



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 74

PRELIMINARY REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Friday

9 November 1990

The House met at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the last several days, in what I believe is an effort by the Premier to confuse the people of Newfoundland and Labrador about the true record - the Premier is tutting already. He is some touchy this morning. He can tut away, the questions are going to come anyway. In an effort to confuse the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Premier has been throwing out wild claims about the amount of increased funding this Government, led by him, had put into the health care system of this Province.

For example, on the weekend past it was \$80 million, yesterday the Premier flung out the figure \$150 million increase in health care Budgets, here in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: That is what the Premier said, Mr. Speaker. The record will show clearly he said it is now up to \$150 million. The question I want to ask the Premier is this: If you look at the health estimates, the increase in health care spending in this Province this year over last year's estimates from the Budget documents tabled in this House by the Minister of Finance, the increase is \$61 million this year

over last year. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier not confirm that these are the actual numbers and not the wild gyrations of numbers that the Premier has been putting forth?

Mr. Simms: Right on!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I will do more than that, I will table the detail. And just so that people know the full story, we have gone back to 1986-87.

Mr. Rideout: Good. So have I.

Premier Wells: Yes. Well, then, we will see where the figures are.

The figures show, Mr. Speaker, that in the year 1986-87, the increase was 7.4 per cent in the health care Budget, and the increase in the general Government Budget in that year was 5.62 per cent.

In the year 1987-88 the increase in the health care Budget was 7.95 per cent, and the increase in the general Government Budget that year was 9 per cent.

In the year 1988-89 the increase was 5.75 per cent, and the increase in the general Government Budget that year was 3.56 per cent. So one can see that even the former Government kept pace on average and in some years increased over and above the general.

In the first year that we took office, Mr. Speaker, the increase was up \$71 million. In the first year over the prior year, the increase we had in the Budget was \$71 million. That was an increase of 10.28 per cent, when the

general governmental increase for the overall Budget was 7.6 per cent. In this current year, the increase went up from \$759 million to \$834 million - this year. In this current year the amount we are spending on health is \$834,111,500, to be more precise - \$834 million.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) million, is it?

Premier Wells: Yes, that is right. Well the Minister has the detail. That is an increase of 9.85 per cent.

Mr. Simms: That is less than last year.

Premier Wells: Well, last year it was 10.28 per cent. It is an increase of 9.85 per cent.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) as last year.

Premier Wells: No. Mr. Speaker, if hon. members would listen. That yattering prevents the truth from coming out and I would like the truth to come out. The increase was 9.85 per cent for health when general governmental increase was 5.44 per cent, nearly twice what was increased in other budgets. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to table this.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the Premier took a three-year look at health care spending in the Province, because the record -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Now, that yattering doesn't help the truth to come out.

Mr. Rideout: The yattering the Premier is talking about, Mr. Speaker, can we do something about it?

I will ask the Premier to look at the two years of his Government and the year coming, because the Premier and the Minister have announced a freeze. And will the Premier not agree that in the three years prior to his Government taking office the increased spending for health care in this Province was 27.1 per cent, and with a freeze coming next year the total budgetary spending over the three years of his Government on health care will be 17.9 per cent, Mr. Speaker? So the Premier is continuing to deceive this House and be untruthful to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: That one came out of the bottom of the barrel, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Rideout: Those are public figures.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have tabled the public figures. The Opposition have tried to misinform the people of this Province, to lead them to believe that we have not met out commitment to give priority to health and education. Well, that will just demonstrate that in this current year we increased the expenditure on health by nearly twice what the normal governmental increase was. We did virtually the same thing in the prior year, which was a much better

performance. That is why we were able to open the hospital beds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talks about this coming year and what the situation will be in the last two years, for which we were responsible, plus this coming year, compared with their prior years. Mr. Speaker, superimpose a national economic recession on their prior years and there would be an actual cut, I would suspect, in the Budget.

Mr. Rideout: What is for next year then, a cut?

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to be ashamed of in our performance in health. I can say that we performed with great pride the promise we undertook during our election campaign. But we also made another promise to the electorate, Mr. Speaker, to be responsible and manage the public affairs of this Province in a responsible way, and that is precisely what we are doing this year.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, every time the Premier stands, his nose grows another centimeter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Premier confirm that hospitals and nursing homes in this Province, this year - let us forget about next year for a moment, but this year, are now cutting back because the Government, with the exception of the salary increases for nurses, did in fact did not factor other salary increases into their budget for this year, hospitals and

nursing home budgets - not the total amount. And people who were getting forty hours a week, nursing assistants at the Waterford Hospital, for example, are now getting seven hours a week because they have to cut back to make up for the salary increases that the Government did not give them in their budgets for this year. Isn't that a fact?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I do not know the detail -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: No, I do not have to. I don't personally know the detail. I will start again, Mr. Speaker. I don't personally know the detail, but while the Leader of the Opposition was making those allegations the President of Treasury Board said to me that is a total and complete fabrication, and I have no hesitation accepting what he said.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Education I will ask my question of the Premier. The Newfoundland and Labrador branch of the United Nations Association of Canada is sponsoring the first Newfoundland and Labrador Model United Nations which is taking place at Memorial University. A number of teams of five high school students from the northeast Avalon are participating in this Model United Nations, and they have worked hard with their advisors over these last six weeks

to prepare for this. Due, however, to the cutbacks that the Minister has imposed on substitute teachers, many of the teacher advisors have not been allowed to attend the sessions with the students. In fact, one of the teams had to cancel attendance at this United Nations Model Parliament. How can the Minister, or how can the Premier in this case, continue to support a policy in cutbacks that is now directly affecting the quality of education for such young people?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to continue to support it. This Province went bankrupt in 1934 because the Governments preceding this year mismanaged the economy and we could not pay our interest. We lost our constitutional Government, an elected Government. This Government, Mr. Speaker, is going to take responsible decisions to make the necessary reductions in Government expenditures to enable us to live reasonably within our means and in the meantime achieve the maximum level possible of educational services and health care services.

Now, in response to the particular question. If I recall the figures correctly there were some \$14 million just for substitute teachers in the Budget and we had asked the Department of Education, in trying to trim expenditures that we felt could be trimmed, to reduce that, I believe, to \$12.8 million, which represents 82,000 substitute teacher days, because we felt it was being used excessively.

Now, I do not quarrel with the United Nations proposal that the

hon. Member mentioned. I can only commend it. But the choice of what days are allowed for substitute and what are not is for the school boards and those responsible, not the Government, and it is up to them to decide what substitute teaching days they give priority to. We do not set the priorities, we provide the funds. And I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I feel comfortable about the amount of funding that we are providing for substitute teaching, bearing in mind the limited financial ability of this Province and the need for so many public services in this Province. We have to balance the interest and concerns. And I am confident that we have done it successfully, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is quite clear that the Premier does not understand how the substitute teacher agreement works at all. He does not understand the discretionary days and non-discretionary days, and I can appreciate that because even the Premier cannot know everything. But during the election campaign his policy stated clearly, and I quote 'Our future economic success depends upon improvements we make in our education programs more so than any other single factor.' I ask the Premier, are these the kinds of measures, are these the kinds of improvements that he is talking about that the Liberal Party had in mind?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker,

but I will tell him what they were. What we had in mind, Mr. Speaker, was the White Paper that we have produced on post-secondary education, and the improvements in post-secondary education. What we have in mind is improving the value of the education dollar that we spend by creating a royal commission to try and find ways of getting better value for it. I realize the former administration, Mr. Speaker, just did not care or did not know how to care, I do not know which. But they did not know how to handle it if they did care, as to how to spend in order to get real value. And they were simply prepared to say well, whatever will satisfy this pressure group, whatever this pressure group wants to keep them quiet and will give us political support, they responded in that way. We, Mr. Speaker, intend to give education the kind of priority that was reflected in the quotation read by the hon. Member.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Premier that we will clearly let our record stand against the Premier's any day at all in the field of education, -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hearn: - at the polls or anywhere else. And I ask the Premier, seeing that he does not understand the educational system of the Province, will he unshackle his Minister who has had experiences in the field and is a knowledgeable man in that area and let him make his own decisions in relation to what is best for education in the Province?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, that is like asking, if I were to ask the hon. Member the question, will you stop beating your wife? It has inherent in it the implication that the hon. Member beats his wife. I do not believe that for a moment. So that question would be as unfounded and as silly and as inane as his question is to me.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Premier. Shortly after coming to office the Premier made a public pledge to cut back significantly on the number of Government owned and leased cars. Wednesday the Premier confirmed that. Eighteen months later there is no significant reduction. In fact, new cars have been added. One in particular for the Premier's former campaign manager, who is now the new vice-president with NewCorp, an agency of the Economic Recovery Commission which reports directly to the Premier. But he says the cars assigned to his people are all needed and used only for Government purposes.

My question is, Mr. Speaker, does the Premier know that the Chevy Blazer assigned to the Premier's Office was reportedly seen on many occasions at the Bally Haly Golf and Country Club? Golf clubs were reportedly seen being removed and loaded into this vehicle. Is this true? And if so was that vehicle on Government business?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with, as nearly as I remember, all of the details of the allegations made by the hon. Member.

An Hon. Member: Only one allegation.

Premier Wells: No, the first allegation was that at the time of coming to office we made an undertaking to eliminate all unnecessary Government vehicles. Mr. Speaker that was a budgetary measure announced this current year at the time that we introduced the Budget. So in the last six to eight months since we delivered the Budget, I have admitted to the House on a number of occasions a difficulty that we are having harnessing in these vehicles. The Ministers have done their part.

Now Mr. Speaker, the Chevy Blazer that the hon. Member talks about was the personal car used by the former Premier's wife, I believe, I understand.

An Hon. Member: The former Premier's wife? (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Well, that is what I understand was the situation.

An Hon. Member: That is what you understand, do you know if that is a fact or not?

Premier Wells: Well, that is what I understand, yes.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, we called it in and said no, that is not to be used in that way. It is to be provided for the Executive -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Premier Wells: - Council, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, and it is to be used as a general vehicle for individuals in the Premier's Office and the Executive Council rather than necessarily getting somebody from Works, Services and Transportation, or a taxi, if it is necessary to go on an errand somewhere. And that should be the sole use for that vehicle.

Now I do not know whether or not the comments of the Member for St. John's East Extern are accurate, that it was seen at Bally Haly -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: I do not know whether the comments made by the hon. Member for St. John's East Extern that the vehicle was seen at Bally Haly with golf clubs are accurate or not but I will endeavor to find out and I will report to the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Does the Premier know that the grey Oldsmobile assigned to the Premier's Office was reportedly seen at weekend -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please!

Mr. Parsons: I will go back over it again Mr. Speaker.

Does the Premier -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Parsons: I ask for silence, Mr. Speaker. Does the Premier know that the grey Oldsmobile assigned to the Premier's Office was reportedly seen at weekend parties around town? And the blue Chevy was reportedly seen moving personal furniture? Is this true? And were those two vehicles on Government business?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, there is no grey Oldsmobile assigned to the Premier's Office.

An Hon. Member: You know the one we are talking about, the one (Inaudible)!

Premier Wells: That is a grey Oldsmobile -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Premier Wells: Let me repeat.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

The Chair wants to remind hon. Members on both sides of the House again that when a question is asked there should be no sallying back and forth, so that the Chair can hear what the question is. And by the same token there should be no sallying back and forth once a person starts to answer the question, otherwise the Chair cannot decide when the question is asked or when the answer is given.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, there is no grey Oldsmobile assigned to

the Premier's Office. There was a grey Oldsmobile that I used to use, that I personally used until we changed the policy to eliminate the cars, and that went back to Works, Services and Transportation.

Mr. Rideout: It is parked down there day after day, after day by your office spot.

Premier Wells: I can tell the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that he is totally, completely dead wrong.

Mr. Rideout: I am not. Every time I see (inaudible).

Premier Wells: The car that is in my lot is the blue personal car.

Mr. Simms: It is registered to the Executive Council.

Premier Wells: I can tell the hon. Members that there is no such grey car used by the Executive Council or used by my office.

An Hon. Member: It is.

Premier Wells: There is none so dumb as those who will not hear, Mr. Speaker. They will be dumb forever.

Mr. Rideout: Not as dumb as those who (inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair is asking hon. members to co-operate again. Hon. members have the opportunity to ask supplementary questions. There is nothing to be gained asking questions while the answers are being given or discrediting the answer while it is being given. Hon. members can pursue it in

supplementary question.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Thank you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no grey Oldsmobile assigned to my office or assigned to the Executive Council. There is a grey Oldsmobile that is in Works, Services and Transportation and is driven by one of the two drivers that have been employees of the Government of this Province for years. They were employees of the Government of this Province in the Government that preceded our Government. They are still there, Mr. Speaker, discharging the same responsibility. That automobile, as I indicated yesterday, is used for a variety of functions, whatever functions those drivers perform. And occasionally they will drive me somewhere in that automobile or in another one, if that one happens to be in use driving an ambassador or some other visitor somewhere, whatever their functions are, they will use another one if it is necessary to drive me somewhere. So it is occasionally used to drive me somewhere. I have told the House this before. But it is not assigned to my office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, occasionally on weekends, rather than call in those drivers and pay them overtime, as the former administration did with the taxpayers' dollars, rather than do that I will get one of the officials in my office to pick me up and drive me wherever I have to go and use that or another car to do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, that saves untold dollars in overtime that we are not prepared to waste for our creature comforts the way the former Government was prepared

to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to these reports that the hon. Member is talking about that the car is reportedly seen there or a blue Chev is reportedly seen, I do not know about any blue Chev. I have not seen one.

Mr. Rideout: The one that you cracked up going to the airport.

Premier Wells: I did not crack up anything.

Mr. Rideout: You told us the other day.

Premier Wells: But I did not do it. I was not in it when it happened either.

An Hon. Member: Why did you say that then?

Premier Wells: As far as I know that is a wreck. A write-off. As far as I know it is a wreck, a write-off.

Mr. Rideout: Before the accident, the one the former Premier had?

Premier Wells: That was six or eight months ago.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: It was what?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The Chair again cannot tolerate these questions. I think the Premier has answered the question satisfactorily. And we will take another question.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier says he is having difficulty prying the hands of civil servants from the steering wheels of Government cars. Aren't these statements or activities hypocritical? Shouldn't he first start prying the hands of his own staff and political appointees from the cars they got from the Premier when he took over responsibility for the eighth floor and the Economic Recovery Commission eighteen months ago?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, when I took over responsibility for the eighth floor eighteen months ago, I will go back now and get the eighth floor and get the accounting people to tell me exactly what the situation was the day I took it on, and I will compare the record now with the record then and make it known to the House. I will find out who had what cars, who drove what, and who was assigned what cars, and I will make it known to the House. At the hon. member's invitation I will go back and look at what the situation was eighteen months ago and how we have dealt with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say further -

Mr. Parsons: I only asked a question, which I am allowed to do.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I will say further that I am not so naive as to believe everybody on this side of the House is perfect, or everybody who works in the Premier's office is perfect.

An Hon. Member: You are perfect - word perfect.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, if there is abuse and there may well have been, I do not know, but if there is, I will make sure that we stop it, because we are not prepared to have the taxpayers dollars wasted in this way.

I do not at this moment know of any such abuse and, frankly, I am not prepared to conclude immediately that there is merely because of statements by hon. members opposite that it has been reported thus. Well, I am not prepared to accept it and I am not prepared to treat it as though it is serious and substantial, but I will enquire into it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a question for the Minister of Justice, the Minister responsible for the Public Utilities Board, but in his absence -

Mr. Murphy: Uh! Uh huh!

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, does the Member for St. John's South have a problem?

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Simms: Why does he not go outside the House and get it treated, if he has a problem.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: - in his absence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier is he aware or can he confirm that three members of the Public Utilities Board, including the Public Utilities Board Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Government Commission Appointee are leaving this weekend

to attend a conference, an American conference in Florida? Is he aware of that, that those three people are going?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of it. But I will check it and see what the situation is. I am not at all aware of it, no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Just one supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the Premier does check it out and finds it to be accurate, wouldn't he agree that that kind of an expense, particularly in these times we are hearing about from the Premier day after day, should not be allowed to occur? And the question would have to be asked, why would consumers of this Province who are facing high bills and high electricity costs have to pay for that kind of jaunt? Would he be prepared to stop it if it is a fact?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I do not immediately jump to the conclusion that there is no justification for it. There may well be no justification, but I do not jump immediately to that conclusion. What I will do, Mr. Speaker, is determine whether or not there is any justification, and whether or not it is appropriate. If it is appropriate that they do so, and important to their ability to properly regulate in the future of this Province, then I have no quarrel with that.

Everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, that regulatory capabilities and

experiences were highly developed in the United States. In the past, many members of the Public Utilities Commission have gone to meetings such as this in the United States, because that is where the expertise has been developed. I recall one former member of the commission who went to New Mexico for a period of training in that kind of thing, and I guess that was done at public expense as well.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) three people.

Premier Wells: Okay. I do not know the reason for it, but I am just saying I am not prepared to jump immediately to the conclusion that it is entirely inappropriate. But I will enquire into it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In the Minister's Budget he estimated revenues from the sale of liquor of \$81.5 million. Will the Minister tell us what the latest estimate from that source is?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, I do not have these figures at my fingertips, but my recollection is that the collections from the Liquor Corporation are on schedule. I will check into it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Certainly they are, Mr. Speaker. It is always a figure the Minister tells the

Liquor Corporation they have to give back to him, so it has to be on schedule unless there is some possible windfall the Minister wants to get from the Liquor Corporation. Will the Minister tell us his estimate for revenues from the sale of tobacco in the Province? It was \$51 million. Could he tell us if that is now an accurate figure, or has that changed this year?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, recently we did get a preliminary statement about the revenues, which is compiled in the Comptroller General's office, in an office in general accounts. What we do with that is we send this out to our tax policy to analyze as to what was predicted for each month to see if revenues are off from what was predicted. We can tell grossly what was predicted for the whole year, and we can say that at the end of seven months it may be 7-twelfths, but that is a very gross way of looking at it. It is much better to do the detailed analysis month by month that was predicted. I am waiting for these figures now, Mr. Speaker, and they should be available in a week or so.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Before proceeding to other business I want to welcome to the galleries today, on behalf of hon. Members, students from Mount Pearl Senior High School, accompanied by their teachers, Miss Toni Doyle and Darrel Penney, and their Teacher Aid Ms. Greeley.

Also we have a Grade IX class from St. Peter's Elementary School in

Mount Pearl, accompanied by their teacher Mr. Arnold.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Bonavista South.

Mr. Gover: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table the report of the Resource Legislation Review Committee with respect to Bill 53, "An Act To Revise And Consolidate The Law Respecting Crown Lands, Public Lands And Other Lands Of The Province."

At this time I would like to thank the public who participated in our public hearing process, either in person or by sending the Committee briefs. I would also like to thank the Members of the Committee who co-operated with me in this particular task: the member for Torngat Mountains, the Member for Humber Valley, the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, and the Member for Lewisporte. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Notices of Motion.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: Did the Chairman indicate there is a minority report attached to the Report, or is there one?

Mr. Gover: On the page immediately following the Epilogue there is a section entitled

Minority Views, in which the objections of Mr. Warren and Mr. Woodford to the amendments to Sections 7 and 15 (1) are noted, and proposed amendments to Section 15 (1), proposed by Mr. Warren. Mr. Woodford is also noted into the report. So on the last meeting we had, all points of disagreement are noted on that particular page and called Minority Views, which immediately follows the Epilogue of the Report.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, just for further clarification of this. I mean, that is fine, I appreciate that. However, when Chairmen give their reports in the future I think they should identify the fact that there is a minority report. Otherwise, it could be interpreted as if it was a unanimous report, or something like that, and that is the only reason I raise the point.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Bonavista South.

Mr. Gover: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Specifically stated in the Report there are words to the effect that the Report was agreed with except for the following items on which unanimity could not be obtained, and those items are listed.

**Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given**

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House the Member for Grand Bank enquired of me as

to why action was being taken by the Fisheries Loan Board against fishermen who were behind in their payments. I have enquired and I am told that no such action has been taken by the Loan Board, no such action is contemplated, and if the hon. Member is aware of any cases where maybe somebody was given that impression, I would like to hear about it and then we will do what needs to be done.

Mr. Speaker, in a subsequent question the Member asked what the Province was doing for the fishermen in our Province, in referring to make work, and at the same time suggested that nothing had been done by this Government to assist the fishermen, or words to that effect. I would like to table now, Mr. Speaker, a list of projects the Fisheries Department did undertake last year and this year. And it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, in the list there are three major projects cost-shared by the Province in the Member's own district.

An Hon. Member: He probably did not know about it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Before proceeding to the next item of business I want to do over again an item that was done rather poorly in welcoming students, because I did not have the appropriate information in front of me and the students were just moving in. So, for them and on your behalf we welcome seventy-six Grade IX students from St. Peter's Elementary School in Mount Pearl accompanied by their two teachers, Mary Sullivan and Jeff Arnold.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Petitions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that was faxed to me overnight, which I cleared with Your Honour. And, of course, we have set the precedent anyway by accepting the fax of the petition yesterday from the Member for Eagle River. The petition is from 265 residents of Grand Falls and Windsor, and the petition was circulated last night out in the Grand Falls - Windsor area in just a couple of hours, so they got 265 names.

I would like to read the prayer of the petition. It is, of course, concerning the agreement regarding the amalgamation of Grand Falls and Windsor. The petition and the prayer of the petition is as follows: We the undersigned do hereby express our total dissatisfaction with the Minister of Municipal Affairs latest interpretation of the September 25th amalgamation agreement of the Towns of Grand Falls and Windsor. We demand that the Minister of Municipal Affairs reinstate the original interpretation of the September 25th amalgamation agreement. That is the prayer of the petition.

Mr. Speaker, 265 people took the time last night, in just two hours or so from both Grand Falls and Windsor, people from both communities, to sign that petition. It is pretty obvious that they have a lot of concerns about what is happening with respect to this issue. All heavens broke out a week or so ago when the Minister of Municipal

Affairs wrote to the town council and in that letter said that this was a letter that was verbatim, I guess, from the Order-in-Council of Cabinet. In other words it was Cabinet's decision with respect to the items that have been raised at the previous meeting on September 25th in Grand Falls with the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

When the communities received the letter, the two councils received the letter, it became clear to all of them, after they discussed the letter, that the interpretation given by the Minister on two significant points, the tax incentive grant and the capital infrastructure funding portion of the agreement, were different from what all of them, all twelve or fourteen, whatever was at the meeting -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Pardon me? That is not accurate? Are you saying that the councillors agree with the latest interpretation of what the Minister said? That is not accurate.

The two mayors of the towns called a press conference last Friday and

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Pardon? They were at a press conference last Friday and they have both spoken. I mean the Minister should not try to interrupt.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I ask hon. Members, please, to refrain from making interjections when we are doing the petitions. There is ample time for members to respond. There is only five

minutes and when there are interjections that takes away from the time. So, I will ask the hon. Opposition House Leader to proceed.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what I was trying to say before I was so rudely interrupted, is that the councils out there met and they have since issued a statement and they said, and that is from the two councils, they do not agree with the Minister's interpretation of those two main items. And nobody can deny that. That is what is being said publicly.

Now the point is, yesterday in the House of Assembly I asked the Minister a precise question. He was not shy about publicly making known the contents of the Government and the Cabinet's Order-in-Council with respect to those items. I simply asked him if they were the same as his recommendations? And the Minister would not confirm that those were his recommendations to Cabinet. All he had to do was say yes, then there would be no confusion.

Now there is even more confusion. Now, Mr. Speaker, my big concern about all of this, without getting into the argument and debating the points which we are not really allowed to do, I guess, is that the last two nights out there there were two public forums, candidates involved and so on, over a hundred people or so I understand at last night's forum, and the questions and questions keep rising, there is talk of legal challenges to what has been transpiring, getting legal advice. There has been talk from the audience of boycotting the municipal election, which I think is very, very sad unfortunately,

no matter what the reasons or cause, I think that is sad. There is a major difference in this whole area, a very significant difference of opinion. And it is unfortunate that the Minister is not more capable of being able to straighten that matter out. Because the people out there I can tell him are upset. His seatmate, the Member for Windsor - Buchans can tell him that people out there are extremely upset. Whatever the reasons, they are extremely upset with this whole issue. And what they can't get through their minds, what they can't get through their heads is why all of those people sitting at the meeting on September 25 would interpret one thing, and the Minister alone interprets it another way. There is something wrong with that. People cannot comprehend that. That is a contradiction. It is a state of confusion.

So I ask the Minister to consider seriously the prayer of the petition. I table it, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that he will give serious response to it at the appropriate time. Because I can assure him the issue is not going away, after the election and into January 1, the effective date of the amalgamation, at least at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this matter because of some complete misstatements by the hon. Member.

Mr. Simms: I have not made any misstatements.

Premier Wells: I am advised that not all of the members agree, as the hon. Member has just said, not all of the members of the council

agreed with that. Now it is true -

Mr. Simms: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order, the hon. Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to provide the Premier with a copy of the press statement issued by the two councils two days ago which clearly state they disagree with the Minister on both those items.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. Member took advantage of the opportunity to make a clarification.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I have not denied what the two councils did or may not have done. I am saying the hon. Member is not right when he says that every councillor agreed with that position and only the Minister disagrees. That is not correct.

Mr. Simms: It is correct.

Premier Wells: If that is what the councils did I accept it. I say to him it is not correct to say -

Mr. Simms: Are we not speaking on behalf of the members or not?

Premier Wells: Well whatever the council said, I can say all of the councillors did not agree with what the Member said.

Mr. Simms: They did agree. Even (inaudible) agreed, if that is who you are talking about.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not denying that -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: - the mayors are trying to get a particular and special position for Grand Falls - Windsor. Let me tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that what the Minister recommended or did not recommend to Cabinet, as the hon. Member knows, no Minister can ever say, and for him to imply that this creates some sort of a dissension or he had a position that was different from Cabinet is totally incorrect. No Minister is going to say ever what advice he gave to Cabinet, and for the Minister to refer to that and to make that statement in that way is quite improper. Now, let me say that the towns of Grand Falls and Windsor knew from the beginning what this Government's position was, that we would not buy amalgamation by promises of millions of dollars that would give unfair treatment to the town of Grand Falls - Windsor, unfair in terms of the rest of the taxpayers. They knew from the beginning what the position was. Now, because of the way they allowed it to go on for all those years and do nothing about it, Windsor was in a difficult position, an extremely difficult position, where it's services are of a much, much lower standard. It is in a situation where, by any ordinary standard of assessing priorities, Windsor would in all probability be high on the priority list for help. We understand and recognize that. That is why, Mr. Speaker, the position that was taken at the

time, the position that the Government approved at the time, and the position that was taken with the councils at the time, was that we would expect that we would be making \$1.25 million for at least three years in order to bring the Windsor area up to a better standard because it could be justified. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the position of the Government was clear from the beginning. It does not matter to me what the mayors of the towns said at the press conference, I am not about to ask the Cabinet to change that position and create an unfairness. It is not going to be done, I can tell the House that, and I can tell the towns of Windsor and Grand Falls that. We are going to assure the people of this Province, including the people of Grand Falls - Windsor, of fairness and balance in everything we do. We are not going to give preferential treatment to anybody.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

When the hon. Opposition House Leader was presenting his petition I rose in my place and asked members to my left to please refrain from interjection because we only have five minutes. We have representation on both sides so I ask the hon. Opposition House Leader to please refrain from interjecting.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I can assure the people of Grand Falls - Windsor, Mr. Speaker, that the Government will do everything reasonable and possible in the circumstances, bearing in mind what limitations there are on funds. We cannot,

for example, close down a school, or hospital beds, to assure \$1.25 million to Windsor or Grand Falls, or any other area of the Province, and we will not do it. To take this kind of a position is utterly irresponsible and instead of trying to help and achieve amalgamation of Grand Falls and Windsor, which is so good for the people of the area, and so good for the Province, the hon. members opposite are only trying, for their own political benefit, to make things more difficult. I consider that, Mr. Speaker, irresponsible action.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to support the prayer of this petition presented by my colleague from Grand Falls. In supporting the prayer of that petition let me say this, I think it is becoming abundantly clear now in this House, and to the people of this Province, day after day, that it does not matter whether you are talking about hospital budget freezes, which mean cutbacks, it does not matter whether you are talking about the freeze on the education budget, which means cutbacks, it does not matter whether you are talking about commitments made verbally by the Minister to elected councils in this Province, in this case Grand Falls and Windsor, none of that matters. Fairness and balance, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier preaches on behalf of this Government has been replaced by deceit and deception. You cannot believe what this Government says. It is not fairness and balance anymore, it is nice before your face and deceive you behind you back. That is what this

Government is doing. Mr. Speaker, I happened to be driving from Shoe Cove on the Baie Verte Peninsula to Stephenville on Tuesday morning when I heard the Minister of Municipal Affairs being interviewed on a live program on CBC Morning Show out of Grand Falls, and my understanding of listening to the commentary was that there were twelve or fourteen people present when the Minister of Municipal Affairs made certain commitments on the tax incentive grant and capital funding to the people of Grand Falls - Windsor, or to the councils of Grand Falls - Windsor. The Mayors were present, councillors were present, town managers were present, the town clerks were present and meticulous minutes of the meetings were kept, but, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs in that interview on the CBC Morning Show out of Grand Falls, in essence, called all twelve or fourteen of them liars. Nobody knew who they were talking about. Not one person in that room, except the Minister, knew what they were talking about. Mr. Speaker, it is a perfect example of what I call now the Wells syndrome.

It does not matter if 550,000 people heard you say something and think what you said was this, if I do not interpret it that way, that is not the way it is. Everybody over there is getting tarred with the Wells syndrome: call people liars, deceive them; they did not hear what I said, they did not hear what I said properly, they did not hear what I said correctly, they did not interpret it properly, and that is what the Minister is doing, Mr. Speaker.

He made commitments to the people of Grand Falls - Windsor, to

twelve or fourteen people in a room, and I tell you this day that those twelve or fourteen people did not all hear the Minister wrong. They did not all hear the Minister wrong, but what happened is that he came back here and he went to Cabinet and the Cabinet scuttled the Minister. That is what happened.

The Premier scuttled the Minister. The Premier said, no, no, Eric - just as he said a minute ago in this House, confirmed really in this House - no, no Eric, I do not care what you told them out there, here is the way it is going to be. Never mind fairness and balance, Eric. Deceit and deception, Mr. Speaker, those are the hallmarks of this Government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand to present a petition on behalf of certain residents of Green Bay with regard to the proposed, possible, anticipated, whatever, freeze, cutback, you name it, in the health care system, and the prayer of the petition is as follows: Because an expenditure freeze in the health care system will mean layoffs and bed closures, we, the undersigned residents of Green Bay District, petition the hon. House of Assembly not to approve such a freeze.

Mr. Speaker, the petition is signed coincidentally by fifty-two persons from Green Bay, the exact number of persons who are elected to this assembly. I guess my own signature will make it fifty-three.

The persons who sign, Mr. Speaker,

are from the communities of Rattling Brook, King's Point and Springdale. The people in Rattling Brook, I do believe in the last election voted for me, the people in Springdale voted for me, the people in King's Point, from where my opponent came, they voted against me, Mr. Speaker. But these people from all three communities, and I have had a number of signatures over the last few days from King's Point, people who supported the Government in the election I presume because they desired to see the real change that the Government promised, that real change being hospital and nursing homes beds being opened where a demand existed. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, such does not appear to be the case.

The Administration of the local health care complex in Springdale was asked to prepare an impact statement as to the impact of a freeze in their particular system. Their particular calculations, and I understand the Minister of Health says their calculations may not be the ultimate final say on this matter, but their particular calculations indicate two pediatric beds at the local hospital, twenty-four nursing home beds at the seniors complex, and approximately twenty jobs would be the outfall of such a freeze.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. Minister of Health had nothing short of a conniption in trying to stop the Leader of the Opposition from addressing the petition I presented yesterday on this same matter. He accused me of soliciting a petition.

Mr. Speaker, I stand accused and I plead guilty with pride. I have

no shame whatsoever in pointing out to the councils in my district that a health care freeze is suggested, is being talked about by this particular Government. I have indicated that to them in a covering letter and said if you have concerns about this, and if you want me to raise my concerns in this Assembly, please send me a petition. That is one mechanism whereby I can raise these concerns.

Yesterday the Minister of Health seemed to feel, when he was accused of soliciting petitions himself, that somehow he had done something wrong. I think any Member of this Assembly who gets a petition, solicits a petition, receives a petition, is doing his or her duty in bringing that petition before this Assembly.

So I am not ashamed of sending around covering letters and a blank petition form to every community council and local service district in Green Bay, including the local service district that is headed by the former Liberal President of Green Bay, who was recently defeated at a meeting of the district Liberal Association in Green Bay.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious concern in the Green Bay area in general, in Springdale in particular. The health care complex there is an integrated one, there is a hospital and a seniors' complex all under one board. It is indeed a model facility in eastern Canada, if not eastern North America. The people are very proud of it, Mr. Speaker, it is a public service. It is, in one regard, a health care industry in the Green Bay area. It is certainly something the people would not like to see downgraded, and I am pleased to present this

petition on behalf of these fifty-two residents of Green Bay. I ask that it be tabled and referred to the Minister of Health. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Motion 3, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Motion 3. The motion is that I do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on supply.

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

Committee of the Whole on Supply

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday we looked at the last two items of this Bill 66. We looked at and explained the reason we needed \$27,630,000 and also why we needed \$105,800. I would like now to address the question of the \$2.6 million which the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation needs for the remainder of the year in order to continue with its operations, and I would like to give a breakdown of some of the items there.

There are six items in the breakdown of \$2.6 million. The first item is a \$500,000 operating shortfall on status quo operations. In order to maintain

the status quo of the operations, the Corporation needs an extra \$500,000. There is another \$600,000 which is not status quo but which refers to additional staff NLDC will be hiring as part of its new mandate, as announced in the Budget. What they are about to do, and are in the process of doing, if I can find it here now - we did announce that the Department would be expanding and setting up five regional offices.

We announced that Government has decided to combine the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and parts of the Department of Development into a new Crown corporation with a mandate to deliver all local development and business programs and services to assist new existing businesses, and that there would be five regional offices - St. John's, Clarenville, Gander, Corner Brook and Goose Bay, with field offices reporting to them in each region, and that the structure will provide one-stop access to Government with a minimum of red tape, for small and medium-sized businesses or enterprises requiring assistance and services. It is the intention of Government to allow a substantial amount of decision making to be made at the regional level, in line with an election commitment, and that the new corporation will report directly to the Minister of Development.

Now in that connection the plan is to eventually hire forty-eight new positions to staff the seventeen satellites and the five regional corporate office operations of the new Crown agency. We are anticipating to fill thirty of these positions in the remainder of this year, and the average cost

of each position will be \$35,000 for salary and perhaps some \$5,000 for travel and related items. That comes to about \$600,000 for the remainder of this year.

Now there is another amount of \$250,000 which will be for the hiring of some additional vice-presidents; five vice-presidents will be in place in each of these five regional offices, and they will have the equivalent of assistant deputy ministers. Two of these positions have been filled, a third one will be filled by this fall. The anticipated salary is \$70,000 with \$30,000 for travel and related expenses, and that is supposed to come to about \$250,000 for these three additional vice-presidents.

There is an additional amount, Mr. Chairman, of \$434,000 for salary adjustments, based on anticipated reclassification impacts upon existing personnel moving into new positions. That's salary increases, and the total is \$434,000.

There is an additional item of \$400,000 for rent; the expanded corporation will require additional premises. These costs take place starting in August and relate to expanded office expenses - office premises in the Viking Building, 20,000 square feet at \$17.35 a square foot, as well as expanded rental premises in Corner Brook, Gander, Clarenville and Goose Bay, and the establishment of new offices in Grand Falls and Placentia. This expanded rent will cost us an additional \$400,000.

Now the next item of about \$450,000 is a complicated matter. We had budgeted \$1 million for these next items, but we need an

extra \$458,250. All I can do with that, I think, is indicate what the items are and then subtract the \$1 million. That should be able to do it. Let me tell you what these are now, if I can find them. The total I will read out now will come to about \$1,458,250, and what we will do is subtract the \$1 million that was in the Budget for it and that will leave the balance to be budgeted in addition, to be spent now for Supplementary Supply, \$458,000. These include six items. Office furniture and equipment \$200,000; we are talking about 102 work stations, seventy new furnishing units at an average cost of \$1,700; a postage meter, photocopiers and that sort of thing to set up the office appropriately - \$200,000.

Then there is \$676,000 for a new corporate information system, because the thought here is that everything will be computerized. I will give you some details on that now, if I can find them.

An additional eighty EDP work stations, electronic data processing stations, required in the new crown agency, including hardware, software, cabling peripherals at an average cost of about \$7,200 for the eighty, and then an additional \$100,000 will be required for NLCS consulting, that is Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services; they will be needed to sort of set up the new system and do some of the programming required to get the work stations in place. So, that is \$676,000.

There is \$250,000 there for staff training, because with the new approach there will have to be one-time staff-training costs associated with skill development

in the new duties. There are relocation costs for the people who will be relocated, I think five employees estimated at about \$40,000, at an average cost of \$8,000. And then there is some expenses moving offices themselves around from various places, \$17,250. There is a marketing effort to launch the new corporation of \$275,000, an advertising campaign to create an awareness of the new corporation - signs, display booths, updates, design set-up, the new stationary, forms, brochures, information kits, audio-visual aids, all that sort of thing, to the tune of \$275,000. When you add up all that, Mr. Chairman, you come to \$1,458,250. If you subtract \$1 million you get \$458,250. That is the sixth item of this amount.

Now, I am sure that is quite confusing, so I think what I should do is sort of recap what we have done. I will just run over briefly again. The \$500,000 is the shortfall to maintain the status quo, \$600,000 for new staff, \$250,000 for the vice-presidents, \$434,000 for salary adjustments; \$400,000 for rent, and the other \$458,250 is over and above the \$1 million we had in place for six additional items. Mr. Chairman, I think I will stop there.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, we heard yesterday from the minister the policy of this Government, how they have changed the approach to assisting individuals in this Province to finance enterprise development. Specifically they have taken away by eliminating the development saving bond issue, the opportunity for Newfoundlanders

and Labradorians to invest in the future of this Province, to use their surplus cash that is available to invest it here in our Province. We have eliminated one of the only mechanisms - there were two installed by the previous administration, development savings bonds and the stock saving plan. I suspect the development savings bonds have gone the way of the dodo bird now, and the stock saving plan, no doubt, is the next one on the minister's cutting block. So we will see that coming up in due course, and that will be an interesting debate.

Mr. Chairman, the minister has given us some information this morning, and I thank him for it. What he has done is admitted exactly what we said was happening here. In the Budget we saw an item of \$1 million budgeted to create a new development corporation. All it was, Mr. Chairman, was taking the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, which was operating extremely well and very effectively in this province, it was taking certain segments of the Department of Development and part of the rural development function and combining them together. For that, the minister said he needed \$1 million. We questioned that. We wondered how a minister could spend \$1 million taking existing people - all he is doing is rearranging the deck chairs, moving them around within government. That is what we were led to believe. Now we find that is not true. I did not catch the number of new positions being added here. Can the minister tell me how many new positions are being added?

Dr. Kitchen: I think there will be forty-eight plus. But that is

not going to go in immediately, the plan is thirty.

An Hon. Member: That is Newcorp, is it?

Dr. Kitchen: That is Enterprise Newfoundland, yes.

Mr. Windsor: Enterprise Newfoundland. Forty-eight new positions. I thought we were into a freeze on increasing staff positions in this Government - all except this Newcorp. But we were led to believe at Budget time, Mr. Chairman, that what we were looking at here was simply combining three different areas of government - the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, part of the old Department of Rural Development, the rural development function of it, and part of the Department of Development, some of the business enterprise development staff from the Department of Development.

What we see here, Mr. Chairman, is first of all we have a half million dollar shortfall over there. And I assume these staff are not in place yet, these new forty-eight positions are not yet in place. How do we have a half million dollar shortfall in existing operations? I think the minister owes us a better explanation than that. He needs \$600,000 this year additional staff. Now that is, no doubt, the maximum six months into the fiscal year that you have there, so the impact of that will be more than \$1 million, \$1.2 million on an annual basis. I point out that we are looking for an extra \$2.6 million here for this initiative, there was \$1 million budgeted, so that is \$3.6 million for this year for Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador, additional. This is

over and above the funding they had.

Now, none of this goes out, Mr. Chairman, to develop industry in this Province, to assist private enterprise. All this entails is staff, office space, relocation of staff. It is interesting, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance stood in his place a week or so ago and he announced that he was going to close down the Motor Registration Division in Clarenville, and he announced he was closing down the tax office in Clarenville, part of his own department. How many people did he throw out? Where are my notes on that? Sixteen employees from the tax office: Four were fired outright. They were declared redundant and their positions were terminated, and the other twelve, Mr. Chairman, are being relocated.

An Hon. Member: And two more at the Motor Vehicle Registration office.

Mr. Windsor: Two at Motor Vehicle, yes. I am coming to that. But out of the Finance Department there were four that were declared redundant, there were two in Motor Vehicle that were declared redundant - that whole office was closed down, that service terminated totally - and there were twelve employees of the tax office now that are being relocated - some to Grand Falls and some to St. John's. And the Minister says he is going to save \$50,000 this year by doing that - \$50,000, and here we are looking for \$2.6 million, part of which is to create a new office in Clarenville, hire new staff in Clarenville. Has the Minister ever considered that perhaps if we are going to close down this tax office we might transfer some of

those personnel? Some of them are secretarial staff and things of that nature who could very easily be absorbed in this new office, if he is going to open it up in Clarenville.

The Minister talks about five new offices. I point out that Development Corporation has had offices in other parts of this Province for many, many years. So there are not five new offices being created. I understand that there is a lot of new furniture being ordered. The Minister has confirmed here that there are seventy new work stations, I think it was. Seventy or eighty new work stations - eighty electronic data processing work stations. These are the fancy new computer work stations. No doubt these are necessary if you are going to set up this type of a structure, but one has to question the validity of doing that at this particular time, when this Government is cutting back in so many areas. How can the Minister justify cutting back on health and education spending and, at the same time, spend - \$3.6 million dollars is now what we are going to spend - to create this new Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador? It does not do one thing for the economy, it does not create one new business, it simply sets up a whole new structure within Government, a whole new bureaucracy.

This Bill also is looking for \$27.6 million for enterprise development loans. That is the money they will be spending, Mr. Chairman. That is what they have available to help enterprise in Newfoundland and Labrador. And they are looking for an extra \$705,000 for the Economic Recovery Commission itself. That is the

umbrella group, I say to these young people, that is now responsible for all enterprise development in the Province. The economic disaster team is what we call it, because they have accomplished absolutely nothing to this point in time.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we are seeing here is \$3.6 million added to the bureaucracy. And after that \$3.6 million is gone, we have accomplished absolutely nothing. It does absolutely nothing. Not one job will be created. And I suspect not one job has been created by the Economic Recovery Commission. I asked the Minister yesterday, and he undertook - the Minister of Development will respond probably on Tuesday, since he is away this week - to give us some details of what projects have been funded by this corporation, by NLDC, or whatever structure they are now operating under.

I do not think the legislation is through this House yet to give legislative authority to the new Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador, I think that is still on the Order Paper. So they are still operating under the authority of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. I have asked the Minister to give us the information as to which funded projects they have funded, and to how many jobs have been created, and to specifically outline for us how many jobs have been created by Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador that would not have anyway been developed, or been created by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. Because we are submitting to this House, Mr. Chairman, that this whole new structure has created nothing except a fancy new name and a

fancy new bureaucracy.

The Minister has just told us he is looking for \$250,000 for an awareness campaign. Mr. Chairman, how can this Minister and this Government justify spending \$275,000 on an awareness campaign so that the people of this Province know we have created a new bureaucracy to fund people? How will they justify that when sixteen people are displaced from their workplaces in Clarenville to save \$50,000? What is the justice in that, Mr. Chairman?

I have some figure as it relates to these people in Clarenville. There are forty-two dependents dependent on those jobs in Clarenville. I have a complete list of the jobs, the seniority, and the number of years of service of service. There are fourteen spouses and twenty-eight children. Now, the Minister just told us he is going to relocate five persons, I think, from Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador at an average of \$8000 for each family. If fourteen families are going to be displaced at \$8000 each, that is \$120,000 my mathematics tell me just to relocate these people. Now, how does the Minister propose to save \$50,000? He might save \$50,000 in salaries, and I doubt that. After these people are terminated, receive severance pay, receive back pay for pension contributions they have made and things of that nature, I would submit to the Minister he is going to be out of pocket this year. Of course, I have already said, and I will not take the time of the House on this particular item to explain, that the Minister is going to lose far more than that, because he will not now have sixteen tax auditors working in the Clarenville area at

a time when developments relating to Hibernia are going to be centered, to large measure, in the Clarenville area. And, of course, that tax office services all of the Burin Peninsula and the Bonavista Peninsula.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be back to have another go. I want to go downstairs and meet those young people from Mount Pearl now. Thank you, Your Honour.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have a few words on Bill 66 which asks the House to allow the Government to borrow more money, the reasons for which are not clear to me, and I do not think they are very clear to anyone. I must say his opening statement was the first time I heard the Minister give any explanation, or clarification, or do any justice to anything he has brought forward in this House, and I must say some of the items, where he stressed the implications and whatever, seem to have some credibility.

Mr. Chairman, he speaks about trying to be fair. When he talks about the stock savings plan he says well, it is better to finish this off. We can get money cheaper in the marketplace, perhaps two percentage points. I do not think anyone will quarrel with that. I am sure he has staff in his Department who perhaps come up with these figures, and certainly I am not in a position to say that they are not factual.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that was the real reason why those plans were brought in. I mean, there are people in Newfoundland who find it much easier to invest x number of dollars in a plan they can think about, that represents Newfoundland alone. We have people I know of, and I am sure each member knows of, elderly people and young people, who have a few dollars and if you said to them go down and try the stock market or perhaps put it in bonds, they think along the lines well, you know, where is my money going to go? Who does it affect? Who will it help? In that line of thinking, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the previous administration did those people justice by giving them the opportunity to see their offsprings, to see people they knew being employed with local companies that could avail of the opportunity of those plans to create employment.

I think that was the whole gist of bringing those plans in. I believe some of the same people who worked in the Department of Finance for the previous administration are working with today's administration, and I am sure they realized then, and I am sure they imparted this message to the minister, that we could get as cheap or perhaps cheaper money elsewhere. But, Mr. Chairman, what they tried to do was help the modest investor invest in Newfoundland and Labrador. By the phasing out of this program now, I think it takes away the opportunity for those people and, in fact, creates an injustice.

Mr. Chairman, also on the second plan, where a person could invest \$1,000 and immediately receive back 50 per cent of that investment, I do not think that

money would ever be invested just for the 50 per cent relief that is there for the person who is investing the money.

I might say to some of my colleagues across the way that I do have some experience as far as that plan is concerned. I was involved with some people in that plan, some people who would not have invested but for the tax - there is a tax incentive, you know, where you can invest in a stock savings plan; you invest \$1,000, and automatically \$500 of it comes back to you. I do not think that was a bad plan. Again, I think it gave a bit of initiative to our own people.

There are a lot of Newfoundlanders believe it or not, I think per capita-wise it is great as anywhere else, who invest in Canada Savings bonds. But they are the people who invest yearly, every year. I think a lot of the people who invested in the stocks saving plan were newcomers to the market, and they did it because of the Newfoundland and Labrador content. Again, I think if this is removed, then you are going to see those people removed from investing, they are not going to invest any more. Because, as I said, I had some experience with it, and this is the real reason why they invested their money. Number one, they got a tax break.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: Fifty cents on the dollar. That is right. If you invested \$1,000, you got a \$500 tax break.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) a good break.

Mr. Parsons: It is a good break.

Let us look at some of the companies. I think Fortis was one of them.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: No, they did not give it, but the Government did. But that is one of the companies this investment helped.

An Hon. Member: The White Hills Development.

Mr. Parsons: Yes, the White Hills Development out there with the ski resort. I think it helped that development. Also Resourcecan which had some involvement in it, I think the Minister of Fisheries, with mining companies and fish companies. Contact was part of it, I believe, and I think this money helped to create jobs and keep jobs within the fishery and in mining which otherwise would be lost. In saying that, I think it is enough said about this particular investment. Because if it did create jobs or helped preserve jobs which were already existing, then I think this Stock Savings Plan served its purpose.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to have a few words to say on supplementary supply for the Economic Recovery Commission in total.

I sat here totally amazed as the Minister of Finance attempted to go through the Bill and point out

where the extra monies were going to be required for this year. I think he said there was some \$400,000 in rent for buildings that Newcorp, I guess we are going to call them, will move into. This Province has numerous locations. I understand from people with whom I have talked that the \$400,000 had to be used because the employees did not want to move into existing facilities and they had to come up with new facilities.

There is another \$676,000 for computerization, new equipment and so on, so we are looking at about \$1 million in rent and facilities for this Newcorp. From what I see of it in my particular area, they have just moved into new offices, but the Development Division already had office space in Gander for quite some time. All they have done is just move to new space, so I would assume they saved on not having to pay on the former site. Because the Department of Development was always set up.

They have moved, I think, to the McCurdy complex now.

An Hon. Member: There were only three offices (inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Three offices. They needed more space and more new cars, too, to flick them about in. (Inaudible) new Dodge, that Chrysler Dynasty?

An Hon. Member: One instead of three.

Mr. Winsor: One instead of three, the Minister tells me so what we see there is a \$1 million. The enigma in all of this is that after eighteen months we are still not seeing anything in terms of

economic recovery.

We have waited and waited. I watched Dr. House and the Premier last week - I think it was NTV news. They did a nice profile of the two - and the Premier was saying that he was impatient with the Development Corporation, or Newcorp, or the Recovery Commission. He thought they would act faster. Then they went to Dr. House who said he did not think there was very much he could do because of cash shortages. He said, and I think his words were, look, we are going to have to go to Ottawa now and see if we can find some money from Ottawa to finance this. Then the Premier came on a minute after and said there is no point in going to Ottawa, they have no money to give either.

Then I think last night or Tuesday night, I am losing track of the days - I missed a day yesterday, I had to go and visit the Member for Mount Scio's District. They wanted me to come and have a look at his new ferry, The Flanders. So I had a trip on that one yesterday, to attend a funeral on Bell Island.

An Hon. Member: And you didn't ask me to go with you?

Mr. Winsor: I would not take the Minister with me, I was afraid he would fall overboard. Not used to being at sea, I thought he would be afraid he would fall overboard. And besides that, I was in the company of some teachers and I thought they might want to pitch him over the bow.

The Member for Mount Scio is trying to distract me. But I watched Dr. House talking about the programs that might be put in

place. One referred to the making of paper cups, I think, tongue depressors and so, and I recalled a number of years ago, when in school, the school library picked up the book Smallwood, The Unlikely Revolutionary, I think it was, by Gwynn, and it reminded me so much of Dr. Valdmanis' economics of the early 50s, the same type of things: do up an import list and see what you import into the Province, then turn around and build a factory to address it. This is the same type of economics I see at play here: the paper cups, the tongue depressors and so on. That is going to be the economic stimulus which is going to put Newfoundland back on the road to recovery. I do not see it here. I see \$275,000 for marketing, but with all of this we have the Premier saying, look, there is no money, so I do not know what they are going to start to market.

We have the Premier by his own admission, and the President of Treasury Board last night - I have to come back to the President of Treasury Board - the President of Treasury Board last night, boy he did a fantastic skating job on On Camera. Or In Camera, whatever it was. I managed to catch a few minutes of it. One of the things the questioner, I think, asked the Minister was about the -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: I am not sure if it was the host or a caller or a questioner who called in. Anyway the President of Treasury Board said the financial problems that I am experiencing at Treasury Board, they are not mine. They are the responsibility of everyone out in the Province. It is the taxpayers' problems. Except that

the taxpayers of the Province have very little say. They will have their say in a couple of years time when they judge the President of Treasury Board, but at this point in time the taxpayers have very little to say. The President of Treasury Board calls the shots on it, not the taxpayers. They did it on April 19 or 20, 1989 when they gave him his chance to represent them. Because the kind of democracy that we have -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: April 26, that was when you were sworn in, was it? The election was on April 20. The day after my wife's birthday. That was the day that they gave you the mandate to administer the finances of this Province and you can not go back and toss it back to them at this point in time. That is the type of democracy that the ancient Greeks used to practice for a while when they had everyone to do it and then they decided this did not work so well, so they did a thing called representative democracy, and they elected people like us to administer the finances. And we can't toss it back into their lap and say no, the problem is everyone's now. The President of Treasury Board has got to come up with some new innovative ideas and not simply toss it back.

An Hon. Member: You are right smart (inaudible)..

Mr. Winsor: I wish the Member from Mount Scio would stand in his place and say something that can go on record instead of the little one-liners. All I get in the Hansard from the Member from Mount Scio is "Inaudible" and perhaps three or four words. The only contribution that he has made to

debate in this House in this session is to tell teachers to give up Easter, Christmas and summer vacation for in-service. That is the only contribution that he has made in this debate.

Now I do not know why he keeps talking and insisting on it. He still says it is only one day. I wish he would explain that to the teachers. They cornered me yesterday and said, did our Member actually say that? Because I do not believe it. Because I sent the little clips out to his teachers, out to his school. Sent it out to the schools around in his district, and they cornered me yesterday and they asked, did he actually say that, was he serious?

And I said dead serious. I said, as a matter of fact, he said more but Hansard did not pick it up. Now I tried to get his seatmate to tell me what it was he said but I could not catch it all, but I am sure there was more.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Perhaps when the Member for Mount Scio gets up in a minute he will elaborate on what he said. But looking at this supplementary supply, the question has got to be asked is, in what direction is the Economic Recovery Commission taking this Province? This Province does not have the luxury of waiting eight or ten years as the Premier indicated when he appointed it. The Premier said it might take eight or ten years for the effect of this Economic Recovery Commission to be felt.

Unfortunately the people who live in Newfoundland now, we do not have that luxury. We have serious problems here that have to be

addressed today.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: We can not wait -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: The Member from Exploits should stay in his seat and be quiet or else the Premier will have to be sent for, and brought down here, sit him in his place, to keep the Member quiet. Because when the Premier is in his place the Member from Exploits never has a word to say. As soon as the Premier is gone he has two lines: seventeen years, and that is not so.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: I do not know if there are going to be any ski racks installed on the Blazer or not, no. That would be a little of an employment.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: He is a good skater though if he is not a skier. He is going downhill fast. I liked his comment in the paper yesterday when questioned on what had happened at the meeting out in Exploits. When he said, well what the hon. Member said, the gist of it was true. I do not have that copy here. Anyway he said, it is not exactly true but most of it was true what he said. That is what the paper said.

Now the Member from Exploits is getting defensive again this morning, he's been getting a rough time the last three or four days -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Oh, the Member from

Exploits is getting a rough time. Last Thursday out in Exploits, the teachers out in the branch gave him a rough time, and he has been a little bit sore since, and now he is getting very defensive.

But anyway, back to the Economic Recovery Commission. These people have a tremendous mandate. The delivery of economic stimulus to get this economy moving is a significant step. I attended NewCorp's, I suppose, inaugural meeting out in Lewisporte last - I am losing track of dates. It was on a Saturday, two or three weeks ago, in a terrible snowstorm, anyway. And what I found a little bit disturbing about it was that I still did not see any plans. We did not know how much money was going to be there. We are told that there is going to be some money.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: We are still not sure because we are not seeing specifics of what is going to be there. And the people that were there, they were a little skeptical.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Two million dollars a month, the President of Treasury Board says, spread out all over the Province. That is a laudable attempt. Except that I am not sure that this particular mechanism that has just been set up costing another \$2 million, \$3 million, \$4 million, \$5 million, is necessary. Because all we have done is just realigned positions that already existed in the Department of Development, in Rural Development.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Good. Now you will get it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

Mr. Murphy: Just a few short remarks, Mr. Chairman, because I think this is a subject that is worthy of some comment. Last night when the Federal Minister of Fisheries was here with a package, I suppose, that we were glad to receive - it is certainly not adequate, and every Member in this House knows it, but I suppose it is better than none - the thing that was interesting in that press conference was that the Mayor from Grand Bank and some of the other mayors were there. And one of the things that the Mayor from Grand Bank got up and was specific about, was that the thing that was very apparent to him, was that under no circumstances could the community of Grand Bank continue to think fishing industry only, and that they had to diversify.

Now I would suggest to this hon. House that the statement from the Mayor from Grand Bank is exactly true. And if a town like Grand Bank or towns throughout rural Newfoundland are going to have any kind of a base whereupon they can have a meaningful income, be employed, that it is totally necessary that the Economic Recovery Commission be in place. I do not know who said it but it was said a long time ago, I guess, that if we are to accumulate then surely heavens we must speculate. And these are the kinds of dollars that this Government is committed to putting forward to provide jobs throughout rural Newfoundland

whether they be four or five, twenty or thirty. We know the necessity and the need.

And it is all well and good for Members opposite to make fun of Dr. House and his analogy concerning such things as paper cups in hospitals, and tongue depressors and what have you, and they might try to make a joke of it. But if these things are successful and there are fourteen or fifteen people employed anywhere in this Province, involved in that type of industry, then surely heavens those direct jobs and the spin-off jobs are worthwhile, and it is something that we need to do.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: It is more than obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government and their reduction in transfer payments, their reduction all over the place, their belt tightening on the other provinces, the have not provinces is more than obvious.

And to use a point of reference, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the St. John's Dockyard or the Newfoundland Dockyard which is more appropriate. We have seen what happened in the last couple of days to that particular industry that over time has provided somewhere in the vicinity consistently of 300 jobs, and at peak periods up to 500 plus jobs. And yesterday that particular dockyard was reduced to about sixty-one permanent people employed of which forty-seven were supervisors. Now at a time when the Hibernia project, Mr. Chairman, has been announced, and a time when you would think that the opportunity for a facility such as the Newfoundland Dockyard

would be intensified, here we see the Federal Member for St. John's West, Marine Atlantic, and the newly appointed Chairperson of the Board, Mr. Hal Barrett, unavailable for comment, unavailable to substantiate why there is no work at the Newfoundland Dockyard.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: Who?

Mr. Murphy: Oh, yes, Mr. Barrett who was a Cabinet Minister in the previous administration. He got an appointment. He is Chairperson of the Newfoundland Dockyard.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: Now the Newfoundland Dockyard through Mr. Peddigrew, who is no longer, this is another great charade and another great secret, Mr. Peddigrew, who was the President of the Newfoundland Dockyard, who was a very aggressive individual, who went all over Europe looking for joint venture projects to become involved in the Hibernia project is no longer with the Newfoundland Dockyard. That, Mr. Chairman, I think speaks and indicates that the Federal Minister responsible, and this just happens to be in his own district, I might add, uncommitted, saying nothing as to why one of the better industries historically for the last nearly one hundred years no longer provides jobs, and not only, Mr. Chairman, to residents of St. John's South or St. John's West or Mount Scio - Bell Island, but jobs to people in St. Mary's - The Capes, that far away, jobs to people in the Ferryland District. I think, I stand to be correct, but I think probably the district that derived the most employment

from the Newfoundland Dockyard would be Harbour Main.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Murphy: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main knows only too well, there is not a boilermaker on that job today, and that is a first, and here we are around the corner from Hibernia and there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that somebody has a hidden mandate, and I do not know if that hidden mandate is to privatize or what it is they are to look after their own or whatever the case may be. But again we can see the reduction of employment in a facility such as the Newfoundland Dockyard. Absolutely no concern on behalf of the Federal Member, Marine Atlantic, which is I expect controlled by the Federal Government and nothing from the newly appointed Chairman of the Board, Mr. Barrett.

So again it just goes to show the great need, Mr. Chairman, for providing funding. This Government has to provide funding to an organization such as the Economic Recovery Commission to try and develop jobs in this Province to pick up on the loss and the lack of concern by our Federal friends and Crown corporations appointed by our Federal friends. So, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get into any great detail on the monetary numbers that are being put forward by the Minister of Finance, only to say that these dollars are obviously necessary and obviously needed when we see such negative things taking place that we have seen in the last few days.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: I stood earlier, but I sat when the Member for St. John's South stood. I only have a few remarks to make at this point in time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are two things here. One is the Bill itself, of course, Bill 66 with some very interesting items in it, not the least of which is that additional funding for the Economic Recovery Commission which gives us a great opportunity to talk about and ask questions about the Economic Recovery Commission and its performance. However, before I get into that area at all since it is my first opportunity to speak in this particular bill, I would point out to members opposite that it is an opportunity to debate as well as to ask questions. And we are hoping that as time goes on and we continue to ask questions and continue to debate that the Government, the Minister of Finance in particular, will provide answers to our questions. Because it is only because we do not get direct answers that we continue to let debate carry on. That is the only reason that we do it. And members opposite do not seem to be able to understand that or perhaps do not believe it. But the fact of the matter is we have all kinds of evidence of questions that we have asked - for example on The Loan Bill, you will remember on The Loan Bill when the Government brought in closure, and in response to our question, why are you bringing in closure, the Premier stood in his place and he said, I say to my colleague for Torngat Mountains, we are bringing in closure because answers have been provided. He said, for

example, the Minister of Finance has provided all kinds of answers to the Opposition's questions. Questions on the expenditures in the Budget overrun, why his deficit has become so large? The Minister of Finance has provided all the answers to the best of my knowledge. And just two days ago the Member for St. John's East Extern asked the Minister of Finance questions on the expenditure side. Why the increased expenditures? Where is it? He said I will have to get the information for you. So who is telling the truth? Who is right? Which is right and which is wrong?

I said the reason we carry on debate in The Supply Bills is to try to get answers from people. And you recall when the Government introduced closure on The Loan Bill, when we were trying to get some answers to questions on The Loan Bill, the Premier said the reason we are bringing in closure, among other things, was because as far as I can understand we have answered all your questions. The Minister of Finance has provided all the answers. That is what he said.

Now a couple of days ago the Member for St. John's East Extern you will recall, asked the Minister some direct, specific questions to explain where the additional overrun has developed in this \$120 million deficit. Remember he has always talked about the Federal cutbacks, but that left another \$70 million, or whatever the amount is, to be explained. And he explained it in general terms, a decrease in revenue in some areas, and an increase in expenditures in others. What the Member for St. John's East Extern asked is: Well,

where are these increased expenditures? Can you tell us that? Where are the decreased revenues? And you said, you would have to get the information for the hon. Member.

Dr. Kitchen: That will be released shortly.

Mr. Simms: Yes, but my point is, I say to the Minister, valid, the information was not provided to us. That is the kind of question we had been asking. So to get back to my original point we will continue debate on this Supply Bill for exactly the same reasons. If we get direct answers, satisfactory answers, we are not going to delay The Supply Bill forever and a day. But if we do not get answers then we intend to continue to ask questions, plus debate, because that is what this is, it is a debate. And my point is, in terms of getting answers from the Government it is like pulling teeth from a hen.

There are all kinds of examples, and the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation is an excellent example. Every time he is asked a question in the House it is either I will take notice, or he will say, in due course. He is very good at providing answers, and has pretty good, and pretty direct answers. The Minister of Finance himself must admit that his own performance in answering questions leaves a lot to be desired. It is usually a yes, or it is a no, and more often than not he will not stand at all to answer.

Ms Cowan: That is not true.

Mr. Simms: It is true, and the Minister of Labour need not get upset. The Minister of Labour is

another good example of not providing really good direct answers. All the Minister of Social Services and the Minister of Health do is totally ignore the questions and try to make a political attack on the Opposition. The Minister of Municipal Affairs would not give me a direct answer yesterday when I asked him what his recommendations were on the amalgamation question. The Premier and the Minister of Finance, as I said again, and I just explained a contradiction, where the Premier said the Minister has given all the answers, and then the Minister says he has not given all the answers. The point of my argument is that we are not getting answers. If we get direct answers to our direct questions, of which there will be many on the Economic Recovery Commission and on financial matters, then we are prepared to let the Supply Bill go, eventually, but the best example of all, the prime example of Government not giving answers, and sometimes I often wish, Mr. Chairman, we had television in the House so we could see the Ministers trying to answer questions, and see how hard it is for the Opposition to extract answers, and extract information from the Government. The best example of all of Government not being able to provide answers was on last night's CBC On Camera program. If ever I saw an example of a Member and a Minister avoiding direct answers to questions last night was the epitome of that. The President of Treasury Board, having had eight or ten questions put to him by individuals who taped their questions from all around the Province, asked the Minister many questions, and in fact, to

emphasize my point, the hostess of the program, Ann Budgell had to frequently interrupt and say, but, Mr. Baker their question was this, her question was that. And the poor old President of Treasury Board had to keep skating around, and skirting around everything in a general way. I thought it was a dismal performance. He hemmed and he hawed, he well, well, welled several times, he hung his head in shame, and so he might. I watched the entire program. I would not miss it for the world. In fact I have it taped so I will show it to the hon. Member if he did not see it because I know he was out to another teacher's meeting. I do not know if I have the headline here. I think I do. I say to the hon. Member for Placentia, I do not know if the news headlines in the paper from Placentia area for tomorrow, or Monday, or whatever, will read like the headlines in the Grand Falls - Windsor - Exploits area from the meeting that the Member for Exploits attended with the Minister of Forestry to -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Will you let me get to it? I do not know if the headline will be as good as that one. I say to Mr. Chairman he would be really interested in this one. Here is the headline, Teachers roast members at open session. Now, there is a really telling headline, and a good headline. In fact, just in case somebody might argue that is misleading, let me just read some excerpts from the story: One hundred and eighty teachers and representatives, it was not exactly a love-in. Both MHAs were heckled throughout the night because of their Government's stand on contract negotiations and for education

funding cuts. That is true. There is a serious rift between the NTA and Government. That is true. The teachers were angry about the possibility Government might legislate an end to the contract dispute if a settlement were not reached etcetera, etcetera. And you said they need not worry about that at this point in time, the key words at this point in time. What else did they say? They talked about the layoffs of teachers and substitute teacher cutbacks. But I say to the Member for Placentia, the Member for Windsor - Buchans, took the Member for Exploits, the former President of the NTA out with him to meet with the Exploits Valley Branch of the NTA because they wanted to ask Government members questions. And there is the results of their meeting. Teachers roast members at open session. Now I know that the Member for Placentia had him down with him last night, I think, to a meeting or whatever. And I hope the headlines are not as telling as this when the paper from that area comes out. Is there a paper down in that area? It is just The Telegram, is it?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: How many teachers did you have?

An Hon. Member: Was it eighty or ninety?

Mr. Simms: Eighty or ninety. One hundred and eighty here.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I shall be undaunted in my attempts to make my point, and my point, of course, has to do with the lack of answers from the Government. And the best example I saw of it was Mr. Baker, or the President of Treasury

Board, I am sorry, on On Camera last night. He never answered a question directly. He never answered one question. She said, Mr. Baker, Mr. Baker, the question was this, but Mr. Baker, they want to know this. She wanted to know that. And Mr. Baker will go on and on and on, and on, and he hung his head in shame, and he hemmed, hemmed, hemmed and he well, well, welled, and he did it all.

Mr. Winsor: Do you know that one of the questions came from the president of a Liberal Association.

Mr. Simms: Is that right? One of the questioners I understand was the President of a District Liberal Association, so my friend tells me. I do not know because I am not interested in the politics or making political points on the issue. That is not the point. The point is the people of Newfoundland and Labrador deserve answers. And the Opposition who represent people in this Province seeking answers, deserve answers. And there is not one Minister over there, I should not say there is not one, there are a couple of exceptions, I will not name them for fear of embarrassing them in front of their colleagues. But I have named several, and some examples of how they answer questions just to prove my point. The Minister of Social Services never answers a question just gets up and attacks the Opposition. All he does is get up and when he answers a question he just attacks the Opposition and goes back, brings up Sprung and pickles and all that sort of stuff. A real valuable contribution to the people's business, Mr. Chairman.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I can see now that members opposite have a changed attitude. The Minister

of Finance assures me, he nodded when I was talking about this in debate and he assures me he will provide answers to the best of his ability directly. So when we say, where are the expenditure increases that has caused the deficit to run to \$120 million, would he please get up on his feet and tell us in this area, in that area, here, we ran over by this much, we ran over by that much, or whatever. That is the kind of answer it was. A pretty clear question, I hope.

And secondly, on the other point of the reduction in the revenues, where have the revenue reductions occurred? I think he said that was around about \$30 million or some portion of it was \$30 million. So is that all retail sales tax, for example, or are there other areas or what? All retail sales tax.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: Okay, Mr. Chairman. In any event I guess -

Some Hon. Members: By leave!

An Hon. Member: No leave.

Mr. Simms: So I just conclude from that then that the Minister did not properly -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: I can get up again, you know. I can sit down and get up again.

Mr. Chairman: You have not sat

down yet.

I will recognize the hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was quite prepared to let my colleague for Grand Falls continue but the Minister of Social Services was adamant that he take his seat.

Mr. Simms: And he said he will give us answers.

Mr. Efford: You haven't asked a question over there.

Mr. Simms: Do not be so silly.

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of questions asked.

An Hon. Member: Hold on to your pickles.

Mr. Matthews: A lot of questions asked.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Order, please!

Mr. Matthews: A lot of questions since last spring about the Budget.

Mr. Simms: You do not make any sense.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Everything that he says goes over everybody else's head in the Province.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I recognized the hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is getting pretty rough in here this morning. It has been a long hard week, Mr. Chairman. And you know when you are in the closing hours you are almost like you are shattered and shell shocked and everything else here.

An Hon. Member: We are going to continue on this afternoon, are we not?

Mr. Matthews: I am sorry?

An Hon. Member: We are going to continue on this afternoon, are we not?

Mr. Matthews: I would like to. That is why it is starting to get warmed up, so we can go on until 6:00 or 7:00 tonight.

An Hon. Member: Or 10:00.

Mr. Matthews: And I can see, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Social Services is getting warmed up and getting ready over there. I wondered when the Member for Grand Falls was talking, I was thinking about how tough times have become and how rough it is getting. I wondered out loud, I said are times that rough and tough now that the Minister of Social Services is starting to chew tobacco? But that is not the case. I know what he is doing and on occasion he has a little taffy or a little candy to keep going.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: That is right, keep the sugar and energy going. And we know that he has lots of energy. He displays it at times here. As I said yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the only one left on the other side with a bit of get up and go.

An Hon. Member: Who?

Mr. Matthews: It is the Minister of Social Services. He is the only one left with a bit of fight in him. He keeps it going and carries the government line, as difficult as it is for a Minister with such compassion and such concern.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Oh, nothing coming after that.

An Hon. Member: Ray Guy says name one Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Matthews: Name one.

An Hon. Member: John Efford.

Mr. Matthews: That is right. Mr. Efford. The Premier and Mr. Efford. Ray Guy is getting pretty good here lately I must say.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: But, Mr. Chairman, I want to just speak to the supplementary. There are a couple of financial connections with the supply bill because I have grave concerns about that, particularly the money, again, \$700,000 I think it is to the Economic Recovery Commission. You know, that is worth concern.

But I want to say to the Minister of Fisheries, the list he tabled this morning when he rose in his place in answers and said that there are three projects in the Member's district. And, of course, it occurred to me, now why didn't he name the projects because ordinarily he would name them. You are right to name them to deflate the person who asked the question. And, of course,

what they are is the three phases of the Marine Service Centre in Fortune. Three phases of the one project, not three projects.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Well, it is too far advanced to cancel it now. You cannot take the thing down, John. You cannot take it down. It is just about done. They are putting on the class A and class B now. It is just about ready to open.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: They took down that, but they cannot take down the Marine Service Centre. It is not the same material, it is a different type material. It is more durable, a different structure, not as portable. So, I just wanted to point that out and have it go on the record, Mr. Chairman, that this is the Fortune Marine Service Centre that was announced, as I said this morning, by the former Member of Parliament for Burin - St. George's, Mr. Joe Price, in an agreement with the Province at the time when the now Leader of the Opposition was the Minister of Fisheries.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Joe is chief of staff now for Mr. Pierre Cadieux. He is Attorney General or Solicitor General, something like that. I do not know.

An Hon. Member: A Tory General.

Mr. Matthews: A Tory General.

An Hon. Member: A thorny general.

Mr. Matthews: A thorny general, yes. But I wanted to point that out because the Minister of

Fisheries, you know -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: And the other thing that needs to be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, is that all of these projects are all Federal projects.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, I am shell shocked.

An Hon. Member: He cannot cancel it anyway.

Mr. Matthews: They are all Federal projects all along the Labrador, all Federal money. All of them.

Another point I would like to make while I am on my feet is to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. I am wonder if the Minister, in light of what is happening with the Gaultois situation and the ferrys and so on. The people of Gaultois are very desirable to keep the Sound of Islay running on that service now because we know there are ten ferry workers being laid off as a result of changes in the Fogo-Change Islands run. And there is a boat freed up. They do have a boat now free that they need. I am wondering if the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation might consider leaving the Sound of Islay on the Gaultois-Hermitage run because the people are very -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Well, I am asking. He is listening. I know he is listening. I wonder if he would considered doing that for two reasons: one is out of concern for the safety of the people who are

very concerned about the Agnes and Anne.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: What are you reading anyway? Is it comics or something?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Would the Minister -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, I am asking a serious question on behalf of the people of Gaultois who have concerns about the Agnes and Anne, a fifty-three year old wooden boat. The people of Gaultois are questioning whether or not regulations of either Transport Canada or the Minister's own Department are being broken by having a wooden boat transport people today, in 1990.

An Hon. Member: That sounds like (inaudible). You know the score.

Mr. Matthews: No, I don't. I am asking the question to the Member from St. John's South on behalf of the people of Gaultois, by the way, who contact me regularly. They called me last night, as a matter of fact, and wondered if I would raise the issue on their behalf. Their Member is not here so he can not defend himself, and it is not right to talk about a Member who is not in the Legislature.

But that is what they are wondering, if the Minister might consider in light of the changes to the ferry system, leaving the Sound of Islay on that run. Because it can transport vehicles, and it has great implications for the future of the fish plant.

Mr. Murphy: What do you have (inaudible)?

Mr. Matthews: I am going to be surprised if CSI, whatever they are, pass it.

Mr. Murphy: Well, then, that is their mistake.

An Hon. Member: It is fifty-four years old.

Mr. Matthews: A fifty-three year old wooden boat?

An Hon. Member: A tub.

Mr. Matthews: Just out of interest to the Member for St. John's South, by the way, they tell me the last boat on there, which was basically a steel boat, was used on the St. Pierre - Fortune ferry run, the St. Eugene IV, and before they would allow that to run on the Gaultois - Hermitage run - there was some wooden structure down where the passengers used to be - they made them take all that out. They would not let them keep that there because, again, the boat was transporting passengers in the Province.

That is the concern they have, so I am wondering if the Minister might consider on their behalf leaving that Sound of Islay there for them. It would have a great impact on their chances of getting a new operator for the fish plant, and there is someone interested as I am sure everyone knows. So I am wondering if he would consider that?

Did the Minister hear that, I wonder? Yes, he did. Very interested. We will send a picture to the people of Gaultois to show the concern.

On this Supplementary Supply Bill, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance has left the House, and I know the Minister has had a grueling week and a grueling few months. And I did not hear the Minister yesterday when he spoke on supplementary supply, because I was off meeting with Mr. Valcourt with the Grand Bank delegation.

Mr. Murphy: Who?

Mr. Matthews: Oh never mind who, now! Your Minister and our Minister, they have made up. The news this morning is that -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Dr. Kitchen: Oh, yes, they have made up! As a matter of fact, the newscasts this morning are carrying the Ministers as saying there has to be more downsizing in the fishery.

Mr. Efford: Who said that, Valcourt?

Dr. Kitchen: No, the Provincial Minister. He agrees now there has to be more downsizing and all this stuff. So I do not know what that means either. I suppose what it will mean in essence is that the financial position of the Province will worsen again. Because we will see more layoffs and less people working, less earnings, less revenues coming into the Minister of Finance, to the Treasury of the Province. So our situation is going to worsen, again. Because what is happening now is the fishery is on such a downturn that I would say it has had more impact on the financial position of this Province than any other factor.

You can talk about the recession and about the transfer payments

from Ottawa, Mr. Chairman -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am glad the Minister of Finance is back, because I have a couple of questions.

An Hon. Member: Tell us more about the (inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: I thought you had enough about that this morning. Now remember, do not tempt me. Do not tempt me, or I will go much farther than I did. Do not tempt me. Remember now. We are getting a lot of calls. There are a lot of people out there who are hurting, who are expecting layoffs, who are expecting health care to decrease and the educational system to go down hill. Those people are very interested in what is happening in Government. So what I am saying to you is, the information I supplied to the House this morning was only the tip of the iceberg. So do not get me involved in it, because I might get mad and say a lot of things, I might blow the roast.

An Hon. Member: Come on!

Mr. Parsons: No, I might blow the roast. I want to talk to my old buddy on times over there, the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible) on this side.

Mr. Parsons: Who hasn't? God Almighty save us and bless us, Mr. Chairman. Did you hear that

statement from the hon. the Minister of Finance? He said I have no friends over there.

An Hon. Member: You have a couple (inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: You know you can not get rid of me politically. Now that is the misstatement of the year, of the decade. You know you cannot get rid of me politically, because there is no one who could beat me in St. John's East Extern, no one.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Parsons: I want to go back to something more serious now and ask the Minister of Finance - I was talking about the Development Savings Bonds.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Parsons: How can I ask a question of the Minister of Finance when I get that jabbling, that rhetoric over there which is continuous? I do not mind it, though. I can take it.

The Minister of Social Services. Do you know something? I have not heard one derogatory thing from this side of the House as it pertains to the Minister of Social Services. The next time around that side over there will be eliminated and we might be sort of sending a message to the Minister of Social Services. We, perhaps, could use him. When we form the next Government, we will have to choose him. And I am being very nice and considerate to the hon. Gentleman from Port de Grave.

Mr. Warren: Yes, we are going to need a night prowler.

Mr. Parsons: No, we are going to

need a fellow who is not scared, who does not shiver and shimmy around when the Premier looks at him; he can look him straight in the eye. That is the type of person for whom we are looking.

Again I want to ask the Minister of Finance, on the Development Savings Bonds, if a person bought a bond four years ago and the rate at that particular time, say, was ten - I am not sure of this - how did the rate fluctuate over the next four years?

An Hon. Member: It was set every year (inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: It was set every year.

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible) like Canada Savings Bonds.

Mr. Parsons: Using what criteria?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: No, he will answer it for me later on. I also want to say to the Minister of Finance that it has certainly been reported that the Stocks Savings Plan is on the chopping block, and I have been asked -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: How much does the hon. Member have in?

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) plead immunity to that. The Fifth Amendment.

Mr. Parsons: Do we have the Fifth Amendment? What do we have to compare with the Fifth Amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Beauchesne Tom.

Mr. Parsons: Will Beauchesne Tom

look up a particular section of Beauchesne dealing with this particular issue and get back to me? At the moment, I will stick to the Fifth Amendment.

Again I want to ask the Minister of Finance, is the Stock Savings Plan on the chopping block? Are there going to be any new issues? Is the Government going to chop the Stock Savings Plan the same way they chopped everything else?

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) where you are going to put your money now (inaudible).

Listen to one-vote Tom over there. The expert on Beauchesne. I have to sway a little now. You remember the day he had Beauchesne in his hand over there, when the hon. Member for Kilbride brought in the minority report, he had told the Member for St. John's South he was bringing it in. So he went and searched Beauchesne and came in armed, armed with his rifle, his only protection, Beauchesne. That was a one-time event. That will not happen again, because we told the hon. the Member for Kilbride not to do it any more, keep them in suspense. Do not let him have the book in his hand. And he agreed. He said, you know, I was trying to be cordial, trying to be nice to the Member for St. John's South, and I did it.

Mr. Chairman, I see in this Bill 66 the search for money. They are asking the House to allow the Government to borrow, and I saw x number of dollars - where is that bill? - was being asked for for the Economic Recovery Commission. This is the one, the Economic Recovery Commission \$705,800. Now does anyone in this hon. House know where that money is going to

be used? I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition knows where that money is going to be used. Did anyone else watch Dr. House on television besides me?

An Hon. Member: We knew nothing about it.

Mr. Parsons: Did any of the members on the opposite watch Dr. House?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: I am sorry the Minister of Finance is going, because I wanted to ask him about what Dr. House had said. He said, we are doing well as far as the Economy Recovery Commission is concerned. We are doing well!

Mr. Matthews: Who said that?

Mr. Parsons: Dr. House.

Mr. Matthews: I suppose he is.

Mr. Parsons: And he said we have created jobs and we are going to create more jobs.

An Hon. Member: Who are you talking about?

Mr. Parsons: Dr. House. And the Premier of the Province - well, the deputy Premier. But he is on par with the Premier. He runs the Commission of Government within this other government. He runs the Commission of Government. But he runs the House. He runs the shop. He runs the Minister of Environment and Lands. Every one over there - Development. I mean, there is no Development any more.

An Hon. Member: How about Social Services.

Mr. Parsons: Social Services? I

am not sure.

Mr. Simms: There is nobody running that.

Mr. Parsons: After all the praise I have given him.

Mr. Doyle: I think he is on his own now.

Mr. Parsons: After all of the praise I have given him.

But now we all know why they want the \$705,000. It is because Dr. House says he is going to create jobs by doing what?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. Parsons: Ah, by leave. I was just getting into to the toilet paper.

Some Hon. Members: By leave!

Some Hon. Members: No leave!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few minutes on this supplementary supply debate this morning to mention the health care budget situation in this Province again. Mr. Chairman, what we are seeing in this House, led by the Premier, is a deliberate attempt to cover up and deceive. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me lay out for members of this House the facts, what the Premier did on the floor of this House this morning. In response to questions about expenditures over the last number

of years, asked by me this morning, the Premier flicked out this document, Mr. Speaker, entitled Budget, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, dealing with health care expenditure in 1986-87, 1987-88, 1988-89, 1989-90, and 1990-91. Now, Mr. Chairman, how was the Premier being deceiving and deceptive? How? It is very simple when you look at it, Mr. Chairman. The Premier told this House this morning that in 1986-87 there was \$603,102,500 spent on health care in Newfoundland and Labrador. Do you know what the Premier did? For each of these years, do you know what the Premier did? For five years in a row, do you know what the Premier did?

Mr. Matthews: What did he do?

Mr. Rideout: He tabled budgetary estimates.

Mr. Simms: What?

Mr. Rideout: Budgetary estimates, not actual expenditures, Mr. Chairman.

Now let me lay out for this House the deceit and deception that occurred here this morning. The Premier was right that the budgetary estimate for health care expenditure in 1986-87 was \$603 million, 7.4 per cent of the Budget. But what was the actual expenditure in 1986-87? In other words, the revised estimate, the dollars that were spent on health care. What was it? \$611,027,000 for a budgetary percentage of 9 per cent, Mr. Chairman. That is the truth. These are the facts. That is where deceit and deception have been perpetrated on the people of this Province.

Now, let us continue to explore

the path of deceit and deception this Government has embarked on. In 1987-88, the Premier published again this morning the budgetary estimate for that year, which was \$651 million. What was the actual expenditure on health that year, 1987-88 by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador? It was \$652 million. Another piece of deceit and deception.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: The member had better crow after this one, now. What about 1988-89, Mr. Chairman? The budgetary estimate the Premier hung his hat on this morning was \$688 million, 5.7 per cent of the Budget. What were the actual expenditures, the revised expenditures? Was it less than \$688 million, as the master of deception wants us to believe? The revised, Mr. Chairman, for 1988-89, \$705 million, up from 5.75 per cent to 8 per cent. Mr. Chairman, if the Premier is going to come into this House and use false information -

Mr. Grimes: What was the original (inaudible)?

Mr. Rideout: Listen, boy, go take the Blazer and head down to Bally Haly and clear off the golf course or something like that.

That was 1988-89. Now let us continue on into the Liberal administration, using the same truthful, factual, figures, not deceit and deception. The health estimates on spending in 1988-89 were \$759 million, 10.28 per cent of the Budget the Premier crowed about the morning. What was the revised? What was actually spent on health in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador in 1988-89? Was it the \$759 million

that was estimated? The actual, Mr. Chairman, was \$755 million. Not 10.28 per cent of the Budget as the Premier said this morning, but 7.2 per cent of the Budget. Deception runs rampant, Mr. Chairman. These are the facts, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Baker: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Order, please!

Mr. Flight: Can you not control them there?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Baker: I am sure the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would want to correct some of the things he just said. I am sure when I point them out to him he will understand what I am saying. From the point of view of accuracy, and I know he does not want to deceive the House, and he has made that quite clear, he continues to refer to amounts of money he claims the Premier said were 10.3 per cent of the

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, this is not a point of order.

Mr. Baker: Would you please listen to what I am saying?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker: It is on the record immediately here. He is claiming a number, which he claims the Premier said was 10.3 per cent of the Budget and so on.

Mr. Rideout: 6.28 per cent.

Mr. Baker: No, it is much more than 10 per cent of the Budget. As the hon. member knows, what the Premier in fact said, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition for the sake of accuracy should be using, the Premier said it was a 10.3 per cent increase over the previous year. That is not what the hon. Leader is saying. He is saying it is 10.3 per cent of the Budget. So, for the sake of accuracy, I am sure he will want to correct that.

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order.

Mr. Rideout: There is no point of order, it is not even a point of nonsense or foolishness. What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, and what the numbers prove, is that the Premier was saying this morning that in 1988-89 there was a 10.2 per cent -

Mr. Baker: Increase over the previous year.

Mr. Simms: That is wrong.

Mr. Rideout: It was not, Mr. Chairman. It is per cent increase in the health budget of 10.28 per cent. And I am telling you that when the actual -

Mr. Grimes: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, I want the Member for Exploits to keep quite. What I am telling you is the actual dollars spent was 7.2 per cent increase. So he deceived this House again, Mr. Chairman, because as he did with this sheet this morning, he took estimates. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one awful big difference between estimates and what actually gets spent. Sometimes it is more,

sometimes it is less, and the only number you can hang your hat on is what was actually spent. And the Premier was hanging his hat this morning in another attempt to deceive this House and the people of this Province, thinking, I suppose, that the only one who can do an accurate bit of research is himself. I am, sure he went and got those numbers himself.

Mr. Simms: Treasury Board gave him those.

Mr. Rideout: Now, Mr. Speaker -

An Hon. Member: Another turr supper.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) going to shoot you for (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Now, there is an exposé for you this morning. Hang your heads.

Mr. Rideout: So you took what was estimated to be spent. You did not have the honesty to look at the actual expenditures. The Premier gave the impression -

Mr. Grimes: Do you have the numbers (inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Absolutely, sir. And I can tell you that they are just as accurate as my golf shot. I say to the hon. Member, those numbers are just as accurate as my golf shot.

Mr. Simms: And he has a better golf shot than you.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Rideout: And I got a better golf shot than the hon. Member.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!
Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Some Hon. Members: By leave! By leave!

Mr. Rideout: We will be back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible) up again?

Mr. Matthews: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yes, I am up again. I was not finished the last time Mr. Chairman, I say to the Minister of Social Services.

I just want to carry on for a minute or so on what the Leader of the Opposition has said about the figures given out by the Premier this morning. And he was so convincing this morning I sat here and actually believed what he said. And the people in the press gallery and the other people in the galleries believed the figures that he gave out this morning.

An Hon. Member: So you should, every word!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Matthews: You are right, so I should, but it is very difficult to believe a person who so often takes these kinds of actions. Now we know in this Legislature, and more and more people around the Province are starting to learn and know about, these actions of the Premier. But I think it is rather unfortunate that this would happen this morning. Because if we can't take the Premier at his word, the First Minister of this Province, then where in the name of God are we heading in this Province? I have to ask hon. Members.

It is not the first time that we could not take the Premier at his word. People in the country, and First Ministers in this country, saw it a few short months ago. And I would say that there is a comparison, a similarity, to what we have seen happen in this Legislature this morning.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to where I was when I finished up, and I was having sort of a conversation with the President of Treasury Board about impact on the Provincial Budget and on the financial position of the Province. And I was saying at that time that if you look at what is happening in the Newfoundland fishery, it has had more of an impact on the economy of this Province, the financial position of this Province, than any other factor, including the transfer payments from Ottawa the Minister of Finance hangs his hat on; the recession; his less revenues than he projected. The thing that has affected the financial position of this Province this year more than any other -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Keep what off? It is not true?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: You think it is nonsense. I do not think a downturn in our most important, traditional, largest industry is nonsense. I think it is very serious. And what I am saying is it is so serious it is affecting the news that you have had to break to the people of this Province in the last few months. It is a factor. I would say a bigger factor than any of the others I have mentioned. And if

we go on and continue to downsize and rationalize the Newfoundland fishery, when we know our financial position is not going to be any better for the next few years, then it is going to be even worse than we are anticipating. And I think it is time the Minister of Finance realized that.

There are more people involved in the Newfoundland fishery than in any other industry in this Province, by far. And once they come out of the Newfoundland fishery, for the most part they end up on the welfare roles of the Minister of Social Service because there is nothing else for them to do. That is what is happening.

An Hon. Member: Diversify.

Mr. Matthews: Diversify is a good word. It is a wonderful word. And there are no people who tried harder to diversify than the people in Grand Bank, Gaultois, Trepassey, St. John's. They have been at it for the last twelve months. They have had more meetings trying to diversify, and they have spent money on travel trying to diversify, and where is still, right today, not one other thing for the people of Grand Bank to hope for, to do, than to go back to work, hopefully in January, for sixteen weeks in the fish plant. They have tried and they are still trying. They have had meetings in the Province, outside the Province, outside the country, but there is only so much of that you can do. And we are not getting a lot of encouragement from people who should be helping us, and I say those are the two levels of Government.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: The only

encouragement we have, Mr. Chairman, the only thing we have that we can work around, is that \$6 million for Grand Bank, Community Development Fund.

Mr. Carter: What about their extension of notice?

Mr. Matthews: I just said to the minister that we are hoping for sixteen weeks work in January - we are hoping! But until the total allowable catch is set for this year, we will not know that. The minister knows that. Maybe the Minister of Fisheries told him yesterday what we can expect from the total allowable catch. I do not know. But if it is any less than 185,000 metric tons, you will not see a Grand Banker work one day in 1991. We have been told that clearly by the Chief Executive Officer of Fishery Products International a number of times. So if it is going to be less than that, I suggest to the minister that his fund he talks about, there will not be any of it spent in 1991. And I hope the TAC does not go below that. But it may. I do not know. Perhaps the minister knows something I do not know.

So diversification is fine, but if we continue and if the TAC is lower than that and we see more plants closed and more workers laid off, my point is that when you look at the financial position of the Province, that is going to worsen. Because this gentleman right here, the Minister of Social Services, is going to have more people on his doorstep trying to keep them alive. There are less earnings. There is less spending. The minister's income from revenues of sales tax and other things is going to decrease further, the more people who are

unemployed. That is what happens.

And when you look at what this Government has done in the resource sector and the spending in resource departments, I would suggest, as well, that that has been a very significant factor in what has happened to our own provincial economy. If you do not spend in the resource areas, your economy is going to downturn.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) recession.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, I recognize there is a recession happening in Canada, but I would suggest to the ministers of this Government across from me that a lot of their actions, a lot of actions of this Government have set in motion a Newfoundland recession. I think you should seriously take a long, hard look at where you are going and what you have done in your eighteen months in office. Always you should look inward, at yourselves and your programs and your policies and your spending, and what it has done.

I think a part of the economic statement of \$120 million deficit is due to that as well. The policies of the Government, the spending, the monetary policies of the Government has influenced that bad news economic statement of \$120 million deficit. So, I say to the ministers, look at it. Do not slough it off lightly. Look inwardly. Look at yourselves, at what you are doing and where you are heading, realizing, having said that, that there is not a lot of money to throw around at anything.

An Hon. Member: What would you do?

Mr. Matthews: Oh, I can give

solutions. Because, you see, it is going to be a lot better to have 300 people working in Grand Bank for a number of months than it is not to have anybody work there at all. And most of them are going to end up on social assistance.

There are some of them who have already started to retrain, looking at other professions - some of them, there are some of them who will be able to retire, but the bulk of them, say 250, if there is not something done to keep them in the fishery, are going end up staying in Grand Bank. They are not going anywhere else. What is the point? They are not going to get anything to do anywhere else. So what does the Minister have on his hands then? Another 200 or 250 families on social assistance.

Mr. Flight: He is not up again.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, I am up again, because I am talking about something that is very close to me, something I do not want to see happen. And if I can do anything about it, I am going to prevent it. Now whether or not the Minister of Forestry wants to listen to that I do not know. But it is very, very important.

I talked to a person in Gaultois last night, and they are very, very worried about their situation as well. The ferry situation I mentioned earlier will have a great impact on them. Whether the Federal Minister of Fisheries will give them 10,000 metric tons of fish, I do not know. I hope he does. I told him yesterday he should do it. I do not know what the Minister told him, but I told him he should give them 10,000 metric tons of red fish and let

them get on with their lives. They are not asking for much more. Mr. Chairman, having said that, it looks like you are going to tell me my time is up so I will conclude my remarks for now.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: No, I am not going through this again, because this speaks louder than any words I can say. This is unbelievable, that the Premier would bring into this House this morning an estimate of expenditure in a certain sector of Government expenditure in this Province for each of the last five years, and not lay beside it the revised actual expenditures.

We said back in March and we have been saying - that is one thing about us, we have been consistent - we have been saying consistently since March, that the Budget was a deceitful, fraudulent document. The Minister knows we said that. And there is no more proof of what we need than what we have seen in this House over the last several days, Mr. Chairman. And I think the people are beginning to realize that. I am coming as close as I can, having seen information that was tabled in this House this morning to try to back up an argument of the Government doing something fantastic in health care expenditure -

An Hon. Member: It is not backupable.

Mr. Rideout: I tell you this is not backupable. I tell that to the hon. member. This is certainly not backupable, what the Premier presented here this

morning. It is awfully, awfully tempting, Mr. Chairman, to call the Premier what he actually is. Because when you table false information like this -

Some Hon. Members: What is he? What is he?

Mr. Rideout: I just might do it one of these days, Mr. Chairman, because I am getting sick and tired of not being able to depend on somebody's word.

Mr. Baker: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the President of Treasury Board on a point of order.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Chairman, I think what is happening here is shocking. The Premier tabled a document which indicated these figures were budgetary figures. It says right on the document they are budgetary figures, and that is in fact what they are, Mr. Chairman, and somehow the Leader of the Opposition is trying to indicate that they are something else. Now, the Premier has tabled a document which he described correctly and accurately. The document is an accurate document, and the Leader of the Opposition is simply not telling the truth about it and trying to create a false impression. I do not think that is right.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: Just briefly to the point of error raised by the President of Treasury Board, Mr. Chairman. What we are seeing here

now is another attempt, of course, by the President of Treasury Board to simply try and explain away what is unexplainable. That is what he is trying to do. That is what we are seeing here, Mr. Chairman. Anybody in this House, anybody in the gallery, anybody in the press gallery were certainly of the understanding that the Premier was saying - in fact, I do not know but he might have said it, and we will check Hansard to see exactly what he said. But he said this is what this Government spent. That is what he said this morning in Answers to Questions. This is what was spent in previous years, this represents 10 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, it is a weak attempt by the President of Treasury Board to try to cover this up, but he ain't going to be able to get away with it. There is no point of order, in any event.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: There is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is touching on tough ground which they cannot explain away, and they are simply going to try to use up his ten minutes with points of order. We all know what is happening.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
Order, please!

The Chair is ready to rule. There is actually no point of order. There is a difference of opinion being expressed between hon. Members, and the President of Treasury Board was using the point of order, I think, to give an explanation of what is being said.

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Much to the chagrin of the Minister of Social Services, my time is not yet up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I tabled here today, the information I gave to this House today cannot be refuted. It is the truth, unlike what we saw here this morning. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to move on to another area, and that is the manufactured deficit the Minister of Finance is talking about, that he has been trying to bamboozle and hoodwink the people of this province with over the last several weeks.

Let's just analyze this manufactured deficit, this made in Newfoundland deficit for a moment. The minister has admitted now to this House that \$34 million of that deficit is the result of an overestimation of revenues in previous years from the Government of Canada - \$34 million this Government chose not to pay back last year. They could have. So, it is a bookkeeping decision that they made.

An Hon. Member: to save money.

Mr. Rideout: Yes, to save \$2 million, they said. I am not disputing that. What I am disputing, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister of Finance knew what the budgetary situation of this Province was going to be this year and chose not to pay back that \$34 million.

Let's look further than that, Mr. Chairman. There is a \$30 million Supplementary Supply Bill here. It is close to \$30 million, \$27

million of a Supplementary Supply Bill here. The vast majority of it, that \$27 million or so, is to redeem Newfoundland and Labrador savings bonds. The Minister of Finance knew before he brought down the Budget that they were going to do that this year. He could have deferred this to another year or another year or did part of it if he wanted to. So, there is \$34 million, there is \$27 million which is \$61 million.

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, let the minister hold on now. This is a manufactured, made in Newfoundland deficit. Is it not correct that the minister told the House we were looking at \$30 million less in provincial revenue this year?

Mr. Simms: Yes. He just told me that, too.

Mr. Rideout: So \$61 million and \$30 million, that explains \$91 million dollars of his present problem, Mr. Chairman. Isn't it correct that officials in the Department of Finance told the Minister before he brought down his Budget that his provincial revenues were over optimistic?

Dr. Kitchen: No.

Mr. Rideout: Oh yes, it is a fact. Oh yes, it is a fact, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister of Finance took the most optimistic revenue chance.

Some Hon. Members: Prove it. Prove it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: They have told

people in the media.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
Order, please!

An Hon. Member: Sit down, boy.

Mr. Rideout: I will sit down when
the Chairman says so.

Mr. Walsh: He told you five
minutes ago.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, there
is no way that -

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the
Minister of Finance on a point of
order.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, there
is no way that I am going to allow
the Leader of the Opposition to
make false statements in this
House about the Department of
Finance or its officials.

Mr. Rideout: It is not a false
statement. Go talk to them.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The Chair is ready to rule on a
point of order.

The hon. the Opposition House
Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you very much,
Mr. Chairman. I realize it is
difficult. I just want to say to
the Minister of Finance two things:

I said earlier that we were going
to ask questions. He has an
opportunity to stand in the debate
and answer them, not to interrupt
speakers and take away their
time. That is point number one.

Point number two. If he thinks
what the Leader of the Opposition
has just said is incorrect, then

just let him keep his ears open
and talk to his officials, because
they have told the media.

Mr. Rideout: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: There is no point
of order.

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. The Minister of Finance
had better keep his ears open.
There are people now in the news
media in this Province who know
that the Minister of Finance, in
bringing the Budget before the
House this year, and in bringing
in an estimate of provincial
revenues, took the most optimistic
projections his officials prepared
for him.

We would not expect him to take
the least optimistic, but we would
expect him to take the middle, Mr.
Chairman.

Dr. Kitchen: A point of order,
Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: Do you see what is
happening now? See what is
happening?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance
on a point of order.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, again
the Leader of the Opposition is
making false statements, and it is
time for him to stop making them
and stop deceiving the House.
Stop deceiving this House by
making false statements.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Just quickly, Mr. Chairman. I think the Minister of Finance got things a little bit confused. It is he and his Government who need to stop deceiving the House.

Mr. Chairman: I want to remind hon. Members that a difference of opinion between hon. Members does not constitute a point of order. There is actually no point of order.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simms: Sit him down, boy. It is not hard to tell when you are hitting a chord over there.

Mr. Rideout: I tell you, when you start to get through to them, Mr. Chairman - and I am not a bit surprised that the Minister of Finance recognizes what he thinks is deception. I mean, he has been living in a world of deception on this Budget for the past eight months. It was deception before before it was brought in here, Mr. Chairman. The Minister knew that provincial revenues this year were not going to be as he projected them in his Budget.

Now, we got through the \$91 million, Mr. Chairman. One thing the Minister has not explained to this House yet in the manufactured deficit, the made in Newfoundland deficit is what is the overexpenditure, what is the overrun on expenditures as compared to his budget? The Member for Mount Pearl has been asking those questions. I believe the Opposition House Leader has been asking him. And we have not yet gotten out of the Minister

what his overrun on expenditure is projected to be for this Budget.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, before my time runs out, is this the only Supplementary Supply Bill that we are going to see during this session of the House? Is there another Supplementary Supply Bill in the wings?

An Hon. Member: There is another one on the Order Paper.

Mr. Rideout: Oh?

An Hon. Member: Did you know that?

Mr. Rideout: Yes. Why isn't it all together I ask the President of Treasury Board? Because they want to do it in little deceiving bits and pieces. Well now if this Government got a Supplementary Supply Bill here today -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to comment on some of the statements that have been made and try to do it in a calmer more rational kind of atmosphere than the Leader of the Opposition tends to try to create.

First of all there is another Supplementary Supply Bill on the Order Paper. The Leader of the Opposition knows that if he can read it. He has known for quite sometime. It was on the Order Paper in the spring. It is on the

Order Paper now, and at some point in time it has to be dealt with. So obviously, Mr. Chairman, we will be dealing with another Supplementary Supply Bill before this session ends.

I would like to deal with the approach taken by members of the Opposition. I would like to deal with them in this way. I think it is fair ball for the members of the Opposition to indicate that they do not like a Budget. That they do not like what we are doing. To state that in their opinion, we are making mistakes. To state that in their opinion they would have done things differently had they still been in Government, heaven help us. I think all of that is fair ball. I think it is fair that they would criticize what we are intending to spend money on. I think it is fair that they would point out that there are expenditures that we intend to make that they would not make, or to indicate that we are wasting money in some areas that they disagree with. I think all of that is normal, and it is the normal function of an Opposition.

But what we are seeing here, Mr. Chairman, is something that goes far beyond the normal, sensible debate in this House of Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: Something that goes far beyond the normal sensible debate. What we are seeing here is not an Opposition that is opposing, not an Opposition that is attempting to hold Government accountable for expenditures. What we are seeing here is an Opposition that has no scruples.

An Hon. Member: None whatsoever.

Mr. Baker: An Opposition that will make statements that they know they cannot prove. Broad statements, implicating people, of imputing motives, Mr. Chairman, and all that kind of thing. Accusing civil servants of doing things. Making statements that the Minister had had certain advice by a certain official in the department before the Budget was done. So the Minister knows that is not true, we all know it is not true. But they can get up and make those charges trying to grab a few headlines. I think the process of parliamentary democracy, Mr. Chairman, is hitting a new low when Oppositions, because they are not capable of attacking a situation head on, because they do not have the ability, I suppose, to attack expenditures and budgets the way that normally Oppositions would try to attack them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have had experience in Opposition I know what I am talking about. They have to go and make blanket statements, charges against individuals from the safety of their seats, unsubstantiated things, Mr. Speaker. They can stand up in this House and try to get on record and try to get some kind of a headline in the press that the Premier said something that was not true.

An Hon. Member: But did he say it?

Mr. Baker: When in actual fact the paper that was tabled does not substantiate what they are saying.

Mr. Hewlett: What did the Premier say?

Mr. Baker: The paper that was

tabled did not substantiate what they were saying. So they can make these statements, trying to grab the odd headline, and then they will run upstairs and talk to the press and try to create this headline. Now that is the kind of game that is being played here. There is no examination of the budget.

In the paper tabled by the Premier it was indicated that these were budgetary amounts. That was quite clear, so the paper that was tabled was accurate.

Mr. Hewlett: Did he verbalize (inaudible)?

Mr. Baker: As a matter of fact one of the items in there was the budgeted figure for 1990/1991. Now if you are going to compare figures like that you compare the budgetary figures. Because we do not know what is going to be spent in 1990/1991 yet.

An Hon. Member: That is the single exception.

Mr. Baker: We have no idea what is going to be spent in 1990/1991. So the Premier was dealing with budgeted figures for the last five years. And budgeted figures show the intent of Government at that particular point in time.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: According to budgetary figures. Now also, since that time, the Premier has indicated that the other comparisons referred to by the Opposition will be dealt with. And he will table other figures and other comparisons. But in actual fact to simply state that what the Premier was doing with this

document here this morning was somehow wrong, is incorrect in itself.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) find out what is going on.

Mr. Baker: The Leader of the Opposition claims that they have been consistent. And I suppose that is one of the few things that I can agree with him on today. He has been consistent. The Opposition has been consistent. There is no doubt about it. They have done two things that are consistent. They have consistently repeated statements that are not true over and over again attempting to get headlines, they have done that, they have been consistent in that.

And I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that they have been consistent in another way, in that they have been consistently inconsistent.

An Hon. Member: Exactly.

Mr. Baker: They have been inconsistently inconsistent, so I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. There is some consistency. The consistency is in the eye of the beholder.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Baker: So, Mr. Chairman -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Baker: I guess the comment I want to leave this House with, is that there are accepted methods of behaviour and methods of debate in the House, and from time to time Members get carried away, and from time to time statements are made that are not necessarily

completely accurate, but usually, Mr. Chairman, that is in the heat of debate.

I believe what we are seeing here, Mr. Chairman, is a concerted attempt, a deliberate plan on the part of the Opposition to deal with matters in the House in this way, to simply get up and repeat things that are not true, are totally unsubstantiated and by repeating them often enough to get some press coverage, because I do not believe they are interested at all in dealing with the affairs of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, it is close to noon, so I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Trinity - Bay de Verte.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that the House at its rising adjourn until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 2:00 p.m.