you are not allowed to touch because people are dying and are sick. When we go out and get a Royal Commission on hospital costs and nursing home costs, it is the hon. members opposite who are on the radio stations and in the local newspapers saying we are cutting back on health. Well, if we do not cut back on wages and if we do not cut back on health and if they are going to criticize us on education, there is nothing left in the budget. There is nothing left to cut. You can cut 100 per cent out and you will not materially affect the current account deficit, let alone the overall debt of \$4.1 billion. You have to go looking for tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions of dollars if you are

going to realistically attack the problem that the hon. member says is a great problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So, Mr. Chairman, they cannot have it both ways. They cannot go on making those measly, weasel words in talking about the public debt of this Province. If you are going to attack the public debt of this Province, then get up and make some responsible suggestions. Is it in Health? Is it in Transportation? Where is the hon. member going to cut? Where is he going to cut to arrest this deficit more than we are cutting? I am getting the distinct impression from the hon. member opposite, who is speaking for the party opposite, that they believe that this budget that we just produced increases our public debt too much. It is a bad budget because the debt is really serious.

Now, if the hon. member and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) are serious, I want them to stand in their places and tell us where we could have cut to materially affect, in other words, tens of millions of dollars - not \$100,000 here and \$300,000 there, that is neither here nor there; that will not do anybody any good. That is only a couple of hundred thousand dollars. If you take the hon. member's words seriously, and he means what he says, then he has to show us somewhere between \$25 million and \$75 million. At a minimum, he has to come up with that if he is going to materially carry out his

criticism of the government. It is no good to talk about \$1 million or \$2 million or \$3 million. That does not materially affect \$4.1 billion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
So you have to get into somewhere between \$50 and \$100 million each year over the next five to ten years and you have to get your current account deficit out of the way completely. You already have a built-in capital account before you begin the capital account with a current account deficit.

Therefore, if the official Opposition over there are serious, then they have to start laying their cards on the table: How many people will they lay off? How many hospital beds will they close down? How many schools will not be built because of their reduction on capital account? How many roads will they not pave and reconstruct? These are the ways in which you are going to get the debt under control and there is no other way around it.

The hypocrisy they are displaying over there since the House opened this time, Mr. Chairman, is simply that on the one hand, in the normal course of events, they want more and more and more, and now they are saying on Consolidated Fund Services, "We want less and less and less." Now, which is it? Do they want more, more and more, or less, less and less?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):  
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman, we have seen the Premier of this Province stand up in this House and confess failure, stand up and throw up his hands and say, "What can I do? What can I do?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Now, here is a suggestion. If you do not have the answers, get out and let somebody else have a shot at it.

I thought I had it in my file. I will bring up for the Premier tomorrow the statements by his federal counterparts where they talk in terms of reducing energy taxes and the impact that that is going to have to benefit the economy of Canada as a whole. Now, will reducing taxes in this Province hurt the economy, is that what the Premier is saying? What he has attempted to do is the old Grade 10 debating trick of reductio ad absurdum, to try and create an absurd hypothesis. The member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) got up and said that this party is saying that the deficit problems are going to be solved in one year. That is the position he has taken.

Mr. Chairman, we do not fall for that. No wonder the Premier had to leave the House because he knew that his spurious debating trick would be shot down. What we are

saying is that if this Province is going to prosper, we have to get people employed. We will never deal with the deficit until we get people employed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

You will never cure the ills of this Province when you have got two-thirds of the work force supporting one-third of the work force who are unemployed. The way you deal with the economy and the way you deal with the deficit is in the longer term, not overnight, not in one year but, in the longer term. The way you deal with the deficit is by getting the unemployed of this Province working. It is not by controlling the deficit on an annual basis, even if they were able to do that. Their problem is not that they have not been deficit financing, their problem is that they have been deficit financing in an unplanned fashion, in a wasteful fashion and in an inefficient fashion. The Premier wants to know where could the money come from. We have already pointed out where \$4 million to \$5 million a year could have been saved by not building the extension on the Confederation Building; interest payments are going to go out there, forget about the repayment of principal. They got up here and said to save \$2 million to \$3 million, they are going to spend an extra \$4 million to \$5 million on interest alone.

Listen to this little suggestion: Do members opposite know that we are getting about 20 to 25 per cent for the Native People of Labrador of what could be gotten from the Government of Canada under a different approach? Do

members opposite know that? Do members opposite know that that amounts to approximately \$30 million a year that they are either too stubborn or too stupid to go after or perhaps both? The Premier wanted to know where they could find a few million. Well, there is \$35 million in one fell swoop right there and I have not even gotten into his wasted and twisted priorities, his distorted priorities in terms of putting a million into the eighth floor or in terms of all these political hacks that you are hiring on an annual basis. What about that \$5 million that they lost on the way to the bank or on the way from the bank last trip overseas.

The bottom line is that this party does have a vision of how we can improve the economy of this Province and it is a people-oriented vision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

It is a vision of this Province which sees people working; which sees all the people working, who want to work and who can work; which does not throw up our hands in a defeatist, negative attitude and say that we are going to leave one-third of the work force unemployed, dragging down the economy because they are not being productive.

Mr. Chairman, with those brief remarks, I will adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to them referred, have directed me to report having made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the debate I would advise the House that tomorrow the Government Services Committee will meet here in the House and consider the estimates of the Department of Transportation and, at the Colonial Building at nine-thirty tomorrow morning, the Social Services Committee will meet to consider the estimates of the Department of Justice.

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

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