



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 10

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

10 May 1985

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Before we get into Statements by Ministers, if I may, with the cooperation of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry): in an exchange of correspondence between myself and the Leader of the Opposition yesterday afternoon and this morning, I think we have an agreement for the establishment of an all-party committee to draft a resolution concerning the fishery. It will consist, from our side, of the hon. Mr. Ottenheimer and the hon. Mr. Rideout: from the Opposition side, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter). Both leaders have agreed that the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) should also be a member of the Committee. It will be a five person committee established to draft a resolution along the lines of these three points: One, concerning offshore overfishing; two, extending of jurisdiction by Canada over the Nose and Tail of the Banks; three, additional powers over the fishery for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Those were the three chief points, or that is the pith of the resolution which will have to be appropriately drafted.

I think the Leader of the Opposition, if he wants to comment on that, does agree with that.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
We agree, as I have indicated to the Premier, having the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) serve on the committee. We think that it is important that this resolution be drafted and be brought before this House at the earliest possible opportunity. So we would welcome early initiatives to have the members meet, sit down and start drafting.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Ottenheimer just indicated to me that after Question Period, if the other members are available, they can get together and perhaps it would not take very long to draft it. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is presently in his constituency but he could easily be reached by phone just to check it out with him. So we could start it.

Statements by Ministers

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, yesterday's announcement by the federal government that the CN Marine coastal service would be reinstated at English Harbour West

and Hermitage is indeed welcome news. I am certain the residents of the South Coast communities affected are equally as happy.

The reinstatement of this service clearly demonstrates the mode of cooperation that exists between the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Government of Canada. This announcement emphasizes this Province's new found relationship with our federal counterparts. Quiet discussions, exchange of correspondence and the ability to listen to reason have replaced the public remonstrations that were so prevalent under the former federal administration.

When my department learned of CN Marine's intention to reduce coastal service to South Coast ports a couple of months ago we immediately started a dialogue with our federal counterparts. My officials and officials of the federal Transport Department corresponded and conversed on a regular basis. Feeling that these cutbacks would have a dramatic affect on people in the various South Coast communities, and, realizing the severe ramifications on business that depended on the coastal service, my department presented its arguments for retention of the service. We quietly and confidently pursued the highroad in this issue and it has paid off.

I have been in contact with Mr. Joe Price, M.P. for Burin - St. George's, whose federal riding would have to be adversely affected by the proposed reduction in the coastal service. Mr. Price and I lobbied our case with Mr. Mazankowski, the Federal Minister of Transport and with his officials. Our arguments for the

retention of the service were uniformly presented with the necessary facts and place to support our opposition to the move by CN Marine. Obviously, the federal minister felt, as we did, that we had a logical case.

The original intent of CN Marine was to drop seven points from its South Coast service. These were: English Harbour East and West, Belleoram, Pooles Cove, Gaultois, Hermitage and Ramea. After a few days, Gaultois and Ramea services were reintroduced, and, shortly, English Harbour West and Hermitage coastal service will be back on schedule. These two ports of call handled the largest amounts of freight and passengers on the South Coast run.

The Federal Minister, Mr. Mazankowski, and I have agreed that ongoing consultation between his department and mine is a necessity to ensure that residents of the South Coast of the Province receive a reason service at a reasonable cost.

Yesterday's good news of the reinstatement of the CN Marine coastal service to English Harbour West and Hermitage clearly points out what we can accomplish when we have two partners in Confederation who are willing to sit down and talk with one another to achieve mutual objectives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I have to ask what about the communities of Belleoram, Pooles Cove, English

Harbour East?

MR. DAWE:

Ask the member for Fortune - Hermitage what happened to fourteen communities when he was MP.

MR. BARRY:

This job is not yet completed. The Minister for Transportation (Mr. Dawe) should not be so complacent. There are three communities that are having their CN service removed, and the minister very conveniently omitted very -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is fourteen to three. What about when the member for Fortune - Hermitage was the MP and in the federal cabinet?

MR. BARRY:

The Minister of Transportation conveniently ignores this. Mr. Speaker, we see the reference to public remonstrations here. I wonder where those public remonstrations used to come from over the last several years? It is one thing for the Premier and for his administration to decide that they are going to change and avoid fighting just for the sake of fighting and avoid sitting down at all. But it is another thing, Mr. Speaker, to avoid any sort of communication until members on this side of the House, including the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), including the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) got up in this House and shamed the minister and government into making representation.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is wrong, wrong.

MR. BARRY:

And I think it should also be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the MP for the area has indicated, Mr. Speaker, that he was unable to get any co-operation from Provincial ministers until members of this House got up and started to put the heat on.

MR. TULK:

That is right. That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Come on now, come on.

MR. BARRY:

And, Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the minister whether he accepts this definition of consultation which seems to be more and more prelevant amongst members opposite. Consultation, Mr. Speaker, for members opposite seems to be trying to close the barn door after the horse is left. Consultation, Mr. Speaker, means acting before the fact.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We did.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No way.

MR. BARRY:

Where was the consultation when the initial decision was made? Why was it necessary to have all of this unnecessary anxiety and uncertainty created for these communities? Either, Mr. Speaker, we have had a total lack of consultation and communication before the federal government brought in this decision? Or else we had total incompetence and negligence and neglect, Mr. Speaker, on the part of members opposite.

And I would suggest to the minister that if they are not trying to play cruel political games with the lives of people on the South Coast, where they try and create a straw horse and cut out the service for seven or eight, when, really, the intention all along is to cut it out for three communities - and then appear to be great fighters for Newfoundland when the end result is that three more communities are without a CN service - if that is not the cruel political game that is being played, Mr. Speaker, then we would like to see real consultation, which means discussions with your federal counterpart, Mr. Speaker, before they make their decisions in the future.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I have just received information on some figures - I do not have the flash sheet yet - from Statistics Canada and they indicate that the rate of unemployment in this Province has gone up from 24.6 per cent as of the end of March to 25.8 per cent as of the end of April. Seasonally adjusted it has gone up even larger percentage-wise, from 21.2 per cent to 23.6 per cent. Now this is at a time of the year, Mr. Speaker, when we normally see an improvement in the unemployment figures. I wonder if this is an indication of the way in which the Premier is going to fulfill his

mandate to create jobs. When can the people of this Province expect the Premier to commence working on that mandate to create jobs?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the figures and the flash sheet that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) refers to. About a week ago the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) issued a press release which was carried on the back page of the local paper, I think some of the radio stations carried it, whereby in the last month or so that department alone had provided loans and grants to small businesses creating 202 jobs in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, we will take a look at the figures when they come out, when I see them. Obviously we are usually a little bit later than many places on the mainland when we get into Spring and Summer employment activities. I guess that is one of the reasons for it. Some delay in the start of the fishery, no doubt, is another. You know, there are certain things that happen over which nobody has any control, like the ice conditions or the weather, either in the forestry industry as well as in the fishing industry and in the farming industry.

We have the largest highways agreement in the history of Newfoundland - we have not signed it yet, we have announced that it will be signed in the next week or so - \$181 million. We have a new ocean industries agreement, which is just getting off the ground, and a new tourism agreement. The

reactivation of the St. Lawrence mine will begin very shortly and more jobs will be created. We will be announcing, through the budget, as everybody knows, new initiatives as it relates to the forest industry and silviculture. We have signed agreements with both Kruger and Abitibi-Price for job creation activities which will be ongoing each year for the next four or five years in the forest industry, which will create hundreds of jobs.

So, Mr. Speaker, whilst we see this increase again right now, I think over the next number of months you are going to see that unemployment rate come down somewhat as these various programmes get off the ground. But as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) knows and everybody else knows, there is no easy way in the next month or two to bring that unemployment rate down from 23 per cent to 10 per cent, say. We will be able to bring it down several percentage points, hopefully, over the next few months, and over the next few years get it down to a more respectable level and to national levels. That will take a couple of years, but in the next couple of months, I am sure, one will see that the unemployment rate will start to come down in this Province.

MR. BARRY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether he would agree that possibly the delay in bringing down the budget, as a

result of the Premier's timing of the election call, might have something to do with the delay in getting an improvement in the economy this year?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

On that point, Mr. Speaker, members of the Opposition criticized the government when we went to a pretending system and called it a whole bunch of things. But we have pretended already, I guess, somewhere around \$11 million to \$15 million worth of road work, and we have pretended somewhere between \$9 million and \$11 million worth of municipal work, and there will be more to come. So we have tried, early on in the year, to pretend as many of the public projects as we could, on which design work had been completed, so that we could get an early start. Quite a few of those tenders have been awarded and work is beginning. So we are doing what we can early on in the year to get work started as soon as possible.

Also, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) has said over the last number of days, the youth employment programme of 6,000 jobs for young people this Summer, young students, is well off the ground and we will be making announcements over the next couple of days of hundreds and hundreds of jobs for the students in this Province. So we are doing all we can to alleviate any delay in getting our own public works projects begun as early as possible.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), I would like to take a couple of seconds to welcome two groups of students to the galleries - sixty Grade V and VI students from Twillingate with their teachers Eric Waterman, Bill Goose, Joe White, Joyce Stuckless, Audrey Goose and Ruth Waterman. Also ten Grade XI students from Westport, White Bay, with their teacher Wesley Goose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, these statistics are certainly startling, particularly when they come at this time of the year when normally the unemployment rate starts to drop. I agree with the Premier they are not going to drop any great degree, but there should be at least some indication that they are dropping. The Premier indicated that there will be a drop over the next few months, and over the next couple of years before we can do anything substantial in terms of making the figures look respectable. My question to the Premier is does his government have a time frame or a schematic design indicating to our people what rates the level of unemployment will be at the end of one year, at the end of three years, or something like this, so that we can give some hope to the people of Newfoundland, particularly to the unemployed people? Can the Premier indicate whether his government has in effect some schematic design - I do not know whether that is the

right word - some time frame that indicates the levels by which our unemployment rate will drop over the next several months, over the next year or so?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have a crystal ball. If the hon. member knows anything about economics, for every statistic there is an economist. With the variables that are current in the economy, it is very difficult to predict at what month our unemployment rate will be 20 per cent, at what month it will be 15 per cent, and at what month it will be 10 per cent. That is a very difficult thing to do. If you look at the Conference Board of Canada, if you look at the Economic Council of Canada, the C.D. Howe Institute and others major national bodies which try to get involved in this, you will find variances among experts on just where the economy is going and at what rate it is going, in one direction or the other, as it relates to consumer demand, as it relates to unemployment, as it relates to recovery, as it relates to the value of the dollar, as it relates to our trade deficit, our surplus, and so on. That is very difficult to do.

In a general way, Mr. Speaker, one can say that our approach to this whole problem is along the following lines: I will not be able to give dates to the hon. member, but with the \$900 million worth of agreements that are signed now with the federal government, especially in tourism and ocean industries, two very important ones, we think we are going to, through those two programmes, stimulate those two

industries a fair amount over the next year, and similarly with the other agreements that are there.

We have major construction going on in Corner Brook and Grand Falls which will begin this year. I think the Grand Falls modernization is due to begin in June. And I would like to also inform this hon. House about developments Kruger as infomed me about recently. Under the agreement we signed with Kruger they have to spend this year in modernization \$33 million. They have since informed us that they are not only going to keep their commitment of \$33 million, but they are going to increase it by approximately another \$20 million. So there should be over \$50 million worth of modernization at Corner Brook. I have indicated the Grand Falls situation, so there is some stability and improvement there. In the mining industry, both IOC and Wabush are up over the predictions that they made two or three months ago, so we are seeing some improvment.

The fishery is a very unpredictable piece of business because of its nature, whether the fish come inshore or whether there is enough there and so on. But it does not look all that dark for the rest of this year as it relates to the fishery. As a matter of fact, I think we will increase our output over last year.

Now given that, building on that will come hopefully by the end of the year. As the minister resonsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Mashall) has pointed out, about two weeks ago both governments appointed Mr. Govier to be a consultant to both governments in the establishment of the board under the Atlantic

Accord. It is highly likely that that board will be established by sometime between August and the end of September. We are now working with the federal government and the companies for the developlment plan. The companies will have the environmental assessment report out on May 15. It will be studied, and we are hopeful that by the end of the year, as I have indicated publicly before, a plan will be approved for the development of Hiberia. So we are looking then to next year for the creation of the jobs.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

A point of order by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

To be fair to the Premier all of this is on the topic, Mr. Speaker. The direct question asked by my colleague was, "Do they have any new initiatives to deal with this alarming trend which sees an increase in the rate of unemployment, fewer jobs, when there should be more jobs this time of the year?" Now it is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, to have the Premier take up such an amount of time in Question Period rehashing what has already been set out. Are there any new initiatives? That is the question.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman

asked a question as to the plan that the government has, so it is a very comprehensive question requiring a very comprehensive answer. I realize, and the House will note, Mr. Speaker, that when the Premier got into the matter of describing the activity that is going to result from signing the Atlantic Accord, he obviously hit a very tender nerve because then the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) got up on a point of order.

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

To that point of order, I think it is fairly well established that questions and answers should be as brief as possible, but in this case I do not think there is a point of order.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I regret if I have been too long but the nature of the question asked about a plan. I will try to be as brief as I can. If the hon. member asks a question like he has asked, then I feel obligated, as a member of this House and the Premier of the Province, to give a detailed answer so that I fully answer the hon. member's question. Because I am sure that the hon. member honestly and genuinely asked the question. He wants to have some idea from me as to how I see the unemployment rate coming down over the next couple of years, and I am trying to do my best. I do not know what grade the hon. member will give me on my answer, but I am trying to do my best to delineate the schematic plan that he asked for in his question, Mr. Speaker.

We are hopeful, as a government, that the development plan will be approved somewhere around the end of this year, which will then see job creation activities through 1986 and 1987 at a much higher rate of employment than we have had any time, perhaps, in our past. Simultaneous with that initiative is our ongoing initiative as it relates to the hydro developments in Labrador. We are also hopeful there of having a breakthrough with Quebec on Labrador such that, over the next couple of years, we will be able to build a \$1.5 billion transmission line down from Labrador. So we will have two large construction projects going on at the same time, one in the North of \$1.5 billion and one in the South of \$3 billion or \$4 billion or \$5 billion, along with our agreements that are in place for five years, along with our ongoing forestry and fishing and farming initiatives. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of plan that we have to reduce unemployment in Newfoundland over the next couple of years.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we just saw a ridiculous exhibition of an attempt by the Premier to avoid taking the heat of Question Period.

Now, I would like to ask another question, Mr. Speaker. I would like a direct answer to this question. Was the Premier aware of the communication by the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Morgan, to the federal government

concerning the alleged behaviour of fisheries observers off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, over the last three or four years we have from time to time, when information has come to our disposal, been on to the federal government, especially the former federal government, about alleged violations out there, about the level of surveillance on offshore fishing activities. We have been aware for some time, but we have never been able to prove any of these allegations. We have been very, very concerned and, as we indicated the other day, we were always in favour of contractual employees in federal Fisheries and Oceans not doing this kind of work, that it should be permanent employees of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

So we are not 'Johnny-Come-Latelys' to this problem as we are not to the whole question of offshore fishing. We have opposed it from day one, we have supported the extended jurisdiction by Canada out on the Nose and Tail of the Banks, and we have insisted the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador have more say constitutionally over the fishery. So on all these areas, Mr. Speaker, we have been in the forefront. On the whole question of surveillance, yes, we have from time to time over the last number of years been aware that surveillance activities were not up to par and that more effort should be made along those lines. We have made representation and, to use the hon. the member for Twillingate's (Mr. W. Carter) expression, 'strong

representation' to the federal government on this matter.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

That does not answer the question. The question I asked was: With respect to the allegations of alleged improper behaviour by fisheries observers, the former Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was very precise. He said he communicated with a former federal Fisheries Minister, Mr. Romeo LeBlanc, indicating that there were improprieties, there was improper behaviour on the part of fisheries observers. Now, if we are not going to have the entire group of people out there smeared, we should have, Mr. Speaker, the precise details of that communication. We want to know has the Premier seen any such letter from the former Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South and, if so, will he table that before this hon. House?

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

The hon. gentleman is quoting me as saying that I corresponded with Mr. LeBlanc. I think he should get the facts straight. Yesterday, in the House and outside the House, I referred to accusations made by a former employee of the federal Department

of Fisheries and that he had communicated in correspondence Mr. LeBlanc.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Listen and you will learn something.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. I said that yesterday in connection with correspondence to and from Mr. LeBlanc to the employee, and that correspondence will be in my hands within the next twenty-four hours or so. Mr. Speaker, in addition to that I said I had made numerous complaints over the last number of years as Minister of Fisheries in this Province not only to federal ministers but also to federal authorities who are in charge of the surveillance in the offshore asking for enquiries to investigate innuendos and rumors of bribes that I could not very well prove. These pleas for investigations fell on deaf ears in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order raised by the hon. the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), there is no point of order. He took the opportunity of further explaining his point of yesterday.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

In light of the clarification by the former Minister of Fisheries, I would ask the Premier if he was

aware that the former Minister of Fisheries was making these representations to the Government of Canada? Is the Premier prepared to table the precise communications before this House?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, over the last three or four years, as I have already indicated to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), we have from time to time complained to the federal government, through the former Minister of Fisheries to the former Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. LeBlanc) and through other channels, that we had heard certain rumours or allegations about the level and effectiveness of surveillance offshore. We indicated that to the federal government on many occasions. The former Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has said this himself on many occasions publicly, on the airways here in Newfoundland, over the last three or four years. This is nothing new at all to the people of Newfoundland and to the people of Canada about his dissatisfaction with certain ways in which the offshore fishery was being run. I myself on many occasions have done the same thing and we have conveyed these complaints to the federal government and to ministers in meetings that we have had with them. So, Mr. Speaker, this is nothing new. It has now come to light because there has been some greater amount of substantiation from within the federal Fisheries and Oceans Department, mainly through former employees of that department, contractual or otherwise, which therefore lends

more credence to the rumours that were prevalent a number of years ago. We have undertaken as a government, through the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), to communicate with our people in Justice. If we have any jurisdiction over establishing a police investigation, and if there is enough information to warrant such, we are going to do it. If there are areas where we do not have the jurisdiction then the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General of Newfoundland, will request the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General in Ottawa (Mr. Crosbie), or the appropriate official or minister in Ottawa, to call for such a police investigation. So these revelations now follow on the heels and give an awful lot of credibility to what the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) and myself and other members of the government over the last three or four years have been saying about the offshore fishery. We are glad now it has come out like this.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

From everything that the Premier says, the very clear impression is given that the former Minister of Fisheries did not make the Premier aware of any such communications to the Government of Canada, and I would like the Premier to confirm whether in fact this is the case. Did he or did he not receive information from the former Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) with respect to these communications? Will he table those communications that were

made to the Government of Canada. And would he explain if there are any such communications that he was aware of why did we not see the Premier out talking loud and clear to the people of this Province about what was happening on this? We heard the Premier say nothing this morning about the alleged improper behaviour of fisheries observers. This is a very serious matter. We are talking about crimes, we are talking about bribery, we are talking about corruption of federal officials. It is not good enough for the Premier to say there was no proof and not ask for an investigation. Did the Premier ask for an investigation by the Federal Department of Justice when he received any such communication from the former Minister of Fisheries?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, that was on another matter, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

That is a good one!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will tell you what the matter was if you would like to know. The minister just advised me, because the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) is not in her seat right now, that we have just been informed, after our communications of yesterday and the day before and last night and this morning, that investigations have started in both Halifax and St. John's through the RCMP on the allegations that have been made over the last couple of days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Over the last number of years, I suppose, just about 95 per cent or 98 per cent of Newfoundlanders knew when the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was having a meeting with his counterpart in Ottawa, because he announced when he was having a meeting, whether it was here in St. John's or in Marystown or Burin or Catalina, wherever it happened to be, or in Ottawa or Halifax or Moncton. And on each occasion the Minister of Fisheries would communicate to me and to the government and to Planning and Priorities what was on the agenda for those meetings. Many, many times when the former Minister of Fisheries would communicate that, he would also indicate to us that there had come to his attention various things that have happened offshore as it related to surveillance, as it related to overfishing, and that he was going to communicate this in the strongest possible terms to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

MR. MORGAN:

Meeting after meeting.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In meeting after meeting the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) communicated this to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I can remember many statements that I made on the matter over the last few years. There were rumours and we passed on those rumours of ineffective surveillance activities out there to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and expressed our concern about them. We did not have hard evidence or information, but we passed it on to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Now we find, Mr. Speaker, that there are other people who have come forward

with more substantial information. It is more now than rumour, it is an allegation almost. You have an individual who worked with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans actually saying this as opposed to our hearing it as a rumour. So obviously there is now sufficient evidence to warrant the police investigations which I have just announced here in the House today. But we have been communicating rumours and so on to the federal government for some time over the ineffectual way in which surveillance activities have been operated on the offshore as it related to the foreign fishing effort.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Premier as a change of pace from what we have been hearing for the last couple of days.

MR. BARRY:

Give him a break.

MR. BAKER:

Yes, give him a break.

I have a concern, Mr. Speaker, that is a concern of all the people in my district and it concerns the airport in Gander. Some time ago, Mr. Speaker, a letter was written by the Mayor of St. John's asking the Premier of the Province for support in an attempt to take some Air Canada flights from St. John's and move them to Gander.

MR. YOUNG:

It is the other way 'round, boy.

MR. BAKER:

Well, that is the way that I would like to have it. The Mayor of St. John's wants to take some flights from Gander and move them to St. John's. Doing so, of course, would mean the reduction of jobs in Gander and a deterioration of the economic base of the town.

What I would like to know from the Premier right now is what was his response to that request from Mayor Murphy? A letter was sent to the Premier on April 11, and I am assuming that that is adequate time to think about it and so on, so I wonder what the Premier's response to that letter was?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have not yet responded to that letter because I have broached the matter with Cabinet and we will be indicating a response to the Mayor of St. John's shortly.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

In the last week or so, the Premier has been also in receipt of another piece of correspondence that comes from the St. John's Board of Trade, that carries the situation a little bit further and is a request for full international status for St. John's which, Mr. Speaker, would be a disaster for Gander.

I am wondering if the Premier has

responded to that particular request and, if not, would he please do so in the near future? Because the people of Gander, Sir, are wondering what the position of the provincial government is with regard to removal of international status from Gander.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, number one, just let me say that I get many pieces of correspondence every day and every week, it runs between 500 and 1,000 a week.

MR. CALLAN:

I bet you got a lot during the election.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We get a lot of it every day, in election and in non-election times. I get a lot of letters from the hon. member's district, an awful lot of letters from his district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We help out more people in Bellevue district through the Premier's Office than almost any other district in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. It is unbelievable! The hon. member, they 'cannot get hold of him,' 'he does not do anything,' 'all he does is bark in the House of Assembly', 'he cannot get this road done,' he cannot get that done.' You know, I mean, it is just unbelievable!

MR. BAKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

On a point of order, the hon. the

member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

I would really like to get back to the question of international status for Gander airport. It is a very serious matter and I really would like an answer.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If the hon. the member for Gander can control his colleague, the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) so I can get on and answer his question, I will be only too happy to do so, but I am not going to be harassed by his colleague and then have him get up and suddenly say it is my fault that I have not answered the question.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, secondly, there is no move underfoot, as far as I know, to try to grab international status away from Gander. Now, I guess this is an emotionally charged issue in Gander and Central Newfoundland and there is a whole bunch of people saying what is happening here is that somebody is trying to grab international status from Gander and give it to St. John's, and then Gander would no longer have international status. Well, that is myth, that is fallacy, that is untrue. There is no truth whatsoever to that from all the

information that we have been gathering since we received these letters from the Board of Trade and the city of St. John's and other people in Central Newfoundland.

So, I think we should deal with the facts of the matter. The facts of the matter are not transferring international status from Gander. On this, let there be no doubt; the Newfoundland Government will always support and maintain and see to it with every effort at our disposal that Gander continues always - forever and ever/my heart will be true - forever to have international status. Through the TOPS programme and so on now, and with usage by Eastern Bloc countries, good economic activity has been established through Gander and we are going to see that it continues. Let there be no doubt about that. I get a little bit disturbed when I hear people saying that there are moves underfoot to try to take international status away from Gander. But we have received representation from the Board of Trade and from many people in Central Newfoundland, and over the next week or so we will be getting back to these various organizations and various people indicating the position that the Government of Newfoundland is going to take on this whole matter. But, let it be clear that whatever the position will be, contained in that position will be ongoing strong pressure to continue with international status in full for Gander.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by Standing
and Special Committees

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to table certain documents related to Lieutenant-Governor's warrants that have to do with Interim Supply, and also certain documents that are required as a result of provisions in The Financial Administration Act.

Mr. Speaker, normally speaking, before the end of the financial year, there is an Interim Supply Bill in the House. Of course, the budget does not come down until sometime after so what we normally do then is issue Lieutenant-Governors Warrants on the basis of the Interim Supply Bill. Now, with the dissolution of the House this year - this is not the only year this has happened, of course - there was no Interim Supply Bill in place, so we issued special warrants. The Comptroller General, quite rightly, indicated that he did not have authority to process the Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants because of the absence of an Interim Supply Bill. The Financial Administration Act provides that Treasury Board can consider this matter and if the exigencies of the financial requirements, obligations of the Province, are such they can overrule the Comptroller General's objections and order that the Special Warrants be implemented. If that occurrence comes about, I am required to table these documents and I now so table them.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies of the Special Warrants in question. If I may take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, I am also required, under The Financial Administration Act, to table Minutes of Council related to precommitments issued up to the end of March 1985.

MR. CALLAN:
When are they supposed to be tabled?

DR. COLLINS:
Within fifteen days of the House opening. I have three or four more days to go.

Answers to Questions for which
Notice has been Given

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I have an answer for the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). The question concerned sessional pay, Cabinet pay, pay to Executive Assistants, to ministers, to the Opposition Leader, Committee pay, how much the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee gets paid, the Vice-Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, how much Select Committee members get paid and the Chairman of a Select Committee, and what the district allowance is. I do not know why he asked the question, it is all public knowledge.

MR. BARRY:
It is an attempt to make a point.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is an attempt to make the point he is not getting paid enough. It is pay for the House positions of Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Deputy Chairman of the Committee, and the Government House Leader. The Government House Leader gets zero, the Opposition House Leader gets \$15,000. On other remunerations, members representing out of town districts, etc., I table the information. The Order Paper and the number of the questions are not on there but I will have that in a second so the table will know what question it was and on what Order Paper because it was not on the sheet.

MR. TULK:

I knew you were going to throw in that business about my allowance.

MR. BARRY:

You are worth every cent of it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to show how we are trying to answer all the questions that are on the Order Paper, trying to get information for the hon. member for Menihek, and do all we can to facilitate the proper operation of the House.

Petitions

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great privilege to present a petition on behalf of 350 residents of the great and historic town of Gambo, a town, Mr. Speaker, that over the

years has produced many stars and many bright lights. Today we are going to be talking about the lights, Mr. Speaker, the high electricity costs to the people of this Province.

The 350 people of Gambo who signed this petition are distressed, frustrated, like all of the other people in the Province who have signed their names to these petitions that we have been presenting over the past few days.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is: 'We do hereby protest the high and increasing electricity rates in the Province and humbly pray that we receive some immediate relief from this increasing and exorbitant cost of electricity.' That is the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, a prayer similar to the prayers and requests that have been submitted by other members on behalf of constituents and residents throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time in recent years that the people have demonstrated in such an emphatic way their concern and this dissatisfaction with the ever increasing electrical rates in this Province. Hon. members will recall that some years ago there was a similarly demonstrated concern and members started getting petitions from all over the Province. At that time I believe the government of the day, in an effort to try and help the people or in an effort to try and appease the people, I think then made it mandatory that any future increases would have to go through the Public Utilities Board. In other words, Newfoundland Light and Power would have to substantiate any increases before

the Public Utilities Board.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what has happened over the past couple of years has demonstrated that that has not been very effective. We have still seen the electrical rates escalate to tremendous levels, so much so that again the people of Newfoundland feel the time has come to stand up and again object to these continuous increases, increases, Mr. Speaker, that are causing great hardship, that are causing financial hardship, increases that are causing a tremendous burden on the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, I think government, if nothing else, should learn a lesson, by now they should be getting the idea that these increases are offending, these increases are objectionable to all of the people of Newfoundland. And when we get that kind of reaction, Mr. Speaker, when we get this kind of response, then the government certainly should be persuaded into acting immediately. Mr. Speaker, when we get that kind of response we must recognize the kind of hardship and the kind of burden that that is placing on all the people of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, if it is placing a burden on all of our people, certainly that burden is not shared equally. There are people on fixed incomes, there are old age pensioners, there are people on social assistance, people, Mr. Speaker, who just cannot afford to pay these bills. They just cannot take this burden anymore and people are going hungry. There are people in Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker, and this is an incredible fact, without electricity. There are people in Newfoundland at this moment, as I speak, Mr. Speaker, whose children are cold. There

are people in Newfoundland today without heat and without lights. That is a terrible indictment on our system, but that is happening today, Mr. Speaker. We have made many suggestions to the government to deal with this problem. We have suggested a public enquiry and they pooh-poohed that, Mr. Speaker. We have suggested that a consumer be placed on the Public Utilities Board to represent the ordinary Newfoundland and Labradorian and they pooh-poohed that. So, Mr. Speaker, what other suggestions can we come up with? We have come up with suggestion after suggestion. We have suggested that they remove the retail sales tax from the fuel adjustment cost. We have asked that and they have said no to that. So, Mr. Speaker, we have made several suggestions over here, but it looks like government are not willing to do anything about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they have been elected to govern and if the people of this Province cannot present a petition to their government and get a response, from whom can they expect a response? From whom can they expect action? They have gone to the highest court in the land, Mr. Speaker, asking for action and yet the government throw their arms up in the air and say, 'We cannot do anything about it.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the question what can the government do anything about? They cannot do anything about unemployment. They say the economy is sluggish and they cannot do anything about that. And they cannot do anything about the electrical rates, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Perhaps the hon. gentleman has been speaking for under five minutes but it seems he has been speaking for about five hours. I think it is five minutes for each person presenting a petition. Is not the hon. gentleman over his time?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member's time is just about up.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, let the people of Newfoundland know that hon. members opposite do not want to hear their requests in this hon. House, as you can tell by their continuous interruptions. Mr. Speaker, let me say I wholeheartedly support the petition and ask that it be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the appropriate department.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand to support the petition presented by the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Bonavista North.

MR. TOBIN:

I am sorry. He was in Terra Nova and decided he wanted to make a lot of money, so he resigned his seat and returned to teaching. He was teaching for about three months and went back to politics again, so there must be a lot of

money in that profession. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I stand and support the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague for Bonavista North, but certainly not the rhetoric the hon. member got involved in. I can assure him that he is not the only one, or the people of Bonavista North, Gambo or any other place, are not the only ones that have been, I guess, infected and victimized by the cost of electrical rates. I myself, Mr. Speaker, have light bills that have gone very close to \$400 during the past Winter and I can certainly feel the problem as well as anybody else. However, when one gets up to speak on a resolution or a petition, I think it is very, very important that politics not be played. And it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, politics is being played from the petitions presented under the leadership of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). They all stand in this House and support petitions presented because of the high electricity rates. And I have heard the Leader of the Opposition stand up and address the issue more forcefully than the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), telling us what we must do to solve the problems and how everything that government has done to assist the people is wrong. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition happened to be Minister of Mines and Energy in this hon. House as part of this government. And, Mr. Speaker, what did he say as it relates to the high cost of electricity on 4 April 1975? "I do not think there is much concern being raised in the general population about this," referring to the electricity rates. "I think everybody recognizes that when fuel prices have quadrupled, in some cases gone up five times for

periods of time, that a 15 per cent increase in the rate payable for electricity, Mr. Speaker, is not unreasonable in this time of rising costs."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has changed so drastically? What was the difference in a 15 per cent increase in 1975 and a 15 per cent increase in 1985? The only difference, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman who made the statement is now on the other side of the House and is playing politics with the people of this Province. The hon. member referred, Mr. Speaker, to the Public Utilities Board. Yet the same gentleman, now leader of the Liberal Party, in response to a question on the Public Utilities Board said, 'I will not undertake to investigate the matter. To do so would be a shocking interference with the responsibilities of the Public Utilities Board. We have set up, Mr. Speaker, an independent Public Utilities Board that handles matters such as the Newfoundland Light and Power contract and it would be a shocking interference with the operation of such a board to engage in the exercise that the hon. member suggested."

MR. YOUNG:
Who said that?

MR. TOBIN:
Who said that? The now Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) who was then a member here. Now I say to the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) that it is time to get on and look after the interests of the people who have high electricity rates in this Province and not to be playing politics. The dollars and cents that these people have to pay for the high cost of electricity is far more important to these people than for

you, Sir, or the Leader of the Opposition, to stand up in this House and to use the high cost of electricity for political purposes. There it is, stated by your leader. Do you condone that or do you not? The leader stated it, Mr. Barry, who was Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. LUSH:
He was not leader then.

MR. TOBIN:
So what has changed? Mr. Speaker, the electrical rates in this Province today are far too high for the ordinary man and woman to pay, I say.

MR. LUSH:
Support it.

MR. TOBIN:
I am supporting your petition. But I am also saying to you, Sir, that what the the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said in 1975 is entirely the opposite of what you are saying today. And the people of this Province will not tolerate being used and abused politically by you or the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition, not for political purposes but because I believe that the people of this Province are facing a very serious problem.

Thank you.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to support the petition

presented by the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). Listening to statements from across the House I can understand why we have the problems with electricity rates that we have today. It seem that every time somebody stands up in this House to talk about the problem, they get sidetracked after about two seconds by trying to either insult somebody, or get their name in the news media.

While this is going on, Mr. Speaker, we have people in communities in all our district who are literally starving. I have only been in the House a short time and I am somewhat confused and somewhat amazed by how lightly we take this problem. The hon. minister gives us a long-term solution, but while we have that long-term solution, we have people sitting down to the breakfast table, taking dishes out of their cupboards, and putting promises on them to eat because of their electricity bills.

For example, we have senior citizens who are receiving an income of about \$500 a month, and while they receive that income of \$500 a month, their electric bill is somewhere around \$250 or \$300 a month which leaves them approximately \$200 to buy food, clothes, or the essentials of life.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not true.

MR. EFFORD:

That is a fact. If that is not a fact, you must have a higher senior citizens incomes than we know of, because your income as a senior citizen is exactly around \$500 a month, and your light bill is definitely \$250 to \$300 a month. If that is not a fact, I

wish you would show me why those people out there are not eating the proper food.

You will recall that just a short time ago it was stated in some of the magazines that there was a point in time when it was noted that senior citizens in large cities and towns were eating dog food. Is that what we want our senior citizens to come to? If this problem with high electricity rates continues, this is what our senior citizens and our people on social assistance are going to have to go to, because right now they either pay their light bills, and do not eat, or they eat and freeze to death.

Just recently I received telephone calls from some people in my constituency, one family in particular, a man, a woman, and two children, one of which was five years old. On \$500 a month they could not eat and be warm, so they chose to eat. When they chose to eat, the Newfoundland Light and Power cut their lights. The family called the district social services offices and were told their bill would not be paid. So with all these problems, instead of a long-term solution, I think the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) should take a very serious look at what is happening and try to do something about those people. And this problem is becoming more serious every day.

Another thing I am quite surprised by is that we have a Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell)., This must certainly come under his jurisdiction, and all the while I have sat in this House I have not heard one statement from this gentleman about putting a proposal before his colleagues to come up

with an answer for helping these people.

DR. COLLINS:

What answer do you have?

MR. EFFORD:

You have heard my answer. Help the people.

MR. J. CARTER:

In other words, give out more welfare and raise taxes.

MR. EFFORD:

You people should create some jobs. That is what we listened to all during the election and since, that you are creating jobs.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

I would ask the hon. member opposite to be quiet while I am speaking. He will have time to speak afterwards, and when he does, I hope he makes more sense than he did in his last few statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not here trying to play politics.

MR. J. CARTER:

What are you trying to do?

MR. EFFORD:

I am elected, I do not have to play politics now. I take the people in my district very seriously. I ask the hon. member, is he satisfied to see senior citizens hungry?

DR. COLLINS:

No.

MR. TULK:

Yes you are.

DR. COLLINS:

You are playing politics with it.

MR. TULK:

We have offered you solutions.

DR. COLLINS:

What is your solution? And I am not playing politics with it.

MR. TULK:

We have offered solutions and you will not take them.

DR. COLLINS:

You want us to lash out more welfare.

MR. TULK:

We have already said it. Be quiet.

MR. EFFORD:

It is unbelievable the way these people carry on when we have such a serious problem in this Province. What we are talking about is the problem caused by high electricity rates, and not to earn a name for an individual. If you want to get into the limelight, go outside and talk to the reporters, give some statements out there.

Mr. Speaker, the problem in my district is the same as that all over the Island. We have people, as I said earlier, who are in very, very serious trouble because of the high electricity rates. I am asking if ministers opposite, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell), the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), whoever is supposed to be in charge of this problem, to take this problem very seriously and come up and immediate solution to help low income people, while

they are waiting for the long-term solution.

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

The hon. member has spoken for five minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
Leave is not granted.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of eighty-three people in the community of Monkstown in the District of Burin - Placentia West. The prayer of the petition is, "The enclosed petition is to make the House aware, or you aware, of the issues which are very important to the people of Monkstown and which need immediate attention. We are very concerned about the deplorable conditions and lack of maintenance work on the Monkstown highway. We are asking that this road be upgraded as quickly as possible. We feel that money should be set aside in the upcoming budget for this purpose. We also request that consideration be given to the possibility of asphalt being laid throughout our community."

Mr. Speaker, there is a long story and a long history, I guess, to the Monkstown road. I wish the Leader of the Opposition (Mr.

Barry) was in his seat right now, because while I have to expose him for the comments he made when he was Minister of Energy, I would also like to say, for the record of this House, that the road going to Monkstown was started through the efforts of my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, when he was the member for Burin - Placentia West. Mr. Speaker, I will give the hon. member full marks for that.

MR. TULK:
The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) was Minister of Transportation then.

MR. TOBIN:
No, he was not minister at that time. He was minister when it was finished.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that it was through the efforts of the gentleman who represented Burin - Placentia West, now Leader of the Opposition, that that road was started, and, in fairness, I give him full marks. At the same time, I would like to say that he was fair when he campaigned with me in 1982 in the district of Burin - Placentia West, because he told the people then, when he left Burin - Placentia West, that he felt strongly that it was through my efforts as a friend of Monkstown, not as a politician, and my ongoing correspondence to the various ministers that the road to Monkstown was completed. So he was fair to me and I will certainly be fair to him.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Yes, sure.

MR. J. CARTER:
Shut up while he is speaking.

MR. TOBIN:

However, Mr. Speaker, the prayer of that petition, I think, basically states the problem that the people in Monkstown are experiencing. The road, in the first instance I believe, was built somewhat under the Forest Road Access programmes. In the initial construction stages, the road is very narrow and, obviously, because of the condition of the road when the frost leaves the ground, which is now about to happen and is happening, the road becomes impassible. In the Wintertime, Mr. Speaker, when we get some extensive drifting and the snowfalls on the South Coast, particularly, on the Burin Peninsula Highway and the Monkstown Highway, there is a problem there with the road clearing programme as well. However, this past Winter the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) issued instructions, I believe, to his officials and certainly to the contractors that the plough in the Wintertime is supposed to be stationed in Monkstown and available to come out at all times.

However, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter remains and that is that there is a very desperate need for road improvements on the Monkstown Highway and in the community of Monkstown. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), my good friend and colleague, has visited Monkstown on several occasions, have driven over the highway and is certainly aware of the problems.

However, I would ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, as the prayer of the petition does, that he would do everything possible to see that there is a maintenance upgrading programme carried out on the road

this year. There are a whole lot of reasons why, Mr. Speaker. The coastal boat services, that used to once visit that community, was downgraded, Mr. Speaker, during the past couple of years -

MR. TULK:

You wouldn't happen to know why that was done, would you?

MR. TOBIN:

- by the way, when your colleague for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) was the member for Burin-St. George's, as well as the downgrading of the Monkstown operation in other places. So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), whose district the Department of Transportation has been so good to and whose workmanship in the great district of Burin - Placentia West, particularly Marystown has been given improved ferry services.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

In spite of the member, Mr. Speaker, there will be improved ferry services given to the Fogo people.

However, I believe my time is just about up, Mr. Speaker, and I lay this petition upon the table of the House with my support and ask the minister to do what is possible to see that the road is improved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented so ably by my colleague, the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). On a number of occasions now the member and I have travelled through his district to look at the road conditions and other transportation-associated problems in his district. As I have travelled around this whole Province with various members and looked at the transportation problems, I think, Mr. Speaker, I have said it before, and it deserves saying again, we have more kilometers of road per capita in this Province than any other province in Canada. With the very small population that we have and a very large geography, a very difficult terrain in which to build roads over, we have an extra strain on the financial resources of this Province. We still have 3,800 kilometers of unpaved or gravel road surfaces of varying conditions right throughout the Province. I can certainly appreciate the concerns expressed by the people who signed that petition about the conditions of the road in their particular area.

It is not unlike road conditions in other parts of the Province, but certainly their road deserves continued and improved upgrading. I am sure that over the next number of weeks the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and myself will be getting together. We will be reviewing this situation again, and certainly we will be addressing, as best we can, the concerns expressed in the petition by the people from Monkstown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support that petition. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I will support the petitions from all hon. members whose district residents are requesting that their roads be upgraded and paved. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more distressing, there is not more disconcerting, as we go into the Twenty-First Century to find out that we have so many roads not paved. And important roads, Mr. Speaker, very important roads, leading to fish plants and farms and this kind of thing where it is absolutely necessary, in terms of putting a good product to market, that we have good roads.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is important that everybody have good roads. It is important that all our residents be provided with the best transportation facilities possible. But certainly it is more important when we have roads that lead to places of industry like fish plants, farms and this kind of thing. And I see the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I think he knows to what I refer. We have so many industries in Newfoundland farms and fish plants and this kind of thing that have to drive their produce over the worst kinds of roads.

MR. TULK:

Primary producers.

MR. LUSH:

I do not believe that that is a criteria that the government uses to pave roads. But we will watch,

Mr. Speaker, I am watching, and I hope the hon. member when I rise in my place to present petitions from Cape Freels and from Greenspond that the hon. member will get up and support them as I am doing with his petition today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
And again, Greenspond, an area with a fish plant, an area that requires and needs a paved road. They have a causeway now they need a paved road.

MR. DAWE:
I will look at that again this year.

MR. LUSH:
The hon. member knows all about what has been done in the area. So, Mr. Speaker, we will be looking for pavement, certainly in an immediate upgrading, so that we can ship that fish out of there in A-1 condition. And the way the roads are now we cannot do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the hon. member for upgrading and paving of the road, as I will support the petitions of all other hon. members and I hope that members over there will also support petitions, not only support them and give them lip service, Mr. Speaker, but support them sincerely.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What is the name of the road?

MR. LUSH:
Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER:
What is the name of the road?

MR. LUSH:

Monkstown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:
Hon. members do not have to remind this hon. member what he is talking about, I can tell you that, Mr. Speaker. They do not have to remind him. I have demonstrated that in the election, Mr. Speaker. I have demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, that I can win in more than one district. I am a dangerous man. I can win in more than one district, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
I can demonstrate that even with the heaviest of the heavyweights, with a lot of money put against me, I can still win, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, sincerely I support the petition from the residents of Monkstown and I hope that this government's policy has changed. I saw the minister rise immediately in his place to support the petition and I hope that is not a reflection of the philosophy that he articulated just some months ago about the criteria by which he used to pave roads. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to drop that, I am willing to believe that the minister got his knuckles sufficient rapped for that that he will never say it again nor will he use that particular criteria as a policy by which he paves roads.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition wholeheartedly and hope that people get what they are looking for in this fiscal year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of eighty-four constituents, 90 per cent of whom are residents of the general Bellevue area. This petition, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the shutdown of Bellevue Beach Park for the Victoria Day weekend. Mr. Speaker, I do not know who prepared the prayer of this petition but it is unique, whoever prepared it, man or woman. It says:

"To the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth: We, the concerned visitors, residents and constituents of the electoral district of Bellevue, do respectfully submit this, our petition, for your support in having the Bellevue Beach Provincial Park declared official opened to campers, outdoor enthusiasts, tourists and local residents in time for the annual May 24 weekend." - then the prayer goes on - "In support of this, our petition, we site the following:

"Number one, WHEREAS Bellevue Beach Provincial Park has become a traditional meeting place for many Newfoundlanders to begin another Summer of weekends in our great outdoors; and

"WHEREAS the proximity of the park to our capital city has established it as a favourite campsite for many city dwellers; and

"WHEREAS the park's location, natural beauty, excellent campsites and natural outdoor

appeal has continued to rate the park high on the list of favourite places to visit by tourists; and

"WHEREAS both patrons and local residents anxiously await the opening of the park; and

"WHEREAS the opening of the park provides not only the recreational facilities for the aforementioned patrons but a very vital and necessary stimulus to the small grocery stores, the confectionery and variety stores and other businesses in the areas, we, the undersigned, strongly request that the minister take the appropriate steps necessary to ensure that the Bellevue Beach Provincial Park be declared officially opened for visitors in time for the traditional May 24 weekend and thereby ensure the continuance of the role of this park in a great Newfoundland tradition."

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a petition but it is also like a resolution and I think the people who prepared that did an excellent job in giving the reasons why Bellevue Beach Provincial Park should be opened, as it always has been, on the Victoria Day weekend rather than opening towards the latter part of June.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the information that I have in front of me is correct, across the Province there are forty-two provincial parks, parks that were built during the Liberal administration of former Premier J. R. Smallwood, and of these forty-two, Mr. Speaker, eighteen will not be opening on Victoria Day weekend and only fourteen will, so there will be more closed than opened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in some parts of

the Province, we are all aware, on the West Coast, for example, and perhaps on the Northern Peninsula, there are parks which even today have huge banks of snow in them and all that sort of thing, but the park that these people here are referring to, Mr. Speaker, is on the isthmus of the Avalon Peninsula. Bellevue Beach is the park and it is the community after which the district of Bellevue takes its name, Bellevue, beautiful site, that is the French version of Bellevue, Mr. Speaker, and that is why these campers want to go there every year. So, Mr. Speaker, not only will the park itself lose revenue because there will not be any overnight fees and visitation fees collected on the May 24 weekend, but there are people in the local area of Bellevue, for example, who own businesses, grocery stores, there are people who sell mussels - and they are in abundance at Bellevue Beach - and there are people who sell lobsters and these people will be adversely affected as well, Mr. Speaker. Now, the minister when he speaks will probably say we are trying to save some money, but I have talked to the Director of Provincial Parks, Mr. Hustins, and he tells me that there will be staff there. So if there is going to be staff there, why are these staff members not being put to work on that weekend to collect \$500 or \$600 or \$700 in fees which, of course, will offset their salaries? I cannot find rhyme or reason why this park will not be opened on the Victoria Day weekend but the minister will obviously give a good reason when he speaks in support of this petition.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. minister, I would like to welcome to the gallery ninety pupils from New Harbour, Trinity Bay, with their teachers, Mr. Boyd Badcock and Mr. George Brown.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I welcome the opportunity to respond to the petition presented by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). There are just a few facts that I would like to pass on to members of the House pertaining to the opening of parks this year. The decision of reopening was made before my appointment, before I assumed responsibility for provincial parks in the Province, but the reasoning behind the selection of certain parks throughout the Province to open was that we are trying to make parks available in different areas of the Province so that people can access the parks without having to drive too long a distance. Of course, we are also doing it for another reason. We have looked at the statistics over the past number of years and we have looked at parks that have not been utilized to a very great extent on the long weekend in May, and Bellevue Beach Park is one of those. The park that has been designated in that area for

utilization by campers is Jack's Pond. And Jack's Pond Park, I would say, has double the occupancy rate of Bellevue Beach. So that, in itself, is one reason why that particular location was selected. But also, of course, Jack's Pond is not an unreasonable driving distance from the people of the Bellevue area. That, in essence, is the reasoning behind the selection of parks. We are trying to make parks available to as many people as possible without having them drive great distances.

Of course, the other thing is we are trying to better utilize the staff members of the parks because, as we all know, particularly on the Victoria Day weekend, the beginning of the park season, and the Labour Day weekend, we do have a fair degree of problems in parks with regard to rowdyism, etc. So we are trying to better utilize the park staff and have the parks that are open better staffed so that they will be more efficient for campers. Also, of course, we are hoping to cut down on some of the problems that we have had. So that, basically, is the reason.

The Bellevue Beach Park in 1984 was very little used and I think there were approximately 80 permits sold for the full weekend, so that was approximately 27 permits issued per night. That was very, very low compared to the other parks in the Province that have been more heavily utilized. That, in essence, is why we have done it. We are trying to make the parks a little more efficient. In the parks we are opening, we are hoping to have better staff control, in conjunction and co-ordination with the RCMP, in case we do have problems.

I would just like to inform the hon. member that is the reasoning for why it has been done. The decision was made regarding parks that were to be open before my appointment. I have reviewed and re-evaluated the situation, and I have found the reasons put forward by the staff of the Parks Division is good reasoning, good logic, and I concur with their decisions.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here on the same topic really. Now, the one I presented just a few moments ago, a petition with eighty-four signatures, came from the residents of the area who are concerned.

This petition, Mr. Speaker, contains forty-five signatures, all of residents of St. John's and the immediate area, Paradise, for example. But again, 90 per cent of the signatures on this petition are from the city of St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of this petition simply says: "We, the undersigned, wish to protest the closure of Bellevue Beach Provincial Park for the Victoria Day weekend." Now, Mr. Speaker, I have talked personally with some of the people whose signatures appear here, they have called me. The Premier, earlier, was talking about the letters and the 'phone calls that he gets from Bellevue district, and I am not surprised. I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker. The way that this Premier has treated the district of Bellevue over the years, closed down the Markland hospital, is planning to

close Come By Chance hospital, promised to have the refinery open in 90 days - and that is 600 days ago - now, to downgrade a provincial park and not have it open on the 24th of May weekend, Mr. Speaker, is unforgivable! The Premier is getting nasty letters and nasty 'phone calls from the district of Bellevue because of the way he has treated the people.

Mr. Speaker, not only these forty-five people whose signatures appear here, but also many, many, many of the people whose signatures appeared on the previous petition, are all friends of the Premier. So, here they are, saying to the Premier, 'What are you trying to do?'

The minister, in his response just now, said, 'Well, we have opened Jack's Pond.' I mean, it is like saying to the minister: 'I know you planned to go to Catalina for the weekend, but instead of going to Catalina, we would like for you to go to Gambo instead.' These people have been going to Bellevue Beach park for ten years. Not only do some of them, Mr. Speaker, go to the same park year in and year out, but they probably, in most instances, try to get the same campsite year in and year out. I have known that to be so. When I was a university student back in the 1960s, Mr. Speaker, I worked in Bellevue Beach Park as a student and I know what the park is like. It is a beautiful park. The minister says that last year on the 24th of May weekend there were twenty-seven permits, so that was twenty-seven families.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I said eighty - twenty-seven per day.

MR. CALLAN:

That is right. Mr. Speaker, you do not need to be much of a mathematician to figure out that the government is giving up money by not allowing these people to go to camp. They are not going to Jack's Pond, that is why they are asking the minister in this petition: 'Please open up Bellevue Beach Park so that we can go and do the things that we have done for the last ten or a dozen years. We can go out and set up our trailers and we can go out then to Bellevue and get a feed of mussels or lobster and we can do the things that we enjoyed. We can go down to Chance Cove and get a codfish, bring it back to our campsites and cook it up. These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker. The minister says, 'Well, you know, they can go on down to Jack's Pond.' But they are not in the habit of going to Jack's Pond, they want to go to this particular park.

The minister, Mr. Speaker, I hope will pay attention as he looks at the signatures on this petition and the other one. He will find out that some of these people are friends of the Premier and friends of this government. And I did not ask them for the petition. I did not initiate this petition. This petition was spontaneous from the people in the area and the people from the city who have been going out to that park for years and years and years. They want the minister to change his mind. I know the minister has changed his mind with regard to some other parks. The list that I have in front of me of parks that are going to be open and parks that will not be open is not the list that existed two weeks ago. I can tell the minister, and he knows it, that some parks that were on the non-open list have now been

put on the open list. I hope the minister, in his wisdom, can do the same thing for Bellevue Beach park.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the second petition. There are just a few points more I would like to make regarding the opening of parks and the non-opening of others. The number of parks that are being opened do have an adequate number of campsites to take care of the anticipated number of campers who will be going out into the parks for the Victoria Day weekend. So there is no shortage of campsites available. Also, on the Avalon Peninsula there will be five parks opened - Butterpot, Gushue's Pond, Backside Pond, Fitzgerald's Pond and LeManche - and, of course, out in the hon. member's district - there is Jack's Pond. So I do not think that anyone can rightfully say that there is not enough park space or campsites available to take care of those who wish to go out and camp.

With regards to his earlier statement about business men and groceries and what not, we have done some research into this and we find - and I think, if we all reflect on our own experiences when we go to the countryside whether it be to a provincial park or elsewhere - that, for the most

part, we all purchase our supplies or groceries or whatever else we carry locally and we transport them to the parks. We do not buy in the park. Most of us do that. I think the hon. gentleman would admit it. Perhaps he never goes camping or has never been out in the countryside, I do not know, that is fine, I understand if he has not.

The other thing that we have to consider is economics and the hon. gentleman mentioned that when he presented his first petition. What is happening is we have opened parks for the Victoria Day weekend in years gone by and then until school closing the parks have been very poorly utilized. We have had staff there from May 15 or May 17 and we have kept them there until June 20, until the schools close, and consequently we have lost money. There was not enough money taken in through the parks to pay for staff.

MR. CALLAN:

What about Bellevue?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Would the hon. gentleman allow me the courtesy to answer his question and to respond to the petition? I did not interrupt him so I would appreciate the same courtesy. There are some staff right now, yes, presently employed in Bellevue Beach as there are in most of the parks within the Province, but there is not enough staff employed at Bellevue Beach to adequately supervise and carry out the functions that would be required if the park was open for campers. There are some there doing very necessary maintenance work that has to be done to get

the park ready for the opening the middle of June. That is the reason for that. If we were to open the park for the long weekend we would have to double the number of staff members in the park which would, of course, increase our costs and we would not, contrary to what the hon. member believes, take in enough money to offset the cost of salaries.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to speak in support of both of these petitions concerning the Bellevue Beach Provincial Park. I know that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) has, perhaps, more requests and more people after him than any other five ministers across the way, Mr. Speaker. I know that this is just one of many things that are on his desk. I wish him well in what he is doing. However, I would like to add some suggestions, Mr. Speaker, concerning the Bellevue Beach Park and so others and maybe the minister could pay attention to and listen to and heed some of these suggestions that I might come up with during the next couple of minutes.

First of all, I understand that there is a limited number of parks opened on the May 24 weekend and I understand, from the minister's answer, that the reason is that even if these parks were full on the May 24 weekend, there is a problem with financing between then and school ending sometime towards the end of June.

In Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, we have to put up with many inconveniences and one of them is the weather. We do not have the best weather in the world. During that time of year I know that the weather is not absolutely ideal for camping. However, the ministry and the provincial government in the past has carried out experiments with opening parks and keeping some parks opened all Winter even for Winter use. I would like to suggest to the minister in this connection that perhaps he consider, Sir, that all of this parks in our Province, that people love to take advantage of, be kept opened from May 24 weekend on and that during the slow period from May 24 weekend to the end of June, perhaps some programmes can be developed in conjunction with the Department of Education and in conjunction with some other ministries, so that these parks can be put to some use during that time. I am thinking in terms of having people on staff and, during that time, using the parks as an experience for the school children of our Province. Bring them out to parks and arrange programmes so that the young people of our Province can experience the parks in an organized and controlled manner. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a tremendous use to put the parks to from the May 24 weekend on. I think that it would be an invaluable experience for the young people of our Province. So this is, perhaps, one way in which the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth and the Department of Education and some others can sort of dovetail their activities. This would provide what people of the Province want. The want on the May 24 weekend to be able to go out, regardless of the weather, if there is five feet

of snow, they still want to go out in the parks because that is the official beginning of the Summer and that is the way they would like to have it. That would mean all parks open from that point on and the problem of non-usage from then to the end of the school year could be taken care of in this educational manner.

I would like to leave that with the minister. Maybe it is something that he can look into.

Concerning this particular park, Mr. Speaker, Bellevue Beach Provincial Park is a kind of provincial institution. I can remember thirty or more years ago, and I am not from that area, but I know people who have been going there for so long and that is why I appreciate the fact that so many people would sign their names to this petition saying, 'Yes, we would like the Bellevue Beach Park opened.' Even though it is not in my district, Mr. Speaker, I understand their sentiment and that is why I stand in support of these two petitions.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Motion 1.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have received a message from his Hon. The Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER:
This message is to the hon. the Minister of Finance. 'I, the Administrator of the Province of

Newfoundland, transmits estimates of sums required for the public service of the Province for the year ending 31 day of March, 1986, by way of interim supply. And in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act, 1867, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly. Signed A.S. Mifflin, Administrator.'

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the message, together with a resolution be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

It is moved and seconded that the message, together with the resolution be referred to the Committee of 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 (Greening):

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman, we are now, of course, in Committee to consider the Interim Supply Bill which the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) obviously will be explaining and piloting. Just so that hon. members are clear, the procedure here is governed by Standing Order 117, I believe, whereby, under the various headings the Government minister initiating the debate has fifteen minutes, the Opposition representative replying fifteen minutes, then everybody else has

ten minutes. That is what the procedure is and also, of course, the hours are subtracted from the total number of seventy-five on the Supply Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order!

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee is debating the resolution and then we can in Committee go into the bill itself and the schedule of the bill. Perhaps I could just read the resolution first: Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in legislation of the session convened as follows "That is is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting of Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1986, the sum of six hundred and forty-eight million, nine hundred and nineteen thousand, five hundred dollars (\$648,919,500)." Then there is a bill which is Bill 17, which is a very brief bill, and then attached to the bill is the schedule which lays out under Heads of Expenditure, that is under really essentially Departments of Government, the various amounts that are required for this period, and those added up together come to that amount, of just about \$650 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Interim Supply Bill is something that is necessary, I suppose, every year. Strictly speaking, I suppose, if we introduced the main estimates and the budget before the end of the old fiscal year, and then the House actually passed the main

estimates and the budget before the end of the fiscal year, a very highly unlikely situation, as you know, we would not need an Interim Supply Bill. But because it is just not practical to introduce the main estimates and budget til towards the end of the fiscal year or perhaps even into the beginning of the new fiscal year, government's authority to dispend money has run out by the time the main estimates and the budget can be processed by the House. In other words, government would have to come to a halt until the main estimates were passed by this, by this hon. House. Obviously that cannot happen. So to have government continue to function when the legislative authority has run out, pursuant to the previous budget, to allow government still to function until the new budget is approved, we need this Interim Supply Bill.

As I mentioned in Statements this morning, usually the Interim Supply Bill itself is brought in before the end of fiscal year, it is accepted by the Committee, and subsequently by the House, and then we can issue special warrants on the basis of that until the main estimates come down. In this year, as it has happened in previous years, when there is an election on, it was not possible to get an Interim Supply Bill introduced and passed before the end of the fiscal year because the House is dissolved. But there is in the Financial Administration Act a provision or a dodge or a way out, whichever you want to call it, you know, it is quite a legitimate provision which says that if the authority is not there to spend public monies on the basis of permission of this hon. House, and the Comptroller General objects, if government does want

to spend such money for the good of the people and for the operation of the public service. If the Comptroller General objects to that, Treasury Board can consider his objections, and even though there is no legislative authority to spend, Treasury Board can overrule the objections, if, in their opinion, it is absolutely necessary for the conduct of public affairs that this should be done, Treasury Board can overrule the Comptroller General's objections, permit government to spend public monies, provided the House, within a certain period of time, is informed of all of this and provided the amounts that are so spent are included in the Interim Supply Bill.

So this Interim Supply Bill includes three things. It includes the amounts of those special warrants that Treasury Board permitted over the objections of the Comptroller General, and which was quite legitimately done within provisions of the Financial Administration Act. It includes that. It includes other amounts that we estimate are going to be required before the main estimates come down, and that total period will be for approximately one-quarter of the financial year, a three month period.

The third thing it includes - and it is my duty to inform the House about this because, normally speaking, the Interim Supply bill has to do with, shall we say, ongoing ordinary expenditures of government prior to the main estimates coming down. But again, the Financial Administration Act permits government to include in the Interim Supply bill an amount for capital expenditures, that is, other than ordinary, ongoing

operating expenditures. It permits us to include certain necessary capital expenditures, provided the House is informed of this in some detail.

I now, so, inform the House that this bill does include new capital accounts projects totalling \$43,705,000. And the cash flow for these projects are broken down as follows, and they are for projects expected to be tendered and awarded up to the end of June of this year:

For Roads and Bridge Rehabilitation, \$12,800,000; for Improvement and Construction of Roads, \$21,955,000; for Bridges and Causeways, \$1,150,000; for Forest Resource Roads, \$2,200,000 - that is under agreement with the federal agency, DRIE, therefore, it is a 90/10 expenditure. We have to put the total amount in, although, in actual fact, as a provincial administration, we are only responsible for the funding of 10 per cent of it, but the total amount has to go in, nevertheless, - Fifthly, airstrips - and this is 100 per cent federally funded but, nevertheless, it still has to go in our estimates - \$4,600,000; and finally, a number of energy conservation projects, mainly related to Public Works and so on, \$1 million. Those amounts I have read out add up to \$43,705,000.

So, that is what the Interim Supply bill is. It covers the special warrants that had to be issued so that government could still operate, even though the House had dissolved and could not give its legislative authority for those expenditures. Secondly, it includes the amounts over and above those that we need until the main estimates come down, and

cover a three-month period. And thirdly, it covers these new capital expenditures which we are permitted to include under the Financial Administration Act and which are necessary to include, otherwise, these construction projects and so on would be unduly delayed. We have a short construction season in this Province and, if we had to await the final approval of the budget, whenever it will be, - sometime in June or perhaps even July or whatever - if we had to await that point in time before we began to put in place our Summer construction programme, obviously, this would be a very short construction year and, just one aspect of it, the employment benefits flowing out of that construction programme, would be much diminished and, of course, also obviously, the benefits from the constructions themselves to the people of this Province would be diminished. So that is why it was necessary to put in these capital projects.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I move the motion and that a bill be subsequently presented on the basis of motion.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:
Yes, Mr. Chairman, the problem that we have with assisting the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in giving speedy approval to this bill is that we still do not know what the minister and his administration spent last year. We still do not have the final figures as to what the deficit on

operating and capital account was for this past year.

Now, we think that, before receiving approval of the amount sought on Interim Supply, the minister should inform this House and the Province as to where the books of the Province were cut off on March 31, 1985. What was the state of the Province's finances at that point? How much of a deficit had we run up on operating account? And what was the final deficit on capital account? What was the total deficit of the Province? How much did we spend more than we took in last year? We would be interested in getting that figure, and if we can get it, I am sure that matters will move a lot more quickly than if we do not get it.

I would also like the minister to indicate the extent to which he has received information from the Government of Canada with respect to the contents of their budget coming down on May 23rd, in order to properly prepare the provincial budget.

Each year for the past several years, we have seen the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) being further and further out in his projections as to how much money the Province was going to spend and what the final deficit was going to be and how much the Province was going to take in, and what the final deficit was going to be. We saw, I think, three or four changes in the minister's figures in the past year and close to the same number the year before that. It is getting so that the Budget Speech is becoming a meaningless document almost. Because we all know that within a couple of months, the minister is going to come into this House, if

it is open, or else is going to stand up in a press conference, and say to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, 'Oops, sorry! I goofed again!'

DR. COLLINS:

Sure, there is nothing new about that.

MR. BARRY:

No, there is nothing new about the minister goofing, absolutely not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY:

The minister will get up and say, 'Oops, I did it again! My figures are all wrong and the deficit is much greater than I predicted.'

Now, would the minister tell us whether his third revision or fourth revision of last year's figures were accurate? What is the final figure with respect to the operating deficit and the deficit on capital account? It is like a shell game trying to find out at the beginning of each year how much government intends to spend. And the excuse that is being used by the minister from time to time is, 'Oh, the information provided by the Government of Canada was incorrect.' Well, how is it that the minister can bring down a budget at all before the budget of the Government of Canada is brought down?

DR. COLLINS:

Do you not know what a budget is?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, it is a projection, Mr. Chairman, but it is supposed to be a projection based upon reliable information, not based on rumour and hearsay and gossip, which

seems to be the essence of the factual data on which the minister has been basing his projections in past years. Why is it that we have to see the budget rewritten four or five times? Are we going to go through the same thing again this year? Will the minister tell us that? Is his Budget Speech next Thursday going to be worth our while showing up for? Should anybody pay any attention? Does it mean anything?

Mr. Chairman, we also see the minister come in and say, 'Well, you know, the reason I have to go for Interim Supply is because the election was called and we could not bring down a budget.' The minister should have had a budget ready and the Premier should have had it tabled when he went into the election, if he decided to call the election in any event. Those figures should have been out before the people of the Province so that they could see just what was going to happen to them.

Now, I am told by the media that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has indicated there will not be a tax increase, that he has confirmed that he is going to live up to the Premier's commitment not to increase taxes in this budget. Would the minister confirm that in this House? Is the minister going to give that commitment today, that there will not be a tax increase? And while the minister refers to that, would he assure us also that he will not bring in any of this sly, sneaky, hidden tax increases, such as the ones brought in over the past several years, by cutting back the grants to municipalities, forcing the municipalities to do government's dirty work? Are we having any of those hidden tax increases in the upcoming budget?

Mr. Chairman, I think we should also listen to the minister tell us whether he is prepared to look seriously at the suggestion, in this upcoming budget, that SSA be removed from the fuel adjustment charge. It is really rubbing salt in the wound for an individual to pick up the light bill and see the high fuel adjustment charge and then see, at the bottom of that, having to pay another 12 per cent. Mr. Chairman, that really puts the devil into people and you have to ask whether it would not be a fine gesture. There should always be a few little goodies. Even at the worst of times, even when he is socking it to the poor taxpayer, the minister always throws out the occasional little goody. Well, we suggest the minister take a hard look at a goody in this budget, i.e. removing the retail sales tax, the RST from the fuel adjustment charge.

The minister has given us some figures on the amounts that are going to be spent on roads, and the amounts that will be expended as a result of the pretending. Would the minister indicate whether the Province got as much as it expected to get under the roads agreement? My understanding is that the Province was looking for something over five years and in excess of \$400 million.

MR. DAWE:
\$470 million.

MR. BARRY:
\$470 million. Now, we saw a great hullabaloo about the \$180 million that is going to be spent at the rate of - what? - about \$35 million a year.

MR. DAWE:
Compared to the (inaudible) we had

under the previous government, (inaudible) more requested.

MR. BARRY:
Maybe it was the provincial Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and not the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who did this, but I have it on reliable authority, Mr. Chairman, that the Road Builders Association of this Province was informed during or just before the election, by members of this administration, that there was going to be something around \$75 million available for road work this year, and the equivalent amount over subsequent years, and that, in fact, road builders had gone out and bought new equipment, have planned their business activities in the expectation that they would have in the area of \$75 million. Now, if we are going to have less than half of what these road builders are expecting, Mr. Chairman, you know what is going to happen: we are going to see bankruptcies and insolvencies as a result.

MR. WINDSOR:
That is a very irresponsible statement. Anybody can stand up and make statements, but you have to back them up. Do not be so irresponsible.

MR. BARRY:
The putative leadership candidate from Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) is interjecting, is speaking out of turn. Well, let us have these members get us and state whether or not the commitment was not given to the Road Builders Association. Those contractors know. Let us find out whether or not it is true that the Road Builders Association was told that there would be \$75 million available for contracts this

year. And let us have members get up and tell us how healthy the road building industry is going to be if they are only going to have 50 per cent of what they were told by government to expect, and on which they planned their business.

MR. DAWE:

Nonsense. That is not true.

MR. BARRY:

Well, we will be interested in having the provincial Minister of Transportation get up and confirm that it is not true. Let him stand in his place and say that and then we will have to bring in some further information and we will see who is saying what is true and who is not saying what is true. I will be very interested in getting the response of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and I will be interested in getting the response of the Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, we have a lot of information that we will need to obtain from various departments of government in the course of going through this Interim Supply. It is a large sum that is being sought. We know that at times Interim Supply is necessary, but we question whether it is necessary to have as large an amount sought for the present time in light of the fact we are having the budget come down on Thursday. However, I will be interested in hearing the Minister of Finance respond to these few remarks first.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

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

MR. BARRY:

We are going to get it all now.

MR. J. CARTER:

No, I think it is time that one got up and made a concrete and appropriate remark on this Interim Supply. I have some concrete suggestions to make.

MR. BARRY:

It must be coming straight from the member's head if it is concrete.

MR. PATTERSON:

Who is your speech writer?

MR. J. CARTER:

I think we might as well settle for the record, now that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is there sitting in his place, and the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is contributing to the debate, I would like to hazard a guess that if it were not for the member for Placentia, who is here now, the actual author of the Leader of the Opposition's speech might well be reading it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Pick that one apart.

MR. J. CARTER:

I am particularly pleased that the Leader of the Opposition is in his place, because I would like him, when he gets up to speak again, and I understand the format is that he will be jumping up and down like a jack-in-the-box, which is fair enough, that is the way the Interim Supply is debated, to either confirm or deny the remarks, I think very irresponsible remarks, made by a member of his group, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), when he said in this House a couple of days ago that the Holyrood refinery had been

known to burn off oil to make room for more oil in their tanks because they had a take-or-pay contract with the supplier of oil. In other words, they had to either take it or pay for it, and if they did not have room in their tanks, they had to burn off the oil. Now this very irresponsible statement, which has been completely denied by Hydro, and denied by the Newfoundland Light and Power, and denied by every responsible person who has anything to do with it, I would like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), who was the Minister of Energy, and who is in a position to know all about these things, to either confirm or deny what the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) said. And if the member for Windsor-Buchans did say it and refuses to retract it then I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to disassociate himself from those remarks. And I think, for the record, that is, yes, and as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) says, followed up by washing out his mouth.

This is an ideal opportunity to put the questions directly to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). I would like him to assure this House that when the Estimates Committees are formed, I do not think, it is not usual for the Leader of the Opposition to attend the Estimates Committees hearings. These are the hearings held either in this House of Assembly or down in the Colonial Buildings or sometimes in one of the board rooms in Confederation Building. They are quite informal and, I think, each group of committees allows fifteen hours to be taken off the estimates debates. But every year, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr.

Barry) is as guilty as any former Leaders of the Opposition, the charges are made that not enough time is left for debates. Now that is not so because although only fifteen hours are allowed off the time for debating the budget in the House, nevertheless, the amount of time that is available to these Estimates Committees has been as high as thirty-two hours in my recollection, and can be, theoretically, as high as forty-five hours. With the agreement of the House, it could be even more. So I would like the Leader of the Opposition to assure us that he will not be making foolish charges that not enough time was left to debate the estimates either in Committee or in this House. I would like that assurance from him. I would like for him to tell us who wrote his speech. I would like him to disassociate himself from the remarks of the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). I would like him to assure this House that he will co-operate or get minions, his henchmen, to co-operate in the debates in the Estimates Committees.

And I would like him, at the same time, when he gets up, to tell us what is the estimate of the Opposition phone bills because I understand that this is something that is entirely out of control. A great many of the Opposition are members from outside of town and they have been running up horrendous phone bills. And if he wants to make a concrete effort to economize and to save some money he might look very carefully into that. So I am looking forward eagerly to his answers to these questions and I hope they are sensible.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

While the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is researching the weighty questions from the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) I will say a few words to keep this Interim Supply debate on the go.

It seems to me that every time you hear the members opposite get up to talk about anything in this House they refer back to history. What happened in the previous Liberal administration or what happened in 1955.

MR. TOBIN:

That is not part of history, that is a nightmare.

MR. GILBERT:

Well, it might be a nightmare to you because you keep referring to it. Why do you not get some dreams for the future. That is what you should be doing instead of going back into the past. The very name of your party is progressive but obviously it is not, it is regressive, if anything. You cannot think progressively. All you think about is stuff that happened in the previous administration. You have asked for a mandate three times in the last six years and you have it but what you talking about? You are talking about stuff that went on when someone built a hydro development. You sit back and set up committees to study great and wonderful things but we very seldom hear anything back from those committees. There was one set up some years ago now, I think the hon. the Minister of

Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), was appointed the Chairman of that committee. It was a committee to study one industry towns and to report back as to what was going to happen when they closed up, as in the case of Bell Island which was gone. They had a mine there which took the resource, they worked for years on it and then it closed up. Now in Buchans is a more current one and, in two months time, 100 per cent of the residents of Buchans are going to be unemployed. In Baie Verte we have a situation where the life of that mine is maybe another ten years. And in Grand Falls we have a situation where you have a paper mill where the machines in those mills, one was put in in 1924 and the other one in 1932. We hear now that there was a great federal/provincial agreement signed in October of last year to provide \$32 million to upgrade the most modern machine, a machine that was put in there in 1966. It was referred to as something that was going to create employment but, again, it is a farce, there is no employment. It is going to be done internally by the present labour force of that mill, and yet we hear this in the House. The hon. Premier said this morning it was going to create employment in that area but it is not, there is no employment going to be created. We have to look at the one industry towns and wonder what we can do to improve the way of life for the people and not have another situation like we almost had in Corner Brook last year when Bowater had used that mill for fifty years, ran down the equipment, and did not put any money back into it. Then all of a sudden we find that they move out and the government then, in a panic situation, had to move in. Fortunately, they got Kruger to

come in and take it over. This government can stand up and criticize what went on before, but they have a situation, and a very real one. And we have a situation in Milltown-St. Alban's area in this Province where we have the one industry, that is a one industry town, the industry happens to be renewable continually, it is a hydro plant and it produces 42 per cent of the hydro for the Province of Newfoundland. And I might add the cheapest hydro that the Province of Newfoundland is able to get. We do not hear much criticism of that agreement, but the people who live in Bay d'Espoir are not reaping any benefits from that. The people that live in the other places that I have mentioned, in Baie Verte, Corner Brook and Grand Falls, get at least a grant from the people who operate the industry right now. There is no provision made in Baie Verte, I do not think, for what is going to happen when they leave or when that mine is mined out, but that should be looked into. Right now we have a live situation in Baie Verte where 42 per cent of the hydro, this hydro that we all talk about, is costing the people of Newfoundland so much dollars. People are not able to eat, as we have heard. They have got to pay their hydro bills and they are starved.

In Bay d'Espoir we have 80 per cent of the people living below the poverty line, living on salaries \$6,000 and \$7,000 a year. Sitting home with nothing to do, they would love to have jobs. They have not got them and yet the children of those communities are not guaranteed the same lifestyle as they could have if they were living in one of the other communities in Newfoundland

where there are swimming pools, skating rinks and stuff like that. It is just not there. Yet, we have an industry there that takes \$110 million out and puts nothing back. This problem has been addressed to government and it has very callously been said, 'Well you better not do anything about it. We are not going to do anything about it.' But we have an unemployment situation there that is just horrible for people to have to live in conditions they are living in. We have basically 100 per cent of the young people in that area unemployed and yet we have this industry that is providing 42 per cent of the hydro for Newfoundland and nothing has been put back, they are not paying any taxes into the area, they are not paying any grants and this government over the last three or four years have reduced the municipal grants, putting the burden onto the taxpayers in that area. I have had people come along to me in that area that are getting ten weeks work, they will have forty-two weeks sitting home getting \$220 every two weeks. Those people were taxed for school tax, town taxes and every other tax and it has to come out of this ten weeks that they are getting. Yet the municipalities are barely able to provide basic service because the tax base is not there to be able to provide any services. But we have this industry that provides \$110 million worth of revenue for Newfoundland Hydro every year.

They take more in revenue out of Bay d'Espoir than it cost to build it. It was \$90 million to build and every year \$110 million comes out. The thing that I am saying is that we have to look at situations like that and those problems must be addressed.

Instead of going back and wondering why the Smallwood government built Churchill Falls, there are some of us who think he built it to create jobs for Newfoundlanders, for the same reason he built Bay d'Espoir, to create jobs for Newfoundlanders. He built them for jobs but all this government does is says is, 'He made a mistake.' There is not much point in debating that now but this is the thing we hear from over there.

I must say the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) when he got up the other day was talking about unemployment. He had one good solid suggestion that I am prepared to agree with. He talked about the terrible service we are getting from the CN ferry. Something should be done. If it was upgraded we would possibly get better service.

It has always been and always will be the policy of the Liberal government to consider the CN ferry from Sidney to Port aux Basques an extension of the Trans Canada highway and people should not have to pay to come here. Then we could possibly improve our tourist industry. The other thing that happened, while we are talking about our friends in CN and our friends in Ottawa, is they cut back the CN service and only for the intervention of the members on this side it would have been cut back. The hon. Mr. Price felt that he was not getting cooperation from the government, was not getting the support he needed from the government in Newfoundland. It is this slavish attitude that the government have developed. They said 'if our masters in Ottawa say we must do it then we must do it' without even questioning. Only for the

Opposition that ferry service would have been cut out to Hermitage, English Harbour West and those places. We are saying that it is done without thinking. All that has to be done is if the federal government says okay, fine we will agree with it. They have a carte blanche to go ahead and do what they like. Last year this time they would have been biting and howling screams of indignation for anything that Ottawa was doing. All of sudden because it is a Tory government in Ottawa everything they do is right. This seems to me to be a sad situation that we have ourselves into. You get the CN ferry again, only for the representation made by the members here there would be nothing done about it.

You can go on and on with this historic stuff. You can talk about what happened in 1950 or what happened in 1965 but, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am asking you now not to worry about what happened in the past and let us take the future, that great mandate they asked for they have it now, and let us put Newfoundlanders back to work.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, possibly at this stage I should respond to a few of the things that have been said or asked about just so they will not pile up and perhaps one would forget. I will do it in reverse order. I will respond to the points made by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) first.

In money bills the Committee and the House does allow quite a wide range in the debate and I think that is a good idea. I just mentioned that because many of the points the hon. member brought up really had nothing to do with the Interim Supply Bill, he ranged over a wide area but he is permitted to do under our traditions of debate in the House and I am going to respond to him even though my responses are not going to be tightly confined to the Interim Supply Bill.

The first thing the hon. member said was that the administration is too concerned about what happened in the past. Now I think we have to reject that out of hand if only on this basis: It is the old aphorism, if you do not learn from your history you are condemned to repeat it all over again. Now there were grievous mistakes made in the past as to how the public administration was carried on in this Province, in particular, in terms of industrial development. Now if we do not recognize those and we do not remember them and we do not put them into our present plans and if we do not recall them to mind frequently, we are going to do the same things all over again. I do not think this Province can just stand it. We made so many mistakes during that terrible - I will not say the whole twenty-three years - during a long portion of that long interregnum of the Smallwood regime. We made so many grievous mistakes in industrial development if we do not have those in the front of our minds the whole time we may slip into doing the same things all over again and if we do, we are lost. They were so bad, they were so insupportable that we just cannot afford to repeat them. The

hon. member mentioned that Churchill Falls was a good idea because it was done for jobs, and I think it was. I think it was done for jobs. I think it was up there and people thought up how many truck driving jobs can we get out of this? How many labouring jobs can we get out of this? How many carpenter's jobs can we get out of this? And that was the sum total of everything that went into the conceptualization of it. Now, if we did the same thing offshore - if we said, now, how many jobs can we get immediately in terms of the offshore? - sure, we would have had an agreement a couple of years ago, but we knew that that was not the way to go at a major resource. You do not throw away your major resource for short-term benefits, for interim benefits, for very transient benefits. You do not take 1 per cent of what comes out of a great resource and let other people take 99 per cent. I mean, that is a foolish way to go. That is the way the Smallwood administration era went and we remember that all the time. There is a great object lesson to it. In a way, I suppose, we should be grateful to Mr. Smallwood because he threw up these lessons that we are learning from, have learned from and will continue to learn from and we will always remember them. So we have to reject the first point the hon. member brought forward.

Now, the other thing he brought forward was that down in Bay d'Espoir there is a very valuable installation there and he is saying that the local area should get special benefits from it. On the surface of it, you know, that does not seem to be a bad argument to make, but I think it is a fallacious argument. Firstly, the individuals in Bay d'Espoir did

not own that resource. They lived in close proximity to it or at least closer proximity than those in other parts of the Province, but they did not own that resource any more than the people near Cat Arm own the resource that the Cat Arm project is based on, i.e., the waterfall and so on and so forth. I mean, if we did what the hon. member was suggesting we would have a patchwork quilt around this Province. That would mean just because, shall we say, St. John's happens to have all the major administrative arms of government here that all the benefits that come from that should flow to St. John's, that this government should not be very concerned, as it is every day of the week, to try to distribute all these benefits throughout the Province to the greatest extent possible. It is not always easy. Take, say, the Newfoundland Dockyard. The Newfoundland Dockyard is a provincial resource. Clearly a lot of the benefit comes to this local area, but this government attempts the whole time to find a provincial role for that resource and, to the extent we can, we distribute it around. And if we do not do that, if we say that any development in a local area has to be confined to that area, we are going to get into tremendous troubles in this Province. If you think there is disparity now from one part of the Province to the other, we ain't seen anything yet if we go that route. So we have to reject that concept.

We also have to reject it on another basis. The hon. member brought forward this comparison when he said that if you have a mill in a community, the community gets some grants from that mill; therefore, why cannot Hydro give grants to the people in Bay

d'Espoir? It would be nice if they could but the two are not similar. The mill has to be serviced by the community. The roads have to be cleared around it, garbage has to be collected and so on and so forth. There are costs to the community for having that mill there, that paper mill or whatever it might be, and these grants are to compensate for those costs to the community. Perhaps in some cases they more than compensate, perhaps there is a little bit of extra return to the community but, by and large, one, more or less, offsets the other.

Now, there is no specific costs to the communities in the Bay d'Espoir area in terms of the Hydro installation there so the argument cannot be made that way. And even if it could, where would the grants to the communities come from? They would have to come from Hydro. Where does hydro get its inflow? It gets it partly from the people who buy the electrical product that Hydro puts out, but partly it gets it from the provincial government. As the hon. member has mentioned many times and people very often forget, we are already subsidizing the electrical users in this Province to a handsome tune. If we followed the hon. member's arguments, what he is asking is that we subsidize them even more so. We would love to subsidize even more so but we just do not have the bucks. That is the bottom line of it. We are subsidizing the electrical users in this Province to the extent we can at this point in time and if we ask Hydro to give grants on some basis - I suppose you would have to try to find a logical basis for it - to these communities down in the Bay d'Espoir area, they would have to

come back to us and say, 'Fine, give us a bigger subsidy', and we just do not have a bigger subsidy to give them.

Now, I will just very briefly touch on the point that the hon. gentleman stated that we do not make our case to the federal government because there is a PC administration in there. We make our case, I can assure you. We make it in a different way, but we make our case. If the hon. member thinks that the Department of Transportation is a pushover for his counterpart in the federal government, he has another thing coming. If he thinks that the member for Grand Falls, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is a pushover, he has another think coming; or the member for Pleasantville, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), he has another think coming. In my own case, I can tell you that I put forward our case very vigorously to my counterpart in the federal government and, as a matter of fact, that was what I was doing yesterday. So we make our case. We feel that we can get some understanding of our case and some response to our case which we did not find under previous conditions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, getting back to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), who brought up a number of points. He wanted us to give, at this point in time, the revised accounts for last year before he would have the Interim Supply Bill going through. In other words, he wants the Budget Speech today. Well, you know, that just is not possible. Our budget presentation in this House traditionally has been a review of the accounts of last year and a comparison of what

actually turned out in terms of what was projected at the beginning of the year. They have never been the same. They have never been the same right from the existence of this Province. Never have the estimates included in the budget at the beginning of the year been the same as the revised accounts at the end of the year. They never have been the same, there have always been discrepancies. There have been discrepancies in every other government budget brought forward since the beginning of time, for the very simple reason that what goes in originally are projections. We do not have crystal balls, we do not know exactly how things are going to turn out, so that at the end of the year it is our duty to tell the people who put us here what was the difference, so they can understand why the projection was off. But we never say the projection will never be off. I am going to bring down, on behalf of the government, a budget next week. The projections I am going to make in that budget are incorrect. I want it to be understood that the projections in that will not reflect completely reality in 1985 - 1986. It is impossible. There is absolutely no way I can do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. minister's time has elapsed..

DR. COLLINS:

I will get back to other points later on.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to spend a few minutes talking to this particular bill. I notice that under the Heads of Expenditure there are a number of items that interest me. The first one that I took particular notice of was the Transportation heading because, Mr. Chairman, I have some confusions with regard to Transportation expenditure. I am certain that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can straighten me out.

First of all, there is a section of road in the Province that is obviously the worst part of the Trans-Canada Highway for the whole Province and has been in bad need of redoing for a number of years. I refer to the section of road that goes between Glenwood and Gander.

MR. W. CARTER:

Not that again!

MR. BAKER:

That again. That particular section of the road has been repaired, patched, patches upon patches, and patches upon patches upon patches, and nothing very serious has been done with the situation.

Now, three years ago, in 1982, there was a federal/provincial highways agreement signed, a primary agreement, and we have heard this referred to here today in this debate. Under that agreement there were two schedules that were involved, Schedule A and Schedule B, and the allocation of moneys went through some changes. I understand from civil servants that that particular section of road between Glenwood and Gander

was under Schedule A and then, when it reached the Cabinet level, it was eventually put back under Schedule B. And, as it later came out, the comment from the government was there was not enough money in the agreement. We have heard this today, the fact that there was not enough money in that 1982 roads agreement. It got shoved back in Schedule B; however, three years ago the people of the area were told that that road would be done. And, Mr. Chairman, three years later, the road is still not done. And we all know what happened to about 70 per cent of that particular highway expenditure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are up to 1985 and, once again, the people in that area have been told that that particular road will be done. And there is this tremendous roads agreement coming that now has more money than we know what to do with, has oodles, stacks, piles of money in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

In the last while, Mr. Chairman, I have seen some indication of that. For instance, six weeks ago, almost to the day, there was a big announcement made. The big announcement was that there was a \$180 million roads agreement that was signed between the Province and Ottawa. It was signed, Mr. Chairman. The people of Newfoundland were told it was signed. The headlines in one of the papers said that the roads agreement has been signed. And I was really happy about this.

We are told today by the Premier that there is another \$180 million roads agreement going to be signed

in a few days. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is \$360 million in this tremendous, stupendous roads agreement that is being signed with Ottawa. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman - and maybe the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can elucidate for me - when are there going to be some more announcements made of another \$180 million signing between the federal and provincial governments? It seems to me that these stacks of money are coming. As a matter of fact, the figure that I have heard quoted, which has been told to me, is that there was supposed to be \$480 million in the roads agreement. As a matter of fact, in talking to some members of the Road Builders' Association - and this has been referred to previously, as well, Mr. Chairman - their problem was going to be to keep the roads expenditure down below \$100 million a year so we would not have to bring firms in from Nova Scotia to go and build our roads. This was their big concern. This concern was stimulated by conversations obviously they must have had with government, or with representatives of government or something, about all of this money that was going to be spent on roads. I would like to know where is this money? Furthermore, I would like to know what is going to happen this Summer. If in fact we are so absolutely sure of all of this money, if six weeks ago there was \$180 million that was signed off between Ottawa and the Province, and there is another \$180 million coming in a few days, then what are the priorities? Why have we not been told the priorities of this particular roads expenditure? Why cannot the people who have been promised some of this expenditure be told, yes, you are in year one or year two or

year three, or you are going to be part of the next election campaign promises in years four and five? Why cannot they be told that? Why cannot their minds be set at ease, Mr. Chairman?

I would also like to know where the impressions came from that there was such a huge expenditure of roads money that we would have to be worried about there being enough local contractors to carry out the work? I think it has already been mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that people have made expenditures of money based on the fact that there was going to be a surplus of work during this present Summer. And we have seen very little indication that, in fact, there is going to be road work done this Summer. The time is dragging on and pretty soon, if this situation is not handled shortly, we will be into the situation where we will have people laying asphalt when the snow is falling in November. Mr. Chairman, we want to avoid that entirely. Anyway, the heading of Transportation was very interesting to me for that reason, and not only for that reason, there were some other reasons as well.

But there are some other headings there, Mr. Chairman, that interest me. I notice that under Head of Expenditure there is an amount - let me see if I can find it here now, it is so small, Mr. Chairman, that I have difficulty finding it - of \$1,086,700 for Environment. I think that this is some kind of an indication of the stress that this particular administration puts on such an important matter as environment. There are some pressing environmental problems around this Province right now and they will come out in the weeks

ahead. But I am sure there should be some of this expenditure to handle some of the problems. The immediate one that I can think of, Mr. Chairman, is the boat that went down in Notre Dame Bay containing hundreds of gallons of oil and that oil is beginning to leak out. I am not so sure, Mr. Chairman, that anything is being done about it.

MR. TULK:

What is it going to do to the fishery down there?

MR. BAKER:

Here we have one of the best fishing grounds around for the inshore fishery, and here we have all of this oil slowly, gradually leaking from this particular ship, that I understand is in medium depth water, a couple of hundred feet, I believe, is the depth that this ship is in right now. And we have no indication that, in fact, this situation is even being monitored, being looked at. We have no indication that there are plans to handle the eventuality if this oil starts to come up, when the water starts to turn over and move due to the heating.

MR. TULK:

There is no point in monitoring when it is on the surface.

MR. BAKER:

There should be some contingency plans, some environmental plans to handle this kind of situation. Mr. Chairman, we are told that we are on the threshold of an era of the oil boom and so on. And, obviously, because the government plans things well, they must have plans to handle these kinds of situations where there is a leakage of oil. After all, that has been the big concern. And when I look at 1/600 or 1/700 of

this particular amount being allocated to environment, I wonder what the plans of this government are with respect to the expenditure of money on environment?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to make a few remarks. I have over the past number of years had several bits of correspondence and some conversation with the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) about the allocation of financing for roads. Of course, it seems that the member for Gander is the only person in the Province who does not understand the process. But I understand where he gets his source of information, so it is logical that he would be as confused with the information that he receives as the person is who gives him the information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

But it appears, Mr. Chairman, that again he continues to be misguided and I do not really know after all of the correspondence and the information that has gone back and forth, if there is any way of

making him understand. You would think that the only piece of bad road ever on the Trans-Canada Highway is in his particular riding.

MR. BAKER:

It certainly is not in yours.

MR. DAWE:

And in reality, Mr. Chairman, the Trans-Canada Highway, particularly in Western Newfoundland, was for a number of years by far the worst in the way it had deteriorated, partly because of an administration - and I do want to get into too much history - which thought it more important to finish the job poorly in a specified time than to finish it well in a more extended period of time, and left with those of us who reside in the Western part of the Province, which is also the gateway for transport traffic into Central and Eastern Newfoundland, a very, very poor standard of road. So it was necessary, Mr. Chairman, to try and allocate the kind of funding necessary to bring that road network up to a standard that would be acceptable and, in so doing, that particular section of road now represents a standard that we are going to try and come back across the system and improve in all parts of the Province.

There have been two Trans-Canada Highway agreements signed over the past seven or eight years. The Province of Newfoundland went to the federal government and asked for a ten year highway's agreement dealing with the Trans-Canada Highway. The Liberal administration in power said, no, what we will do is provide you with a three year agreement and at the end of that three year agreement we will try and negotiate for another phase or

another three year agreement. Well, what happens in such circumstances to a road, Mr. Chairman, as to any kind of a physical structure, is that it deteriorates. You can plan ahead and envisage what the deterioration will be down the road, but there are always circumstances which crop up, or time goes by and the immediate priorities have to change. Well, that first three year agreement expired and we did not and were not successful with the former Liberal administration in signing a continuing phase of the Trans-Canada Highway agreement, so there was a one year gap when nothing was done. We then negotiated a very small TCH agreement of some \$48 million, again over a three year period, that really addressed emergency concerns. Some of them, from the first proposals that had been put forward two years ahead, had changed considerably. There has to be, in the management committee, from Transport Canada and the Department of Transportation, the kind of flexibility in any roads programme to address concerns that change because of time and circumstances. This is an ongoing process that the officials do from time to time and come forward to the provincial minister and the federal minister with their recommendations as to how they perceive changes should come about. This is an ongoing process and has occurred in all agreements, and I would assume will continue to occur in the agreements that we are entering into now. So the area now that the member refers to, as it relates to the Trans-Canada Highway at the present time, is by far most in need of upgrading at the present time because of the kind of topography and heaving in

the road and so on. There is no question about that. I would only like to point out that that has not always been the case and there have been many other parts of the Trans-Canada Highway in the Province that have been in much worse condition than the one the member speaks about, even at that time. It is now the worst, but even in its present condition it is not as bad as some other areas were three, four, or five years ago. So that will be addressed. You cannot lay everything out before the officials have finalized their arrangements to see what they are doing with regard to tendering, the kind of scheduling and construction time phase they are dealing with, so it is necessary to spread some projects out over a period of time. You cannot just put a large amount of money into one project because the construction may not allow that to be done. There is reconstruction to be done in one phase and in another phase maybe resurfacing and so on. It is necessary to spread that out over two or three years in some cases, not in all cases but in some, so this is the reason projects go on over an extended period of time.

But, Mr. Chairman, it would be very remiss of me if I did not point out again, as I have in dialogue back and forth, that the present roads agreement that we have arranged with the federal government is the largest single agreement that we have ever been able to negotiate with the federal administration in Ottawa, and I think that is very significant. What we will see happen over the next four, five and six years to the Trans-Canada Highway will be very significant, not only in terms of the amount of expenditure but in terms of the quality and

improvements from a safety factor, from a load factor, from general transportation considerations both for commercial and personal travel. It will be a very significant contribution.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have put forward and we did put forward some two years ago, a proposal to the federal government in three areas basically. One dealt with the Trans-Labrador road network which was started two years ago; a second phase dealt with the Trans-Canada Highway; the third phase dealt with the secondary roads programme that was previously administered under the Department of DREE. So it is a three-phase ground transportation system we have been dealing with the federal government on. The total package was some \$470 million that we would like to see signed. This was indicated to the previous administration in dialogue with them. We even asked for a year's extension so we could get into some detail, which was continuously refused, which would have meant that this year we should have seen a very large Trans-Canada highway programme. Had we been able to negotiate that programme with the former Liberal administration, the kinds of problems associated with the short construction season that the member talks about could have been addressed, because we had a programme of early tendering based on cost-shared agreements. It was done in consultation with the construction industry and the road builders in meetings that I have annually and periodically. Individuals in the Road Builders Association are fully aware, and have been fully aware, of our position with regard to the expenditure of money, basically where it would be spent and how it

would be spent in general terms. We have tried to carry on that kind of dialogue with the road builders, not apparent in former years, whereby they hit the peaks and valleys of the construction industry and so went through the kind of scenario that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) referred to of getting themselves in financial difficulties based on assumptions. We have tried through dialogue with that group to eliminate that kind of speculation with regard to very large or very minor expenditures and we have been successful. So I take exception to remarks that in some way either the Department of Transportation, officials of my department or government somehow indicated to the Road Builders Association that they were going to get something that has not come off. They have been fully informed of our position, of our approach and of our expectations and perhaps some of the hopes that we had, but certainly in no way were there any definite indications about any aspect of this. As a matter of fact, it was by way of saying to them, 'Look, we do not have an agreement in place now. If we do not get an agreement in place we are going to be in some problem with regard to the road construction business in this Province.' That is what we have been saying to them. We have been very careful and very cooperative and in dialogue that I have had with them, they have been very appreciative of the way in which we have handled that association with the Road Builders Association. So I take exception with the fact that somehow they have been misled. That is entirely untrue. As a matter of fact, the dialogue that we have had with them, collectively through their association in

annual meetings and representations, through briefs that they have presented to us, and individually as well with people who have spoken to us, has been anything but an attempt to mislead. As a matter of fact, it has been just the opposite, designed to keep them fully informed of the approaches that we were making.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. the minister's time has elapsed.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Chairman, with leave from hon. members there opposite I will certainly answer the question that was raised about the sunken paper carrier by the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker).

Mr. Chairman, the hon. the member for Gander raised a question about the sunken paper carrier Manolis L. in Notre Dame Bay. We have no evidence at this time that there is any seepage or leakage from that tanker. The Canadian Coast Guard, under whose jurisdiction and purview it comes, are now monitoring the situation on a daily basis with aerial flights. There was some leakage from that boat but it is felt by the authorities, the Coast Guard and the officials of the Department of Environment, that that leakage came about as a result of the sinking incident itself.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

I wonder would the hon. gentleman answer a question on that spill because it is pretty important to my district. Let me ask the hon. gentleman to reply to this. I understand that monitoring is going on, I understand all of that. In case of a spill, which can happen very suddenly when water warms up, would the minister tell us where the Coast Guard is or his department is in regards to cleaning up a spill, should it happen, so that it does not quickly spread? It is down there, and when the water warms up it can come up if there is leakage, and it is a rough coast.

MR. BUTT:

I am quite prepared to answer the hon. member's question and I appreciate his concern for the environment and the fishermen in the area. I was about to come to that by way of answering the hon. member from Gander's (Mr. Baker) question.

It is under surveillance almost on a daily basis from aerial view and also from fishermen in the area. There is one big problem that we have right now and that problem is that there is ice in Notre Dame Bay. The Department of the Environment, my department, and the Coast Guard are monitoring the situation as it exists and cannot do anything substantial at this time because of the ice. As soon as the ice moves out, and perhaps it will by June, the Coast Guard will be sending down divers at that time to do further on-site surveillance. If there is oil

seepage from the tanker and it surfaces and it is visible, we cannot do very much while the ice is in the bay. Hon. members will be aware of that. But as soon as the ice goes out, the Coast Guard is quite prepared to take whatever steps are necessary to safeguard the environment and that very fragile marine environment there in Notre Dame Bay.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

Why do you not just pump it up and be done with it?

MR. BUTT:

Well, I want to inform the hon. the member for Fogo that we cannot go down through the ice right now.

MR. TULK:

No, but once the ice is gone, you know. I mean, I am serious about this matter.

MR. BUTT:

Yes. Every possible method will be looked at just as soon as the weather improves and the ice is gone, the divers will be going in and, with the expertise that they have now, I suppose, they are quite capable of doing almost anything in a marine environment. We will leave no stone unturned.

MR. TULK:

To get the oil out.

MR. BUTT:

It is a burning issue with the Department of Environment and senior officials in my department are working on a daily basis, in close co-operation with the Canadian Coastguard.

MR. TULK:

Are you going to push to get that oil pumped out as soon as the ice is gone?

MR. BUTT:

We will do whatever is necessary and we will leave no stone unturned.

MR. TULK:

Okay, thank you very much.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Could I ask the hon. the minister a question? Again, it concerns my district.

Fishermen in my riding tell me that, in fact, there is a seepage and they have the proof of it on the bottoms of their boats. They tell me if you travel that area in a boat, when you come in, you have to wash it with some kind of a solution to get the oil off. So, obviously, there is a seepage from the tank.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that at this moment, sitting like a time bomb almost, on what is probably one of the most prolific fishing areas in the North Atlantic certainly, insofar as the inshore fishery in Newfoundland is concerned, there is 500 tons of bunker C fuel, ready to break loose. I am not sure that something could not have been done before because, while there is probably ice covering the area now, that has not been the case all Winter.

MR. TULK:

All Winter it was frozen.

MR. W. CARTER:

Frozen, but quite accessible.

The question I wanted to ask, Mr. Chairman: The vessel that is sitting on the bottom, in which this 500 gallons of fuel is now resting, is owned by a company. Can the minister tell me if there have been any discussions with the owners or with the insurance company involved? In the event a spill does occur - and I know it is hypothetical and the minister might not want to answer because of that - but if a spill does occur, if that 500 gallons of bunker C breaks loose, it will ruin the fisheries in the area and will cause damage to fishing gear, nets, and boats. What, if any, compensation can the people expect to get and from where will it come? Will the company who owns the vessel accept responsibility for it, or will the government?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is a hypothetical question.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is hypothetical, yes, but there is a very real danger it could happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Well, I appreciate the hon. member's concerns, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is - and I will point it out once again, because obviously, the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was not listening when I said it - there was a slight trace of oil on the water in that area, but we believe, from the evidence we have, that that oil originated during the actual sinking itself, and since that paper carrier sank,

there has been no seepage from the ship. There is no seepage from it.

As for what action will be taken as a result of this sinking, that is under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Coastguard. It is in the federal domain, because it is at sea. I am quite certain that the Canadian Coastguard, Mr. Chairman, will take whatever steps that are necessary to rectify the situation and it will be done in great haste, just as soon as the environment lends itself to getting down to where the boat is. Right now, there is ice there. This happened in January. I mean, Notre Dame Bay in January, as hon. members are aware, is a pretty hostile environment. So every effort will be made in June or thereabouts, I would say, to do whatever is necessary to correct the situation. But the fact of the matter is there cannot be anything done right now because the bay is full of ice. In the meantime, there is continuity there, there is aerial surveillance. We are getting good co-operation from the fishermen in the area. They are reporting in to my department and we, in turn, to the Coast Guard, while others are reporting directly to Coast Guard, almost on a daily basis, Mr. Chairman.

So the thing is well in hand. Every possible thing that could be done, has been done, and everything that we can do, will be done once the ice is out of the bay.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TULK:

Sir, let me make a couple of points to the minister. It is almost one o'clock. Perhaps we can clear up the issue before one o'clock. Let me make a couple of points to him. First of all, as my friend for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) said that area this year, as the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) well knows, was covered not with Arctic ice, not with moving ice, it was covered with stable frozen ice. The Minister of Transportation knows all about it, it cost his department a lot of money. That could have been taken care of.

The other thing that I noted in the minister's answer in reply to the question to the member for Twillingate, is that he suddenly said it is a federal jurisdiction. Now I want the minister to assure the House that he will not let it slide by in that way, that if something happens out there that he will not slough it off by saying that it is a federal jurisdiction, that he will push that federal jurisdiction to see that the job is done. I believe he will, but I wanted to reaffirm that.

And the other thing is the matter of compensation raised by the member for Twillingate. Would he answer that question that was put to him?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Chairman, I indicated to all hon. members who have raised a question. I said every possible avenue will be explored. We will leave no stone unturned. We are very sensitive to these matters. We realize there is a sunken

carrier out there in a very fragile marine environment, and my department, the Department of Environment, in co-operation with the Canadian Coast Guard who have been very co-operative with us up to this point in time, and will continue, I am sure, will do every possible thing that can be done to ensure that the environment is protected, and that people who reap a living from the sea in that area, that their interests are protected. I mean I have said this now four times, I do not think it is necessary to comment on it any further. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, there is an item in the estimates that we are now discussing having to do with the minister's department. I am saying this now, Mr. Chairman, and I am not questioning the minister's sincerity, but he has been given a snow job by his federal counterpart.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You will have to prove that.

MR. W. CARTER:

I do not have to prove anything. The proof is there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Where?

MR. W. CARTER:

On the bottom of the boats that fish in the area. The fact of the matter is that oil could have been removed during the Winter. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that

if that situation existed today in any other part of Canada - the Bay of Fundy or any river in Canada - it would not be tolerated. And I am saying to the minister that he should get on the phone this afternoon to his federal counterpart and tell him to get that oil removed. It is a very serious matter. You have an area where fishermen in my district, Fogo and other areas fish, while under the surface there is 500 gallons of Bunker C fuel that could break loose any minute, any hour of the day. I am not prepared to accept the minister's response that the federal people are doing everything they can, because they are not. Everything is not being done, Mr. Chairman. And I suggest that he get on the phone this afternoon and make sure it is.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to it referred and has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on Interim Supply reports that it has considered the matters to it referred, and has directed him 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 President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House so that the hon. gentleman there opposite will know the Order of Business on Monday, it will be Interim Supply. I would anticipate that Interim Supply should take about ten minutes to pass. Then we will get on with the Public Service Bill, and the Labour Bill with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard).

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 P.M.

On motion, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 P.M.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

May 10, 1985

REPLY

- 1) Sessional Pay - \$23,022
- 2) Cabinet Pay - \$30,160
- 3) Pay for Executive Assistants to Ministers and Opposition Leader - There are nine (9) steps in the classification. The salary ranges from \$30,061 to \$36,540
- 4) Committee Pay - The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee receives \$3,000 per annum; the Vice-Chairman - \$2,500 per annum; Members - \$2,000 per annum. When Select Committees meet while the House is in a period of adjournment, pursuant to Standing Orders, the Chairman receives an amount of \$75 per meeting and Members \$50 per meeting to a maximum per fiscal year of \$3,000 for the Chairman and \$2,000 for each member. Ministers and those receiving salaries equivalent to Ministers are exempt.
- 5) District Allowance - There are six categories, for which the allowance ranges from \$11,511 for Categories 1 and 2 to \$15,511 for Category 6; (Schedule attached)
- 6) Per Diem - \$59.40 An average year would be approximately 80 sitting days.
- 7) Pay for House positions -
 - Speaker - \$30,160
 - Deputy Speaker - \$10,000
 - Deputy Chairman of Committees - \$5,000
 - Government House Leader - Nil
 - Opposition House Leader - \$15,000
 - Leader of the Opposition - \$30,160
 - Whips (Government & Opposition) - \$3,090
- 8) Other remuneration - Members representing out-of-town districts are reimbursed for 12 trips a year to their districts; Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier - \$15,000
Parliamentary Secretaries - \$12,500

Mr. Vardy
A.G.
R.J.J.
File

SCHEDULE

(i)

Category 1:

St. John's East
St. John's West
St. John's Centre
St. John's North
St. John's South
Pleasantville
Mount Pearl
Kilbride
Waterford/Kenmount
Mount Scio
St. John's East Extern
Conception Bay South

(ii) Category 2:

Harbour Main
Port de Grave
Harbour Grace
Ferryland
Carbonear

(iii) Category 3:

Trinity/Bay de Verde
Placentia
Bellevue
Gander
Grand Falls
Stephenville
Humber East
Humber West

(iv) Category 4:

St. Mary's/The Capes
Burin/Placentia West
Grand Bank
Trinity North
Bonavista South
Terra Nova
Bonavista North
Fogo
Lewisporte
Twillingate
Windsor/Buchans
Exploits
Green Bay
St. George's
Port au Port
Humber Valley
Bay of Islands

(v) Category 5:

Fortune/Hermitage
Burgeo/Bay d'Espoir
LaPoile
St. Barbe
Baie Verte/White Bay
Strait of Belle Isle
Menihek
Naskaupi

(vi)

Category 6:

Eagle River
Torngat Mountains

Order-in-Council 719-'83 is hereby rescinded.

D.A. Vandy

Clerk of the Executive Council.