



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 39

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

26 May 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
I rise on what I consider to be a matter of privilege to this Legislature. Your Honour, I make take a few minutes to explain what I am saying and I would ask that you bear with me a little while. Last May 15, in other words, May 15, 1985, over a year ago, the Chair, yourself, found that the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) had established a prima facie case of privilege.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that in itself, as you are well aware, and as every hon. member in this House is well aware, is a rare occurrence in every Legislature, that there is found a prima facie case of privilege. As Your Honour is also aware, privilege goes to the very heart of Parliament, goes to the very core of Parliament, and that was evident in Your Honour's ruling last year. I reviewed it again today, and it is very evident that Your Honour believed, and believed very strongly, having quoted from various sources to show how important the establishment of a prima facie case of privilege is.

It is also of course, Mr. Speaker, evident in every parliamentary authority that exists that a case of privilege is not something to be taken lightly. As a matter of fact, page eleven of Beauchesne points out to us just how important privilege is to the

functioning of any Legislature in the free world. I could quote from page eleven, but I will not waste the time of the House to do that, Your Honour is well aware of it. But chiefly there are two key phrases on page eleven that have to do with privilege and that is that privileges have to be maintained so that the House, the use of its members, is not impeded in any way. Of course members of the House, of the highest court in the land, have to enjoy the protection of the Legislature and it is important that the Legislature give that protection to its members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last May 15 when Your Honour made the ruling there was no doubt on the part of anybody in this House that the urgency of the matter of the prima facie case as had been established by Your Honour had to be dealt with. Hansard of May 15 of last year will show that. It will show that the President of the Council, the Government House Leader, the Premier, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and every other person who spoke in this Legislature on that day pointed out the importance and the urgency of dealing with this matter. As a matter of fact, it was the feeling that it had to be dealt with in as fast a manner as possible, immediately, if it could be. As a consequence of that, a Committee on Elections and Privileges was put together and the Committee spent long hours interviewing witnesses at great expense to the taxpayers of this Province and the House, which it should do when there is a prima facie case of privilege established. People were called as witnesses and, I would suggest to Your Honour, that even outside

of this House we have a responsibility to the people whom we called as witnesses and whom we leave hanging in the air as to what we are going to say in a report to the Legislature on those people.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, since last Fall the Chairman, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), I cannot say that he has refused to call the Committee together, there has been no outright refusal, but there has been a stonewalling, a neglect to have the Committee meet. In the last meeting, which I believe was in November of last year, the Committee was attempting through discussion and through argument to try and decide if we could put in a consensus report or if there would have to be a minority report. Mr. Speaker, I believe we were quite close to doing that. I am not going to say where individual members stood in that particular instance because that would be totally unjustified, unfair, and it would be irresponsible. However, Mr. Speaker, realizing the urgency and the importance of this matter, I wrote the Government House Leader in April of this Year and I pointed out that there were two essential things that had to be done: April 9, 1986, that we had investigated the point of privilege and that we were attempting to formulate a consensus or to decide if a minority report would have to be submitted, and that it was urgent that the Chairman call that Committee back to see that that was done. I also pointed out to him that there was a motion on the Order Paper in the last session that required the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) - I wish the member for Bonavista South were in his seat, but I

cannot let this go on any longer. The member for Bonavista South made certain statements in the Legislature in which he cast - he did not cast any aspersions or did not cast any shadows over the Opposition, by the way, but he cast shadows over somebody, whether it was the government or whether it was the civil service of the Province, when he pointed out that there was a story that he had to tell and he would tell it in his own time. Consequently, the Committee asked the member for Bonavista South to tell the story. He refused. The Chairman, then, as is proper, put a motion on the Order Paper asking that the member for Bonavista South be asked the question and that he answer it. Of course, that motion died on the last session's Order Paper.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point that I want to make, and my point of privilege I will get to shortly, I wrote the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), as I said, asking him to see that those two things were dealt with that the member for Bonavista South was required to do by the Legislature, and that the government would put down a motion requiring him to do that. I have, on numerous occasions, spoken verbally to the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) asking him to reconvene the Committee, and there has been no action, absolutely no action. So that brings me to what Your Honour obviously is asking himself now, what is the point of privilege that I am raising?

Mr. Speaker, I could go back again and refer to page 11 where Beauchesne points out 'that members in this House must not be impeded from carrying out their duties,' and, of course, that is

paramount for the House to function. The other thing is 'that members of this House must enjoy the protection of the House.' To do otherwise is to take away from the dignity of this Legislature and the dignity of Parliament itself. If we are one thing in this House, we have to parliamentarians.

Now, there is also a point, Mr. Speaker, that some people will raise, that in procedural matters government have the right to say how we proceed in this House. Mr. Speaker, I would draw your attention not only to those privileges that are enumerated, that a member has in the House, but I would also draw your attention to another point that has been made by various authorities: It says, 'Obstructions other than breaches of the known and enumerated rights and immunities of members may be contempts and therefore a breach of privilege.' Then it goes on to say, 'Any act or omission which instructs or impedes either the House in the performance of its function, or which has a tendency to produce such a result, may be treated as a contempt even if there is no precedent for the offence.'

Mr. Speaker, I would ask Your Honour to look at this. You might raise the issue as to why this matter of privilege was not brought before the House before. There has to be enough time left so there is no doubt that the Chairman or that the Committee could have met, or that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) could have put the motion concerned, about the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), on the Order Paper and had it debated. I would suggest to Your

Honour that that time has now come, that there has been ample opportunity, even since April 8, for the Chairman to have called the meeting, for the Government House Leader to have introduced that motion and to have had it debated. I can assure you that from this side it would not have taken a great deal of debate because, the truth of the matter is, everybody in this House and everybody in Newfoundland, and I am sure the media that was brought through all of this nonsense, has been sick and tired of this point of privilege hanging around. I want to suggest to Your Honour that if the cloud of uncertainty, the cloud of mistrust that hangs over the government and the civil service and, indeed, every member of this House is to be done away with, the member for Bonavista South has to be required to answer the question. The Chairman of that Committee has to make a formal attempt to see that that Committee is brought back together and either submits a consensus report or a minority report. It cannot be treated as a joke, but it has become a joke. I want to suggest to Your Honour that the people who are laying the obstructions and impeding this House are the member for St. John's East, who is the Government House Leader, and the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). Therefore, I want to ask Your Honour to find that in this particular case alone -

MR. J. CARTER:

Not so.

MR. TULK:

I heard what you said last year when this one was brought up - a prima facie case of privilege has been brought up, in that there is a tendency in obstructing a

Committee on Privileges and Elections to perform its duty and to report to this House, that there is an obstruction there that can impede me, as a member, or any other member of this House, from carrying out my duties in this Legislature, and that it is, indeed, a contempt for this parliament, for this Legislature, for anybody to attempt to hold up a report that must deal with a question that affects all of us, that affects our integrity and affects the dignity of this place that we serve. Otherwise, if we do not rule on this thing, if there is no action taken, then this Legislature becomes not only a laughing stock for Newfoundland but it becomes a laughing stock for the rest of this world.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I do not know if it is a point of privilege, but I will say to that point, the Vice-Chairman of the Privileges Committee has made several points, some of which I agree with.

First of all, I will give my personal assurance, as far as I am able, that that report will be brought in before the end of this session, before the Summer recess. That is the first thing. The second thing is that I do not wish to discuss matters in this House that we have discussed in

Committee, because I do not think it is right or proper, as the Vice-Chairman has pointed out. I concur with him there. We have had some difficulty in reaching a consensus, but only last week, I had a fairly lengthy discussion behind the Speaker's Chair with the Vice-Chairman with a view to trying to expedite matters. I would just ask any member to cast his eyes around this House; now, it does so happen that today the Vice-Chairman and the Opposition member of that Committee is here, but the two government members are not here, and it is quite difficult, it really is, much more difficult than I had thought possible, to get everyone in place. Now that may seem silly, but, except for opening day, I do not think I have seen a day when every member has been in this House, I mean every member of this House. One of the government members on our Committee is a parliamentary assistant and these duties have taken a lot of his time. I agree that I could have been more energetic in trying to get a meeting going, but I have to say there has been a great deal of difficulty reaching a consensus. But I do give my assurance that before the Summer recess, that report will certainly be drafted and, I hope, introduced.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that statement by the member is encouraging in terms of his finally giving a commitment that it will be brought in before the Summer recess, as I understand. But, Mr. Speaker, his

explanation as to why it has not been brought in before now does not hold water. All the Chairman of this Committee had to do was to give notice of a time for a meeting, reasonable notice, and I am sure members would have been there. And if members were consistently absent, then all he had to do was ask that anybody who could not make it be replaced. But this is nonsense. The member has not wanted to call that Committee together. He is trying to somehow or other stonewall this issue. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the Vice-Chairman, has, on a number of occasions, asked him both in the House and out, to convene the Committee. He has refused. They met behind the Chair recently, at the insistence of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), and the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) again stonewalled. Mr. Speaker, we ask your protection to ensure that the member lives up to his responsibility as Chairman of this Committee and does have this report delivered before the recess for the Summer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, I do not think there is any prima facie case at all. I am not at all sure that the hon. Chairman of the Committee has to bring in the report anyway, if he does not want to do so.

MR. TULK:

But he should.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will look into that matter. To my mind, there is no prima facie case.

Statements by Ministers

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I read the report on health care prepared by my honourable friends on the opposite side of the House with great interest. I know that the committee was genuinely interested in the health care services of Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), who, while he was Health Critic, demonstrated a very sincere concern and attitude towards the health care services of our Province. I might say that I have reviewed this report in a very positive sense because I believe it was produced in that spirit.

From a personal perspective of approximately 40 years in Newfoundland's health care services, exclusively in rural areas, I was not surprised by the three main areas of concern which arose from the report of the committee: (1) shortage of specialists; (2) shortage of nursing home beds; and (3) elective surgery waiting lists.

The committee also commented on health services in Labrador.

It is true that these four areas represent the greatest problem areas and yet the greatest challenges facing those entrusted with the responsibility of providing health care in our Province. It is also worthwhile

to note that these problems are not unique to Newfoundland.

In recent years, the government's commitment of resources to health care has increased phenomenally. An examination of the past years' Budget will uphold that view. This year the gross current and capital expenditures on health care will amount to over \$600 million or over \$1,000 for every man, woman, and child in the Province.

In February of 1983, because of the continuing escalation in the cost of institutional care, we appointed a Royal Commission to review matters and to make recommendations in that regard. The Royal Commission Report indicated that the system was not underfunded but some restructuring was required and necessary. The Commission also recommended fewer acute care beds and additional chronic care/nursing home beds. Government accepted the recommendations of the Royal Commission Report and an Implementation Committee of the government and the Newfoundland Hospital Association, which represents hospitals and nursing homes, was established to oversee the implementation of the recommendations of that Report. In that context, government has taken every reasonable effort to determine the strengths and the weaknesses of the current system and has approached the matter in a very rational way, recognizing the high cost of providing health care services today.

In terms of the specific recommendations of the Caucus committee comprised of the hon. members from the opposite side, I would make the following comments.

Shortage of Specialists: I agree with my hon. friends' conclusion that Newfoundland continues to have a shortage of specialists in a number of areas, as well as distribution problems. However, at the same time, I must say that we have never had more specialists at any time in our history than we now have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:

Specialists establish in the Province and leave the Province for a variety of reasons. It has been common over the years and, as much as we would like it to change, we know that it is not going to change significantly except with time and with increases in the overall numbers of specialists in the country.

We recognize that there must be incentives, and we have attempted to put those into place. However, for some specialties, we must be realistic and realize that any number of incentives will, at best, only change the manpower situation marginally.

We are also concerned about the distribution of specialists. In the modern practice of medicine, specialists tend to want to practice in areas where there are other specialists and where there are educational facilities.

My hon. friends referred to the need for more specialists throughout the Province. I would be the first to agree that distribution of specialists is a real problem. However, realistically speaking, there are only a few centres in the Province which can hope to attract specialists.

It is my honest view, from my own experience in the system, that equipment and pay differentials are only marginal issues when it comes to attracting specialists.

I agree with the emphasis on training. Indeed, we have implemented a training programme whereby we provide assistance to physicians who pursue specialty programmes and agree to return to the Province to practice their specialty. My department encourages physicians to take advantage of that programme. To date, we have assisted 50 physicians to become specialists under this arrangement. This programme will be continued. This assistance has cost the Province approximately \$750,000.

A shortage of specialists in some specialties is common for rural areas of Canada. It is a major problem for those areas. Incentive schemes have been put into place by a number of provinces to pay specialists more if they will relocate to rural areas. Unfortunately, these schemes have not been successful in attracting specialists to these areas. It is a major problem to turn around. I wish to assure the committee and all members of this House that we are working diligently in co-operation with the medical profession and the university to improve the situation.

Nursing Home Chronic Care Beds:
The committee referred to the need for more chronic care beds. Arising from the recommendations of the Royal Commission Report, government engaged a firm to do a study of hospital beds in the Province. Shortly after that began, the study was expanded to include nursing home beds as well

as licenced boarding home beds. The purpose of this study was to provide a rational and planned basis for the expansion of beds in nursing homes, boarding homes and in other hospitals fields.

It is the view of government that we cannot construct beds in the Province without having some sense of where the needs are greatest and direct our efforts in this area. The report of this study was received about a week ago and, after government has had an opportunity to study the report, action will be taken with respect to the recommendations of the report.

From that report will evolve a plan to build future chronic care beds additional to the ones that are currently in process. However, in the interim, the system has not stood still. Since the Royal Commission Report was addressed in 1985, ninety beds were opened at St. Patrick's Mercy Home in St. John's; fifty new beds were opened at Lakeside Home in Gander; fifty new beds are near completion at the Bay St. George Nursing Home in Stephenville; forty new beds are near completion at Harbour Lodge in Carbonear; and a new seventy-five bed home is now operational at Placentia, in addition, eighteen beds have been opened in Buchans. There will be fifteen extra beds in Clarenville when the new hospital opens. As well as that, a seventy-five bed home is under construction in Botwood. Plans are under way to redevelop Agnes Pratt Home in St. John's and expand its present capacity by sixty-five beds, and to expand the Golden Heights Manor in Bonavista by forty beds.

So, hon. members will see that this government has in place an

ambitious plan for nursing home construction and expansion in times of economic constraint that will deal with many of the problems referred to by the committee. Nevertheless, we see the need for additional nursing home beds as a high priority, and we will pursue it in a rational manner.

Waiting Lists for Elective Surgery: As long as I have been in the health care system, there have been waiting lists for elective surgery. This is a common feature of the health care system, and, to satisfy myself that we were not unlike other jurisdictions, I recently made a number of enquiries across Canada and found that the waiting lists in this Province were, more or less, the equivalent of those in others.

It is well known in the health care system that the infusion of new resources and personnel would only marginally effect the waiting lists. As I said many times in this House, waiting lists are, at best, imperfect documents that are the function of a variety of factors including the availability of physicians, the availability of beds, the time of the year, as well as a variety of other factors.

People are often found to be on the waiting lists of a number of institutions. Indeed, people who had their surgery performed sometimes continue to be on the waiting list of other hospitals. This has an inflationary impact upon the waiting list of that hospital.

Indeed, it is commonly understood among people in the system that waiting lists are a normal part of doing business and that often not

a great deal of attention is placed upon the reliability of waiting lists as a yardstick for those who actually need care from that institution.

However, this becomes a problem when people, well-intentioned people I might add, who are unfamiliar with all the vagaries of waiting lists start to discuss them in a public forum. I have seen this many times, and I fully understand it and appreciate it.

The same imperfections apply to waiting lists for chronic care homes as they do in respect of acute care institutions. While, in terms of gaining admission to chronic care homes, there are a number of people who genuinely need admission to these homes, the waiting lists of the individual homes are really no realistic reflection of those numbers. However, there are people who need the services and that is not in dispute.

Health Services in Labrador: Mr. Speaker, the Committee referred to services in Labrador. I would suggest, for the record, that on balance, the health care services - the number of professionals that are available - the number of services that are available in Labrador on a per capita basis - are reasonable and exceed those anywhere in the Province. Having said that, I realize that, in light of the immense and vast geography of the land, there are constraints which apply in terms of trying to provide services to everybody in the area. I think that, generally speaking, the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board, which provides services in the area, is doing a commendable job under the circumstances of trying to service such a vast

geographic area which has a relatively small population.

I would agree that other social issues are fundamental to health care as they relate to public health and the prevention and mitigation of disease. The resources we devote to those other areas indirectly pay dividends in terms of better health care. However, these situations do not lend themselves to easy solutions, and there are practical limits which constrain us in terms of addressing these types of problems.

While acknowledging that the health of the residents of Labrador is poor compared with the rest of the Province, it should be noted that there are extenuating circumstances beyond those found normally in other communities throughout the Province which lead to the poor health status of individuals in these communities.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the report of my hon. friends opposite did focus on three common problems in the Newfoundland health care system. To the extent these problems can only be addressed over considerable time, I would not classify them as weaknesses in Newfoundland's system. I think they are realities of the system in which we live and we share them with other areas similar to ours.

I want to assure my hon. friends that government is taking advantage to every available measure in trying to combat and improve the situation with respect to these particular problems. While our ultimate goal would be to eliminate these problems, I have to be realistic and say that I doubt whether that will be achievable in my lifetime. However, we must seek to make

progress with respect to these particular problems, recognizing that we do not have them alone but that we share them with other provinces of Canada and other jurisdictions outside. We are heartened by the progress we have made in recent years, and that indicates to us that we shall win in the long run.

I want to commend my honourable friends for their survey of health care services in the Province. I am pleased that they undertook this particular project because (and I say it in all sincerity) I know that all of them who participated in this exercise have a better understanding of the system today that they had, perhaps, before they embarked upon this particular review. This is good and it brings to this House a more informed debate on these crucial issues.

I would also speculate that this exercise has provided my honourable friends with some insights into some of the myths surrounding the health care system because, quite frankly, as one who has been in the system for years, I know that there are mythical perceptions out there that the health care system is underfunded and no amount of dollars is too much to spend on the health care system. Obviously, we must take a more rational approach to health care.

While people who would advocate these measures are well intentioned and sincere, the reality is that the health care system has an infinite capacity to consume resources and no amount of resources will really satisfy the system nor improve, in a meaningful way, the health status of residents of our Province which

is, after all, the ultimate objective of the health care system. Indeed, there are no factors to indicate that the health of Newfoundland residents is any better or any worse than any other province of Canada. Indeed, in some respects, the indications are quite positive.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would commend the Chairman and members of the committee for their perceptive review of our health care system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that the health committee found and that was that we cannot doubt the sincerity of the present Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Nor was it our intention to declare any personal attack on anybody who is involved in the health care system of this Province. We found that there are many dedicated people out there who are trying to work within the system and who are doing their best to work according to the means at their disposal.

We did find though, Mr. Speaker, and it was evident in this statement today, that there tends to be a great deal of complacency on the part of the system, and I

do not think it is being unkind when I say, even on the part of the minister there is this complacency. He makes it quite clear in this statement, Mr. Speaker, that the recommendations or the points that this committee made were not new. I would venture to say, for many years they have been known to him. But the logical question to ask, Mr. Speaker, is how in the name of goodness can a government be so complacent when they already knew that there were problems out there?

For example, he says here, "It is also worthwhile to note that these problems are not unique to Newfoundland." Of course they are not unique, but that, Mr. Speaker, does not make them right. Murder, Mr. Speaker, is not unique to Newfoundland but does that dampen our desire to eliminate that from the face of this planet or from the face of our Province, the acceptance that something is unique?

Another favourite trick or favourite approach which we found, Mr. Speaker, is to keep comparing today to what things used to be like. One of the points is that this year the gross current and capital expenditures will be \$600 million or over \$1,000 for each person. An examination of past years budgets will uphold the view that somehow it is better than it was yesterday. This is something that you can do with practically anything in an evolving society.

You can compare roads to yesterday and say roads are better; you can compare practically anything to yesterday and when you compare it to Newfoundland in the 1930s, if we are going to compare Newfoundland today to Newfoundland

in the 1930s, Mr. Speaker, no matter what sector we zero in on surely goodness we are going to say things are better than they were in the 1930s but I ask, Mr. Speaker, is this good enough? Is this good enough? Surely, we have got to stop comparing today to the past. We have to compare to the rest of the world, Mr. Speaker, and we have to compare to where we want to be as a people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, we also find on the part of the department, and it is part of the government as a whole, this defeatist approach. 'We know it is not going to change significantly except with time and with increases in the overall number of specialists.' It is this sitting on their haunches again, Mr. Speaker, and waiting for something to happen. We have seen this so many times since this government has come to power, this reacting to events. Crisis management it has been called, Mr. Speaker, and this is not good enough today. It is certainly not good enough in the Department of Health. Things are not going to get any better, sit back and wait for things to get better. It is reacting, whereas the role of government, whether it is the Department of Health or Education or whatever the case might be, is to make things happen, not to react to something after it happens, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

I would like to refer to it as a civil service mentality, when you just sit there and let things go. It is like starting up an engine and letting it run and as long as it runs, things are reasonably okay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

But it is the role of the Department of Health and it is the role of all departments of government to make things happen.

The minister says "realistically speaking there are only a few centres in the Province which can hope to attract specialists." Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a government which, throughout the Liberal Administration in the sixties and early seventies, by preaching the salvation of rural Newfoundland, here was the administration which was going to make rural Newfoundland come back into its own. Immediately after it was elected, it began to rape rural Newfoundland; it began to centralize hospitals; it began to centralize schools; it began to centralize employment; and all it left in rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, was a few bedrooms, a few places for our people to sleep and you try to centralize them.

The Resettlement Programme, which was done completely above board, was taken and carried, it was taken over, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

It is not a hidden one, an under cover one.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You spent a lot of time under cover.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, if I am permitted to speak, in the place of an above board resettlement programme, which may or may not have been right, in the place of it came a malicious under the table plan to wipe out and eradicate rural Newfoundland, except for a few bedrooms which are dispersed up the Coast of Labrador, up the Northern Peninsula and around the rural outports. This is quite evident in what is happening to health care in this Province.

The small hospital is doomed. The people in Grand Bank who are screaming to keep their small hospital open might just as well stop screaming now. It is going to be closed. The small hospital at Come By Chance is going to be closed. The hospital in Port Saunders, Mr. Speaker, believe you me, is going to be closed. This is going to happen over and over and over.

DR. COLLINS:

You want it closed.

MR. TOBIN:

What about the new hospitals?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

"There are only a few centres", he says, "in this Province which can hope to attract specialists." Of course, he is talking about St. John's; of course, he is talking about Corner Brook. He might even be talking about Gander, but I doubt it, because in the minds of this administration, the mentality is that the only place to survive in Newfoundland is in a city, in the city, this side of the overpass.

Mr. Speaker, it is a reflection on rural Newfoundland to say that there are only a few centres which can hope to attract specialists. Why cannot Noddy Bay attract people? Why cannot Roddickton attract people? They are just as good, they are just as valuable, and I would challenge anyone to say that somehow, because it is rural Newfoundland, they cannot hope to attract specialists.

They have a city mentality, Mr. Speaker. They bluffed their way into power by telling Newfoundland that they were committed to rural Newfoundland, and they turned around and began to defeat, they began to destroy, to wipe out, and it is evident in this Department of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

The minister says the pay differential will not make a difference when it comes to bringing specialists into this Province. I tend to agree with him up to a point. I do not think a pay differential of 5 per cent or 10 per cent is going to make any difference. But we have cases

where specialists are getting as much as 30 per cent more just in Nova Scotia, Mr. Speaker. I understand at one time an ophthalmologist could get up to 50 per cent more by working in Nova Scotia but that has been changed in certain specific cases.

Mr. Speaker, the minister, in his compacency, is admitting that the pay differential is not making a difference. The pay differential might not attract enough people. Then that administration, Mr. Speaker, is second to none when it comes to awarding perks. Maybe they can find some way to throw a few perks in to bring some specialists into this Province. They can dream up car allowances, they can dream up, under purchased services, a good way to take your friends out for a meal now and again. Surely, there must be some way they can dream up a few perks which will not cost all that much. Maybe the odd trip down South to a specialist might attract them to coming into this Province.

MR. TOBIN:
I do not think they left you out.

MR. BARRY:
There is a world offshoire show in Houston.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has just about elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave! By leave!

MR. DECKER:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave. No leave.

MR. DECKER:
I was just getting to the good parts, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. BARRY:
Before we get to Question Period, it might be a good point for us to table the report that has led to such an interesting discussion on the part of both members, if the Government House Leader will permit. We have it being printed, and we will have copies for all members once it is printed.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I like it in a red cover or not.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! We had a ruling a few days ago that we cannot table a document on a point of order.

MR. BARRY:
We might be able to do it by leave, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave! By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave.

MR. BARRY:
By leave? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:
Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Agreed.

MR. TULK:
They are getting humble over there today. We are getting the

Committee back together, and they are allowing us to table our report.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this time I would like to welcome to the visitor's gallery eight students from Vera Industries, St. John's and eight visiting students from Crystal Bay School, Ottawa, with their teachers Ann Marie Currie and Paul McFadyen from Vera Industries, and Heather Rendell and Ted Valerier from Crystal Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I think it would be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge, since we have the students from Vera Industries, that I suspect most of the members in this House can attribute one or two of their votes to the campaign buttons that many of us used from that institution. They do very fine work, and I am sure members on both sides of the House have benefitted from that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on that. As matter of

fact, I visited Vera Industries a couple of years ago and they were good enough - it was just after the flag debate -

to make a special flag presentation for me at that time. They do excellent work not only as it relates to buttons but a whole range of other things, and I want to compliment the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) for his ongoing support for that institution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, at the end of last week Premier Getty of Alberta, indicating he was speaking for all premiers, stated that there was a difference of opinion among all the premiers as well as the Prime Minister as to what full participation for the provinces meant in the context of the freer trade negotiations. Would the Premier indicate whether Premier Getty was speaking the truth, and was he speaking for the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador? If so, how is this consistent with the Premier's statement that he was satisfied that he understood what full participation for Newfoundland and Labrador would be in the free trade negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there is a meeting June 2 in Ottawa of the Prime Minister and all the First Ministers of Canada on the whole question of trade and the matter will be dealt with at that time. I would not like to make any further comment on it until that meeting is held.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We thank the Premier for that information, Mr. Speaker, but it does not answer the question. The question is what is the matter that will be dealt with at that time? According to the Premier there is no matter to be dealt with. The statements he has given to this House have indicated that there is full participation and he is satisfied with the method of participation for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now what did Premier Getty mean? Was he speaking for the Premier of this Province when he said that there is a difference of opinion amongst all of the premiers and the Prime Minister as to provincial participation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will have to ask Premier Getty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Come on!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Premier this question: Is there a difference of opinion between the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Prime Minister of Canada as to what full participation means in the free trade talks?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I will answer those questions after the meeting on June 2.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that that is not satisfactory. I would ask the Premier to consider that he has given statements in this House. Does the Premier recall he has given statements in this House saying that he is satisfied with respect to the method of provincial participation? Do those answers of the Premier now stand or, in the words of former President Nixon, are those replies to the House of Assembly 'inoperative' at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Everything I say is operative, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. FUREY:

No wonder you are sitting on the polls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I need quiet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). Last May 15, over a year ago, as I pointed out today in raising a point of privilege, there was an RCMP investigation carried out by the Criminal Division of the RCMP, I believe, into the missing files, if you want, of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). I want to ask the minister if she has a finalized report on that yet? What are the conclusions of it? Does she intend to table it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Fogo should know well that all police reports are confidential documents and the reasons for keeping confidential police reports are very obvious, or should be obvious to anyone who thinks about how our criminal justice system works. The particular case the member asked about was investigated by the RCMP and from my memory I recollect that at least one report, and I believe it was the final report, was submitted to the Justice Department, but to be

absolutely sure I will take the question as notice and confirm that information or indicate otherwise tomorrow.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The minister seems to be kind of fuzzy or again seems to be telling us that we should not ask for this report. Yet as a part of the investigation of this Legislature she committed herself last year to have the Criminal Division of the RCMP carry out an investigation presumably to help this Legislature, determine whether one of its member's privileges had been breached or not. I would ask, in light of that, if she would indeed say that in this particular case, yes, the report should be tabled, and when does she intend to table it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the reason the police were asked to investigate was to present the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, the Crown Attorneys, the Law Officers of the Crown with information to try and determine whether it was warranted to lay any criminal charges. I believe this matter was concluded some time ago. I said I would double check and indicate the exact position tomorrow, but the investigation and report to the department to date has not warranted the laying of any criminal charge. I believe that matter was concluded some time ago. Now the whole matter of the privileges of the House, of

course, is one for the Special Committee of the House and it is not a matter for the police.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I point out to the minister, if she recalls the debate last year, as a matter of fact the terms of reference of the Committee have never been clear as to whether it should just rule that there was a breach of privilege or whether it had any jurisdiction to say whether anything out of the ordinary, shall we say, had been done. That was always a debating point in the Committee. I would ask her, in view of the peculiar nature of this case being a breach of privilege, if she has sought any legal opinion or, indeed, parliamentary opinion from people as to whether she should table the report and, if so, would she give us that opinion?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. SIMMS:

That is out of order.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, as the former Speaker to my left pointed out, that question is completely out of order. Beauchesne makes it very, very clear in several passages that questions soliciting legal opinions from the Attorney General or Minister of Justice, or opinions rendered agencies of the government by lawyers of the Department of Justice are completely out of order and

violate the rules of procedure.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands. As a result of the major forest fires in Central Newfoundland, areas around towns like Windsor, Grand Falls, Wooddale, Red Cliff, Brown's Arm, and Porterville have been devastated. People find themselves living in what are literally battle zones. You have to see it to believe it, Mr. Speaker. There is no way for people or even the towns to cope with the necessary clean-up.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. FLIGHT:

Will the minister commit funds and undertake an immediate clean-up and restoration of these areas and lands around and in the towns concerned?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me assure the hon. member that I have seen the areas that he refers to and probably seen the areas more closely than he has. I have been around all of the areas, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly would not use the dramatic term that he used

when he talks about it being a battle field. I mean, that is exaggerating a little bit. Perhaps it might get him a headline, you never know. With respect to the meat of the question, Mr. Speaker, I have not had any official request from any source for any assistance, but in response to a similar question from, I think, the Leader of the Opposition, a few days ago, I did indicate that I have instructed my officials to check to see if there are any funding sources available with respect to this kind of a situation. We do not have a response as yet. I have not had any official request from any group or organization, but the hon. member can rest assured that first of all our priority is to make sure that the fires are under control. At the present time they are still not under control, and so we do not know yet, for example, if the area flares up, whether there would be further devastation and so, therefore, how much improvements might be required. So it is all kind of hypothetical at this point in time. But, Mr. Speaker, he can rest assured that the department and the government, indeed, will, I am sure, respond in whatever way it has to to ensure that the communities involved are assisted and do not suffer personally too greatly.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to requests, the minister is now getting requests from the member who represents the district where

probably most of the damage has occurred. He talks about me being dramatic, but in his own statement yesterday he says, "Several communities were evacuated and fires burned to the doorsteps of houses." Well, beyond those doorsteps looks like a battle zone, Mr. Minister, and that may be why I was dramatic.

Will the minister undertake the clean-up and restoration of these lands, if and when he does, in the areas where people live and around and adjacent to the towns that are affected, over and above any silviculture or forest restoration programmes that were planned prior to that major forest fire in Central Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member quoted from my press release. I did not use the word battlefields, the hon. member uses that word. Then again I suggest to him he is being overly dramatic. It is typical of his style, of course, and I know he would admit that at the earliest opportunity he gets.

Mr. Speaker, again I can say to the hon. member that his second question is precisely the same as the first question and my answer would be the same.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. FLIGHT:

If the Speaker will permit me, it is not the same, Mr. Speaker, when

the towns concerned are worried -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
I recognize the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Your Honour, this is only my third supplementary. The Speaker will know this is my third supplementary.

The minister has said on several occasions now since the fires were burning that he has not been considering restoration or clean-up. Would the minister indicate when he is prepared to indicate to the towns and the concerned people out there as to what restoration and clean-up they can expect, that indeed he will indicate to them just what commitment he is prepared to make, or his department is prepared to make, this government is prepared to make by way of funding and by way of assistance to clean up and restore the areas to some sort of normality? When can they expect to get some indication from the minister as to when this will happen?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, there are two points there. First of all, as I said on

a number of occasions, our number one priority is to put the fires out. Until we put the fires out we do not know how much devastation there may be.

MR. FLIGHT:
The fires are out in Grand Falls are out in Windsor.

MR. SIMMS:
The fires are not out. The hon. member says in all his preambles he knows how serious this is. Obviously he does not. But, number one, we have to ensure that the fire is out. Number two, I cannot respond to the towns or individuals involved if they do not ask me. I have not received any representation from anybody to do anything of the nature that he describes.

MR. FLIGHT:
Do you consider me a representative of that area?

MR. SIMMS:
Well, Mr. Speaker, that is all I can say.

His question was when will I respond to the towns or communities involved? Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received any requests from the towns or the communities involved, so I do not know what he is talking about.

MR. FLIGHT:
You will.

MR. SIMMS:
Of course, and when I do I will respond.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) - it was for the Minister of Labour - oh, there he is - I thought he disappeared for a second. It has to do with the effects of Bill 19, the amendment to the Workers' Compensation Commission Act that we passed last Fall. In it there was a change that integrated the disability pensions with the Canada Pension Plan, and at the time the minister indicated that none of the recipients would lose money as a result of it. I want to ask the minister would he please give us an update on the change to that legislation and indicate whether any individual recipient has lost money as result of those changes?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I really believe that is the kind of a question that I would have to do some examination into the background of. I can tell the hon. member that I have not received any complaint from any Workers' Compensation recipient claiming to have lost money at all. That was done in the bill all right, but there have been no complaint. So if the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, has some information, or some people have complained to him that I have not received complaints from, I would be very happy to receive the source of information and to check into it.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the

member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

As a matter of fact, I do have. There was one individual who contacted me about it, and since then I have checked and it looks like there are approximately 100 to 150 pensioners who will now end up losing their Canada Pension Plan income or the equivalent of it. My question to the minister is how does this square with his comments when he closed debate when he said at that time that there would be no loss of income by any of the recipients?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, again I have to say that in the absence of having some material in front of me to look at to determine whether in fact there is validity to those complaints that the hon. member is talking about, I would be very, very happy to receive the information from him. I have to repeat to him that I have not, as the minister responsible for the Workers' Compensation Commission, received any complaint at all. That was the intent of the bill, that it would be amalgamated and that there would be no loss of income by any of those people.

I think it is the kind of a question, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member should either put on the Order Paper or give me the information that he has.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

My final supplementary is that I will ask the minister if he would wish to contact the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Commission, whom I talked to Friday, who indicated to me that between 120 and 125 recipients, in that order, would be losing. Would the minister get in touch with Ed Maynard, the Chairman of that Commission, and get back to us tomorrow with information on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to do that. In the meantime, I repeat to the hon. member that if he has got additional information, to give it to me. It is very simple for me to ask Mr. Maynard what complaints he has received, but I am not sure whether I will have that information for the hon. member for tomorrow. I will get it as soon as possible.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I yield, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I was beginning to wonder, Mr. Speaker, what colour I was down here.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), seeking some information. I would like to ask the minister if there are any guidelines, or what is the local hiring practice when they are hiring people in the parks within a district, if there is local preference given to the students?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, when we are hiring students in the parks we, of course, look for students with certain qualifications who can do the work that we ask them to do within our parks. Where possible, Mr. Speaker, we try and hire in the proximity of the parks, as close as possible.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I had several calls, Mr. Speaker, from students over in the Trinity - Bay de Verde district. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, since we have local preference, why was local preference not given in the case of Backside Pond Park over in Trinity - Bay de Verde when the Minister of Public Works and Services' (Mr. Young) Executive Assistant's son was hired and another person from Harbour Grace district was hired in that particular park? Was local

preference given there or was it political patronage?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, the procedure with hiring in our parks is any student who has been in our parks in previous years is given an opportunity to return the following year. In the case of the people referred to, they have been in our parks now for more than one year and were given the opportunity to come back again.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I would like to ask the minister the first part of the question again, Mr. Speaker. How did they get in the first year? Also, Mr. Speaker, I have a question concerning the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid). A lot of the people from his district are wondering why he is not asking any questions pertaining to this. They are wondering - and probably the Minister of Public Works and Services might have something to do with it, or maybe the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth can answer - was it because he was told to keep quiet concerning the contracts that he is getting from the department and if he raised any point he would not get any work over there?

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that kind of question is completely and absolutely out of order and is the type of question that drags down this House in the eyes of the public. The hon. gentleman is imputing motives to the hon. gentleman. The gentleman is not here in his seat and it is typical of the gutter-type of response that we expect from the hon. member.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I asked a very valid question and I never got an answer. To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, there are students in Trinity-Bay de Verde district, and regardless of their political beliefs over in that area, Mr. Speaker, they are very concerned that they cannot get any Summer employment. They are very concerned as to why people can come in from another district, regardless of the politics they believe in, and take the jobs away from the people of that district. The member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) has been in his seat for the last number of weeks, ever since this House opened, and he did not pose the question and that is the reason why I put the question to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a response to that point of order. If the hon. gentleman wants to he can get up in this House and ask why people have not been employed and say that people of certain districts are in or what have you. But to impute that somebody in exercise of his duties as the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde is not representing his constituents because somehow or other he has a contract is the type of base imputing of a motive that calls for the immediate retraction of the hon. member, an apology to the member for Trinity Bay de Verde, and an apology to this House and to the people of Newfoundland. I suggest the people of Port de Grave did not elect the hon. gentleman to carry on that type of tactic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

We have now seen the Government House Leader go to where he would like to be. I understood Your Honour had ruled on the point of order and was recognizing the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. The words were said, 'The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth', and immediately the hon. gentleman jumped to his feet to question the Chair. No, Mr. Speaker, he is not allowed to ask that kind of

question; you are not allowed to ask questions in this House about patronage. No, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be allowed, afraid something is going to be uncovered that the hon. gentleman does not like. That is his real problem. He would like to run this place, he would like to take it on his back, Mr. Speaker. He should be reprimanded from the Chair. What a nuisance!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I did not rule on that point. I am going to look into this matter and rule on it tomorrow.

MR. TULK:

We are on questions now.

MR. FLIGHT:

Answer the question.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Do not answer him.

MR. YOUNG:

Do not answer the slime.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. YOUNG:

The Speaker should tell him not to answer it.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Premier told him not to answer it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, could we have the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) silenced, please? I mean he does not know what is going on in his district with the fires out there, so would he please be quite and let me try to answer the question as best I can?

The situation, Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), is there have been people hired in Backside Park this year because of representation made by the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid). I say that to him right now. There have been people hired down in the Twillingate area because of representation made by the hon. member. He made a recommendation to me and a lady was hired in the park down there. I have had discussions with the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact within the last ten days, which he must agree too, on representation he made to me about having someone hired in the park, but unfortunately the park was a little far removed for the girl to get transportation to and from it. That is the kind of patronage I have been dealing with since I have become the minister. I treat everyone equally.

The members over there have people in the parks because they made representation to me. Liberals, PCs and NDPers, I do not care what they are. The problem with you is you have not made any representation for students to get hired in our parks. That is the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Question has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Development.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! There is no leave.

Petitions

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, on behalf of 220 residents of Conche I present this petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, could I have silence from my own members on my own side of the House?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:
"WHEREAS the residents of our community have suffered financially and physically throughout the past sixteen years because of the deplorable road conditions which exist on Route 434 leading into and around our community." Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not Route 432 which I have been petitioning for. It is a different road completely, but it is all tied into the same network of roads up there.

There are several WHEREASES. But the prayer of the petition, "We, the residents of Conche, hereby petition the hon. House of Assembly to instruct the Minister of Transportation to take immediate steps to have Route 432 upgraded to an acceptable level

for a standard gravel road."

MR. BARRY:
Which Route is that?

MR. DECKER:
Route 432.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Route 434.

MR. DECKER:
Route 434, yes, I am sorry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the thing which comes to my mind immediately is that the residents of Conche are not asking for pavement. Now that says something about the reasonableness of the people of this community.

AN HON. MEMBER:
It is paved, is it?

MR. DECKER:
No, it is not paved. It is presently a narrow and winding gravel road which is extremely difficult to maintain. They are asking that this road be brought up to a better level for a gravel road at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar with this particular road. I travelled over it many, many times. It was put through in the 1960s. It was not put through by a contractor, it was put through by the Department of Highway's own local maintenance unit up there, which in those days used to do some road building. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the concept of the Department of the Highways putting roads through is not be any means a bad concept from where I stand. I see nothing wrong with the Department of Transportation building its own roads in certain parts of the Province, provided they have the equipment to do the

work.

This road was put through in the 1960s, but about the first six or seven miles of the road was put through by the Department of Forestry as a forest access road. A forest access road even today does not have to meet the same standards as a road, say from one community to the other, would have to, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, when it was built in the beginning, it was not built to the standard which you would normally have for a road from one community to another. In 1960s, the Department of Highways went in and finished pushing the road through to Conche.

When this road was put through, there was no great amount of money made available for its construction, Mr. Speaker, so the Department of Highways and their engineers followed the path of less resistance; therefore, on that road there are an awful lot of crooks and turns.

I remember one turn in particular. My colleague from St. Barbe district (Mr. Furey) who spent a year teaching there is familiar with it. You come over a hill and you go down a short 'dip', as we call it, and you are looking straight into a pond.

MR. SIMMS:
A lake, you mean.

MR. DECKER:
Mainlanders call them lakes, I say to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, but we call them ponds. It is probably as big as a lot of lakes. You have to make almost a 90 degree turn to avoid going into this pond. The reason for the situation was that there was not enough money to put a bridge across, so they went

around the pond. But the crooks and turns are still there, which makes the road extremely dangerous.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the bridges on that road are narrow. There are quite a few places where brooks and rivers cross the road and bridges have to be put in, and the bridges are very, very narrow. Most of the bridges are wooden structures which were put there in the 1960s and are now becoming dangerous.

For the benefit of hon. members, Mr. Speaker, I would point out a hill which has a very colourful name, Sailor Jack's Hill. That hill, Mr. Speaker, is where the road comes out of Conche. It is a very steep incline and again, there are several turns in the road. I imagine the reason the engineers had to put in the turns was because putting the road straight up would have been impossible because it was so steep. But the proper engineering has never been done. The road is still narrow and it is still a very dangerous hill for people to drive over, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, on behalf of the people of Conche, I am very pleased today to get up and support their petition and pray on behalf of them that this hon. House of Assembly will indeed instruct the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to take immediate action to see that that road is brought up to an acceptable standard for a gravel road in this year 1986.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I take some pleasure in supporting the petition so ably presented by my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker). That road was built, as he pointed out, in the early 1960s and, having been the member for that district at that time, I did have some little part to play, Mr. Speaker, in arranging for that road to be built. Having gone to the area frequently in that period and realizing the problems brought on by isolation, Mr. Speaker, it did not take much persuasion on the part of the leaders in Conche to encourage me to speak to the then Minister of Highways to have that road completed.

Conche, Mr. Speaker, is one of the finest communities in Newfoundland. It has some of the finest people living within its boundaries, all hard-working, independent producers of new dollars in this Province. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that they should not have to beg or plead with their government, a government to which they have paid very substantial taxes over the years, to have this road made passable. And I understand that is all they are asking for. They are not asking for a big four-lane highway. Indeed, they are not even asking for pavement. They are only asking that the road be made passable, safe and passable.

Mr. Speaker, what less can the good people of Conche expect? Now the people of Conche, Mr. Speaker, are obviously suffering from the same kind of neglect and indifference as expressed and as indicated by the government

opposite, as are the people in my district. Only last week, as you will recall, I took the opportunity to present a petition from a large segment of the area of my district, Twillingate district, a petition signed by almost 500 people with a similar request, pleading, begging, praying to their government, that their roads at least be brought up to a reasonably acceptable standard.

Mr. Speaker, how much more do we have to do on this side to impress upon the members opposite the need to do something with our road system? It is a known fact in this society of ours, Mr. Speaker, that the progress that is attained by a country can usually be gauged, or it is an indication of the extent to which they have been able to develop, how well they have developed their transportation system within their country.

If you look at Japan, Germany and certain other countries that over the years which have made vast strides in improving their economies, you will find that it is not just a coincidence that in each case they do have an up-to-date, modern, efficient mode of transportation. The same thing, only on a much smaller scale I realize, applies to this Province. If you go in in a community where there is a good, paved highway leading into it, there is an air of prosperity in that community, an optimism on the part of the people who live there. And conversely, to drive into a community, and I probably in my district have ten or fifteen such communities, as is the case now in Conche, if you drive into communities where you are almost smothered with dust driving in,

stones going everywhere, cars being wrecked, then conversely Mr. Speaker, there is an air of doom and gloom in that community. It is difficult for the people to get too enthused about their future, or too enthused about getting down to the business of trying to do something for themselves or for their Province.

So the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that it is certainly in the interest of the economy of a community, and in the case of Conche where Conche, as we all know, is a community that is totally dependent on the fishery for its existence. All the fish caught in Conche must be transported over this, if you want to call it a road, to the plant in Englee.

Mr. Speaker, we spend time, effort and energy talking about the need for improving the quality of the product that we produce from the sea, but this is certainly not putting our money where our mouth is, by forcing the people of Conche to transport very substantial quantities of fish during the fishing period of the year over a road that is not fit to travel over.

In my district we have a similar situation, as I pointed out here last week. Good, hard-working fisherman, out trying to make a dollar, are having to haul their fish over roads that certainly will have the effect, once it is all over, with fish that in some cases I suppose is hardly fit for human consumption, where it has been beaten to a pulp, literally beaten to a pulp by the condition of the roads over which it is forced to travel, and I suspect the people of Conche are showing the same kinds of concern by

virtue of their petition presented here today by their member.

Mr. Speaker, I take some pride in seconding this petition. I would ask the government opposite now to finish the job that we started, that I had some hand in starting, back in the early 1960s, when we first brought that road through to Conche and ended, I suppose, 300 or 400 years of isolation. I am happy to support the petition, and I hope that government pays some attention to these petitions because the people who circulate these petitions, today 200-and-some-odd people, I think, in my own case, last week, it was 500 people, it is no mean task, Mr. Speaker, to walk around a community, or communities, and to get 400 or 500 people to sign a document. That is no mean task and for that reason I do not think the end result should be taken too lightly. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask the government to pay special attention to this petition and to others we have presented, and to take whatever steps are necessary to accede to their request.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 5, Bill No. 29.

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

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

Order 5.

Resolution

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to authorize the raising from time to time by way of loan on the credit of the Province the sum of Two hundred and seventy-five million dollars (\$275,000,000) and such additional sum or sums of money as may be required to retire, repay, renew or refund securities issued under any Act of the Province.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, the Resolution and the Loan Bill is something that comes up each year. In the budget, we indicate that the Province will be borrowing for particular purposes, and the Loan Bill is to give effect to this.

This year, the Loan Bill asks for authorization to borrow in the amount of \$275 million and that is somewhat less than last year, when the authorization of \$325 million was requested. Possibly, the Committee might wish me just to indicate how we arrived at that figure.

The total borrowing requirements, as indicated in the budget, was \$422 million. Now, that included our budgetary requirements, that is the requirements on current and capital account, and it also indicated the amount that had to be included for debt retirement. So, there were three elements to it: what we needed for the deficit

on current account, what we needed for our capital account requirement and what we need to replace our debt retirement. So that was \$422 million.

Now we have authority already in place to borrow from the Canada pension fund, which we do each year, and the reason why we do it there is we can borrow at quite preferential rates, we can borrow at the Canada rate, in other words, a AAA rate. So, obviously, we borrow to the maximum we can from the Canada pension fund. Incidentally, the amount we can borrow from the Canada pension fund is related to the contributions that come from the particular province involved, so we can borrow a certain amount. Obviously, a province like, say, Quebec can borrow considerably more from the Canada pension fund because they make annual contributions to a greater degree.

This year, we can borrow \$53 million, approximately - I am using round figures - so that leaves \$369 million otherwise to be borrowed. Now, we also have authority already in place to borrow to the extent of our gross debt retirement. We do not need to put in the Loan Act authority for that, that is already in our statutes, it is a continuing authority. Our gross debt retirement this year was \$161 million, approximately. Now, hon members may see in the Budget document a different figure, they may see the figure for debt retirement at \$135 million. That is a net figure. We have the authority to borrow already for our gross debt retirement, that is with the additional sinking fund. So that is just an aside in case there is some confusion on that. We have the authority to borrow

\$161 million and, if we take the \$161 million from what I already indicated, the \$369 million, we are left with \$208 million. Theoretically, we need only borrow \$208 million to get by but, in actual fact, the Loan Bill includes the amount of \$67 million, making up the total \$275 million that I have already mentioned, and that \$67 million is to give us some flexibility. Now, we need flexibility for two reasons: Firstly, as I mentioned, we already have authority to borrow to the extent of our gross debt retirement. But our debt retirement goes on throughout the year, so we only really build up to that amount of \$161 million that we already have the authority for at the end of the year. We almost certainly will need to do all our borrowing before the year is finished, so we need a certain amount of flexibility to allow us to do that.

Secondly, of course, sometimes the markets are very much in our favour and we occasionally pre-borrow, borrow for the next year, if we have information that the markets are good now and in the early part of the next fiscal year they will not be so good, so it is obviously to the advantage of the Province to do some pre-borrowing for next year. We have done that occasionally, but it does not happen very often. I can remember on two occasions when it was desirable to do that and we did it. That is where the \$275 million comes from. It is not an excessive amount, it really is just an amount plus a bit of flexibility to meet our budgetary needs, the needs set out in the Budget statement and, as I indicated, it is a bit less than last year.

Mr. Chairman, I have a fair bit of information here that members of the Committee may like to have as we go through the piece.

One question that might come up is, what do we do with all the money we borrow? I think the answer to it is fairly obvious. We borrow, firstly, and this has only been a recent phenomenon but it is a necessary phenomenon, for any deficit on current accounts. We clearly have to do that. If we did not borrow to meet our deficit on current account it means that certain day-to-day operations could not be carried out because we would not have the funds to do them, and, of course, our day-to-day operations include public services that are absolutely required, be they health services, or educational services, or social services, or development services, or fishery services or whatever they might be. Anyway, we just have to meet our day-by-day operating budgetary requirements. So that is the first thing.

The second thing is that we borrow to replace debt that is already in place but is now redeemable. We borrow at some point in time, say for ten years, fifteen years or twenty years, or whatever it might be. That money is used for good purposes, and I will indicate in a moment an example of those purposes. Those purposes are ongoing but the debt becomes due and must be repaid according to the original term of the debt, so we have to roll over that debt. That is another need for our borrowing programme.

And, of course, the final need is where we have new capital funding to put in place, capital funding for transportation purposes, for

health purposes and so on. I might just give an indication here that the Committee might be interested in. I looked back and I got the figures for the last five years, and this is our net capital account expenditures, not our total capital account expenditures, our net. There is a certain amount of income or funding we get which helps with our capital expenditure programme. I am speaking now of the figure that is net of that income, and it comes to almost \$1 billion - \$942 million, in actual fact, over the last five years we expended for our capital account.

The major portion of the expenditure was for school construction. Over 26 per cent of the total amount, or \$250 million of the \$942 million went on school construction, and that, I think, is a reflection not only of the size of our school child population but it is also a reflection of the emphasis that this government and, indeed, I suppose, all governments place on education.

The second most important area for capital expenditure was transportation projects, and that chewed up 23.6 per cent of the total amount, or \$225 million. Again I do not need to point out, it has been pointed out many times and it is still a very important fact of life in this Province, that our transportation needs are large and they are extremely fundamental to the conduct of public affairs in this Province. We have major needs and we are trying to meet them in the best way we can, and the fact that this is number two on the list of our capital expenditure commitments I think is indicative of that.

I will not go down through the whole lot, but the third one, then, was major public buildings, and that would include buildings that government requires for its own purposes and that type of activity. I guess the fourth one was in the resource area.

I think that everyone would like to be able to expend more in the resource area. Because this is the area that I think bodes well or bodes as well as it can for the future development of this Province, the more we can get our resource areas accentuated and developed not only to spin off funds but also to spin off employment, of course. Unfortunately, we cannot ignore transportation, school and other public building needs to concentrate as much as we should on resource development, but I do not think we are doing too badly, because we spent \$110 million during that five year period in terms of capital expenditures for the purposes of resource development.

MR. SIMMS:

This is not all capital expenditure, necessarily.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, these funds that I am talking now is our Capital Expenditure Programme.

MR. SIMMS:

Those you are referring to?

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, that I am referring to.

MR. SIMMS:

The \$275 million is consolidated revenue, so it could be for any purpose.

DR. COLLINS:

Well, I think the hon. minister may have just missed a bit of the point I was making. I was laying out the proportions of our total capital expenditure over the past five years in the various major areas.

MR. SIMMS:

I am sorry.

DR. COLLINS:

And the fourth major area, the fourth in order of amounts expended, was for resource development.

Now, as I say, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other issues that will no doubt come up in debate, you know, what is the state of our public sector debt, how is it doing and so on and so forth. There are so many things you could say there, I think it would be best if I waited for questions to arise and then I will be able to respond to them, hopefully.

This, as I mentioned, is a necessary thing. It flows from the budget. We have had a fair bit of debate already on this year's budget, so I do not think that what I am saying now comes as any surprise to hon. members of the Committee. It is something they expected. It is something that happens each year. It is a necessary thing. With those words, I move the resolution.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, I find it absolutely amazing when I sit here and I hear hon. members opposite, whether it

is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or whether it is some other member, talking about the budget and talking about how well-managed the fiscal affairs of this Province is.

MR. SIMMS:

Are.

MR. LUSH:

No, how well-managed.

MR. SIMMS:

Are.

MR. LUSH:

Are. Sorry, you are right. Exactly. How well-managed the fiscal affairs of this Province are. I was misplacing the subject, Mr. Chairman, put it too far away or did something wrong there anyway, which I do not normally do - how well-managed the fiscal affairs of this Province are.

Mr. Chairman, when I was a person not sitting in this House and, at that particular time, observing with some degree of interest the affairs taking place here in the people's House, how vividly I recall, back in those days, certain hon. members opposite and how they emphasized the amount of the public debt and how they said that we were on a road to fiscal disaster. Mr. Chairman, you hear very little talk of the public debt today. I would hope that we would not say anything here that would fly in our faces when we shortly become the government.

We certainly, as a matter of principle and as a matter of philosophy, see nothing wrong with the public debt or with deficit financing, Mr. Chairman. We see nothing wrong with it provided that we have something to show for

it; provided that there is activity going on in the Province; provided that our economy is not stagnant; provided that it is buoyant and provided that there are jobs. Of course, we see none of that but hon. members would do well to note that since 1972, a period of some fourteen years, hon. members opposite have succeeded in more than quadrupling the public debt.

I think when hon. gentlemen took over, I do not know exactly what the figure might have been but it was far less than \$1 billion. It might have been hitting somewhere around \$700 to \$800 million and this year was a landmark with respect to the public debt because we, for the first time, went over \$4 billion to \$4.1 billion. That is the provincial public debt of this Province at this point in time - \$4.1 billion. So, Mr. Chairman, they have succeeded in more than quadrupling the public debt.

The minister talks about this year's Loan Bill being less than last year's Loan Bill. If the minister will listen, that is a little bit related to, or taints of, if not cooking the books, certainly putting them a little out of perspective, Mr. Chairman, to make it look good to the public. The minister suggests that the Loan Bill this year is for \$275 million. Last year it was in excess of \$300 million. I believe he said it was three hundred and twenty something million dollars. The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that the minister knows very well what I am talking about. It is not cooking the books in the sense of doing something that is illegal but the minister knows very well that this year the borrowings will be \$422

million, a little in excess, \$422.1 million.

Now, the minister goes through and tells of the different types of borrowings in which the Province is engaged. He talked about the borrowing for capital account, debt retirement and current account, the three areas in which the Province is required to borrow. I am not sure that I understand yet, in the meantime, why it is that the Loan Bill is less this year than last year when we are borrowing \$422.1 million. The minister can laugh and sneer, Mr. Chairman. I am doubtful that he himself understands. I do not profess to be an expert in finances, Mr. Chairman, but I am getting there.

The point I would like elaborated on a little more - and I think the minister did go down through it and probably went over it rather swiftly - but the point of the matter is that the Province is borrowing this year, total borrowings, \$422.1 million which represents \$65 million more in borrowing than the year 1984-85, the last fiscal year. I believe that is factual. The total amount of borrowing by the Province this year is \$422.1 million and that represents \$65 millions more than the requirements of the Province for last year. As a matter of fact, it is \$65.4 millions according to the figures released on Budget Day.

So, though in essence the minister says that the actual Loan Bill is calling for less money borrowed this year than last year, the actual total borrowings for the Province are in excess of \$65 millions more. So, Mr. Chairman, maybe the minister can rationalize the difference between these two

situations where, in essence, the Province is borrowing \$422.1 million this year, which is \$65 million more than what the Province borrowed in the previous year.

It is fine to say that the Loan Bill is actually for less but that does not mean that the Province is borrowing less. The Province is indeed borrowing more money this year than last year. I do not believe that that is the impression that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) left with this House. I believe that the people of this Province have to know because it is not much point, Mr. Chairman, in them being under the erroneous impression that though the Loan Bill is for less money for last year and that means that the Province is not further in debt.

Mr. Chairman, that is the bottom line. The Province is borrowing \$65.4 million more this year than it did in the last fiscal year. As I said, that is the sense in which I used, 'cooking the books'. Maybe that is not the right terminology. I have been struggling for the what the right word might be but let us put it in this sense: That is putting the Province's borrowings out of perspective, to say the least. It is putting the Province's borrowings out of perspective when the minister says that the Loan Bill of this year is somewhat less than what the Loan Bill was for last year. We must certainly make the point and make it emphatically that the Province this year is borrowing in excess of \$65 million more than were the financial borrowings of the last fiscal year. Maybe the minister can allude to that a little more specifically.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude my few remarks at this time by again emphasizing the fact that this year, for the first time in our fiscal history, for the first time in our entire history, the public debt of this Province is, at this particular point in time, \$4.1 billion. Mr. Chairman, that is an astronomical figure. I would venture to say that this places us at the top of the heap of all provinces in Canada on a per capita basis. It could be worked out, but this \$4.1 billion puts us at the top of the heap in terms of public debt on a per capita basis.

Just one more reference. The minister makes a lot of the budgetary arrangements for this year when he says that the Province is going to reduce the current deficit by some \$2.3 million. But, again, we must remember that the Province will be borrowing \$65 million more this year than last year. Now, how does that square with reducing the deficit by \$2.3 million? How do we rationalize that when we are borrowing \$65 million more this year than last year and yet, are reducing the deficit by \$2.3 million?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I did say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in Committee that I certainly hope that he is accurate with respect to his reducing the deficit. I certainly hope that he is accurate, because \$2.3 million does not give him much leeway. When you are talking about a budget in excess of \$2 billion, a \$2.3 million discrepancy does not come out to be very much. The minister knows that in the past he has been wrong on a much larger scale than just \$2.3 million.

Now, with what is happening in the oil industry, with the prices going down, I am wondering what effect that is going to have on the minister's estimates. Again, the minister indicated in Committee that that would not have much of an effect. I hope it does not. I hope the minister is right. But that is not the reading all across Canada. The reading with respect to budgets across Canada is that the declining oil prices are going to affect budgetary estimates in the rest of Canada. It might not hurt this Province in the short run. And when I say the short run, I do not know whether that means two or three months, but it is certainly going to matter in the long run, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to conclude these opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, by saying that we on this side do not necessarily think that a public debt is a bad thing. We do not necessarily think that deficit financing is a bad thing. But we believe that the people should see some productivity, some tangible measure of attainment, of achievement, of success, and when we look at our unemployment rates hovering around 20 per cent, we wonder what this government is doing with the money they are using. We wonder what they are doing with the public purse when we see a public debt at an atrocious figure of \$4.1 billion and when we have the highest level of unemployment in the land.

Mr. Chairman, if we could see a reduction in the unemployment rate, I think we could tolerate a public debt of \$4.1 billion and we could tolerate the minister borrowing \$275 million. But, when we have the level of unemployment remaining consistently in the area

of 20 per cent, then one doubts how well gentlemen opposite in the government are spending the money that they are getting. Certainly, if we are spending these kinds of dollars, if we are in that kind of a situation, one would hope that we could see some tangible results. I certainly do not see these tangible results as of this moment. So, Mr. Chairman, on these few remarks I will clue up and let some other member espouse on how they feel about how this government is managing the peoples' money.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, I am not closing the debate. In Committee we can go back and forth. I could wait until a lot of questions are asked and then answer them altogether, but, in actual fact, you often lose the point of a question unless you answer it fairly soon.

The hon. member now sort of implies that I was saying that we are borrowing less this year, when I said the Loan Bill has to amount to \$275 million which is less than last year's Loan Bill, which was \$325 million. But I have to differ with the hon. member. I was not implying that, I was just explaining how we arrived at that figure in the Loan Bill. Yes, we are borrowing under the Loan Bill, under the authority given to us under The Financial Administration Act in regard to debt roll over, and under the authority that we have to borrow from the Canada Pension Fund. If you add those all together, yes, we are borrowing more this year than last

year. Our total financial requirements last year were \$357 million, in round figures, this year they are going to be \$422 million in round figures. So it is about \$65 million. That is quite true. And I am not in any way trying to get away from that figure, but I was explaining how come the Loan Act this year will only, if it is accepted by the House, be \$275 million whereas last year it was only \$325 million. As I was explaining, we do have these other authorities which change from year to year, and this year they happen to give us greater authority already to borrow without having to put that amount in the Loan Bill.

Now, the hon. member also wondered where the extra authority came from. I think he wondered about this. I can tell him that our gross debt requirement this year will be over \$40 million more than last year, so that makes up much of the increased authorization we need. The fact that our gross debt requirement this year is going to be \$40 million more than last year means that that will give us \$40 million more this year than last year. That is another reason why the Loan Act, itself, has a diminished figure in it.

Now, the hon. member also made a statement that has been made before, I have corrected it before, and I am going to correct it again. He made the statement that we have the highest per capita debt of all the provinces. That, Mr. Chairman, is just not so. I have some figures in that regard, and we are number three, as a matter of fact. The per capita public sector debt in Quebec is \$7,826, it is the highest per capita public sector debt in the country. The next

highest is Manitoba, \$7,124. We are third with \$6,760. These are the most recent figures I have; they relate to 1985. So we are not, indeed, the highest per capita. At one time we were, back in the late 1970s, but we are not now. And the reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is that over the past several years, four or five years at least, the rate of growth in our public sector debt has been almost the best in the country. In other words, almost the lowest in the country. The rate of growth has almost been the lowest. The only province that has a lower rate of growth in their public sector debt is New Brunswick. They had a rate of growth from 1981 to 1985 of 7.1 per cent. That is the rate at which their public sector debt was growing, 7.1 per cent. We were 7.2 per cent. Now, many other provinces are much higher than that. For instance, Saskatchewan, in the same period of time, their rate of public sector debt, even though it started off at a lower base than ours, granted, has been 23.5 per cent. Their rate of growth in the public sector debt has been three times ours and that is why we are achieving a better position relative to all the other provinces, with the exception of New Brunswick. The reason why we are achieving a better position related to them is that our rate of growth is much slower than theirs - theirs is accelerated, ours is slowing down.

MR. TULK:
What is?

DR. COLLINS:
That is the per capita public sector debt.

MR. TULK:
Why is that?

DR. COLLINS:

Why is it? Because of good management, very good management. That is why.

I am not, for one minute, denying that we have a heavy debt load and we will have a heavy debt load for some considerable years. You cannot get rid of that in a very short period of time. It has to be a gradual battle and we seem to be going that way. We still have a very heavy load, and I am not denying that for one minute.

Now, the hon. member also referred to the deficit that was projected in the budget, saying there is only a couple of million dollars less than the deficit our revised figures show for last year, and that is true - it is only a couple of million dollars, about \$49 million, whereas last year the revised figure was \$52 million deficit - and he is saying, 'Will that hold?' How can you say a projection will hold? We have given our best projection. We feel it will hold. There are changes going on in the economy of Canada and of the world and of this Province and some of them will be unexpected changes. Some changes we have not built into our projections. But I think we have built enough cushion, shall we say, into our projection so that if some things go down other things will likely go up. For instance, I fully expect that trade this year will be somewhat better than our projections. Figures to date have shown that trade is going up at something like 9.8 per cent. In our projections, we only built in something like 7.5 per cent.

MR. TULK:
What is that?

DR. COLLINS:

That is automobiles and consumer goods generally. Of course, as trade goes up, we will get more revenues from the retail sales tax and that type of activity. We may get less in, shall we say, from gasoline taxes. Because our gasoline tax is an ad valorem tax, it means that as the price of gasoline goes down our percentage tax renders us less revenue. On the other hand, as everyone knows, as the price of gasoline goes up it renders us more revenue. At this stage of our affairs, sure, we are likely going to lose a bit more revenue than we originally projected when we started building the budget back in January. On the other hand, as I have just said, I think our trade and our RST receipts will probably be a bit more than we projected. So I think there will be a certain balancing out and I feel, at this stage of the game as confident as at budget time, that our decrease in the deficit will stay in place. We will just have to wait until the mid-year figures are in, when I would expect to give a report to the House.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, is the minister saying that our deficit will decrease? Is he really saying that our rate of building a deficit will decrease?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I guess we are into a bit of a semantic area here. I never project a deficit. I have never projected a deficit in my life, but, then, no Finance Minister does. What Finance Ministers do is project their expenditures and project their revenues, and by subtracting one from the other you get a deficit. I have never set out to say, I, this year, would like to project a deficit of \$50 million. That is not the way it works.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order. The hon. gentleman -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance is speaking to a point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, I was.

MR. TULK:

I am speaking to that point of order. The hon. gentleman cannot mislead this House like that. Every year he has projected a deficit in the accounts of this Province. He has been wrong most years, on the downside: Last year he turned the trick around and projected a deficit that he knew was going to be far higher than what it was going to be and, as a result, made himself look somewhat better. But he was still terribly bad.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the House Leader of the Opposition just made a dastardly attack on me, but I will turn it aside. I will just

let that go by.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. minister's time is up.

DR. COLLINS:
We will get back to it later.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Chairman, it has been mentioned a few times in debate the need to spend money prudently and identify projects that money is spent on properly. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about now for the minister, and particularly for the minister under whose jurisdiction this request will apply, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the devastation that came about as a result of the recent forest fires in Central Newfoundland. There is no question, as he said today in Question Period, that the fires may still be burning. However, there is no evidence for the people to see in communities such as Windsor, Grand Falls, Badger. I am not certain about Brown's Arm or Porterville, I am not certain about Wooddale. I do not think there is any physical evidence of fire in Wooddale right now. There might be, but I do not think there is. But there has been awful devastation in Wooddale, Windsor, Grand Falls, Brown's Arm, Porterville and in Red Cliff. Mr. Chairman, as the minister said in his statement, fires came right to some doorsteps. Now, I seem to have raised the hackles of the

minister by suggesting that if you stand in a given place in Wooddale right now, in Grand Falls or in Windsor, you are literally looking at what appears to be a battle zone. There are dead trees everywhere, nothing but stumps standing, burnt ground, burnt topsoil, rocks projecting through the topsoil, and that, to me, looks like a battleground, and it was just a literal comment. However, I did not coin that phrase. The Mayors, the Deputy Mayors, the councillors, the Development Association and everyone who lives in the areas I am talking about coined the phrase. I have heard it many times, and I can confirm that it is indeed so. I cannot get up in this debate, Mr. Chairman, without asking the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, and I am sure that he will respond in a minute, if he would put in place a contingency plan, would he access some funds to help those communities and those individuals because there is no community in Central Newfoundland, there is no individual that can cope with the mess that surrounds either their private homes or sections of the town in which they live? They are incapable of coping with it, and there is some question as to the possibility of being able live in some of the areas that have been burnt over and burnt around. We just signed a \$50 million forestry subsidiary agreement that I suppose the bulk of which will be spent on reforestation and silviculture. Well, it seems to me it does not take much imagination to see that as an extension the restoration of these sites, but the minister says to me, "I have not been asked. I have not had any contact. Nobody has made any representation to me." Why should they? He is the

member for the district. He represents the town that has the most damage, right in the commercial area that he says he saw and I am sure he did. On Cromer Avenue, in the great industrial heart land of Grand Falls, Cromer Avenue, between Grand Falls and Windsor where fires just passed through commercial structures and burnt the trees and burnt the tops off. It is a miracle. We hear of miracles, Mr. Speaker, but if ever there was a miracle, there were miracles took place in Central Newfoundland last week when there were no houses and businesses burned.

But the minister stands up here and he says, "I have not received any representation." You know, Mr. Speaker, that begs the obvious. The minister is the member for Grand Falls, and the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) is the member for Wooddale, and the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell) is the member for Lewisporte, Brown's Arms and Porterville and still they stand up and say, "But nobody has asked me. When I get representation from the towns that I represent I will consider and think about and then maybe address myself to it."

I know what they do as ministers but what do they think they are here for as members of the House of Assembly? Who are they representing? I stood up and asked the question on behalf of the district I represent, Windsor - Buchans. It would be very selfish of me had I asked simply to have the problems in Windsor-Buchans addressed; if I did not ask to have the problems in the Minister of Health's district, Wooddale addressed, or

asked to have the problems in Grand Falls, the member's district addressed. It would be very selfish of me. So I chose, Mr. Speaker, in framing my question to ask the minister if he would undertake a programme to restore and reseed or whatever is necessary, to get those towns back to some state of something close to normal before the forest fires.

And the minister stood up, Mr. Speaker, and said that he had not had any representation. What is the minister doing here? He is doing a great job ministering the Department of Forestry but what is he doing here? Is he not representing the 8,000 or 9,000 people in Grand Falls? Does he need a letter from the town council? Does he need a letter from the individuals in Grand Falls to say, "Mr. Minister, we have been almost burned out and we believe that we need some assistance and some help." I have never believed in the ten years I represented Windsor-Buchans that I had to wait until a town or a community or a group wrote me a letter or phoned me and asked me to make representation on their behalf. I never saw my role -

MR. PATTERSON:
(Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT:
The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is so ignorant he does not know the difference and I ignore him. I mean that is total ignorance, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. the member for

Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman, I never felt it was contingent on me as a member of this House of Assembly to wait until a community experiencing great difficulties, or an individual who was experiencing great difficulties called, if I became aware of those difficulties. I did not believe it was my role to wait until I had received an official representation or an official request to do something about it. I would suggest to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) that the people of Grand Falls and of Windsor -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please! Could we have silence while the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans is debating, please.

MR. FLIGHT:

I am going to sit down in a minute.

MR. TOBIN:

Nobody listens to him.

MR. FLIGHT:

The ignorance is oozing through, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Could we have silence, please?

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Undoubtedly, Mr. Chairman, the

minister is going to get up now. But I could not believe when he took the position that he would have to wait for official representation from either Windsor or Grand Falls or Wooddale or anywhere else. He was there, Mr. Chairman. He flew over. He saw Grand Falls. I know he walked around some areas. I know he seconded a helicopter and he went in and had a press conference in Beothuck Park, that beautiful Beothuck Park that they used as the centre for co-ordinating the fire-fighting activities. The minister went in and held an open-air press conference. I was only about a mile away from him, Mr. Chairman, when he held his press conference.

MR. SIMMS:

Why did you not show up?

MR. FLIGHT:

I showed up the day before, seconded a helicopter and went to look at the fire.

MR. SIMMS:

I hope you did not.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman, I saw the fire from all vantage points, from the air and from the ground. The minister was aware, Mr. Chairman, when he held his last press conference, of the kind of devastation that Grand Falls, Windsor and Red Cliff had suffered. I really do not know why the minister would feel it necessary to wait for official representation. I would guess, Mr. Chairman, that most of the 8,000 to 10,000 people he represents, or most of the 20,000 people who had the most damages would have thought it second nature that the minister would be on his feet looking for ways to help solve their problems, not

necessarily waiting until they came to him.

However, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the problem has been brought to the attention of the minister. I represent one of the districts that got most of the damages on behalf of all the people in Windsor - Buchans and the record, Hansard, will show I have said this - on behalf of the people of Badger, on behalf of the people of Windsor, on behalf of the people of Red Cliff, if I want to be small-minded, I will simply request on behalf of my own district and he can make the representation of behalf of his district.

I ask the minister to accept this as an official request: Would he put into place immediately a programme to help restore and reseed the areas, certainly within the town boundaries, around the areas where people live where, as he himself said, fires came to the door step?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. FLIGHT:
Put in place programmes that would help alleviate the terrible problems and get the people's way of life back to some sense of normality.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman, I just want to have a few words in this debate. It

really has nothing to do, I suppose, pointedly, with the bill we are debating, the Loan Guarantee of \$275 million. But the hon. member seems to feel, I guess, in retrospect, that during Question Period, he was devastated, shot down, and did not even get a chance to ask his second supplementary question. He feels that perhaps he did not make enough headway to get a headline for himself, so he feels the best way to raise it now is during the Loan Guarantee Bill, where we are talking about approval to borrow \$275 million. He raises this same old issue again.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want the hon. member to pay attention here, listen very closely, because I am sure when I finish my explanation and response to the charges he has made, he will not feel any need or desire to again get to his feet. It will be clear as a bell.

First of all, there were many inaccuracies in the hon. member's comments a few minutes ago, many inaccuracies.

MR. POWER:
What else is new?

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, what else is new? - as my friend from Ferryland reminds me.

Number one, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says, 'The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands was out in Central Newfoundland and he seconded a helicopter and went into Beothuck Park.'

MR. FLIGHT:
I did not say that.

MR. SIMMS:
Okay, 'He seconded a helicopter.'

MR. FLIGHT:

To look at the fire.

MR. SIMMS:

Number one, Mr. Chairman, he is wrong, he is totally wrong, he is absolutely wrong, he is wrong again, Mr. Chairman. The reason he is wrong is that I did not second a helicopter nor would I second a helicopter because the helicopters were used to fight the forest fires.

Now, in the next breath the hon. member says he seconded a helicopter. Well, if he did, I say shame on him. This minister would not dare second a helicopter because they were all in use fighting the forest fires. So that was point number one. He was wrong. I had a fixed-wing aircraft, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member must know. He thinks he knows it all but he did not know that. Now that is number one.

Number two, Mr. Chairman - this is only the inaccuracies we are dealing with thus far - he says I went into Beothuck Park, 'Flew into Beothuck Park,' I think is what he said.

MR. FLIGHT:

Drove in.

MR. SIMMS:

Drove in. You are sure now? What did I do? Does the hon. member know? He does not know.

MR. FLIGHT:

You had a press conference.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, this is point number two, Mr. Chairman, I did not hold a press conference. You see, Mr. Chairman, there is the second inaccuracy. I advised the press that I was going to be at Beothuck

Park, I went out, Mr. Chairman, particularly to talk to fire fighters who were waiting in the Beothuck Park area, which was their base of operations. I talked to twenty-five or thirty of them personally. I know how hard it is, on their behalf, to fight fires, to go in and face those flames. I wanted to talk to them personally. I advised the press I would be there and while I was there we had an opportunity for a press briefing but I did not call a press conference, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FLIGHT:

What is the difference?

MR. FUREY:

Was there a photo opportunity?

MR. SIMMS:

So, that is item number two. Now those are only first two points and on both points, Mr. Chairman, he has been wrong, totally wrong. The hon. member is wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, again, on two occasions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, then he talks about and makes reference to the words he used in Question Period, 'battle zone', I believe, 'battle zone.' Now he says, 'Those are not my words. Those are not my words.' I should have understood that, of course, the hon. member would not be capable of coming up with words like that on his own anyway, I suppose, some would say. I would not, but there are those who might suggest that. But he used the words 'battle zone.' Mr. Chairman, now he says in debate here in Committee that what he meant was that there are people out there who were calling it a 'battle zone,' not him. So he is backing off from that. Now, Mr. Chairman -

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
I just thought I would give the hon. minister an opportunity to have a glass of water and clear his throat and clear his Cartesian logic.

MR. SIMMS:
I thank the hon. member.

MR. FUREY:
I think what the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) clearly was alluding to - and the minister should know this - was the minister a school teacher at one point? Were you a school teacher at one point? Anyway, Mr. Chairman, what the member for Windsor - Buchans was engaging in was what is called - and it is very simple and it is understandable - a visual metaphor. You paint a picture so that somebody looking through simplistic eyes can, by way of their imagination, conjure up a visual image in the mind's eye what is a battle-scarred area. What that is is a visual metaphor. The land has been torn up, it has been raped, it has been burned, it has been hurt, and people around that area are in desperate need of help. So, Mr. Chairman, in fairness to my colleague for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), what he was engaging in is what is called visual metaphors; the ability to paint a picture with words for the simplistic to understand.

MR. EFFORD:
They do not know that. They do not understand that.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman, I never heard such nonsense in all my life. The Birthday Cake Boy they call him up in his district, by the way, whatever that means. I am told, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) is referred to up there as The Birthday Cake Boy. I do not if he knows what it means himself. But that is the kind of feedback I get from people up there who are calling my office all the time, which is the same case, by the way, for people from Windsor - Buchans. Constituents of the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. FLight) are calling me constantly. Now he talks about my representing the 8,000 or 9,000 people in Grand Falls district, but he does not mention the fact that I am also representing the 8,000 or 9,000 people in Windsor - Buchans district who are constantly on the telephone to me. They tell me, Mr. Chairman, that they cannot find him. Where is he member for Windsor - Buchans? My colleague the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) goes to Buchans and they say, we did not get a photograph of the member for Windsor - Buchans, would you send it down to us so we can see what he looks like. So the member for Windsor - Buchans need not lecture me about representing my constituents, he should be more concerned with representing his own constituents.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get down to the crux or the meat of the hon. member's comments, which he could have put in about

thirty seconds instead of ten minutes, taking up the time of the House, wasting the time of the House.

MR. EFFORD:

What are you trying to do?

MR. SIMMS:

I am trying to respond to all of the silly comments he made and the inaccuracies that were contained in his comments.

Mr. Chairman, he emphasized the fact that he represents the people of Windsor - Buchans, and he wants to make sure that the minister now knows that there is a request, it is from him. He represents the constituents for Windsor - Buchans, so he leaned right over his microphone to ensure that he gets it right in Hansard so that he can take it out of Hansard and send it out to the Grand Falls Advertiser.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Grand Falls part of it is right.

MR. SIMMS:

I know what the hon. member is up to, I have been there before with him. I would not stoop that low.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Grand Falls part of it.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, the people in the Grand Falls district, and the people in the Windsor - Buchans district, and the people in the Lewisporte district, and the people in the Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir district, all those people know that this minister will do everything he can to ensure that those areas are looked after and cleaned up. But the hon. member was not here last

week, and I understand why, but the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) asked me a question very similar to the one he asked today, and I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition then, and I will say to the member for Windsor - Buchans now, that I fully intend to explore every possibility, every avenue that may be available to improve the esthetic, first of all, problems that have been caused because of the fire. As he knows, it has seriously affected the parks and the towns and so on, esthetically. I say to the hon. member 'esthetically', the hon. member can say that after me 'esthetically'.

MR. FLIGHT:

'Esthetically'. Right on!

MR. SIMMS:

Very good. So I will be doing whatever I can in that regard.

With respect to compensation for those who lost personal property, private property, I said to the hon. member in Question Period that I had not received any requests from individuals for compensation.

MR. FLIGHT:

I did not say compensation.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes, the hon. member did mention compensation.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, I did not.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, he did. Well, I understood him to raise it or 'Leo' did the other day.

MR. FLIGHT:

I will be.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member is saying now he forgot to ask about compensation for those who lost private property. Mr. Chairman, he forgot to say that he was looking for compensation for constituents of his who lost private property. That is not what he was concerned with at all, I gather. I hope Hansard gets it right.

MR. FLIGHT:

Not today, but tomorrow.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, with respect to those individuals, my understanding from talking to a number of them personally, by the way, I have talked to a number of them, is that many of them had their properties insured and they are confident that the insurance will look after their losses.

MR. FLIGHT:

Did all of them have insurance?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I am not aware of any that did not, you see. That is the point I am trying to make to the hon. member. I have not had any representations from anybody along those lines. Those who did not, I said to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) last week, if I become aware of them, or somebody makes representations to me - obviously I would have to get a request from somebody who was affected personally or whatever - I would see what I could do. For example, there is a funding programme available federally, the hon. member is familiar with, that emergency disaster fund, and apparently this is what they were talking about in Ottawa last week.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe..

MR. FUREY:

While you are on that subject, perhaps you can tell us if there is a mechanism in place provincially for some kind of fund which is established for emergency crises like this particular one we are experiencing, or like flooding, or is there some kind of mechanism within the provincial regime whereby you do have X amount of millions of dollars put aside, or hundreds of thousands of dollars, to help people? We know that you are sincere in saying that you want to help these people if you have requests, so let us take the hypothesis to its logical conclusion. Say you do get requests, where do you go to get the money? Is there some mechanism in place?

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, and I know the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is probably as knowledgeable as anybody else about it, because there have been situations in recent years with respect to flooding. There is a way to access funding for areas where there were disasters and that sort of thing. It is done, I think, on the recommendation of EMO through the Departments of Municipal Affairs and Justice, as I recall the situation with respect to Bishop Falls, for example, a couple of years ago.

I cannot give him the specific details, but there is a process available. But I believe there has to be a disaster of some sort declared. I do not know. This is the point I was making when the hon. member asked his question. There is a federal fund available that covers emergency disasters.

MR. FUREY:

How is that done?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, it is done through that mechanism, Municipal Affairs, Justice, EMO and then through this federal funding programme. I am not sure if what has occurred with respect to the forest fires could be categorized or would fit a criteria for which funds from that emergency disaster fund, or whatever it is, would come, and that is precisely what I have asked my officials to check into, to see if there might be some funding either for esthetic improvements to those areas that were burned over, and, secondly, also whether or not, if I did receive any requests from individuals who had some personal losses, we could access any funds from that source.

So we are looking at that already and I hope that my officials will have a report.

MR. FLIGHT:

Would the minister permit?

MR. SIMMS:

If the Chair will permit.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

It is very easy to visualize a restoration or a reseeded or a putting back to normal the areas that were burned over around Grand Falls - Windsor and what have you, and it would seem to me to be a logical extension of a silviculture or a reforestation programme where the minister has got, as he knows, \$50 million or something under a subsidiary agreement that he could access.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, that, too, is a possibility, and I indicated last week that it might be a possibility. The only problem is the programmes for this year, for example, have already been identified and plans are underway. Now, those funds are used for harvestable wood, economic wood, in areas that the paper mills serve. So a lot of this area is not necessarily wood that would be harvestable by the companies, they would not necessarily be harvesting that wood, so obviously that might not be their priority from funds under that programme.

Funds under that programme are to put in supplementary trees, additional trees for the long-term future of the mill, trees that will be harvested one day to make paper. In the areas that were burned, a lot of that is not necessarily wood that they would be harvesting, so it might not fit under that particular programme. But, as I said, I am looking at all of those avenues and we are going to have a look to see if there is anything we can do to improve the esthetics as a result of the fire, and also to assist any individuals or people with private losses, if in fact there are any and they request it. That is about all I can say in response to the hon. member's question. I think it is pretty clear and pretty straightforward. I hope it is, at least.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I have a couple of comments, Mr. Chairman, on this particular resolution. I was saying in the House the other day in response to a Ministerial Statement from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) that I was very happy about the Brig Bay fish plant opening in the Northern section of my riding. I was pointing out that I was very happy and proud of the work that the current Minister of Fisheries had done to see this to its fruition. There were quite a number of recommendations and presentations made by the people of St. Barbe district to the Minister of Fisheries about this particular fish plant and I was congratulating him for his sensitivity, when all of a sudden I was cut off by the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) because he wanted to stop me from pouring too much praise, I suppose, on the Minister of Fisheries. I want to continue and say that I was very pleased with his hard work and with the hard work of the St. Barbe district, particularly the St. Barbe Development Association, to ensure that this particular plant in Brig Bay was open to create work for 120 people, and possibly 150 people, in the Northern section of my riding which has chronic high unemployment. I say to the Minister of Fisheries, and I will say it anywhere, on any public record, that he deserves a great deal of credit for being sensitive to this particular problem and to the situation and to the plight of the high unemployment of my people in that area.

MR. TULK:

Surely somebody else gave him the solution to it.

MR. FUREY:

Oh, yes. Had the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) had one tenth the sensitivity of the Minister of Fisheries, then we would have a ferry system running right now, today, between Norris Point and Woody Point, in Bonne Bay. Had he had the sensitivity of the Minister of Fisheries, we would have a ferry system running now and, if that ferry system were running, there would be more tourists in the Bonne Bay area; if there are more tourists in the Bonne Bay area, there are more tourist dollars left in the Bonne Bay area; if there are more tourist dollars, there are more jobs for our people. So the hon. Government House Leader who is very insensitive, very uncaring - very snapperish is the word we used to use in highschool, he snaps when he hears any negativity - he sat there content on his rear end all the while I praised the Minister of Fisheries, who deserved praise, but when I compared him to the Minister of Transportation and said that the Minister of Transportation was not sensitive, he snapped across at me that I should shut up and sit down. He was Billy Beauchesne in full flight, with both guns reeling. He reminds me of the Old West, you know. What I was saying was that the Minister of Fisheries was very sensitive and if the Minister of Transportation had one tenth the care, one tenth the sensitivity, we would still have our ferry system running in the Bonne Bay area.

I also wanted to say that had the hon. the Government House Leader, the Minister responsible for Energy had one tenth the sensitivity of the Minister of Fisheries, perhaps we would know now where the Teck Corporation

application stands with respect to hydro power subsidization in Daniel's Harbour, and perhaps now we would have a long-term commitment from the company to watch the price of zinc in that area for the next two years instead of going from month to month.

You know, without being too cruel to the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) I do want to say he is very insensitive on those particular issues for those particular people in the St. Barbe district. Usually he is so kind, he has got such a large heart.

MR. EFFORD:
Who has?

MR. FUREY:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What?

MR. FUREY:
Of course he does. Look what he has done for the local people and their hydro bills, was that not showing heart? Look at the great Atlantic Accord, all the jobs he has created for Newfoundlanders, was that not showing heart? Surely to God, you fellows on this side are not going to sit here and tell me that the hon. Government House Leader, Minister responsible for Energy in this Province does not have a heart. I will defend him until the day I die that he has a heart.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. FUREY:
Do you have a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is all very interesting. The hon. member, when he speaks, is very interesting but the only thing I want to say is this, if the hon. gentleman wants to heap praise or insult on me I will stay after 6:00 p.m. and he can do it, but we are trying to get a little bit of legislation through. Here we are talking about a Loan Bill for a piddling little amount, it is only a little small little amount when you take into account the gigantic revenues that will be rolling into this Province in the future as a result of this government's operations. Why do we just, by way of a nice suggestion - I know what the hon. gentleman is saying is relevant and I do not want to interrupt - but why do we not just pass the Loan Bill, see if we can get a few through Committee and then get onto a little bit of legislation because we debated it all.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
To be quite frank with you, I like the hon. gentleman a lot more when he is nasty because when he is smiling his sweet baby smile over there I am wondering when we are going to get the knife in the back. The truth of the matter is that the hon. member is being very relevant and he speaking about something that is very important. When the Government House Leader decides to bring legislation, we will speak to that when we want to speak to it and we will not speak

to it when we do not want to. The hon. gentleman will not get out of here by turning on what he considers to be a charming smile but, in actual fact, we know what lurks behind the face.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

I declare there is no point of order. The hon. member just stated his position.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, I will take the hon. the Government House Leader's advice and I will restrict myself to the \$275 million expenditure but I should say with this caveat, it is not predictable, it can never be predicted when I will stand in my place again to heap such praises upon him at his feet. He is such a wonderful, caring, sensitive, decent, wholesome human being and he has got all of the single parents in this Province problems at heart, he has the widows of this Province problems at heart, he has the young people, the 45 per cent youth unemployment between sixteen and twenty-four, he has their concerns at heart, he has the concerns of the elderly at heart, he cares about everybody, that is why he brought his Atlantic Accord down and that is why he is going to create 45,000 jobs and he, Billy Marshall, the hon. the Government House Leader, is going to be the one to put a stop, once and for all, of the out-migration of Newfoundlanders away from this great rock who do not want to leave. I know I can count on him to do that.

MR. TULK:

And do not forget the conflict of

interest.

MR. FUREY:

Let us not get nasty now.

MR. TULK:

No, he is the person who brought in the legislation.

MR. FUREY:

But you are being unfair, you know, because he is only a part-time minister and you can only have part-time criticism for part-time ministers.

Let me say then, to go back to this bill, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the \$275 million and I want to talk specifically about young people. Now whenever we talk about relevance, Mr. Chairman, every public cent that is spent in this people's Legislature can be made to be relevant if you were talking about just exactly how much or how many of those cents are going into your district where you have been sent to the people's Legislature by those people.

Now, I have a young fellow from Daniels Harbour, I have been mentioning this to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) but he gets up with his hockey stick moving in all directions. I have never met a better verbal stick handler in my life than this guy who occupies the chair of Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. EFFORD:

The next Premier.

MR. FUREY:

The young fellow from Daniels Harbour tried to get a job in this Province when the university closed. He worked really hard. His dad just got laid off from the

mine. There was real no opportunities for him up North, so he sought a job here at the local Manpower Office here on Elizabeth Avenue, and he discovered that in the Banff area they are looking for hundreds of young people to engage in a reforestation programme.

All he had to do was buy a pair of hicking boots, a tent, a sleeping bag and the regular outdoor stuff that he needs to go into the woods. What guts, Mr. Chairman, to go into Banff, into the woods, into black flies, for three straight months reforesting with other young people from across the country. He got the job; he landed a job, but he had a problem. He did not have a cent in his pocket after university, after he spent his student loan, after he lost his grant because of the money that he had made the previous Summer which came off that grant this Summer. So he really did not have any money. He could not go to his folks since his dad who had been laid off at the mine. Where could he turn? He asked government. He said, 'Government, will you please help me? Surely there must be some kind of programme to get me to Alberta so I can make \$500 a month, so I can go to work, so I can come back and go to college?' And the federal government said 'no, you cannot have a mobility grant because young Albertans out there can fill the same job as a young Newfoundlander' who would walk across Canada to get to that job.

What does the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) say in the House? Talking about a caring young fellow, talk about a great minister, talk about a heart that

bleeds for youth! He said, 'I am going to tell you that I have \$7 million for the SEED programme -

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
- so many millions of dollars from the federal people, -

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
- so many millions of dollars from the provincial people.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):
Order, please! The hon. member's time is up.

AN HON. MEMBER:
By leave!

MR. FUREY:
So, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, by leave, of course. There is no problem with leave, is there?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
So what does he say? Instead of offering a decent, solid, sensible solution to this young person, who is in desperate need of work, he stickhandles in all kinds of verbiage around the issue, skates pass him, and leave the young fellow there with his jaw dropped down to his knees. He was sitting in the gallery. He could not believe it, he told me.

Now what are young people supposed to do, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! The hon. member's time is expired.

MR. FUREY:
By leave! —

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
There is no leave.

MR. FUREY:
There is \$275 million we are being asked to vote on.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please! The hon. member's time has expired. There is no leave.

MR. FUREY:
The hon. House Leader gave me leave.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman, we would give leave to the hon. gentleman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
I looked over and one hon. member shook his head and said no leave.

MR. FUREY:
Yes, but the only hon. member over there who counts is the House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL:
I do not think so. I think the hon. gentleman was looking at the stock market in the paper. So that was his problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
No, the member for St. North (Mr. J. Carter) —

MR. MARSHALL:
Yes, I know, but he was looking at the stock market.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is leave. The hon. member may continue.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
He was doing a crossword puzzle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Chairman, talk about living proof of having a heart. Look, how come my colleagues there say that this gentleman here, the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) does not have a heart? I will defend you, Sir, until the day I die that you do have a heart; that behind that cold reptilian exterior, even though there lies a cold reptilian interior, somewhere behind all of that, there is a heart beating.

You know, I talked about the sensitivity of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and I said if the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) had one-tenth sensitivity of the Minister of Fisheries, we would have a ferry in Bonne Bay.

What about the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), had he had one-tenth of the sensitivity of his good and hon. colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, Grade Kindergarten to Grade VI would not be drinking bog water in St. Genevieve's School on the Northern Peninsula right now and running home with diarrhea, throat sores, and all kinds of problems, having to bring bottled water to these children. Sensitivity! Had you had one-tenth of the sensitivity of the Minister of Fisheries because he helped the North up where I am.

MR. TULK:
The Minister of Education, what a

heart he had in closing down those schools.

MR. FUREY:

The Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) and his secret resettlement agenda. We know about what is going on there.

The hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) is yawning, so perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it is time for me to - oh, I have one more thing to say, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), there he is, coming in, he did not even know what a visual metaphor was, but we gave him a little lecture on that and he tried to engage in some kind of convoluted Cartesian logic, which he knows nothing about, so he twists and turns it and spills it and twists it and does whatever he can do with it to try to make it work.

But let me ask him about the F.E.S.P. Programme, the Forest Economic Stimulation Programme for the Northern Peninsula, talk about

MR. TULK:

Put in place by a Liberal government in Ottawa.

MR. FUREY:

- a Liberal Government in Ottawa, talk about a lack of sensitivity! Every year for the last ten years we have had people in the woods on the Northern Peninsula, as the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) knows, reforesting, doing silvicultural work and thinning the forests. What do we have this year? Forty people, for the first time ever, are sitting home wondering why they have no work this year. Their families are wondering why they have no work. These people

are in an area of chronic high unemployment, Hawkes Bay, Port Saunders/River of Ponds area, where can they turn? Can they turn to the fish plant? The fish plant is closed. Can they turn to logging for Kruger? They have cut them back. Can they turn to the minister in the F.E.S.P. Programme? No, because the minister knows nothing about the F.E.S.P. Programme except that 'I got a better deal this year under 70/30 than I ever got before under 90/10.' Now you figure that mathematical logic out for me?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

He actually said the other day, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The Chair is advised that leave is withdrawn. The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, a final sentence?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member can conclude his remarks.

MR. FUREY:

He was saying the other day that New Brunswick only got a 60/40 agreement, Newfoundland got a 70/30 agreement, 'are we not way better off than New Brunswick?' How ridiculous is that because what we do not have, and the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) will want to note this, what we do not have under the 70/30 that New Brunswick does have under the 60/40 is a \$40 million federal forest research centre on top of that agreement. We do not have it

and it is because you are incompetent and because you are not working hard enough for your district -

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
- and you are going to be booted out the next time. There is no doubt about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Are we ready for the question?

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. J. CARTER:
Oh, for heaven's sake!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:
You were not standing.

MR. SIMMS:
Do you want me to respond to -

MR. FLIGHT:
No, sit down!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Does the hon. minister wish to speak?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
I am sorry. I am sorry.

MR. SIMMS:
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Obviously, Mr. Chairman did not see me stand to speak in the debate so I just wanted it to bring it to Your Honour's attention that in keeping with tradition I would be prepared to make a few comments, if the hon. members opposite would be prepared to give the Chair some leverage.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TULK:
There is no point of order. The fact of the matter is the Chair recognized that the minister was not standing when the Chairman looked around the room and the truth of the matter is the Chair has already said 'the member for the Strait of Belle Isle,' and has recognized him.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

I am not concerned about the fact that I have recognized the member for the Strait of Bell Isle.

MR. TULK:
You should be.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Neither do I hesitate to say that I erred in not recognizing the hon. minister. I was not aware of the fact that the hon. minister wished to speak. I saw him standing, but I recognized the hon. member. We are in a bit of a

dilemma really. One hon. member says the minister was not standing, the minister says himself he was standing. If the hon. minister was standing, I would change my acknowledgement of the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle and recognize the minister because we go from side to side.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The truth of the matter is that the Chair recognized the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle at least spoke two or three words, now is the Chair going to allow the minister to stand five minutes after the hon. gentleman is up and then take his word that indeed he was standing?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

To resolve this whole dilemma, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to wait and speak later on. Let the member for the Strait of Belle Isle carry on.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, what we have seen here, quite obviously, is living proof that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) had no intention or no desire whatsoever to speak. All he wanted to do was stop me from speaking. As soon as I was recognized and the clock started running, taking away my time, the minister got up on silly points of order. He had no desire to speak. If he had had any desire to speak, Mr. Chairman, he would have been like me, he would have been on his feet so fast that the Chairman would have been mesmerized in trying to decide who was to speak. But no, he very slowly, lethargically tried to get to his feet. It is disgraceful!

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from the St. Barbe district was heaping phrases on the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). After he went over and embraced them, I thought he was going to quote this little poem: "In Islington there was a man/Of whom the world might say/That still a Godly race he ran/Whene'er he want to pray; A kind and gentle heart had he/To comfort friend and foes/The naked every day he clad/When he put on his clothes." I think that is rather appropriate for the hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

What are we on now?

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

I just want to point out that, which was uncustomary, with a smile on my face, I gave leave to the hon. gentleman because I had thought that we had debated this appropriately and that the hon. gentlemen opposite were going to allow the matter to go through. Well, it is their prerogative not to, and that is fine. First of all, I will say, it will be a frosty Friday before this side will give any leave ever again. The second thing is we do not need to listen to inanities and banalities and poor attempts at humour such as is coming from the hon. gentleman. There is a rule of relevancy here. The Loan Bill is a loan bill and we do not expect them to recite some arcane, ancient poetry.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is having a terrible time. We know that he does not like for people on this side to say good things about him, but not because he cannot take the praise of the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), or because it hurts him to have somebody from the Opposition speak nicely him he has to get up and get on in this manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

My ruling is that I am not going to comment on the initial remarks

by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). His remark with regard to the rule of relevancy, however, is well taken. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) has not addressed the question before us up to now and, in fact, before the hon. the President of the Council rose in his place, I was attempting to remind the hon. member by saying, 'What are we on now?' So I would ask the hon. member to address the question that is before us.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BAIRD:

A good ruling, Mr. Chairman! A good ruling!

MR. DECKER:

An Excellent ruling, Mr. Chairman! The whole point is, obviously, we are not going to get any more leave.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

My point of order is a rather lengthy one and rather complex. I ordinarily would not have raised it at this time, but it seems to me that the stuff being said across the way is of very little importance and I have some documentation here. I have a page from Hansard, dated May 21, 1986, R2125, No. 36. I am not sure what No. 36 means, but I can table this. It is a Hansard of the proceedings of this House on May 21st and it happened while I was

speaking. And, while I was speaking, the ungenerous Opposition decided to leave the Chamber and cause a Quorum to be called. Our side, of course, very quickly made up more than a quorum, but the Opposition, because they were bad minded I suppose, or selfish, decided to stay outside, they did not come in, so briefly reading from what I said, I said: 'Mr. Speaker, may I perhaps move the adoption of the entire Order Paper?' which I did. I said, 'In the absence of the Opposition, perhaps we could move the adoption of the entire Order Paper. It might save a lot of time. SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried, carried.' So it was carried. There was quite a large majority which carried the entire Order Paper, so all this is now just an exercise in futility. I am willing to table this and I would suggest that perhaps the Chairman might like to recess the House for awhile until this matter is properly researched and a decision rendered.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member made his point.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, I wish to table this for the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Chair will certainly take it under consideration.

MR. J. CARTER:

Perhaps the Chair would like to recess the House for awhile.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to belabour with this, because it is obviously just another one of the silly pranks that the hon. gentleman carries on. He should recognize that the Chair has to first put a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I would have to consider this matter, but initially I will determine there is no point of order. There is certainly a grave difference between two hon. members.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I am having an awful difficult time speaking and it is blatantly obvious that the members do not want me to speak. I do not know if it is because they are in such a rush to get this Bill through. If that is the case I can excuse them, but if it is simply a route they are using to shut me up, Mr. Chairman, I have to try and find out why. Because I believe that I do have a right to speak for my ten minutes at least to this particular Bill. I know I am not going to get any leave from the other side of the House, because the minister said he would never again give leave. Mr. Chairman, the question is this, who is supposed to give leave over there? I would have thought that it would have been the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), but we have seen such a shemozzle over there today that even the Chairman had a difficult time figuring out whether or not leave was given. The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) was up waving his arms, but we

understand he was just reading as to whether his stocks are faring well today, and the House Leader was saying something else. Mr. Chairman, I do not think for a moment that the Government House Leader has the authority to say that leave will not be given. He certainly does not give any indication of that authority. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, when he gave leave just now the Chairman would not have had any doubt, he would have just accepted that leave was given. Instead, there was such a mix-up over there that it was extremely difficult for the Chair, as it is very difficult for us on this side, to know whether leave was going to be given or not. When the Government House Leader says there will never be leave given again, I tend to take it with a grain of salt. Because I think leave will be given again, Mr. Chairman, if the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), for example, were to insist that leave be given.

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Are you ready for the Question?

A bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province." (Bill No. 29).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. HICKEY:

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.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province," read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 29).

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentlemen for their cooperation.

I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 27, 1986, at 3:00 p.m.