



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 30

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

11 June 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, before we get into Question Period or Statements by Ministers, the Premier or Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) would agree to having a resolution proceed unanimously from this House along the following lines, and, in fact, I move, seconded by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), that this House unanimously condemn the Wilson Budget and the Government of Canada for its de-indexing of senior citizens' pensions and for attempting to cure deficit problems on the backs of the aged and the poor. Just in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I note that the Conservative representative in the legislature of Manitoba has consented to this all-party resolution in that Province.

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

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

MR. BARRY:
I am asking for leave.

MR. MARSHALL:
I distinctly heard His Honour, the Speaker, call Statements by Ministers. The hon. gentleman was a minister, he is not a minister now. He attempted to be a first minister and he skittered across

the House but he certainly has not got the status of a minister and I do not think he ever will again, first or otherwise.

Now, Your Honour calls the order of business and it was Statements by Ministers and the hon. gentleman has been out of order. Now we do not mind from time to time if people get up in the House and want to pass resolutions of congratulations or various other things, we co-operate in this, but this is an abuse of the House for the hon. gentleman's own political purposes. He is completely out of order. There is an order of business in this House. If he wants to present something I will not advise him of the rules, but this is not the point in time to do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Every time this year, as the pressure gets on in the course of the estimates debate, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) starts getting a little scratchy. It was a very innocent request. We are asking for leave, Mr. Speaker, and we understand that any well-intentioned member of this House of Assembly, any member who is concerned about the aged and the poor in this Province, would give leave to present this innocent resolution. I have just pointed out that in Manitoba the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gary Filmon, the leader of the Manitoba Progressive Conservative Party, has joined in a unanimous resolution with Premier Pawley of

Manitoba along the same lines. The Premiers of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are doing the same thing. Now is this government going to do the same thing and protect the senior citizens of this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I was just about to ask if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) had leave in connection with the motion he was putting to the House but, actually, Statements by Ministers was called at the particular time.

Statements by Ministers

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DOYLE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In 1984, government introduced a new formula for the recovery of real property assessment costs undertaken in municipalities imposing the real property tax. It was government's intention to have the new formula phased in over a three-year period commencing in the fiscal year 1984-1985, with full recovery of property assessment costs in the fiscal year 1986-1987. Specifically, 50 per cent or .0002 of the total assessed value of taxable property in the municipality would be recovered in the fiscal year 1984-1985. In

1985-1986, an additional 25 per cent or .0003 of the total assessed value of taxable property in the municipality would be recovered, and the fiscal year 1986 - 1987 would realize the recovery of 100 per cent of property assessment costs, or .0004 of the total assessed value of taxable property in the municipality.

For a number of years previous to 1984, partial recovery of property assessment costs was implemented on the basis of \$10 per residential and \$15 per commercial or industrial property. It was considered, however, that a more realistic approach to the recovery of property assessment costs would be to charge the cost of the assessment services to municipalities on the total value of the assessed taxable property. That method is also in effect in other provinces in Canada. This new formula was based on the understanding that the Province would supply full assessment services, and that departmental assessors would be available to maintain the municipal assessment roll to ensure that property values were consistent with market conditions and to coincide with the budgetary requirements and tax revenues of the municipality.

Many municipalities voiced concern over the new formula having regard to the impact on municipal budgeting. These concerns were contained in the annual brief presented to government by the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. While the government considers that full cost recovery of municipal property will some day be borne by the municipality, it realizes that because of current restraints it

has not been possible to provide full assessment services envisaged when the new formula was implemented. In that connection, government has decided to restrict recovery costs to 50 per cent and not, as we previously said, 100 per cent. We will restrict it to 50 per cent or .0002 of the total assessed value of taxable property in the municipality. That initiative is being taken as a result of the ongoing consultative process between my department and the Federation regarding this most important matter.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that many municipalities have contacted me directly over the last six or eight month period on this matter to indicate that it is a very, very pressing priority for their towns and to ask that government take some steps to curb the cost of having these assessments done. In response to that my department immediately undertook an analysis of that situation and we feel that this initiative will go a very long way in helping municipalities all across the Province to better deal with the cost of having these property assessments done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, any change in this rather odious practice is welcome. I would like to point out to the minister, however, that the basic principle is still intact. And that basic principle is that we are going to transfer some of the

tax collecting burden that the Province used to undertake from the Province to the municipalities, making things still much more difficult for the municipalities of this Province.

The Federation in its brief requested that the method of collecting assessment costs be returned to the original situation before this was brought in and that a complete review be done in the meantime. This still does not really answer the request that the Federation put in in its brief. I understand that this also means a change in the budget for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) as the budget plans for greater than a 50 per cent cost recovery for this year. So that is something that the Minister of Finance can look into.

I would like to point out one further thing, that the reason given is because of current restraints it has not been possible to provide the full assessment services envisioned. Now if this means that in fact the Department of Municipal Affairs will be able to do the reassessments every six or seven or eight years rather than every five years, I would like to point out to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) that for the municipalities this still means - if in fact that is what is happening, this is what that means - that a municipality which previously paid \$30,000 assessment costs will now over a longer period of time still pay \$300,000 or in other words an increase of 1,000 per cent in the cost of assessments. So whereas any change in this practice is welcome, I would point out to the minister and the municipalities that there is not as great a

change as there may seem on the surface.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, the substance of the following statement is going to be released in the House of Commons by the hon. Otto Jelinek today but for our members I am very pleased to be able to announce to the hon. members of the House today that the Government of Newfoundland, in conjunction with the nine other provinces, has just completed successful negotiations with the Government of Canada establishing a new Federal-Provincial Lottery Accord. An agreement has now been reached whereby the Government of Canada will not re-enter the lottery field, and Criminal Code and legislative amendments are being made to effect this new arrangement.

For the exclusive right to operate lotteries in Canada the Provinces have agreed to pay the Government of Canada the sum of \$100 million over the next three years. These payments will be made by the various provincial lottery corporations across Canada. Lottery revenues in Newfoundland, which amount to \$6.7 million for 1985-1986, represent a sizable source of funds and this new accord with the Government of Canada will help protect the future growth of these funds.

The spirit of co-operation and consultations which permeated the negotiations during the past nine

months was an important and basic element in the satisfactory resolution of our differences. It is this type of joint effort which will allow our Province and Canada to move ahead in the years to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we have gotten Atlantic Accords and Western Accords and now we have gotten the Federal/Provincial Lottery Accord, and the next thing we are going to see all the Cabinet ministers driving Honda Accords, I suppose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, what we see here now regrettably is government resorting more and more to lotteries to squeeze a few more tax dollars out of the general population, because a lottery is nothing more, Mr. Speaker, than a voluntary tax. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this can be abused. I have to confess at times I become concerned when I see the extent of the advertising that we have on television these days pushing and promoting the various forms of lotteries. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that so many of our families are in depressed circumstances because of the sad economic conditions brought on by members opposite that they are resorting more and more, Mr. Speaker, to lotteries as a means of escaping from the cruel reality

arising from unemployment and lack of jobs, Mr. Speaker, that faces them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister should have given us some indication of the net share Newfoundland would get after it pays its percentage to this \$100 million to the Government of Canada. How much we will net? But, Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the minister to consider some form of educational programme to balance out this advertising that is ongoing to make sure that we do not have families and individuals being lulled into paying more than they should be paying of their monthly incomes into this attempt to escape the cruel, bitter, economic realities of the day in this Province.

Lotteries, Mr. Speaker, the odds, as we all know, make them very poor investments. They are far from blue chip investments. And while we all, I am sure, like to take a flutter of one kind or another from time to time, we should all also keep our feet on the ground and not try to escape from reality. The minister would do well to consider having some form of advertising to make sure that people are educated to the risks of getting into too regular an expenditure and too large an expenditure on this type of escape from reality.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Before calling Oral Questions, I would like to welcome to the gallery representatives of the Guiding Movement in Newfoundland and Labrador. I am sure members will join with me in congratulating the Guiding Movement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the hon. the Minister responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (Mr. Marshall). Will the minister confirm for this House that he has given Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro permission to add from \$4 to \$12 per month as a fuel adjustment charge to the electric bills of the consumers of this Province for the months of June, July, August and September, in spite of the fact that no oil will be used to produce electricity during those four months?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows that the hon. minister does not give approval per se to increases in bills. There is a policy that is set down that the user pays. Now the increase in the bills for that period of time is not referable to this period but it is because, in estimating the amount of fuel that would be consumed during the Winter months, the fact of the matter is that there was less rainfall than had been normally anticipated. It was a very abnormal year, and the result of it is that more fuel was

burned than had been anticipated through causes beyond the control of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, beyond the control of the minister and, even if the hon. gentleman were on the other side it would be beyond his control because there was a lack of rainfall. You see, you need rain in order to build up the reservoirs and the rain was not there. Consequently, there was an adjustment that was necessary which is going to mean \$4 dollars per month, during the period of time when the bills are normally at their lowest for people who have their houses heated with fuel, and for those who have their houses heated with electricity it is \$12 per month.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the figure, of course, is \$4 to \$12 depending on how much electricity a consumer burns. Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro admittedly made \$50 million profit last year, would the minister undertake to order Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro not to impose this unfair and unnecessary charge which will have the affect of further ravaging the people of this Province at a time when they were expecting a break from the high cost of electricity?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure during the

hon. gentleman's enforced absence from the House for a period of three or four years he must have been taking a graduate course in distortion. Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro did not earn \$50 million last year as the hon. gentleman tries to put out. I know what he is referring to. He is referring to the financial statements of Hydro. If the hon. gentleman would look at the explanatory notes attached to the financial statements of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, he would find that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro made very much less than that. The reason for that amount being put in the consolidated balance sheet of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro was that there was a review of the power taken by Hydro Quebec over the proceeding eight years and it was found that there was more power taken over that period of time than had been paid for. So what happens, in accordance with the terms of that magnificent contract that the hon. gentleman has this Province under the anvil of, is it is not paid immediately - bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with that contract - that would be too good for Newfoundland, because we would have the \$30 million in our pocket. But way the hon. gentleman allowed the contract to be negotiated, that is spread over a period of eight years. It is recorded in the balance sheet, but because they are on a cruel system and because it is a consolidated balance sheet, as being received this year. But if he looks closely at the fine print, if he can read the fine print or any print at all the hon. gentleman will see that that is spread over five years and for him to say \$50 million is a complete and absolute

distortion. I do not say intentionally because I am not allowed to, and because I know that the hon. gentleman is incapable of understanding simple writing in the balance sheets of the corporation.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. FLIGHT:

We appear to be hitting a nerve here, Mr. Speaker. In my final supplementary I would ask the minister, since this mandatory, unilateral \$4 to \$12 per month has been tacked on to the light bills in order to collect money that Hydro did not collect last year, is that an indication that starting September we will be going back into the full fuel adjustment charge? Are we just going to pay \$4 to \$12 a month for June, July, August and September, and then go, starting in October, with the full fuel adjustment charge like we have been ravaged with since last October?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman must realize that, as I have explained, that is referable to the rainfall that occurred during that period of time, and that there was less water there than had been anticipated. There was no way to anticipate the amount of rain that is going to fall, the amount of water that is going to be in the reservoirs.

MR. FLIGHT:

You can anticipate the misery you are causing the people of Newfoundland.

MR. MARSHALL:

I can tell the hon. gentleman that any misery it has caused is misery which is of great concern to this government, because if you cannot generate the electricity by hydro you have to rely on the fuel.

MR. FLIGHT:

You have to gouge the public of Newfoundland, the working poor.

MR. MARSHALL:

The fact of the matter is to the extent that the water levels are not there we are going to have to pay a fuel adjustment charge, and all of it, Mr. Speaker, thanks to the hon. gentlemen there opposite who gave away all our hydro resources and put us at the vagaries and the mercies of fuel adjustment.

MR. FLIGHT:

Will we have the SSA tax on fuel adjustment?

MR. MARSHALL:

I am responding to the hon. gentleman's question. So the hon. gentleman knows what the answer is. I mean, if the rainfall is not sufficient, and I am quite sure there will not be enough because the demand is there anyway even at the highest rainfall level, there is going to be some fuel adjustment cost. So what we have to hope for from a hydro point of view is to have as heavy a rainfall as we possibly can because the heavier the rainfall, the more the reservoirs build up, the less the general cost is going to be to the public.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Will the minister undertake then, since he is not prepared to shelter or consider the feelings of the people of Newfoundland on the fuel adjustment charge and the devastatingly high cost of electricity in this Province, would he undertake to discontinue the sales tax, the SSA, that is collected on electricity and on the fuel charge? Will the minister undertake, on behalf of the consumers of this Province, the senior citizens, the working poor, to discontinue collecting sales tax on the electric bills in this Province, and particularly on the fuel adjustment charges that Newfoundland Hydro is gouging the people with?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to respond to a person who, innocently, I have to say, distorts or just does not understand the facts. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, since he has gotten up and made the statement, if he is prepared to apologize to the House for distorting the fact and saying that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro made \$50 million last year.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, Sir. No, I am not. I explained the \$50 million.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman has distorted the facts. He has given the indication or the impression that \$50 million of cash flowed in that

Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro is somehow or other sequestering away which could be used for reducing rates, which is entirely contrary to the actual facts.

With respect to the hon. gentleman's question, the hon. gentleman knows the financial position of this Province, he knows that we have a \$70 million deficit on current account, he must realize now, because he has conducted such a penetrating analysis of the estimates of each department, how much money is needed and how the short-fall is with respect to money to meet the expenditures in this Province, and I think that should afford to him a full and sufficient answer.

MR. FLIGHT:

So you are not going to take off the SSA.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier pertaining to the future of the Come By Chance oil refinery. About a dozen days ago I wrote the Premier concerning the five bids that have been submitted, expressing my concerns that a favourable decision will be made for one of the three bidders who bid to reactivate the refinery. As I understand it, Petro-Canada has approximately a month, they say, to assess the bids and come back with a decision. That will be June 21. Now, a week ago in response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) the Premier said that he would be meeting with Petro-Can officials in the near

future concerning the bids. Let me ask the Premier if he can give us an update. What is the status of it now? Has the Premier and his officials, or his colleagues, met with Petro-Can and what is the status of it now?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, we have not met with Petro-Canada on it yet. They are still analyzing the bids. As soon as they have them analyzed they then will be getting in touch with the Government of Newfoundland and then we will both sit down and go through their analysis, and allow us to do some analysis, and then come to a decision. At this point in time we have not sat down with Petro-Canada to go through the bids, but as soon as their analysis is done they will be in touch with us and then we will be sitting down with them to go through the bids and then, hopefully, come to a decision on the matter.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, in my letter of May 31 to the Premier, eleven or twelve days ago, I also made a suggestion to the Premier that perhaps other interested and concerned groups, especially groups in the Come By Chance area, should also be given an opportunity, perhaps, to appear

before Petro-Can officials to give their concerns, to give to Petro-Can officials what they see as a last-ditch chance for Come By Chance to have a part to play in the offshore. Could the Premier indicate whether or not he has given that any consideration, and is there perhaps a possibility that some other groups besides the Premier and his colleagues can appear before Petro-Can officials, or appear before the Premier and his colleagues to express their concerns and their interests in these bids and the future of Come By Chance?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, two points arise from the hon. member's question. One is the hon. member's statement that this is the last chance for Come By Chance to have some economic activity arising from the offshore. I would say to the hon. gentleman that that is not a true statement, that there are going to be many opportunities including this one but others besides this one for Come By Chance to benefit directly from offshore activity. That is statement number one. I think that the hon. member should be clearly aware of that, that we have not forgotten about a community in his district as it relates to development opportunities relating to Come By Chance. As a matter of fact we are not passive on this. It is not a question of 'forgetting Come By Chance', nor have we forgotten Too Good Arm, nor have we forgotten Nain. We are actively pursuing through the Department of Development, through the Petroleum

Directorate, through the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet, through Cabinet itself - what shall I say? - pushing, advertising Come By Chance and area for various development opportunities there. I want the hon. member to clearly understand that we are totally on his side as it relates to that.

Number two, on the suggestion that he made in his letter to me -

MR. CALLAN:

Any chance of concrete platforms there?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- I will get back to the hon. member in the next day or so and see whether in fact there are some avenues available for the local people to have a further input as it relates to the refinery situation. But I would be completely remiss in my duties as Leader of the Government if I did not indicate to the hon. member that we are very, very cognizant of the concerns put forward. A number of groups in the Come By Chance area have written me and I have written them back, they have wired me and I have wired them back, and I want him to know, and I want the people whom he represents to know, that they are very much on our minds when it comes to the development opportunities that are just around the corner for Newfoundland and, hopefully, we can plug Come By Chance very well in there for development opportunities for the people of his area.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Premier is saying, even though we are suppose to wait until the middle of August, that we will be going with concrete platforms. Because the Premier, I am sure, is fully aware of the Environmental Impact Statement, Volume 1, the Summary, wherein on page 70 it says about Argentina. 'Hibernia development activities could take place in Argentina whichever development option is selected,' floating or fixed platforms. But on page 68 it says, 'Come By Chance would only experience direct Hibernia-related impacts if the Fixed Production system is selected, and then only if Come By Chance is confirmed as the construction site.'

So the only other future that Come By Chance has as it pertains to offshore is if either number one, the oil refinery there is reactivated or, as the Impact Statement says, number two, if concrete platforms are chosen, 'and if Come By Chance is confirmed as the construction site after contractors have been selected.' Would the Premier not confirm that is what he is saying?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

My first comment to the hon. member would be, Oh, those people of little Newfoundland of little faith, and those of the Liberal Party of little faith.' There was a time in this hon. House, in the

not too distant past, I remember so clearly when I was Minister of Mines and Energy, when there were a number of people on the other side who harassed me to no end that we would never, never get the right to levy royalties, levy taxes, to have control over the mode of development, that I was obstructing development, that I was against the oil companies. Just let me say to the hon. member, that in the same vein as I said in this House a couple of days ago or a number of weeks ago, that is a document put out by the oil companies. It is put out for many reasons, not the least of which is a negotiating reason. And they have to do their thing; we have to do ours. I will just say to the hon. member again - I am sure he understands where I am coming from - we are as committed today to our preferred choice of mode of development as we were five years ago. As a matter of fact, if anything, in the meetings that the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) has had and the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) has had in the last two or three weeks, and ones that I have had myself personally after Question Period almost every day for the last three weeks, we are more committed today than we were five years ago. We are pursuing this with all diligence and we want to capture as much economic activity both in the refining and processing end of it as we do on the front end for mode of development.

Just let me refer to Argentina for a second. I guess the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) will appreciate what I am saying here, and I mean it genuinely in a factual kind of way, that and I think he will appreciate it

perhaps better than anybody else on the other side from his involvement in it years ago. As it relates to Argentina in this part of the report, perhaps it has some accuracy. From my reading of the situation, and I hope I am right for the hon. member for Placentia's (Mr. Patterson's) sake, I do not think in the spinoff activity area of the offshore that Argentina can lose. I think there is going to be something regardless of which mode is used. I think they have an opportunity there that is good for either mode.

MR. BARRY:

When it starts.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

When it starts, yes.

Just let me finish off by concluding what I said a couple of days ago or a week or so ago. They talk about the golden triangle as it relates to Southern Ontario and so on, but we think, from what we have seen and the discussions we have had in the last little while, that we have got a great opportunity to have our own triangle as it relates to some parts of the development - Hopefully we can also get into Central and Western Newfoundland with other parts of it - we have got Marystown and Cow Head, Come By Chance - that is not going to come by chance, it is going to come by hard work - and Argentina, and other areas in the Province as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier talks about those of little faith. I mean, it has been nine years since the refinery closed. You know, there is another one, "My faith looks up to thee, thou Son of Calvary, Saviour Devine". Now, the Premier can be the saviour of Come By Chance. As I said, the people out there have been waiting a long, long time. But, anyway, it seems as though, Mr. Speaker, what the Premier is saying is that, 'Well, even if the refinery is not reactivated there is still some hope'. I hope that the Premier is not saying, 'Well, even if Come By Chance is sold down the drain, sold to a scrapper in a couple of weeks time that there is still hope,' because the people out there in that area, as I have said, have been living on hope for too long.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member if he would pose his question.

MR. CALLAN:
My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier is this. We all know that Petro-Can is a Crown corporation of the federal government. What representations has the Premier made to his colleagues in Ottawa to make sure that they do not allow Petro-Can to make the wrong decision? Not a cold, hard factual decision, but a decision based on politics, perhaps.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, just let me say, because I have to in answer to some of the preamble to the hon. member's supplementary, that there

are a number of members in this House, and some who are not in this House today, who have been chiefly responsible for having Come By Chance even being considered today in its present mechanical and engineering state, members, from this side of the House who worked very hard on it - one is the present Minister of Finance, (Dr. Collins), the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor - and others, who are not in this House, who work for this government, negotiated with Petro-Canada at the time to see that they took over the cost for keeping the refinery at its present level, to spend the money, because it was \$700,000 to \$1 million a year. And I would like for the hon. member, in his preamble, to at least acknowledge -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
- that this government did not sell Come By Chance down the drain when every single person around wanted to see it go down the drain. And we were successful over several weeks. As a matter of fact, I can remember where I was when the final deal was done. I happened to be in Prince Edward Island. It was 11:00 or 12:00 one morning when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) called me. There had been a lot of negotiations going on through that previous week on it to try to put something together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So the hon. member should at least acknowledge that there would not even be an opportunity, as related to refining in Come By Chance, except for this administration.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, we want to see as much processing of the crude and of the gas, and extra petro-chemical complexes at Come By Chance and other places in Newfoundland, but particularly Come By Chance, because of its history, as the hon. member does, and we will leave no stone unturned over the next couple of weeks and the next couple of months and on into our development plan.

I myself have spoken to the Prime Minister; the hon. the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall), in his talks with Mrs. Carney, has mentioned it. We have deluged the federal people up there over our preoccupation with ensuring that we get the best possible deal all the way through on this whole bit and piece.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is, as usual, only telling part of the truth, only part.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Now, first of all, in terms of consulting with the people of Come By Chance and surrounding area, I would ask the Premier whether he

would confirm for this House that representatives of the former employees out there have been seeking meetings with him and with the Minister of Development since sometime last August, Mr. Speaker. And I do not know what happened during the election, but I know that right up until a week before the election those gentlemen had not been able to get inside the Premier's Office. Is that, or is that not, correct?

Also, I would like to ask the Premier whether it is not correct that the Premier, the Minister responsible for Energy, (Mr. Marshall), and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) had conceded that the refinery was gone, that it had to be scrapped and based that upon a report on Come By Chance which the Minister responsible for Energy had not even seen?

Now, would the Premier confirm that these are part of the facts of the Come By Chance history?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we had a good question and answer period here. I told the hon. member that I would seriously consider his letter to me asking for some more input from the local people and get back to him in the next day or so to see if there were other avenues. I was trying to be reasonable. Now, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) gets up and because Question Period was going too good, because we were trying to be co-operative with one of his members, and because he is aggravated by the fact that he is now on the opposite side of the House, when he sees these golden

opportunities passing him by, he has to start bringing up a whole lot of red herring!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

The questions are there, Mr. Speaker. I throw them out again and I ask where are the answers? Did he or did he not refuse to meet with the officials representing the former employees at Come By Chance? And secondly, did or did not the minister responsible for energy (Mr. Marshall), and did or did not the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), relying upon a report from Petro-Canada, which apparently they had not even seen, did they not say that that refinery should be scrapped?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, two very, very red herrings the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) wants to bring up now when I am trying to deal in a reasonable manner with one of his members. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition is not part of this great promise that we have for Newfoundland but he made his own bed and now he had better lie in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

One final time, Mr. Speaker, and let the records show, if the

Premier refuses to answer, that he believes in dealing in half-truths, that he believes in misleading -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) please put his supplementary?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will ask my question.

Would the Premier stop dealing in half truths and would the Premier confirm the truth of the two points that were just made? And would the Premier show that he is a man of his word by getting up and committing himself to the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) that he will meet with these representatives of the former employees of the Come By Chance refinery whom to date he and the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) have refused to meet with?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) said, excellent, excellent, when I sat down after his final supplementary. I heard him with my own ears. Now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is upset because I happened to single out a number of people and not mention him. And after I mentioned the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), two extremely competent individuals who did this administration proud over the last four or five years, he said, What about me, Mr. Speaker? And, my answer to the

Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is, yes, what about him, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! The hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) has been trying to get my eye.

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess everything will be anticlimactic now. But I would like to ask the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) if there is any public funding being contemplated for groups wishing to intervene in the EIS hearings that just started yesterday?

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his question. The government is exploring that possibility, and we are looking into the matter. We are in consultation as well with the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada, because, there will be, certainly, some funding provided between both orders of government, but the amount of it and the respective contribution of it has yet to be determined. But it will be determined very shortly.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A supplementary, the hon. member

for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, that is the question I got when I asked the environmental panel about the funding. I have already been in touch with the Secretary of State's office, which informs me that there is no money in the budget whatsoever available for this funding. What I would like to know is, in view of this, what is the Province planning to do in terms of getting in funding for these groups?

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, there is a danger in the hon. gentleman getting up and saying that the Department of Secretary of State has advised. Well, I have been in contact as recently as two or three days ago with the hon. the Secretary of State for Canada (Mr. McLean) and we are ironing that out now. As I said, a certain amount of funding will be available, the level of which will be determined by the outcome of that particular interchange. So I just suggest to the hon. gentleman it is easy to get up and say to the House 'I have been in contact with somebody at the Department of the Secretary of State' but I can also say I have been, and it is the fellow at the top of the ladder.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr.

Collins). During the most recent election - we have one practically every year - but in the most recent one the Finance Minister made a quick trip to Come By Chance in a helicopter, I think he was there an hour or so. He went in and he met with one or two of the top brass there, the management, but did not meet with any of the employees. Now some of these employees thought that he was there because an election was on the go. Well, of course, I explained no, that was not the reason. Would the Minister of Finance indicate, since he did not have time during his most recent visit to the refinery to meet with these people who have been, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) says, requesting a meeting for months on end, when will the minister arrange a meeting with these employees at the refinery?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. the Premier has answered the substance of the hon. the member's question but just to reiterate, the trip out there that the hon. member referred to had nothing whatsoever to do with the election. My constituents, although they have a broad concern for the Province, are not really terribly and minutely concerned about Come By Chance, I can assure you. That trip out there was for the purpose of satisfying a request to us by a reputable firm who may be interested in the rejuvenation of the refinery, should that decision be made, and we did not want to leave any stone unturned so we accommodated that request, that was what it was for. While I was out there I was contacted by some of the local people. They

understood, when I spoke to them on the phone, that we were going up for a very specific purpose. I subsequently spoke to them on the phone and said that when definitive information came forward I was sure that we would meet with them and give them that information, and they were quite satisfied with that.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

Notices of Motion

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

MR. MARSHALL:
On behalf of the Minister of Justice I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bill, a bill, "An Act To Amend To Amend The Companies Act."

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

MR. BARRY:
If necessary I will give notice of motion, but I would rather not, Mr. Speaker. No, I will not bother notice of motion. I will ask the Government House Leader and members opposite to grant leave to present this resolution to the House for unanimous passage. I move, seconded by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), that this House unanimously condemn the Wilson Budget and the Government of Canada for its de-indexing of senior citizens pensions and for attempting to

cure deficit problems on the backs of the aged and the poor. And I again point out to members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba, the Conservative Premiers of -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
- Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick have participated in such a unanimous resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman, if he was anything, which is questionable, he was an illustrious Deputy Speaker of this House at one particular period of time in another incarnation, and he must realize that we have certain orders that are followed, Statements By Ministers, Oral Questions, and we are now on Notices of Motion. Notices of Motion are the period of time for a minister to get up and give notice of government motions, or for a private member to get up. The hon. gentleman has not given notice of any motion. He gets up all of a sudden, just out of the blue, and says, "I move something." Mr. Speaker, that is totally out of order. There is an appropriate place for the hon. gentleman to do it. He should be versed in the rules of the House and realize that this appointed

period of time is not for him to get up and say, "I move".

MR. BARRY:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, as the Government House Leader knows, by leave a member can introduce something at any time during the House proceedings. However, if the Government House Leader wants to hear it one more time, then I will bring it up at Orders of the Day. I will bring it up one more time now, I will bring it up a third time.

Answers to Questions for which
Notice has been Given

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to some questions raised last night in the Estimates Committee by the hon. the member for Gander, questions relating to the fenitrothion and PCBs. Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer to a question raised by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) yesterday regarding the operations and dams on the Exploits River. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, in tabling the answer to the question, that there was some misunderstanding in that the Exploits dam referred to, I was not totally familiar with it; I understand now the Exploits dam is the Millertown dam. But just let

me say in tabling the answers to the questions for the hon. member, that there are no problems with the operation of dams on the Exploits River, and the Goodyear dam in Grand Falls is quite acceptable to the Department of the Environment. The new dam that was built at Bishop Falls has a capacity to handle unusual amounts of water, and the chances of having the kind of flood that happened in the past there again would only take place once in 10,000 years. We have visually inspected the dam that the hon. member referred to, the Millertown dam on Red Indian Lake, and that dam, Mr. Speaker, has been inspected by the Department of the Environment and it is acceptable to us. So, Mr. Speaker, on the whole we have no problem whatsoever, the Department of the Environment, with Price-Abitibi in Grand Falls on the operation of their dams.

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

In the first instance, Mr. Speaker, I did not have a question on the Order Paper. Obviously, what we have just seen is an attempt by the minister to clarify a situation that he was clearly unfamiliar with and handled very flippantly in question period yesterday, Mr. Speaker. And based on the information he has just given, he is still very unfamiliar with the issue. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the minister familiarize himself with the situation of the Millertown dam, as he refers to it, because it is a serious, serious situation, and

it is his responsibility to put the fears and the concerns of the people in the Exploits Valley at rest, and not come in here and try to clarify questions that he was uncomfortable with yesterday.

MR. BUTT:

to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Just let me say to the hon. member that I think the hon. member is somewhat of an alarmist. He acts irresponsibly. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there is no problem. You know, I have not been out and looked at it, I am not a dam inspector, but my officials in my department have visually inspected that dam. They had a look at it.

MR. FLIGHT:

They looked at the dam.

MR. BUTT:

Well, my inspectors have been up there. The best reports that I can get, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member's point of order, is there is no problem with the dam that the hon. member refers to. And the hon. member is acting very irresponsibly and he is an alarmist, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I do not think there is any point of order. I think there was something to be clarified. It was more a point of clarification than a point of order.

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Would the minister now, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has indicated to the House -

MR. BUTT:

Question Period is over.

MR. FLIGHT:

- that his officials inspected the dam, would the minister indicate when?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council, on a point of privileges.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is getting up now, but Question Period is over. The hon. gentleman gave an answer to a question for which he took notice of both yesterday in the House in part, and apparently today in his estimates. The hon. gentleman does not want the answers. Well, that is fine, he may disagree with the answers, but he cannot take the House on his back, Mr. Speaker. There are certain proceedings to be followed and it is not for the hon. gentleman to get up on a point of order and continue on with the Question Period. The hon. gentleman wants to do that and he wants to flagrantly disobey the rules of the House. There is a proceeding to be taken, and the proceeding to be taken, Mr.

Speaker, is naming him and asking him to leave the Chamber if he cannot control himself.

MR. BARRY:

To that matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

You know, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) are making a very serious mistake here. What we are talking about is potential risk to the property, the health, the safety and possibly the lives of individuals. There is nobody, Mr. Speaker, trying to create unnecessary fears. The member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), as the member responsible for bringing the concerns of his constituents to this House, has raised the matter with respect to the dam at Millertown. Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister has shown himself unfamiliar with the situation in the first instance, and the member for Windsor-Buchans is doing nothing improper in making sure that the minister has completely examined the situation and familiarized himself with it to make sure that there is no risk to the constituents of the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight).

MR. FLIGHT:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

As I understand, a point of

privilege was raised by the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). I do not think there is any point of privilege, there is no point of order, so I think we should move on.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a new point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of privilege, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister in referring to my questions yesterday referred to me as an alarmist and irresponsible.

MR. TOBIN:

So you are.

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister tabled answers to questions that I purportedly put to him yesterday. There is no mention in this written answer, Mr. Speaker, that he tabled today, no mention of the Exploits dam, no mention of the Millertown dam, no mention of the fact -

MR. BUTT:

If you are dissatisfied with the answer, debate it on the Late Show.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

There is no prima facie case that the hon. member's privileges are being interfered with in any way.

Petitions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here which I would like to present on behalf of close to eighty or ninety, I did not count the names, individuals from Bell Island who are concerned, Mr. Speaker, with respect to a pit which has been left open by the DOSCO Mining Company which was fenced one time but since then the fence has deteriorated and there is now a very dangerous situation as far as children, particularly, are concerned. The pit is the open pit called the 44-40. It is about 600 feet by 80 feet and has a depth which is unknown but it is a very, very dangerous situation. It was used from separating rock from the ore during the mining operations. A number of people tried to have the pit filled in previously. They have contacted council and the RCMP, but I do not know if any approach has been made to the Department of Mines or the Department of Labour. And, Mr. Speaker, I have to confess since the Mines Inspection branch of the Department of Mines and Energy was moved to the Department of Labour, I am not sure which department would be responsible for investigating and examining and correcting this situation. I have a letter and a copy of this petition to go to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) and I will send this over immediately. But I ask the House to send a copy to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) as well just in case it is the Mines Inspection Division which will have the ultimate responsibility for taking action.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Mines and Energy,

when I was minister, where there were mining operations which had left hazardous situations, that department would go out and take action to correct them. In fact, on Bell Island we had a situation a few years ago where, as a result of erosion, part of the underground workings of the mine came open on the Beach and was accessible for children and by the population generally. The mines are very dangerous in that, apart from the risk of falling, they go on for so many miles it is very easy for people to get lost in them. So it is important that they be kept closed. The Department of Mines and Energy went in and closed up the opening at that point in time and I would ask the Department of Mines and Energy or the Department of Labour - I am not sure which one would have the responsibility now - or any other government department concerned to make sure that this is looked at immediately because there is a serious hazard there as far as children, particularly, in the community on Bell Island are concerned.

So, I table this and I would like to have it referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for presenting his petition in the House today. We have an arrangement with the town council at Bell Island. To be quite honest I was aware that there was a pit area open over there, that there was a problem

area over there, and what we have tentatively agreed - as a matter of fact the agreement has been in place for some time now - was that the council would hire two people to secure the area and the Department of Mines and Energy agreed to pay their salaries. That was the arrangement made with the town. But if there is a further problem then I will have the department look at it and see what if anything needs to be done and see to it that the problem is handled. But from my point of view, from the department's perspective because I had been asking about that I had a briefing on just about all the mining areas in the Province, and that was one of the areas we felt was secured to the best of what was expected of us. In that there was a problem, the problem was identified to us, we talked about a fence and we talked about securing the area. Even with a fence it was thought that kids might get over the fence and there would still be a problem. So we thought that the best way to secure the area was to have council hire two people as security people. They would look after that and secure the area and we would pay council whatever it cost them for the salaries of the two individuals they hired. But if there is a further problem I will certainly have my people check into it and make sure that there is not danger to the people of Bell Island.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition that was raised today by

two members of a senior citizens' group in this Province. I will read the prayer of the petition.

'We, the undersigned, petition the hon. the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador to do what is in your power to oppose the de-indexing of old age pensions by the federal government.' I rise to bring this up and I am especially pleased to be able to get it into the House today because it, of course, refers to the same issue we brought up yesterday in Question Period. That is, of course, that we have an intolerable situation here. The federal government has brought in a budget which is destructive in many areas, but it is especially destructive to the level of income of our senior citizens and we have an obligation to be on record immediately and as loudly as we can in order to get this extremely oppressive measure changed.

Yesterday when the Premier rose to give an answer he said that they were doing a comprehensive response to the budget and that they would have their answer on Thursday. But I suggest that that is not good enough. If the Premier cannot see clearly that this is an issue that the entire House must be united on and must immediately send a strong signal on to Ottawa to indicate that we do not want to see our senior citizens, many of whom live in poverty, sink any more, then he certainly is not capable of being the Premier of this Province, because this is such a clear issue that it hurts the least capable people in our Province to respond to it. That is the kind of thing that all parties in this House should immediately be on the same side on. So, Mr. Speaker, I forward the petition to the

Premier and ask that he make immediate representation to see that it is acted on.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to speak to that petition.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned last Friday, I think it was, when the Minister responsible for Government Stores, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Aylward), raised the matter of discounts for senior citizens, I pointed out on Friday morning how this did not go nearly far enough in terms of correcting the problem that was created by de-indexing and I pointed out on a number of occasions that is taking in the area of \$1,500 over the next five years out of the pockets of senior citizens. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I get up for the third time today to present my resolution, I know the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) will be on this side of the House supporting and granting unanimous leave to have this resolution go forward and I hope the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) will have changed his mind and will have seen the errors of his ways the last two times when he tried to muzzle me. The same point is being made. This Wilson Budget is an abomination, it is a scandalous attack upon our aged and our poor and, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be allowed to go unnoticed by this House. There are too many individuals affected in this Province, many more than the seventy to whom a pittance is being granted by the Northern Development Minister in this

government stores discount. So seventy individuals will be helped. Well, let me tell members opposite a lot more than seventy of our senior citizens are being scourged by this Wilson Budget and members opposite are going to have to take responsibility. Are they going to be the silent lapdogs that they have turned into since this federal budget was brought down or are they going to stand on their hind legs like men and lady and do something about it?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petitioners in putting forth this petition.

[POWER FAILURE]

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I understand there has been a car accident which has interrupted the electrical supply. I do not know how long we will be without electricity, perhaps some considerable time, so a motion to adjourn would be in order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, before we do I want to advise the House of the Committee meetings. The Clerk says she has to take this in shorthand and told me to speak slowly, so I will speak to the mental process of the Opposition.

The Social Services Committee, Mr. Speaker, will consider the estimates of the Department of Health at the Colonial Building tonight at 7:30.

Tomorrow morning the Resource Committee will, first of all finish, hopefully, or consider Fisheries, and I invite all hon. members for the final stages for the Energy Estimates. That will be here at the House. And down at Colonial Building, Social Services will consider the Estimates of Health.

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 12, 1985 at 3:00 P.M.