



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 11

---

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

***Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas***

Friday

11 April 1986

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, today I would like to detail for the House some exciting new initiatives being undertaken by my department in the area of product research and development. The main thrust of those initiatives are in the areas of secondary processing and by-product utilization, two areas where development has been slow in the past. In an effort to spur development in those areas, the mandate of the processing division of the Department of Fisheries has been expanded to promote further processing of fish.

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, this will achieve two primary purposes: First, it will utilize species and fish waste that are presently discarded, and second, it will result in the further processing of some primary-produced fish products. This would mean improved employment levels in the industry, increased economic return through value-added production, and a possible extension of the operating season for some plants.

Given these major objectives, Mr. Speaker, the following programme

strategies have been set: (1) To identify opportunities and solicit the involvement of companies with existing capabilities to develop specific products to commercial levels; (2) To provide incentive grants in support of private sector research, development and innovation; (3) To co-ordinate departmental research with other research and training institutions together with the private sector; (4) To co-ordinate the development of programme resources in conjunction with other related federal and provincial programmes; and (5) To provide technical assistance and information on the various aspects of secondary processing to the industry.

This new programme, Mr. Speaker, has three major components designed to achieve these objectives: The first major component is product research and development. In this area, some projects have been undertaken already, including:

(A) Surimi research where my department has provided the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology with a grant of \$30,000 to be used towards the purchase of a miniature surimi processing line for research and development work. Activities will be focused on the application of underutilized species and wastage in an attempt to develop new types of surimi based products on a cost competitive basis.

(B) Salt fish by-products and consumer packs: My department has provided the Canadian Saltfish Corporation with a grant of \$30,000 to assist with research and development activities related to salt fish consumer type products. Specific activities have concentrated on the

development of an institutional product pack as well as salt fish based products. The objective of the salt fish project, Mr. Speaker, is to transform low grade, finished salt fish products into acceptable consumer products.

(C) Cod-roe and cod liver: This past Winter, my department has conducted preliminary research activities in Port aux Basques on the quantity, quality and suitability of cod roe for production on a commercial basis. Some market potential for cod roe has been identified and plans are being made to expand research on cod roe to other regions of the Province during seasonal cod fisheries. Preliminary research has also been carried out on the recovery of cod liver from the Port aux Basques Winter fishery. Discussions are also being held with private interests regarding the canning of cod liver specifically for the European market. While initial problems have been identified in relation to cod liver, ongoing research is attempting to resolve these difficulties.

(D) Cod Tongues: In the area of cod tongues, Mr. Speaker, preliminary research has been carried out by my department regarding the suitability of various cod tongue removal machines. Two machines in particular show potential and arrangements have been concluded with a private concern who are currently demonstrating the commercial feasibility of the machines and who are providing my department with statistical data pertaining to its operation.

(E) Lumproe: The final area where we are doing the research is in lumproe. Some initial research

in processing has been done for the production of lumproe into consumer type products. Discussions are currently being held with private industry to further carry out and expand activities in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, the second major component of this programme consists of a Financial Incentives Programme, specifically designed to spur industry participation in secondary processing. At present, certain levels of funding can be accessed through grants provided by the National Research Council of Canada. As well, there are programmes available from a variety of government departments and agencies. However, it appears that the critical stages in secondary processing and new product development relate to the application of new technology to the plant as well as to the promotion of new product in the marketplace.

Accordingly, the Department of Fisheries is proposing to establish a new incentive programme to be administered in a two phase approach. Funding of up to \$25,000 will be provided to be directed towards initial production costs for value-added products that have already been researched and developed. Additionally, funding of up to \$25,000 will be provided for strategies directed at promotion and marketing. This financial commitment should generate increased industry participation in new product development, and has the advantage of providing up-front assistance to qualifying companies committed to this development. The programme also demonstrates governments commitment to the development of new products and the utilization

of by-products.

Mr. Speaker, the third major component of this revised programme consists of technical assistance and information services. There is a genuine need for the co-ordination of information and the provision of advice to industry on various aspects of secondary processing and product development. Departmental staff and possibly contracted expertise will be utilized for this aspect of the programme. For example, an information bank should be established pertaining to the various funding agencies and related programmes that exist. Additionally, information will be correlated on established processes and products and equipment requirements. This service would also outline procedures to be followed in each case. The information service should help eliminate unnecessary delays, and generally create a favourable environment for increased industry participation in secondary processing activities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we must recognize the fact that the fishing industry today has reached a critical and decisive stage. Fish plants can no longer depend on major increases in volumes of fish to improve their financial viability. Thus it appears that one of the more promising areas for future development centres on better and more expensive utilization of available resources. We have held extensive discussions with all areas of the industry regarding product development and by-product utilization. The result of these discussions is a consensus that identifies three major problem areas:

(1) The lack of expertise and funding to pursue product development.

(2) Product development should be linked to market demand.

(3) Lack of industry awareness regarding steps, procedures and available assistance programmes.

This programme, Mr. Speaker, that I have announced today, is a response to the problems that we have been able to identify and will not only create a favourable climate for exciting new initiatives in the industry, but is a major step towards allowing us together to better control the destiny of our most vital industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House welcome any announcement from the minister that would have the effect of diversifying the processing of fish in Newfoundland. We welcome any announcement on the part of the minister or government that will increase productivity in the plants and put dollars into the pockets of our fishermen. Obviously that is what is needed, a more diversified processing sector. I am a little disappointed that more money was not made available. The minister referred, I think in one section of his release here, to a \$25,000 grant with respect to establishing a new incentive programme in a two phase approach, \$25,000 in the

first phase and an additional \$25,000 in the second phase. I doubt very much if that is going to do very much, but certainly we will have to wait and see just exactly how effective this programme is.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the minister's reference to salt fish as well deserves some comment in that it has been said to me by people in the industry, people who have a lot of expertise in the salt fish industry, that the mandate of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation is a detriment. It does not lend itself to encouraging the production of a good quality salt fish. They say - and certainly I think this is something worth considering on the part of the minister - that the mandate is too restrictive, that they virtually have a monopoly on the production and sale of all salt fish coming out of Newfoundland. That is something, I think, that deserves to be looked at. Maybe it might well be that the terms of reference of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation will have to be amended to, maybe, make some allowance for the fact that we do have companies and people in the Province who over the years have accumulated a lot of knowledge in terms of salt fish production and marketing.

The minister, in his statement, does not make any mention of marketing. Of course we all know that marketing is probably one of the most important components of the fishing industry. It is all very well to develop new and modern harvesting techniques and processing and diversification, but if we do not have markets, then, of course, it is all for nothing. I would again strongly suggest that the minister maybe

turn his attention to the possibility of getting European markets. To me that is a market that is virtually untouched in terms of Newfoundland fish. We are inclined, maybe, to put all of our eggs in one basket, as it were, and to direct all of our fish products into the U.S. I believe about 95 per cent of all fresh frozen fish ends up on the shelves of supermarkets in the American states. Of course, we all know what happens, Mr. Speaker. That being the case, when we become too reliant on the American market the least little thing, if the price of chicken wings or minced meat drops, then the sale of fresh fish is affected. Mrs. American Housewife is a very fickle consumer, and when she shops, of course, cost is a big factor. Like I said, once the price of other commodities drop then it does have a bearing on the price that we are going to get for our fish.

I again compliment the minister and I hope he follows through with making available an information service to fishermen. Because all too often, and I have seen it and I am sure other members have had the experience having talked to fish processors in some little faraway, remote Newfoundland outport that is not at all acquainted with the various programmes of assistance and regulations, I might add, that are available and have to be complied with.

So I think the minister's promise here to open it up, as it were, and to provide information to the processing sectors is a good idea. I compliment him for having thought of it and come up with it.

Mr. Speaker, I think too his

comments about the need to diversify are well taken. I think we all know that in Newfoundland we appear in the past to put more stock or to put more emphasis on quantity rather than quality. We seem to be always trying to produce a lot of fish, but we seem to have forgotten one very important fact and that is that sometimes quantity is a lot more important, certainly in the marketplace it is more important, than the production of -

MR. RIDEOUT:  
You mean quality.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Quality I meant. Quality is much more important in the marketplace than quantity. Now with the fish being scarce in certain areas and to avoid over-exploitation again, I think we should process all we have. I would also, Mr. Speaker, suggest to the minister that he look into the yield. I do not know what he has done about this, and maybe he has looked into it. During my few years in the office now held by the minister, I was alarmed at the low yield in the fish plants. I think at that time 30-odd per cent or 35 per cent was looked upon as an average yield. In other words, for every hundred pounds of fish caught we were lucky to salvage thirty-five pounds that would be salable.

I had the privilege one time of visiting a fish plant in England owned by Bird's Eye.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:  
May I just finish one sentence?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:  
By leave.

MR. W. CARTER:  
The yield in that plant, as opposed to the Newfoundland yield which was then 35 per cent, was 62 per cent. They were utilizing everything, the cod tongues, the cod cheeks, livers and all parts. So, Mr. Speaker, I do compliment the minister on this statement, and I hope that it does have the desired effect, but again I wish that he had made more money available for some of the things mentioned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
I wish the statement that I have to make was as positive as the one that my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries just made, but regrettably it has not been so for reasons that this House will see in a moment. Mr. Speaker, before the reconvening of this House I contacted the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) concerning the complement of the Standing Committees in this House to consider the estimates because, as you know, under the Standing Orders there are seven members of each Committee. These Committees are appointed on motion of the government. But as is tradition at all times, Mr. Speaker, in any parliamentary system, the Committees usually reflect the

same numerical complement as is in the House. If we had applied that to this House we would be entitled to five members on the seven man committee and the Opposition to two. But what we have done and what we will continue to do, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of seeing the Committees operate in an effective manner, particularly with respect to enquiries into the financial administration, instead of the five and two, to which we are entitled, we have four and we have invited the Opposition to nominate three.

On April 7 I called the Opposition House Leader and I discussed the matter with him. At that particular time I said that the nominees from the Opposition should include all of the Opposition, the official Opposition and the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), I noted the fact that the member for Menihek had not been on one of these Committees last year and suggested to the official Opposition that they might like to get together in a co-operative fashion with the member and ascertain his desires and put him on a Committee.

I will table this letter both for the press, so the press can see it, as well as the House. On April 7 that same day, I received the following letter from Mr. Tulk and it reads as follows: "The MHAs nominated by the Opposition for the various Committees are as follows." I will not name their names. They are three members of the official Opposition on each Committee. "Regarding the operation of the Estimates Committees, please find enclosed a copy of correspondence from the Leader of the Opposition to the Premier dated June 14, 1985. We request your careful consideration

of the issues and points raised therein."

This point I want to draw to the House's attention, Mr. Speaker, to show the type of lack of co-operation and the lack of affect, I would say, of the Opposition itself. It says - now get this - 'During our telephone conversation of today you expressed some concern regarding the participation of Mr. Peter Fenwick, MHA for Menihek, in the Estimates Committees. Our position on that matter can be stated as follows.' Now let us note their position, Mr. Speaker. 'First, in the same manner as any other member of the Legislature, Mr. Fenwick can attend and ask any questions he wishes of the ministers concerned.' I dare say that is true, and I dare say that all members of the Opposition can as well, as well as all members of the government. So that does not answer anything.

'Secondly' - now get this for consummate, arrogant nonsense - 'If you have an overwhelming desire to have Mr. Fenwick officially appointed to a Committee,' - I know the hon. member knows that I have no overwhelming desires for him, Mr. Speaker. I think that is a liability by the Leader of the Opposition - 'I would suggest using' - now get this - 'one of the four positions held by the government on each of these committees for him.' In other words, they want the member for Menihek to sit on the government side of the House in the Committee. That is their great solution. Here on monetary matters, Mr. Speaker, which the government could fall on ostensibly in a committee, the hon. the member for Menihek could come over and vote for us. Now I

know they think we are cozy-cozy but we are not quite that cozy-cozy yet, Mr. Speaker. Now I responded in my usual temperate manner to the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), and I am going to quote that letter, as well, and give the gentlemen of the fifth estate a copy of it. I think it is a good letter, as I hope all members will agree. It reads as follows: 'I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 7 last and note your desire to make certain changes in the compliment of Opposition representation on the committees. Before bringing in the motion to make the changes, however, I think I should draw to your attention one conspicuous omission from your list in that there apparently has been no mention or consideration given to the member for Menihek sitting on one of the committees. As you are aware it is for government' - and I know that grates the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) - 'under the House rules to propose the specific memberships to the various standing committees. By long standing tradition here and in other parliaments, numerical membership in committees usually corresponds to the membership in the House. In the present instance the existing membership in the House entitles the government to five and the Opposition to two members in a seven person committee. However, because it desires to see committees enquiring into finances as effectively as possible, government has agreed that in a seven member committee there should be four from the government and three from the Opposition. I repeat, this is more than the Opposition is entitled to as a result of the decision of the electorate a year ago. The Opposition consists of both the

official Opposition and the member for Menihek. We feel that the member for Menihek is entitled to representation on at least one of these committees. He was not on a single one last year and, surely, with a total of sixteen members on the Opposition side of the House the member for Menihek is entitled to serve as a member on at least one of the committees during his term. Mr. Fenwick has indicated to me his desire to do so and I would ask that the official Opposition accommodate this wish. I propose you get together with him and agree with his being appointed from the Opposition membership on at least one committee. I would appreciate receiving your response as quickly as possible.' Is that not a reasonable letter, I ask?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I gave that yesterday to the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) in the absence of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), because I said you are the Whip. And I was absolutely appalled to find that he must have done something to the hon. leader because he is no longer Whip, and, lo and behold, it is the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

So I gave it to the member yesterday and, you know, Mr. Speaker, you talk about, as they say, 'overwhelming desires.' I had an overwhelming desire this morning to get an answer. And I was told in unequivocal terms that their answer was given first off. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not



acceptable to the government. As far as the government is concerned, all members of this House are equal. The Opposition is entitled to be treated equally, so consequently, Mr. Speaker, I am going to invoke a new procedure. I will be leading in at the appropriate time this morning nominations for those committees. I talked with the member for Menihek this morning and he indicated to me that there was stony silence from the official Opposition. I asked, 'Which committee would you like to go on?' And he, having consummate faith in me, said, 'I will leave it up to you.' I have decided it is to be the Social Services Committee. Lo and behold, the official Opposition wanted the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) and the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) on the Committee. Now, Mr. Speaker, only two of those can be on, and one of them is going to be removed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
So, I mean, Mr. Speaker, to add to the tension of this statement, I am going to give this to the good minister for Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), and I have their names on three papers. Now, I am going to draw one of them, Mr. Speaker, and one of them is going to be sunk, he is going to be gone!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
So here you go. Now, the sixty-four dollar question. It is the member for Gander who is gone, and the member for Menihek is

going to be placed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall give the hon. gentlemen opposite about a half-hour or so to sulk over this, and then I will get up and I will propose the Committees with the member for Menihek being one of the new members on the Social Policy Committee. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I would not put it past the member for St. John's East, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to have had the name of the member for Gander on all three of those pieces of paper

MR. SIMMS:  
Not so. There were three single ballots.

MR. BARRY:  
No, there was a quick switch there. I saw that quick switch underneath the table - because the member for Gander has shown himself to be so effective, Mr. Speaker, in pointing out the weaknesses of members opposite. But the Government House Leader is still going to have the opportunity to be subjected to the rapt attention of the member for Gander as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and he should

not forget that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, what we see here today is part of a continuing plot, a continuing conspiracy, a continuous systematic effort to weaken the rights of the Opposition in this House, and we see it regularly with respect to the interpretations placed on the rules of this House by the Government House Leader. Mr. Speaker, if anybody wants to talk about a long established tradition with respect to the numbers who should be on the estimates committees, let us remember that these estimates committees were only created in - was in 1975 or 1972?

MR. SIMMS:  
1979.

MR. BARRY:  
1979. And, Mr. Speaker, let us look at that long standing tradition. Last year, when the official Opposition consisted of eight members, there were still three members on the estimate committees. Now how is that for a long standing tradition? And not just last year, but for the last session of the Legislature, for the last session of the Assembly. Now if anything else that would show the falsehoods that the Government House Leader is engaging in to purport to say that there is a long standing tradition that the government has the right to appoint less than three members. Tradition has it, the practices of this House has it, Mr. Speaker, that the official Opposition will have three members. That is the tradition between 1979 and now. If anyone wants to look there have been three members of the official Opposition. And now, Mr. Speaker,

let us also consider this new attention being placed on the member for Menihek. Your Honour has had the opportunity, as have Speakers before, to decide whether a single member of another party is entitled to special recognition, a special role to play within this Assembly other than the role that is granted to all members. And Your Honour has decided on a number of occasions, as have previous Speakers, that no, there has to be more than one individual from a particular party, there has to be a group. And although, Mr. Speaker, he seems to go in all directions at times, the member for Menihek, with all due respect, has not yet formed a group. This again is an interference with that practice and tradition of the House. Now the Government House Leader, and it is hard to see his convoluted logic, somehow he feels that by giving the member for Menihek some special status on the Opposition, that somehow this is going to improve things for members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, it is just whistling in the dark. It shows the desperate outlook that members opposite have. It shows how far the Government House Leader realizes they have sunk in the polls. They have done their polls. The poles show that they are being wiped off the map, they are being wiped off the map, Mr. Speaker, right now by the Official Opposition, by the Liberal Party.

MR. PEACH:  
You mean you are wiped out.

MR. BARRY:  
The polls show, Mr. Speaker, that they do not have a prayer, unless some miracle occurs next time around, in the next election.

They are desperately looking for a miracle, but interfering and tampering with the traditions and practices of this House of Assembly, and attempting to weaken the rights of the Opposition are not the miracle. That is not the miracle that they are looking for. That is not the way, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to turn things around, turn the polls around in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the real issue with respect to these estimate committees - we object, yes, to this reduction of the role of the Official Opposition. We object to this taking away of the traditional rights which the Opposition has - but, Mr. Speaker, the real crunch with respect to the estimate committees has to do with that letter I wrote the Premier last year, to which the minister referred, which has to do with the extent of media coverage which these committees will receive. Because there is absolutely no value and no point, Mr. Speaker, for members of this House of Assembly to sit on an estimates committee if there is no information being conveyed to the general public. At least when I say something in this House the media have a choice of covering or not. The member for Carbonear, Mr. Speaker, we have yet to hear get up and make any sort of a speech. We have yet to hear him do anything other than heckle. And as a former municipal politician he had a degree of respect out in Carbonear at one point in time, but it is being wiped out totally by his asinine and childish conduct in the House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, it is really sad to see a former respected member sunk to the depths of heckling from the backbenches rather than getting up

and making a comment.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, just to conclude, we object to this downgrading of the rights of the Opposition.

Do you really have a failed vision, 'Bill'? 'Brian' is not listening to you any more, is he?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Did you read Mclean's?

MR. BARRY:  
No, I have it here with me now. It gives a great picture of that vision of members opposite and what they are doing for the Province.

MR. MARSHALL:  
"He does not play well upon rural voters."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
What does the next line say? Sincere.

MR. BARRY:  
I found that rather strange considering the results of the last election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, yes, we object to this downgrading of the rights of the Opposition. And we object also, Mr. Speaker, to the

continuing attempts by members opposite to shout us down again today as they regularly do as we make our points.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

In the absence of the Premier I would like to ask the Government House Leader if he would indicate to the House why is it that we do not see any negotiations with the Province of Quebec with respect to getting a hydro development project moving and getting some improvement to the Upper Churchill contract. Why have we not seen the minister and the Premier meeting with Quebec officials to get these projects going?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, who said we have not met with Quebec officials to get these projects going? We are constantly addressing that gigantic, colossal mistake that the Liberal Party of this Province made in times past that has brought this Province year after year to its knees financially. There has been a new government, as the hon. member will realize, elected in the Province of Quebec. It was very unfortunate that it happened to be a Liberal

government, but it is not of the same strain and the same germs that the hon. gentlemen there opposite have. But, Mr. Speaker, we certainly are keeping the avenues open, and, at the appropriate time, when it is in the best interests of the people of Newfoundland, we shall be making our approach. Mr. Speaker, we will do our best as we are constantly aware that the people of this Province suffer under the nightmare and the anvil of the mistake that the hon. gentleman's party made when they sold this Province down the drain in Churchill Falls.

As the hon. gentleman knows from the colossal achievement that we made in the offshore, we are not likely to do that and we are likely to be the best government around that can possibly bring about an unravelling of that mistake for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland forever and a day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have to accuse the Government House Leader of attempting to mislead this House in that the information we have received from the Government of Quebec is that there have been no meetings, that all we have seen, Mr. Speaker, are general telephone conversations and letters of a general content. Except maybe at the very low officials level there have been no meetings between the Premier and the Government House Leader to deal with the issue of seeing -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech. This is a supplementary question.

MR. BARRY:

I would ask the minister whether he would tell us if he is aware of the fact that there are serious negotiations underway now between the Government of Quebec and potential buyers of power in the United States? Is the government going to wait until those deals are concluded before attempting to participate in gaining access to an export market which may be necessary for surplus power for many projects developed in Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am half tempted to give an answer to the hon. gentlemen that would show just how much Liberal colleagues in Quebec regard the hon. gentleman. If he wants to purport that he got this information from his colleagues in Quebec - in the interest of fruitful negotiations I do not want to call Monsieur Bourassa and company colleagues of the hon. gentleman because I think that they would take exception to it if we did - all I can say at this stage is his information is completely and absolutely incorrect, that this government is making the appropriate moves with respect to the Government of Quebec. Those appropriate moves will be revealed in due course when it is in the best interest of the people of Newfoundland to do so. I can tell the hon. gentleman that he is completely incorrect.

Obviously, the Liberal Party in Quebec trusts him no more than the Liberal Party in Newfoundland. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that moves are being taken but I am not, in the interest of getting a resolution, going to expound any farther on the specific nature of those moves.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I notice that the minister did not respond to my point, which was that I asked whether face to face meetings had been held between the Premier and the Minister responsible for electrical Energy in this Province. The minister danced around very carefully on that point. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have seen this government elected long enough for this administration to have made the proper approaches. I would like to ask does the minister, think that he is going to be able to wait until a month or two months before the next provincial election and attempt to hype a misleading campaign that something is happening with respect to hydro electricity with Quebec when we see this deliberate delaying strategy which has taken place now for close to a year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. the lackluster leader, Mr. Speaker, I have really to respond to directly and all I am going to do is say that we are doing everything conceivable and

possible. I think we are taking a much different approach than my predecessor did. One of the remedies by the hon. gentleman there opposite, which we agreed with, which was a good one, was the Reversion Act. We brought the Reversion Act before the court. I still believe that that Reversion Act should have been upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. BARRY:

So do I, by the way.

MR. MARSHALL:

But, do you know what happened, Mr. Speaker? Can you believe it? This man, who is now querying me, who brought in that act, instructed CF(L)Co to oppose the validity of that act in the court. He actually did. My first act as Minister responsible for Energy was to instruct Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and instruct CF(L)Co not to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, this great enquiring press that we have in this Province, incisive, incisives in many events, all they have to do, and it was before you all the time, was go and just look at the court record and they will see CF(L)Co going in and intervening, opposing it while my hon. predecessor was Minister of Mines and Energy and sat in the post, so he has something to answer now to the people of Newfoundland of why he tried to sabotage his own efforts.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like the minister to confirm that in fact any decisions taken with respect to the progress of that court case were decisions taken on the instructions of the entire Cabinet, including the member for St John' East the hon. House Leader. I would like to ask the minister whether he would indicate to the House just what is the date on which we will have to take a decision with respect to our next generating source and will we have our negotiations concluded with Quebec by that time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I presume it is the last of the supplementary questions asked by the hon. gentleman. I just want to make it perfectly clear so that nobody will misinterpret it. We have been communicating with the province of Quebec with a view to having talks, and that is as far as I am going to say. Whether meetings occurred or whether they did not occur is not in the interest of the people of this Province to answer at the present time. But it is in the interest of the people of the Province to know that this government is communicating with Quebec and doing its utmost with respect to it. With respect to the hon. gentleman's last question, I can say that within the year there has to be a decision taken of the nature that he asked about another generating source, according to the present predictions with respect to the electrical loads. We sincerely hope that within that period of time we will be able to base that decision so that the alternate source will be through hydro power, but it is going to require a lot of work and a lot of effort on our part before that can

be achieved.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) concerning the hiring practices at Exon House since yesterday and previously he stated they were hired through quite normal practice. I would like to ask the minister when last December seven people were hired on at Exon House did these people have any prior training? Is he aware that six out of the seven definitely had no prior training whatsoever?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:  
Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no idea in this world about seven people who were hired at Exon House last December, absolutely none, but I will get the information for the hon. member and pass it along to him.

MR. EFFORD:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
It continues to show, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Social Services is not aware of anything that is going on within his department, and especially at Exon House. I would like to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, is he aware that on the shift from four to

twelve that there is only one member of the cleaning staff on?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:  
Mr. Speaker, I am not the administrator of Exon House.

MR. EFFORD:  
You are the minister.

MR. BRETT:  
I do not know, Mr. Speaker, how many cleaners are on from six to twelve or from twelve to three, whatever. There is no reason why I would have that information at my fingertips. But again, Mr. Speaker, if there is a problem there I will check it out and advise the hon. member.

MR. EFFORD:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, this problem with Exon House has been going on for the past two to three months. Has the minister ever taken into consideration that he should be aware of what is going on down there? It is unbelievable that the minister will stand question and question and say, "I am not aware."

I would ask the minister, seeing that he has admitted over and over again that the is not aware, will he set up a third party, independent public enquiry into all matters pertaining to Exon House so that we can once and for all get these matters straightened out?

MR. SIMMS:

Chaired by you, of course.

MR. EFFORD:

I will volunteer that, yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what that hon. member is trying to prove. He was here in the House yesterday waving around a piece of paper, but I am not sure if he said he had a report or if he was going to get a report. Mr. Speaker, since yesterday we have checked every record that we have at Exon House and at the department, we have checked with the Department of Health, there is absolutely and positively no record anywhere in either one of these departments indicating any problems which that hon. member mentioned here yesterday. And now he is at the same thing again today. The hon. member knows that we have dozens of institutions and group homes across this Province, and for him to expect me to get up and be able to say what is going on in any one of these group homes or institutions at any particular time is absolutely ridiculous. We have competent staff. We do not have any problems, Mr. Speaker, just something that is prefabricated. He wants to make some trouble, to get false information out to the public and, of course, he is being aided and abetted by other people who do not sit in this House.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health who is looking quite chipper this morning unlike the health situation in this Province. When Bill 96 passes through the House of Commons, Established Programme Funding will be reduced from 7 per cent to 5 per cent with a loss of \$121 million to Newfoundland by 1991. I should like to ask the hon. minister what plans has he made to pick up the shortfall in health care after Bill C96 is passed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. We have obviously given considerable thought on this side to the problems of the restricted Established Programme financing. Because of that I have asked for a special meeting with Mr. Epp. I believe that meeting is going to take place on Monday, April 28.

Furthermore, I have been in communication with all the provincial Ministers of Health across this country. I think that they will also be meeting at Laurier Place, I believe, and after that we will be able to make further statements.

MR. DECKER:

I thank the minister for that.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Will the minister deny or confirm that with the reduction in EPFs to this Province the status of our health care will fall to less than 50 per cent of the national



average?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you. First of all I do not accept the premise of your question, that our standard of health care will fall to 50 per cent. Under no circumstances is this true. None whatsoever. If you can give me any proof that this is so, I will be delighted to have it and respond in a meaningful way.

My information is such that health care in Newfoundland compares rather favourably with the health care of any other province in Canada, in this Nation. We are putting more of our gross domestic product into the health care budget than any other province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:

Furthermore, we have increased our health care budget this year by 1.5 per cent more than the Province of Quebec. We have had more doctors in this Province than ever in the history of this Nation. We have the highest number of accredited hospitals and nursing homes, I believe, in Canada. I believe that 95 per cent of our acute beds are accredited by the Canadian Hospital Accreditation Association.

Our infant mortality rate is only surpassed by two provinces, Ontario and Quebec. Our life expectancy is, I admit, only one month better than all the other provinces in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:

Furthermore, on our ambulance services, we have more ambulances in this Province per capita than any other province in this Nation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister did not understand my question. The government's own green paper states that our health care is 80 per cent of the national average. Now I asked him to deny or confirm whether the reduction of EPF would bring the average down from 80 per cent to 50 per cent. I did not state the premise. I asked him to deny or confirm it.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

By some remarkable degree of excellence our Minister of Finance has been able to find within our revenue \$41.6 million more this year than he put into the health care budget last year.

MR. DECKER:

That does not answer the question.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, it does. It clearly answers it.

DR. TWOMEY:

I cannot forecast what is going to happen in the future, in five or ten years. But we in the Department of Health, and I am sure the government members agree with me, are doing everything that is possible to keep the health care of our people equal, if not better, than most provinces in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) concerning unemployment insurance to fishermen. In view of the fact that Newfoundland fishermen are the only workers in the country whose right to receive UI benefits, when he or she is otherwise is qualified to receive them, is restricted to certain dates that have been set arbitrarily under the regulations - no other worker in Canada, Mr. Speaker, is restricted to certain dates once he or she qualifies - there is a widely held view that maybe this does indeed contravene the new Charter of Rights. Would the minister undertake to have her lawyers study the unemployment insurance regulations, look at Section 15 (1) of the Charter of Rights and give her an opinion as to whether in fact there might be a case where that section of the act should be challenged in the courts?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to have this matter considered by my officials, in consultation with my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I am not sure if the question goes to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs or to the Minister of Fisheries. We will try it on the Minister of Fisheries. In reply to a letter that I sent to Mr. Crosbie concerning this matter, he suggested I contact the Forget Commission which is now studying all aspects of unemployment insurance. Will the minister tell the House if he has made any representation to that Commission? In fact, has he entered maybe a question as to the legitimacy of that section of the act, where fishermen are denied benefits other than within certain dates? Would he be prepared to table that recommendation? Mr. Speaker, I would like to table these letters, too, that I have sent to the minister in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to tell the hon. gentleman that not only the Minister of Fisheries acting on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, but the Minister of

Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) acting on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) acting on behalf of the Province, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and there may have been some others, have all made a very detailed Government of Newfoundland and Labrador presentation, to the commission that the hon. gentleman refers to. And that presentation by the way, Mr. Speaker has already been made public so it is public knowledge. So we made a very detailed presentation on the overall Unemployment Insurance regulations and Act as it effects all of Newfoundland and Labrador, but in particular, from our perspective, we had a very comprehensive section on how the Unemployment Insurance regulations impact on fishermen. We were able to detail the many discriminatory aspects of those regulations as far as we are concerned. Fishermen should be treated equal to other workers across Canada and should be able to draw Unemployment Insurance if that is the mechanism that is going to be used for stabilization of fishermen's incomes at any time during the normal period that people on regular benefits should be able to draw.

The other thing that we were very forceful on, Mr. Speaker, is the correcting of the discrimination as it relates to fishermen who live in Northern Labrador, for example. They very often cannot get back fishing when fishermen on the Island can because of ice conditions and climatic conditions, so they are discriminated against in another way. So we have made a very

detailed proposal to the commission, we have also made proposals to the federal government suggesting that we should look at other ways; perhaps Unemployment Insurance is not the right mechanism after having tried it for a number of years to stabilize the income of fishermen and we have made proposals to the federal government and to that commission as to other options that are perhaps better suited for stabilizing fishermen's income than UIC insurance.

If the hon. gentleman does not have a copy of our presentation, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be delighted to provide him with one.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker. We have ten minutes. It did not start until 10:30, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

My time down here is 10:24.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, that is wrong.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if we could just get that checked out, it was after 10:30 when we started.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will check it out.

My watch must be wrong. I am sorry, you were perfectly right. It started at 10:35. I had 10:24.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted a brief supplementary on that line of questioning. Would the Minister of Fisheries indicate why it is that he would make his presentation to the commission without having obtained that opinion which the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) has now asked the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) to have obtained?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, we were addressing, as a department on behalf of fishermen in this Province, inequities that we see, and I guess everybody generally involved, see in the Unemployment Insurance regulations as they relate to fishermen. It is not my responsibility to look for legal challenges under the Charter of Rights. We were doing our work under the terms and conditions of the Forget Commission and it was under those terms of reference that we were acting. The legal challenges and so on have already been addressed by my colleague, the Minister of Justice.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, we seem to have gained notoriety nationally and internationally with our infamous labour legislation and are proclaimed to have the poorest labour relations right throughout

Canada. In view of that, I wonder if the minister can wipe out or eradicate these notions, ideas or preconceptions by giving a brief and concise statement to the House this morning outlining just what is the state of labour relations in the Province, particularly as they relate to NAPE and the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, first and foremost I am not sure where the hon. the member for Bonavista North gets his information that we have the worse labour relations in Canada. We have an excellent Labour Relations Act, one that was developed and expanded after quite a high profile commission headed by, in the first instance, Mr. Justice Rand and later by Mr. Justice Cohen. We brought in some very modern changes to that piece of legislation, with some exceptions, and many people throughout the Province will question the wisdom of some of the labour strife that we have had from time to time, whether good decisions were made in bringing the workers out. But I challenge the hon. member's opinion on that, Mr. Speaker.

With respect to the police negotiations, Mr. Speaker, we had understood back several weeks ago that these negotiations had pretty nearly concluded. Of course, there was a change of executive and the new executive which was brought in had some differing opinions with the earlier executive which had agreed with what had been negotiated at the table and, in fact, had voted on it and agreed upon it. There was one non-monetary issue outstanding

and. Of course, the new executive has now raised some questions and these matters are being discussed on a current basis with the Police Brotherhood. At this very moment, though, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that anybody from my department is involved in these negotiations.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I am not sure from the minister's answer just what is the status respecting negotiations right now. From the minister's answer I am not sure whether they have broken off and, if they had broken off, why they had broken off. Who left the bargaining table? Could the minister be a little more precise, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I had adequately answered the hon. member's question in my last sentence when I said the negotiations are continuing. Obviously, in circumstances such as I have just described, where there was a vote and the agreement had been accepted with the exception of one non-monetary item, obviously the whole matter has to be very carefully assessed and, if it satisfies the hon. member, I can assure him that these matters are being very carefully assessed at the present time.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn). On Monday he announced that the Housing Corporation will be selling 328 units in Stephenville. Since that time I have heard a lot of comment from the individual tenants themselves who are very worried about increases in rates and so on. In his statement the minister said, and I quote, 'The corporation is in the process of having an independent appraisal carried out on these apartment complexes. Following the completion of these appraisals public proposals for the sale of these buildings will be advertised.' My question, Mr. Speaker, is what kind of value is going to be placed on these units? I am not asking for the specific amount, but what kind of ranges are we talking about and what kind of money is going to be required in order to purchase these units?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister Responsible for Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, that is the total purpose of the assessment. When the assessment is completed, the assessors working on behalf of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation will recommend to the Corporation what the acceptable prices will be. I do not know how I can give the hon. member a range. What we are talking here are apartment buildings that contain four, six, eight and twelve units. So, I mean, I would have no idea at all, I can tell

the hon. member, what the assessors will come back to me with, or to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation or what their recommendation will be. That is the total purpose of the assessment. I did hear some of the complaints from the people out there as to why we are selling and, indeed, why I did not inform all the tenants. Well, here in the House, Mr. Speaker, I think I have a responsibility to, number one, inform the House of Assembly; I think that is my first obligation. Shortly after that, of course, the news got out anyway and the tenants were informed, but I had an obligation to the House and to the people who work for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation in Stephenville. But until the assessment is done, Mr. Speaker, I will have no idea what the price of the individual units will be.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is just time for a short question and answer.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will try to make it very short.

I am assuming, then, that we are looking at a market value of some sort that will be accepted for it and probably a minimum of \$20,000 or \$30,000 per unit within the octaplexes and sextaplexes and so on.

My question is, since twenty years ago the provincial government got all these houses as part of the one-dollar sale of the assets of the United States Air Force, does

that mean that 320 units times \$20,000 or \$30,000, in other words, somewhere between \$7 million and \$10 million worth of revenue - will be realized by the provincial government out of a free gift from the Air Force and that these will have to be added to the rents of the people after they have been turned over to the private sector?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister Responsible for Housing.

MR. DINN:

No, Mr. Speaker, it does not mean that at all. I know the hon. member would like to think it means that so he can go out and get on his bandwagon. What is going to happen here, I will inform the hon. member, is that, number one, the units out in Stephenville have not made money for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to this point in time. They have continually lost money every year up to now. So they have lost a lot of money. Number two, any money that is received from sale of buildings out there - the hon. member will know that we have over 500 units in Stephenville - any moneys that are received from the units out there will be used and put back into the units that are left there to make them more energy efficient, Mr. Speaker, as we are doing in all of our units throughout the Province. So the Minister of Finance is not waiting there to grab any moneys that might come in from sale of units in Stephenville. We have lost money in Stephenville all the way through the bit and piece up to this point in time. We have continued to lose money on them because the rents are not high enough, as was outlined in the

statement. Number three, any moneys the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation gets for the sale of these units will be put back into the other units to make them more energy efficient, so that the people will be happier in their homes.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Before calling the next item, I would like to welcome to the Visitor's Gallery sixty students from Holy Redeemer School, Spaniard's Bay with their teachers John Drover and Malcolm Smith.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of mineral licenses and mining licenses issued, April 1, 1985 to March 31, 1986, as is required by Section 3 (2) of the Mineral Act.

Notices of Motion

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my lengthy statement this morning, I move that the following members replace the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) and Fogo (Mr. Tulk) on the Resource Policy Committee: The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) and the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). I should explain to the Opposition that they also nominated the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) but he is already a member of that standing committee.

I further move, Mr. Speaker, that in place of the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), Gander (Mr. Baker) and Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) on the Government Services Committee, that they be replaced by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), who was already on it last year.

On the Social Services Committee, Mr. Speaker, I move that the hon. the members for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) and the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) be appointed to the Social Services Committee in place of the hon. the members for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) who have been there before. These three Opposition members on each committee will constitute the Opposition members for the present time on the standing committees. I might say, there may be changes in the government complement but they are going to stay the same for the present.

MR. BARRY:

Would the Government House Leader permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Are those the names that were supplied by the Opposition House Leader as suggested membership, apart from the member for Gander (Mr. Baker)?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the only thing is because the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) and the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) were on that list and they were already on the committees last year anyway. They are the ones, except for the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

MR. SPEAKER:

It is moved and seconded that these members be appointed on committees as read. All those in favour 'Aye', those against 'Nay', carried.

Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday during Question Period I took as notice a question posed by the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) about the present status of a police investigation into an incident at Port aux Basques Harbour. I have ascertained since yesterday that the RCMP are indeed conducting the investigation. It is their Corner

Brook subdivision which is handling the investigation. The investigation is still proceeding and it is quite intensive. I am told about forty-five people have been interviewed. When the investigation is completed, in the usual way, the RCMP will give a report to the Director of Public Prosecutions who will assess it and determine whether criminal charges are to be laid.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) posed a question pertaining to the recommendations contained in the report of the Select Committee on a Food Prices Review. I indicated at that time that this report had been conducted and carried out prior to my assuming responsibility for the department of Consumer Affairs and Communications. I have looked at the report and there are, of course, numerous recommendations in it, very few of which pertain specifically to my department. Subsequent to that report being received by government, my predecessor made a press release. I am prepared to table a copy of that. There are a couple of paragraphs in that that pertain to my department.

It says, "In response to consumer needs as indicated in the report of the Select Committee on Food Prices, government is seriously considering expanding its consumer service to the Labrador region. Being considered is a fully staffed office in Happy



Valley-Goose which would provide services to all communities in the Labrador area as well as the coastal region."

Mr. Speaker, I think most members are already aware that we have now officially opened an office in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and, in fact, as a coincidence perhaps, today, with the usual excellent co-operation of the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), I have arranged for the employee there, the gentleman who is in charge of that office to, well, right now perhaps he is on his way to L'Anse au Clair for the meeting with the Joint Councils in Labrador. He has been given a place on the agenda to give some information pertaining to consumer affairs matters and to the office at Happy Valley, Goose Bay. So I think that kind of takes care of that aspect of this report.

The Department of Consumer Affairs and Communications will also address education and counselling programmes for consumers. The Departments of Education and Health have been instructed to further review the nutrition and consumer education being provided in the school system.

Mr. Speaker, in some of the schools throughout this Province there is some consumer education courses being taught. Albeit, perhaps not as much or in the depth I would like, but they are in some of the schools and, hopefully in time, in all of the schools, particularly, with the expanded high school programme.

I have received an invitation, for example, to speak to that class at the Lewisporte High School at a time convenient to everybody. In the home economics courses that

are being taught throughout the schools, certainly nutrition is a very, very important aspect of that.

Mr. Speaker, I can only speak for the matters in this Food Prices Review Report as they pertain to my department. If the hon. member for Eagle River has questions pertaining to this report concerning other ministers in other departments, I would suggest that he pose those questions to the appropriate minister. Thank you.

### Petitions

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by 141 people in the town of Englee. This petition is similar to the petitions, and actually has the same wording as the petitions I have been presenting for the past three days in this hon. House.

At this time I would like to express appreciation to the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) who supported my petition yesterday so adequately. Needless to say, since then I have contacted the people in the Strait of Belle Isle and told them that they have a friend on the other side of the House and they are quite pleased to hear that.

The prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker, is that, "We, the residents of Englee, hereby

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

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to be able to stand up and support this petition. It is referring to a road that is Route 432. This is the road, Mr. Speaker, which joins Englee to the rest of Newfoundland. To get up to the Northern Peninsula, you drive up what is called the Viking Trail and when you come to Plum Point you have to take a turn to your right, which goes across the Peninsula and takes you into the Canada Bay region, the Main Brook region and Englee is found in the mouth of Canada Bay.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this road to the fishery of Englee is almost indescribable. Without that road, there can no longer be a fishery in Englee. Now a lot of things have happened to the fishery in Englee. The plant in Englee has increased its capacity over the years so much so that there is not enough fish landed in Englee by boats, by longliners and by the inshore fishermen to supply the plant in Englee. Therefore, as much as half of the fish which

is processed in Englee is caught on the other side of the Peninsula in the Plum Point area and the Anchor Point area. This fish has to be trucked into Englee over this Route 432. Now Your Honour, I am sure, and hon. members of this House know what happens to the quality of fish when it has to be trucked over a dusty road or a muddy road, depending on the weather. And members also are aware I am quite sure of the extra costs involved to truckers who use their vehicles to bring fish into that fish plant in Englee. So this road is essential in order to keep the fish plant working in Englee.

Then again, Mr. Speaker, after the fish has been processed in the plant in Englee, where it is made into fillets and it is frozen into various forms for the international market, it has to be trucked out of Englee and again we have this Route 432, this gravel road, this road which has been in a terrible state of disrepair ever since a few miles were extended on a woods access road to open up Englee to the rest of the Province. Ever since that happened back in the late fifties or early sixties, Mr. Speaker, this road has been a problem. It has not been up to any acceptable standard.

The people of Englee, who are producing fish to go to the outside world markets, are finding that this road is giving them a problem. There is an extra cost involved and it is also interfering with the quality of the product that they are putting on the market.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I speak on behalf of those people in Englee, I am not speaking from the

position of a dying town. Englee has taken a very major turnaround in the past number of years. When their plant went on the block to be sold, I understood from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) that there was indeed a lot of interest expressed in the Englee fish plant. This is because, I believe, in addition to other reasons, because of the calibre of the work force in Englee.

Fish companies will tell you that we have one of the most dedicated and most efficient work forces in this Province, albeit it is small when compared to say St. John's but when you compare the quality, they do not have to take second place to anybody in this Province. They are possibly one of the most efficient work forces we have in Newfoundland today. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, the fish plant in Englee has now been sold to the Blackwood Group of companies and become Dorset Fisheries and the fish plant has a tremendous amount of optimism. They are looking forward to taking their rightful place in this Province. The growth rate in Englee, Mr. Speaker, which for a while was at a standstill, now has turned around and we are looking forward to the next census when there is going to be a very clear improvement in the population in Englee.

For these reasons, as well as others, I am extremely happy today to be able to stand up and represent 151 other people of Englee, along with the fifty odd who a few days ago presented their petition, now another 151 who are petitioning this hon. House, and they are doing it very reasonably, Mr. Speaker. I will stress again that they are not out blocking

roads, they are not out destroying government equipment, very reasonably because they still have a faith in the parliamentary process, Mr. Speaker, and what they are asking for, as hon. men and women, that this House of Assembly would make provisions so that Route 432 could be paved into Englee.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:  
I thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Speaker. I would like to support the prayer of this petition which calls upon the federal and provincial governments, at the earliest possible opportunity, to sign a secondary roads agreement.

I am quite familiar myself with this particular road, Mr. Speaker, which is often referred to as the Cross Country Road, Route 432, which connects Plum Point to the Roddickton, Englee, Bide Arm, Conche and areas. Mr. Speaker, I used to teach for a number of years in Conche, a very historic fishing community. I know the people of Roddickton and Englee. I have known them for years, and I can attest to everything that the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) is saying. These are extremely hard-working people and God-fearing people. They have a tremendous respect for the law and for the parliamentary procedures of this particular Legislature. So, Mr. Speaker, in a non-violent, very civilized way, they are presenting, through their member, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, their views with

respect to this road.

I would like to see some of the gentlemen opposite - and I am sure some of them have already - travel across Route 432. I believe it is a sixty kilometer distance. That particular road, Mr. Speaker, is in absolutely horrific shape. This is the main artery which connects the West and East sides of the Peninsula. It is the main artery which connects trade and it has increased substantially in the volume of traffic currently using it.

I believe that a number of years ago an agreement was put in place - perhaps the member for the Strait of Belle Isle could correct me - there was an agreement put in place to actually upgrade and pave that road under the former Liberal administration in Ottawa. I think monies were carved out. We are not only seeing, Mr. Speaker, a failed vision within a Province but we are now seeing, concurrently, a failed vision of prosperity, a failed vision of cooperation, a failed vision of consultation between the Brian here and the Brian there. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have said, two Brians do not necessarily make a right. Our people are seeing that time and time again. The minister of trees can wander out and shake his head and chase hemlock loopers but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that human lives are being affected by a piece of transportation work that is desperately needed on the Northern Peninsula connecting the West to the East.

My hon. friend from the Strait of Belle Isle talked about the intertrade and the movement of fish. Let us talk about the

movement of fish. Michael Kirby in his report stressed to Atlantic Canada that if we are going to get our act together in the fishery, we better start spending an awful lot more time focusing in on the problem of quality. Well, Mr. Speaker, quality and transportation go hand and hand. It is not just quality for gutting, bleeding and icing the fish at sea so that it is a fresh product brought up on the wharf, we are also talking about the quality of transportation. The hon. member knows, and I know all too well from my own plant owners on the Northwest Coast in the St. Barbe district, how bad fish can become trucked over modern paved roads. We are not talking about a modern paved road. We are talking about a cow path running along Route 432. I think it is only fair to call it a cow path. How many mufflers have you lost on it? How many have I lost on it? How many have the ordinary citizen lost on that road? When you move fish, which is a quality product under Kirby's guidelines, onto a dirt road full of pot holes and dust and oil to keep the dust down, Mr. Speaker, the fish, which was quality, turns into soup and we question whether it is even fit for human consumption.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Englee and the people of Roddickton and the people of Conche and the people generally on the Northeast Coast, in the great district of St. Barbe, are hard-working people. They have taken their lives and their destiny into their own hands for probably the first time in history. They are trying to make their communities work with that crab plant in Roddickton. They are trying to make their communities work with the fish plants in Englee but what

do we see here? We see a cowardly government back away from a decent proposal to upgrade and pave and make that transportation network first class. Why first class? So that the fish can be first class. If the fish is first class out of Englee going into the Boston markets, the people are first class. If they continue providing first class services, we are going to have first-class jobs for many, many years, Mr. Speaker. So I support the prayer of this petition. I think it is important for government to collectively open their eyes, for the first time in fifteen years, and to do what is right and what is morally just for the people on the Northeast Coast, on the Northern Peninsula in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough any more to just look at areas of Newfoundland that voted Tory and areas of Newfoundland that voted Liberal and say, let us pork the Tory areas and punish the Liberal areas. That is not good enough any more, Mr. Speaker, and it is time they woke up and stepped into the twenty-first century.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any further petitions?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I have just had the opportunity of reviewing the report of the Public Accounts Committee for January 17, 1985. I am not sure if it is on

Page L437 or R437, they are both at the bottom of the page, but we have the then Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Penney, stating that in his opinion the expenditure of funds by Special Warrant, as had been done in a previous year, was illegal. I think it was 1982. There were only three precedents, I think, that they found, one in the early 1960s, that we have earlier referred to, one in 1972 and one in 1982.

The Deputy Minister of Justice at that time states, "I think everybody who has looked at it has recognized that there was not, in fact, legislative authority for the expenditure at the time." He goes on to say "So, in fact, from our perspective now, the act of Treasury Board was legal because it was subsequently ratified by the Interim Supply Act." In other words, it is not legal if it is not ratified by the Interim Supply Act. So we have a former Deputy Minister of Justice giving an opinion to the effect that what the government has done again this year was illegal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had the Minister of Finance stand up in this House and say that he has legal opinion saying that what was done was legal. In light of this statement by the former Deputy Minister of Justice, in light of the advice given by law officers of the Crown, I would submit to you that the privileges of this House are being breached, that right now the prima facie case is that what the Minister of Finance and what government is doing is illegal, that they have spent money in an illegal fashion, and that is confirmed by this opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

First of all, this is not a point of privilege. As soon as the point of privilege is over and we get to the ordinary business of the House, we will get into Interim Supply. It is the same point that the hon. gentleman has brought up in the House in Interim Supply debate. I am not going to get into a legalistic argument with him. There is a section in the act which says quite clearly that Treasury Board can overrule the Comptroller General when the Comptroller General makes any adverse comment with respect to expenditure. That is precisely what was done, and it was done within the ambit of the Financial Administration Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is not Your Honour's duty to enforce laws, as it were, during the proceedings of the House. This is a legalistic matter. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is really attempting to prove. We have Interim Supply before the House now and it can be considered. Now to what end is all this going, first of all before Easter refusing to allow us in the usual, normal fashion to get Interim Supply and risking the cheques coming out to social assistance recipients and pensioners and people who were then working in essential services in hospitals? He did cause delay in the receipt of some of these cheques. We acted as a government would to see that these people got the cheques, within the law, and now he just continues on in this refrain. What is the purpose of it? Is it

that he wants the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) to go to jail or something, or does he want to go? Does he think all the people who received cheques throughout the Province should be arrested and apprehended.

MR. FUREY:

Yes, it sounds good to me.

MR. MARSHALL:

The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) says, "Yes, it sounds good to me." He wants to send people out to take the cheques back. It is consummate nonsense what the hon. gentleman is doing. I know that opinion that the very respected former Deputy Minister of Justice gave, and the hon. gentleman is quoting it out of context. There is such a thing, Mr. Speaker, as doing something that is not in accordance with one section, but if one is not so narrow-minded and constricted in one's thinking, one would read the whole act. Many acts state 'You cannot do this, but go on, 'but, because you cannot do it this way there is another way' and that is what we have done, Mr. Speaker. There are more ways to skin a cat, as the saying goes. That is what we did. We did it for the protection of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is basing his whole lacklustre leadership now on the premise that these payments are invalid. And to what end? To ask the people to repay the money.

Anyway, it is not a point of privilege, it should have been brought up at the earliest possible opportunity, it is a matter of enforcement of law, not enforcement in this House. His remedy is the remedy of trying to persuade this House to vote

against Interim Supply, and then all the cheques would have to come back. It is consummate, it is not a point of privilege.

MR. FUREY:

Sit down, boy, you are making a fool of yourself.

MR. MARSHALL:

It takes a fool to know a fool, and the hon. gentleman should be very knowledgeable about what fools are if he uses that yardstick.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of privilege, it is a point of legal interpretation and the hon. gentleman is very legalistic, he is very lacklustre, and I think he should get on now with the business of the House.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, to the point of privilege. So there can be no misunderstanding, I will be tabling this document in a moment. I would like to obtain a copy of it before I do that, so I would ask Your Honour's leave to table it subsequently. There is no question about the thing being read out of context. Mr. Penney, the then Deputy Minister of Justice, stated quite clearly that in his opinion there was no legal authority for the expenditure of funds obtained by Special Warrants in the circumstance identical to the situation that we have before the House today. I will be tabling this report.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege: If I recall correctly, about two days ago I stated that legal opinions in this matter did not come within my jurisdiction and I think I mentioned it at an earlier date, also. However, I will look into this matter and have a final word to say on it on Monday.

Before calling Orders of the Day I would like to welcome to the Visitors Gallery forty students from Gander Collegiate with their teachers, Brian Keough and Gerald Winsor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear hear!

### Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 6, first reading of bills.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1977". (Bill No. 16).

On motion, Bill No. (16), read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Marine Institute Act". (Bill No. 19).

On motion, Bill No. (19) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For Payment Of Financial Assistance For Students Attending Post-Secondary Educational Institutions". (Bill No. 2).

On motion, Bill No. (2) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 1.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain Resolutions for the Granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I yield to the hon. the member for Menihek, Mr. Chairman. Just as long as I do not have to listen to another Liberal, I do not mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Boy, I will have to watch it. I am being embraced to death by Tories today.

Mr. Chairman, I actually just want

to make a few very small comments, maybe one or two minutes. This is an Interim Supply Bill. I think we have gone over the arguments. It is quite obvious that government bent badly, if it did not break, its own law. Unfortunately or fortunately for the government, they can always rectify it later on and they probably will, or they are doing it right now with this Interim Supply Bill.

It seems to me, that the longer we talk on the Interim Supply Bill the less time we have to discuss the budget estimates. And since I now have the privilege of actually doing the kind of questioning I want on the Committee on Social Services, I will suggest to the whole House, both sides, that we now pass this bill with dispatch and get on to the actual budget estimates, themselves, so that we can find out what government is actually doing rather than beating our gums on this dead horse right here. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

An eminently sensible speech made by the member for Menihek. Let us understand what we are about here so hon. gentlemen opposite will know why a national magazine refers to their leader as a lackluster leader, and the



official Opposition as being lackluster. Mr. Chairman, we have Interim Supply before this House for \$750 millions. First of all, we brought it in prior to the end of the year in an effort to get the people of this Province who were entitled to cheques, salary cheques, pensioners, recipients of social assistance, payment, because at the end of the year, Mr. Chairman, our legislative authority ceased. Hon. gentlemen there opposite in the most wreckless manner possible - I include the hon. member for Menihek, so the honeymoon is over today, because he voted against it as well, Mr. Chairma - attempted to get government in a position were it could not meet these payments. What they did is they deliberately caused a delay in payment of those cheques, and each and every person in Twillingate, every person in Bonavista North and on the Strait of Belle Isle, and in St. Barbe who got their cheques late over the past two or three weeks and will get them late within the next few days, can thank the member for Twillingate, can thank the member for Bonavista North and other members there opposite for not forcing the Opposition to respond in the way in which they should.

And what has happened since? What we have been treated to is another act of consummate stupidity and irresponsibility, and I disassociate the member for Menihek, as he has shown in his speech. Here we have Interim Supply and we have been treated ever since we came back on Monday with a legalistic, boring, lackluster argument, day after day, to the effect that the payments were illegal. Mr. Chairman, that is what the hon. gentleman has been trying to

prove. That is the whole basis.

Now, what is the purpose of it? The purpose can only be to see if they can further delay the cheques to social assistance recipients, to see if they can try to embarrass the government further. Further, Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested on the floor of this House this morning by the official Opposition that they would like those cheques taken back. Now that is the type of -

MR. BUTT:  
What!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Yes, that is what the hon. the member for St. Barbe said. When, in responding to the point of privilege by the Leader of the Opposition, I said, "Do you want the cheques returned?" the hon. the member for St. Barbe indicated in the affirmative.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
I have never, Mr. Chairman, seen in my life such a distortion from such an hon. member. Look, the brain is made up, Mr. Chairman, of black matter and white matter, then there is grey matter and then there is diarrhea of the grey matter, and that seems to be the problem of the President of the Council.

He talks about the Macleans article, that national magazine which called my leader lackluster, Mr. Speaker. It also called him sincere. It called him intelligent. Was that the same magazine that said senior Tory

insiders claim they are gone, it is over, Peckford cannot do it anymore, the gig is up? Is that the same magazine, Mr. Chairman? Is it the same magazine that called the Billy - Brian vision of Newfoundland a failed vision? Is that the magazine he is referring to? Is that the magazine, Mr. Chairman, where a former minister of the Crown talks about Mr. Peckford picking up his marbles and running if he cannot have it his way? Is that the same magazine?

The President of the Council has got to watch what he utters in this hon. Assembly. If he is going to shoot let him shoot straight, because the people of Newfoundland are on to him. That national magazine, Mr. Chairman, I am not proud of what that cover says. That cover talks about my Province and of failed vision, and it further talks about unemployment spiralling out of control, labour relations spiralling out of control, young people not being able to find work. Is that the same magazine?

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

Could the hon. member please state his point of order.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Chairman, my point of order is this, that I did not say what the hon. the President of the Council assumed I said. What I simply said in response to him was this: He said, "Should we throw the Finance Minister in jail?" I simply said, "You have thrown everybody else in jail, why not?"

MR. DECKER:  
To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleague not to get upset. The only time you have to worry is when the hon. Government House Leader is praising you. As long as the hon. Government House Leader is trying to attack you, then you must be doing something right in this Province. So I would ask my hon. colleague not to get too upset. I love for him to attack me, because it means I am doing something right in this Province, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
The hon. gentleman is worry-free for the rest of his life, as he has been before, as well as all members of the official Opposition. I am not going to respond further. Obviously that article in Macleans has some of the official Opposition all upset and some of them very delighted, some not too far away, and I will not mention any names, we will not mention them, we will not get them going. The fact of the matter is, this administration is alive and well. We celebrated a victory a few days ago, which was the most significant victory that any government in this Province ever won, when last year we won twenty seats, in a fifty-two seat House, under the most difficult of situations. I am not going to get on that, I am just going to talk about the way the Opposition, as I was saying, now want to get the cheques back, and what is the purpose of this Interim Supply.

They have had the opportunity to sit down and talk logically with respect to the elements that the Minister of Finance has brought before the House in his Budget and his Estimates and to ask specific questions, but instead they have spent - now mark this - a whole week talking about legalistic, lackluster and boring subjects with respect to the legality of the payment. The fact of the matter is, as I said, it comes under the Financial Administration Act, it was not illegal. You cannot be so narrow-minded when you are reading a book or you are reading an act to read just two sections and not read beyond those sections. There is that other section which says that Treasury Board can make it legal, which we have done and we are ratifying it here. Now, all we are doing is asking hon. gentlemen there opposite to ratify these expenditures that have been made. And bear in mind if any member of the Opposition gets up, first of all, and votes against Interim Supply, he is voting against these people getting their money. That is number one. Number two, we are attempting to bring about a meaningful debate of the financial questions that are before this Province, and hon. gentlemen have shown themselves consummately unable to do so.

The member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), according to his statement, realizes the error of his ways and I take it that this really amounts to almost an apology to the people of Newfoundland for his conduct on March 26 last in voting against Interim Supply. I think he was overwhelmed and overcome by the official Opposition, he was taken in by them, and he voted with them to try to prevent the people of

the Province getting their cheques. I take it that what he said a few moments ago was an apology.

MR. W. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

This is an exceptional morning. In the galleries we have twenty-five or thirty very handsome, bright, young students from Gander listening to all this, listening to the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) mislead the House. I think he should be at his best this morning to impress these young, future leaders.

MR. DECKER:

That is his best.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, I suppose. But he is trying to give the impression, as he is doing, that we are against people getting their cheques, that we wanted to hang up the delivery of their cheques, and then he charged my friend from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) -

MR. MARSHALL:

He can get into debate, Mr. Chairman, but he is not allowed to

MR. W. CARTER:

This is a point of order, Mr. Chairman - charged my friend with having uttered the words, 'Let them send the cheques back', he know very well that that was not said. This morning we have seen the House Leader distort the facts to be political. He cannot open his mouth without being political

and nasty. This morning, when we have these young leaders and their teachers in the galleries, try to be at your best - that is all I ask - for their sake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to respond to a thrust from a former colleague of mine, who sat in Cabinet with me, when he knows it is different. I realize now he is chafing because he saw that article about the lackluster leader, and he sees his opportunity as he has seen his opportunity before. As a matter of fact, I would think the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) would make a marvellous Leader of the Opposition, just as I think the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) would have made a marvellous whip. I wonder what he did to get removed as the whip.

They distract me, Mr. Chairman. What we have before the House, what we are attempting to get before the House, is an intelligent investigation and examination of the expenditures in the budget that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brought before this House and the Opposition has blocked it. Now, why do you not pass Interim Supply, as the member for Menihek indicated, so we can get into the Legislative and Executive Council section and ask certain specific questions rather than spending, as the hon. gentlemen did, this

period of time arguing about this issue. Sure you can focus on an issue like this, but you could have discussed it in about a half an hour. The fact of the matter is, what we did is legal and we are asking you to ratify it. Do not ask us to go out and take the cheques back from the people of Newfoundland.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, what we have just listened to was a tirade and a political diatribe that we are not unaccustomed to hearing from that hon. member. Now, Mr. Chairman, what we are debating in this House at this moment goes right to the core of the existence of a parliament and that is, namely, the expenditures of public funds. This is what we are talking about. Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who just spoke for government, he, over the years, has been a champion of following the correct parliamentary procedures right to the detail in every matter. As a matter of fact, he was one who stood up for the power of the purse strings being decided on this floor, being decided in the correct democratic procedure in the House of Assembly. That hon. gentleman has spent hours in this Chamber espousing that particular well-established tradition of parliament, that all monies be appropriated on the floor of this House, and I plan, in the course of my few moments, to outline how that hon. member has done that over the years.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to allude to the speech made by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) a couple of days ago in trying to justify this matter. He went to great lengths to say that one cannot establish laws for every eventuality. We cannot establish laws for everything that will happen, so obviously there has to be some flexibility. What the minister said was that there was no law governing this particular case; since it was for the public good, then government should be permitted this flexibility. Mr. Chairman, there was not a law for it but there was a law against it. Again, without reiterating and belabouring the point, we have two cases whereby government is given the opportunity or given the right to allocate funds with respect to Special Warrants. We have two and they are: One, is when we have appropriated funds in a particular year, in a given year, in a fiscal year and government runs short, whether it is a department or whether it is government at large, they are then entitled to go to His Honour and get a Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant for a particular service. The key point being, though, that it must be a matter of urgency. You see, the point is that no government likes the idea of getting Special Warrants because that is really outside the normal routine of parliament, because all expenditures must be approved by the House of Assembly, or Parliament, using the broader term. So no government likes to use this situation. Now, this is where we have laws to govern that particular eventuality. We would not want the government to get caught in a position of not being able to provide a very urgent vital service, be it pay cheques -

DR. COLLINS:

Does the hon. member -.

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to interrupt my train of thought, I want to develop this. So, Mr. Chairman, there is that eventuality, when, within a fiscal year a government runs out of money, they then have the right to get Special Warrants. But, as I say again, let us not forget the point that responsible governments try to avoid that situation like the plague; they try to avoid it because they do not want to be accused of going outside the House and getting monies that have not been approved by the House, been approved by Parliament. That is one situation, where they run out of monies in a fiscal year.

The second one is when the House is not in session or has been adjourned for at least thirty days and they again run into a situation that is urgent. They do not have a right just to issue a Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant or a Special Warrant, they do not have the right, they have to demonstrate to His Honour that is a matter of extreme urgency.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the second case, then, is when the House is not in session and has been adjourned for at least thirty days and some urgent matter comes up that has been unforeseen, if the government has not got the money, it has not been approved, they can then go to His Honour and state the case.

These are the two cases. This one that we have is a unique case, the House was in session and the government closed it. I can see by the remarks made by the hon.

the House Leader this morning why it was that he did it. He did it to try and blame the Opposition. He did not know how to go about it and he said, "We will close this House and we will lay the blame on the Opposition. We will tell the people of this Province they were the ones who tried to hang up payment of cheques and salaries."

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, what we are debating goes right to the core of Parliament. It was an illegal act and we just cannot dismiss that. The reason why we have prolonged the debate is that we believe that if the people of this Province understood what is at stake they would agree with us, they would agree that this government is becoming arrogant and they are disregarding Parliament. That is the reason why we tried to debate, to make sure that the people of this Province understand -

DR. COLLINS:

The people of Newfoundland still do not believe you.

MR. LUSH:

It takes some time, Mr. Chairman, for the people to be fed all of this information. It takes time for people to understand it. But we are trying to make sure that the people of this Province understand that what has gone on, what this government have done is an act of arrogance, of complete disregard for the established customs and tradition of Parliament. That is what has happened.

Mr. Chairman, we are not against the people receiving their welfare cheques and other people receiving their salaries. We do not want these people to pass back their cheques. We do not want any of

that nonsense, but we want to establish that what this government did is an illegal act. That is what we want to establish. We want to make sure that we maintain the customs and the traditions of this Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, the hon. Government House Leader is one gentleman who, over the years, fought for keeping the expenditures in this House of Assembly. He is one gentleman who fought for that.

Let me give you some quotes, Mr. Chairman: Back in 1971, when the opposition of the day put an amendment to what was called The Audit Act, I think, of that particular time, they did not agree with the act because it gave too much power to Cabinet for spending, and, indeed, to ministers.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

DR. COLLINS:

The other day the hon. the Leader of the Opposition read from an old Hansard the words of the member for St. John's East, and he read them in such a boring, laborious way that it almost drove people to distraction. Now, the hon. member is apparently going to read the same again. I think he is being repetitious. However, if Your Honour permits him to do that, and it is within Your Honour's prerogative to do so, I do implore him to read them in a more vivacious manner than the Leader of the Opposition read them the other day.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order. The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I will read them, Mr. Chairman, as only I can read them, always with enthusiasm. When I was a teacher teaching students, I was never known to bore to bore them. They always stood in awe when I stood before them to speak for forty minutes, or fifty minutes. Many of them always wanted me to stay long after the bell.

I want the people in the galleries, particularly the students, to understand the procedure. When you are getting to the core, when you are getting to the truth, some minister will always get up and interrupt you because this takes away from your time.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to point out how this government have now, all of the sudden, changed. Where they did not want any expenditures to be approved on the floor of this House, now they have changed. Now they say they would like to do that. Back in 1971, the hon. the House Leader, at that particular point in time, passed an amendment to bring back more power to this Legislature in terms of approving expenditures. What does he say? He says, "Mr. Chairman, it is \$53 million that was borrowed in the secret Cabinet Chamber. After the fact we are informed of it. After the fact we are told what additional amounts the government has spent" - and here he talks also about Special Warrants - "and they used a lot of this money to spend extra money which is a point to which I will avert in a moment. But this is not right. It is incorrect and it is very, very wrong." That was in

1971, Mr. Chairman. Very wrong in 1971.

MR. BARRY:

'Tom' who said that?

MR. LUSH:

The hon. the House Leader.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. LUSH:

Up, Mr. Chairman? By Leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, boy.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Leave is not granted.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, if we could have a slight change of pace. This is very boring, what the member is trying to do. It is already in Hansard once, and he wants to put it in Hansard twice. I think we should have pity on the poor Hansard staff. I mean, it is bad enough the amount of stuff they have to put in anyway.

I came across a very interesting article in a magazine last week and I thought it might be useful if it were read into the record. I have made some copies that are available for members. I think it puts the whole budgetary predicament that we find ourselves in into perspective. So, by right, I beg the indulgence of members while I read this

relatively short article.

It is from the magazine called **The Western Report**. While it does not refer to anything in Newfoundland, in fact it refers to the federal situation, still the implications are monumental insofar as it affects Newfoundland so, therefore, I will read it. It is by a columnist Ralph Headland and the title of it is, **We Cannot Run Away From Trudeau's Debt Legacy**. I think it is very, very relevant. I think this should be framed and hung in every building, in every public office government has.

Now this was written for March 3, just prior to the federal budget being brought down, but it is still quite relevant. "Aided by some last minute adjustments and changes, the Government of Canada may succeed in holding the 1985 - 1986 budgetary deficit at its target figure of \$33.8 billion. In a revealing move, Finance Minister Michael Wilson froze all discretionary spending for the final months of the fiscal year. Why? To frustrate the historic search of departmental managers to seek something, anything, upon which to spend allocated funds that have proven surplus to their current year requirements.

"In Canada, we have come to view control of growing government deficits as impossible. We have been trained in this belief by governments since 1968. Mr. Trudeau and his successive Ministers of Finance uncoupled the old relationship that once existed between government revenues and expenditures. They thought us that we could buy at no cost in the great supermarket of government giveaways. So we could for a

while but, debt mounted.

"Net public debt increased by a factor greater than twelve times during those Trudeau years. It actually doubled every three years from 1975 and, bad news, it was not free, it was a fraud. We found there was a giant price to pay. Mr. Trudeau and his ministers, gone from the halls of government, have left a heavy mortgage on Canada and our future. When retiring Liberal Prime Minister Mike Pearson handed over the Prime Ministership to new Liberal Leader Pierre Elliott Trudeau in 1968, the net federal debt was \$18 billion. By the time Mr. Trudeau was through and the Prime Ministership passed to Brian Mulroney, the net federal debt had been ballooned to an incredible and almost unbelievable \$225 billion. Canada's net national debt built to \$18 billion over a period of one hundred years and fourteen Prime Ministers. One Prime Minister of fifteen years added over \$200 billion to that total. Had Mr. Trudeau added debt at the more frugal pace of his fourteen predecessors, today's taxpayers would be paying some \$2 billion a year interest on debts instead of the \$26 billion we are paying. The difference is the current annual cost to Canadians of the unforgiveable extravagances that marked and marred the fifteen years of Mr. Trudeau's reign.

"The gross over spending that resulted in this massive debt was irresponsible at best, at worst it was the cynical and immoral use of their own tax dollars to bribe voters. Mr. Wilson could be excused for feeling some bitterness towards predecessors who burdened every future government and finance minister with the servicing of these



crippling debt costs. He could not, however, be excused for failing to marshal every force under his influence or control in a --

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. J. CARTER:

Before the point of order is heard, may I just finish my sentence?

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is making an outstanding speech, one of the best speeches I have heard him make in this House and I think it extremely unfair that his colleagues are not here to listen to this. I think, Mr. Chairman, we should call them in. I am not calling for a quorum but I think we should call his hon. colleagues in.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

For the people in the gallery in particular, it is a well known fact that members during debate in the House frequently move back into their Common Rooms as that one is in there on that side and that one is in there on that side. There is a speaker system in there and members here on this side of the House, as well as

members over there, can clearly hear any of the debate that is going on. Sometimes, in fact, Mr. Chairman, members on this side get called on that side to go out of the House to have a meeting with their constituents and so it is important that that should be pointed out.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I think, Mr. Chairman, that points that have been made are quite accurate. If, for instance, we were to look into the Opposition Common Room, we would find a whole nest of Liberals in there.

"Mr. Wilson could not, however, be excused for failing to marshal every force under his influence or control in a relentless assault on further deficits and, discouraging though the prospect may be, on the debt itself. It is imperative that over expenditure, the hallmark of the Trudeau years, be tolerated no longer. Public debt and deficits are at the root of the decline in the value of the Canadian dollar. This, in turn, is at the root of the escalation of interest rates. High interest rates push up the carrying cost of the national debt, which increases the annual deficit, which again adds to the net national debt. So the circle spins and as a crucial side bar, high interest rates retard capital investment, slow economic growth, reduce the Gross National Product and through reducing government revenues, contribute to further growth in the annual deficit.

"There is nothing easy or simple about picking up after a fiscally irresponsible government but, that is Mike Wilson's job. He must convince his colleagues in Cabinet and in caucus that he must rebuff those looking for government handouts. He must successfully confront the special pleaders who see their own project or pleasure as more vital than the fiscal integrity of the nation. Canada's finances are in dire straits. The first priority is to start our country seriously on the road back. If Mr. Wilson's budget of this week" - this is March 3 - "has failed to set our nation feet on that path, it would be a grave negative on the record of the Mulroney Government, much more serious, it will strike an equivalent blow at the future economic health of Canada."

Well now, Mr. Chairman, it is a known fact that Mr. Wilson's budget did address these difficulties. Perhaps he should have done more, but he certainly could have done less. In keeping with the rules of this House, I would like to table this thing since I did read verbatim from this article. I can sure that the table can do what it wants to do with it.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons we have had a difficult time in this Province is precisely because of the fiscal record of the Trudeau years. I am sure the Finance Minister at some time in this debate will give chapter and verse to these allegations."

I am only sorry that the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is not in the House because I think he should be taken to task for having the temerity to support this particular

administration and, especially, to support it in Cabinet, although it was only for ten days, tens days, I might add, that did not shake the world. Nevertheless, for ten days he vigorously supported the Trudeau Government in its fiscal irresponsibility. I think that he should bear a fair share of that blame. If he had any decency he would absent himself from the House not for ten days, but for perhaps one hundred days. I think it is the only way he could show a proper act of contrition.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Or forever.

MR. J. CARTER:  
Or forever. The House Leader has suggested that it would be more proper if the member resigned forever. I do think, yes, the member for Hermitage should resign, there is no doubt about it, to have supported such a government is a shameful awful thing.

I think the Opposition have suggested that we should not have closed the House, we should kept debating morning, noon, and night until - what was it? - Monday night, March 31. We were left with no doubt that the Opposition were not going to pass Interim Supply. They just wanted to make a political football of it. We gave them every opportunity to move the debate forward but it was quite clear that they were only interested in making foolish points, and I think the House Leader quite properly, moved the adjournment and proof that the Opposition were only interested in playing their silly political games -

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I thank the member for St. John's North, the former Minister of Education, which I am sure speaks volumes of that department.

Mr. Chairman, I want to put what we are doing in this hon. House into some sort of context. I think it was on March 25, over the objections of the hon. the Opposition, the weight and power of the government forced us to adjourn the House before Interim Supply was approved. We recessed for Easter. I think it is symbolic, Mr. Chairman, that in that time of the year, when we think of the old story of the Crucifixion, there was another crucifixion which took place in Newfoundland - the whole process of democracy. Democracy as we have come to know it and love it for generations was literally crucified. Democracy, Mr. Chairman was eradicated from the face of Newfoundland. It was wiped out. Democracy was eradicated by a corrupt, arrogant administration who think that they somehow have the divine right of kings to do what they like.

During that period, Mr. Chairman, when our minds were on the Crucifixion, this arrogant

government went beyond all the confines of democracy and used a Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant to give authorization to spend almost \$1 billion. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a horrendous amount of money.

If the welfare recipients of this Province require \$1 billion to meet their payments between March 25 and April 6 when the House reopened, then I would suggest to the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that this Province is in a much worse state than even I and the rest of Newfoundland think it is in, if we had to break the law, Mr. Chairman, to get \$1 billion.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, we have as a duty as members of this House to maintain some semblance of order in the House. This is a heavy load placed on all in this House and I submit that the hon. member opposite is making a farce of this House, i.e., not contributing to good order. The farce he is making is a little while ago he got up on a petition and said, "Please build a road," and here he refuses to help us to even get Interim Supply. He says, "Build a road," and makes a plea for it and he will not even give us Interim Supply, not to talk about main supply. He will not even give us Interim Supply. I think he is making a farce of this House and should be brought to order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two

hon. members.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER

Mr. Chairman, this member would be pleased if the government would give the money back to that Route 432 that it took from it. That is what I would like to see this government do and that is what I am trying to make them do, Mr. Chairman.

In our parliamentary system, which we inherited from our ancestors, certain procedures have been established and one of the procedures which has been established, Mr. Chairman, is the procedure for the spending of money, the people's money. The most important thing, I suppose, in the people's estimation, is the spending of money. When we talk about money, Mr. Chairman, I am thinking about the 12 per cent sales tax, the 12 per cent sales tax which was spent on government waste, government arrogance, government trips to China, government's extension to the Confederation Building, government's attempt to raise the status and prestige of the Premier by making his office into a little empire of his own, Mr. Chairman. This is the money that, in the wisdom of the parliamentary procedure, in the wisdom of democracy, there have been provisions so that the people of this Province, who own this money, can have some checks and balances so that the whole premise of democracy is not thrown out the window by an arrogant, uncaring government who believe that they rule by divine right, who completely ignore the process of democracy as we have come to inherit it down through the years.

Some of this \$1 billion, this Interim Supply money, which was taken, presumably to last for a little more than a week to ten days, while members were basking in the sun down South, Mr. Chairman, was supposed to go for welfare recipients. Well, as I said, what kind of a mess is this Province in if we need \$1 billion to last us ten days? This money was raised because we have overtaxed consumers in this Province. We have given them an unbelievable 12 per cent sales tax which, in some cases, Mr. Chairman, is also a tax on tax. If you buy a sheet of plywood, there is a 14 per cent federal sale tax on it. Then, on top of that, there is a tax on tax, a 12 per cent on top of the federal tax. This is some of the \$1 billion that this arrogant, uncaring government broke the law to get and the pretense they use, as put forward by that silly, arrogant, little, mean hon. gentleman over there from St. John's East, who gets up and tries to justify what he did by saying he is caring for the welfare recipients in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, he is only concerned for big business. He is only concerned for big Tories. He is only concerned about patronage. He is not concerned about the welfare recipients of this Province. If he was concerned about the welfare recipients of this Province, he would be doing more than this government is doing to make sure that the need for welfare is eradicated from the face of this Province and that welfare recipients are put to work, that they are given meaningful employment. That is far more important, Mr. Chairman, if he was as concerned for welfare recipients as he would have us

believe. But we are not so gullible as to accept the nonsense that he is going on with.

What he did cannot be justified in a democracy. There is no excuse for what he did, Mr. Chairman. It is setting a precedent whereby democracy will be completely wiped out, Mr. Chairman, and all our traditions and all that our forefathers fought for will be wiped off the face of this Province. We will become exactly, as my colleague so ably points out, Mr. Chairman, like Marcos.

I would ask the Government House Leader and the Premier why they do not now buy some real estate in Hawaii, why they do not now buy some real estate in some other place, in Panama somewhere, so that when this population finally comes to its feet, as it is doing more and more, Mr. Chairman - look what is happening? It was been stated on The National news cast that we are on the brink of anarchy.

I would advise the hon. Premier and the hon. House Leader to make their reservations now in Panama, make their reservations now in other places, in Brazil or wherever in this world, so that they can run because, just as sure as the sun shines in the East, Mr. Chairman, just as sure as day follows night, the people of this Province are not going to lie down much longer. They are going to rise up in masses and they are going to throw this group of intolerable, intolerant, arrogant, uncaring, corrupt people out of this hon. House of Assembly. We are fast approaching that day and that is the only bright light I see, Mr. Chairman, in terms of what is happening in this Province today. This amount, almost \$1

billion, which the government says it needs, which it did without the consent of this House of Assembly, which it did without giving the Opposition - who represent the people, remember, Mr. Chairman. We are not fifteen half-wits who came here on our own right. We are fifteen members who represent about 150,000 people who voted and put us there. That is what we are, Mr. Chairman. When we get up and ask that this Internal Supply Bill be debated, we are doing it for the people of this Province so the people of this Province can see what is happening. Does the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) wish to say that the people of this Province do not have a right to know where their \$1 billion is being spent? Is this what the member wants to say? If so I will sit down and let him say it. Are you saying that it is none of their business?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words in this debate. First of all I must say that I always enjoy following the member for the Strait of Belle Isle. He gives us sermons in the House and lectures in the House that are, I suppose, second to none, although they are somewhat repetitive. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle I find rather humorous. A few

minutes earlier, when somebody else was debating, his colleague the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Fury) stood on a point of order because he objected to something that the Government House Leader had said. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle got up and said to his colleague, the member for St. Barbe, now do not get upset because you can be certain that if you are being attacked then you are doing something right.

MR. FUREY:

That is not exactly right.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, that is the interpretation I put on his comments. I think that is what he said, was it not? If you are being attacked then you must be doing something right. Well, then to turn that right around, the hon. member has just given us ten minutes of attack over here on this side of the House, therefore, to use his own logic, we must be doing something right. We appreciate the attack and the criticism although it was not very constructive and that is the whole unfortunate thing about this debate, I guess, Mr. Chairman. Prior to that I had occasion to listen to the new finance critic in the Opposition. The member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), I gather, is the new Finance critic. I am not sure if it was ever announced.

MR. PEACH:

It was in the paper.

MR. SIMMS:

Was it in the paper about the whole shadow Cabinet shuffle? I must have missed that. I apologize. I was on Her Majesty's Service somewhere.

MR. FUREY:

In China.

MR. SIMMS:

No, I have never been to China.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I listened to the new Finance critic, the member for Bonavista North, who I must admit publicly I have a great deal of respect for. Certainly personally I have a great deal of respect for him, but I cannot say that I have a great deal of respect for his ability to enter into debate with respect to the finances of this Province as a Finance critic. I think he is a bit out of his league just yet, but perhaps with time he will improve, perhaps if he changes his suspenders. I notice he has taken on a new tactic now to improve his image, I guess. To improve his image he now wears suspenders, and that is probably a new tack taken by Finance critics all across the world, although I am not quite sure. In any event I compliment him on his new image and his new look and trust that over the coming years he will be able to improve his abilities and become a much more forceful Finance critic.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we only have a few minutes to speak in the debate, so I think it is important to put this whole thing into perspective and to talk about exactly what it is we are trying to do here today, or what we are supposed to be doing here today. We are debating an Interim Supply Bill which, in essence, provides the government with a small amount of funds out of the entire budget, a portion of its entire budget, to carry it over the period of time that it takes to get the budget concluded and passed. We had three or four days before the end of the fiscal year to have some debate on it when it was brought

in; and members opposite said it was not enough time. But we are debating a Supply Bill that allocates in excess of \$700 million.

MR. DECKER:

Only \$715 million.

MR. SIMMS:

Okay. Only \$715 million. But, Mr. Chairman, just to put it in perspective, let us not forget that the entire budget for the whole country of Canada, which is \$109 billion, takes only six days to debate in the House of Commons. This is an Interim Supply measure which asks for an expenditure just in excess of \$700 million - \$770-odd million, I guess it is, less than \$1 billion. We had three or four days prior to the end of the fiscal year and we spent the last three or four days here on it, and they still have not been able to use enough common sense to get this measure out of the way so they can get on with the Budget Debate where they can ask some questions. I understand the last few days of debate on this measure there have been no questions. The Finance critic, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), has been attempting to use his new-found legal talents to try to argue the technical, legal points with respect to obtaining a Special Warrant but, instead of putting his efforts into trying to get some questions about the finances and the expenditures outlined in the Interim Supply Bill, he decides -

MR. LUSH:

Oh, that is coming. That is coming.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I mean, when is it going to

come, Mr. Chairman? Why do not members opposite use their common sense, take the advice of their Opposition colleague over there, from Menihek, get on with this particular measure, vote on it, get it out of the way today, and let us get to the main estimates and the Budget Debate. That is where the members opposite would be fulfilling their responsibility. So the entire budget of Canada, \$109 billion, takes six days, the devolution bill on Scotland took six hours, Mr. Chairman, and we are talking about an Interim Supply Bill that will provide for an expenditure of less than \$1 billion, not to forget also, Mr. Chairman, that all these last numbers of days that we spent on Interim Supply debating nothing is all going to be included in the budget. It is all included in the budget. And the Budget Debate will come up as soon as members opposite get to their senses and pass the Supply Bill. But I suspect, Mr. Chairman, maybe they have a strategy. Maybe they have a strategy now. There is an entire allotment of seventy-five hours debate for the budget. Now, maybe they want to spend a lot of time on this Interim Supply legal nonsense so they will not have to go through the good news budget that was presented by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a few weeks ago. Maybe that is their strategy. They want to waste their time at this little legal argument on Interim Supply so they do not have to go into the main budget and deal with all the good news that is in the main budget. And then, Mr. Chairman, when time runs out, they will be able to say, 'Mr. Chairman, there is not enough time provided for debating the budget.' That is what they will say. So that is probably

what their strategy is. And, I suppose, given the mentality of the members opposite and their political approaches, that might be a fitting strategy for members opposite, I do not know. I really do not care, to tell you the truth.

The Warrant was issued under the rules with the approval of Treasury Board. There is provision for Treasury Board to do it, they did it, it is done. So members opposite should get on with dealing with this Interim Supply Bill which is just a normal process to give government authority to pay its bills for salaries of people who were still working, social assistance payments already alluded to, commitments for various contracts, Mr. Chairman, that have to be entered into, for road maintenance, for transportation purposes, for silviculture contracts. I am very concerned about that. There are also funds provided in the Interim Supply Bill for payments to various groups around the Province to help them with their administration, which this government supports. Mr. Chairman, another very important point that I am concerned about here is that in that Interim Supply Bill there was funding provided in my department to enter into contracts for transportation and air services with respect to gearing up to the forest fire season. Now, Mr. Chairman, had this government not taken the action that it took, then that particular measure would not have been able to have been undertaken. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about that. Why did we not do this, why did we do this, and all that old stuff is nonsense, Mr. Chairman. What is done is done. Does the hon.

member know there was a forest fire four days ago? The hon. member would not know that because he is too busy reading his little books, looking for the little legal technicalities of what happened with respect to the Special Warrant and the Interim Supply. It is typical, Mr. Chairman, of an intellectual Towny who has a lackluster group with him, thereby, making him a lackluster Opposition Leader. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be disturbed by comments from members like those opposite. I just wanted to make those few points. I do not intend to take my full ten minutes, Mr. Chairman. I think I have made my points and I think I have made them well. I suggest members opposite take the advice of their colleague in the Opposition, get on with it, support this bill and let us get on to the budget debate.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Chairman, I do not want to spend a lot of time alluding to any of the comments made by the speaker who just sat down, but I do feel it obligatory to comment on some of the few beginning remarks that he made when he was more or less questioning my credentials to speak in this particular debate. I am not one to flaunt or publicly display my credentials, but the minister did border on intellectual snobbery when he suggested something to the effect of my new-found legal expertise. As I said, it borders on intellectual snobbery. Obviously, the minister is part of



that old school that believes that if you have not studied or have not got a lawyer's degree that you cannot comment on legal matters; if you have not got an administration degree in finance, then you cannot comment on administrative matters; if you have not got an M.D. you cannot talk on health matters; and, I suppose, if you have not got a degree in education, you cannot comment on educational matters. I would suggest if the hon. member applied that logic to his own Cabinet there would be very few Cabinet ministers qualified to be Cabinet ministers. Mr. Chairman, I do not happen to subscribe to that school of thought. I believe that there is such a thing as self-education. I believe there is such a thing as initiative where a person really digs in and tries to find out what is happening in different areas, and that is what I shall attempt to do. I can tell you that the hon. member will have no reason in a short time to question my credentials with respect to questioning financial matters and how this Province is run financially.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I spent any time dealing with that, as a matter of fact. So, Mr. Chairman, I want to develop the point that I was making; how it is that a gentleman can try to be on two sides of an issue. The hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall), when he was in the Opposition, fought for keeping approval of expenditures on this floor, keeping them within the realm of democracy, and not giving the power to Cabinet, not giving the power to Treasury Board or any other institution, but approving expenditures on the floor of this House. I was reading from his

speeches and I just want to carry on in that vein. Remember, what we are arguing against here is an illegal act by the government, number one, the circumstances under which they issued these Special Warrants, these Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant, which actually makes redundant speaking to this Interim Supply. They have got it. They have got their Interim Supply through the Lieutenant-Governor Warrants, Special Warrants, some \$715 million, just about a third of the budget taken without parliamentary approval, without the approval of this House, which we say is illegal. That is the point.

But, Mr. Chairman, the other point is they have removed the power of the purse strings from this parliament, from this House of Assembly. This was something that the hon. the Government House Leader would never tolerate. And in talking to this, in talking to an amendment that would change that, that would bring the power of the purse strings back to this House, this is what he says, 'Furthermore, the public of this Province is entitled to a better budgetary set up, and better management by this government than to be out in their estimates of \$54 million in a certain year, as we see by the Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants of \$43 million last year.' He was objecting to the Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants of \$43 million, and we are talking about \$715 million. He said, 'It is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. The bad effect of this legislation can be seen, and it can be seen rather patently and sorrowfully right now. The public of this Province have a right, particularly in these very trying financial times, to know all times when money is being borrowed, when money is

being spent and for what purposes it is being spent.' These were his words.

Another excerpt, 'Surely this Legislature, any progressive Legislature in the twentieth century should not be afraid or any progressive government should not be afraid to come before the Legislature.'

MR. BARRY:  
Who is saying that?

MR. LUSH:  
This is the hon. the House Leader on that side.

MR. FUREY:  
The present House Leader, the member for St. John's East?

MR. LUSH:  
The Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate.

MR. DECKER:  
Half a minister.

MR. LUSH:  
Half a minister. He says, 'We should come before this House'. He says, 'Surely this Legislature, any progressive Legislature in the twentieth century, should not be afraid or any progress government should not be afraid, to come before the Legislature before it borrows millions of dollars and inform the Legislature of its intentions before so doing and get its approval, and thereby inform the public of this Province through its elected representatives of its intentions. It is not necessary to do this.' These were the comments.

DR. COLLINS:  
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

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

MR. FUREY:  
He is testy today, is he not?

DR. COLLINS:  
Just so that the hon. the member does not really confuse things too much, this is the Interim Supply Resolution. The hon. member was reading something that was appropriate to the Loan Bill. This is not a Loan Bill.

MR. LUSH:  
This was an amendment to the Audit Act.

DR. COLLINS:  
The hon. member I know is a new Finance critic, but he thinks that we are on the Loan Bill. No, it is not a Loan Bill. It is Interim Supply we are on, just to make sure that it is not confused.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
To that point of order. There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:  
How unfortunate. It is pretty difficult, Mr. Chairman, to make the Minister of Finance understand. What we have here was the hon. the Government House Leader back in his day in the Opposition objecting to removing the approval of expenditures from the floor of this House. This is what we are talking about.

MR. BARRY:  
Objecting to the same thing he is doing now.

MR. LUSH:

Exactly. This is what it was, it was an amendment to the Audit Act.

Now after that, when they got in government, the hon. the House Leader would now have his day to correct all of this. So they bring in the Financial Administration Act, the act that they have now broken. This is what the minister said when he brought in that act, he wanted to say how this was going to change things. What was it going to do? It was going to bring back to this Legislature the approval of expenditures where it belongs, he said. It was going to bring it back here. The Financial Administration Act was going to bring that back. Of course, there were some arrangements in the Financial Administration Act for government warrants, what we now have.

I want to read an excerpt from that speech because I think it is very enlightening and it is very elucidating. He was talking about what this Financial Act was going to do, going to bring back the expenditure, going to remove from Cabinet this right to make this decision in secret meetings. It was all going to be done in the open where it should be, in the House of Assembly.

Somebody in the House talked about the arrangements for Special Warrants. They thought they were probably a little too flexible and they wanted all of the discussion done here. Even though there were certain arrangements within the Financial Administration Act in case of emergency to allow the government to act, the hon. the Government House Leader gave his assurance to the House that they would not abuse any of the powers

given them, that monies would be approved on this floor.

This is what he says: "Mr. Speaker, this government have decided that all of the flexibility that this government needs and all of the flexibility we should have is the amount that the Legislature is prepared to allow us to borrow within a certain stipulated time." Let me read that again, Mr. Chairman. This is very important. He says, "This government have decided that all the flexibility that this government needs and all the flexibility we should have is the amount that the Legislature is prepared to allow us to borrow within a certain stipulated time, plus extra amounts to meet our commitments if emergencies occur. If emergencies occur there has to be an emergency borrowing power." Of course that was approved. But he gave his assurance that we are not going to take advantage, we are not going to misuse the powers given us by the Financial Administration Act.

I say it is as clear as crystal, Mr. Chairman, that this administration did abuse, did misuse its power. They broke their own act. They broke the Financial Administration Act which, again, I would suggest in closing, only allows the government to use that area of Special Warrants, Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants on two occasions.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hickey):

Order, please!

I am informed the hon. member's time is up.

MR. LUSH:

Just in conclusion if I may, Mr.

Speaker, ten seconds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

By leave.

MR. LUSH:

Just in conclusion, I say that the Financial Administration Act of this Province just allows the government the issuing of Special Warrants under two circumstances, and we have described these. The circumstances under which the government issued these particular Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants is against the law. There is no provision for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in this debate because I think it is important from the point of view of what hon. members opposite are basically saying here this morning. We opened the House of Assembly before April 1 and spent some time in here in order to pass Interim Supply so that we could do certain things, so we could, for example, keep schools open, keep hospitals open, build houses for people and so on. We spent some time in here discussing that. Now normally Interim Supply is passed fairly quickly and we get on to the main estimates in the budget and discuss those. So, what did we do? We brought them in. The hon. the Government House Leader informed the Opposition of what our plan was, what the

procedure was to be, and that we would like to have Interim Supply passed before April 1. If we did not have Interim Supply passed, we could not spend money, Mr. Chairman; therefore, monies not being approved, teachers would not be paid, hospitals would close. All of these things would happen if what the hon. members opposite contend is what is actually supposed to happen.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what did we do? We said, "Let us lay it out for them so that they know exactly what is happening. Let us give them a particular time in order to pass this and then we can get on to the seventy-five hours that we normally take in this Legislature to approve the budget, the good news budget as was proposed by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Finance, on budget day. Then we asked for \$715 million in the Interim Supply Bill, so the Opposition got up in the House and they said, "Interim Supply will never be passed until the strike is over with NAPE." Now, Mr. Chairman, that is clearly beyond the control of this House of Assembly. Anybody who knows anything about labour negotiations at all knows that if the union did not come back to the table, for example, there would be no Interim Supply - schools closed, hospital closed, they all close. Now what hon. members are arguing is that the money that we have sent out to social assistance recipients, the money that we sent out to teachers for teachers' salaries, the monies that we went to tender for so that we can get into the construction season and construct roads, all of that money that is going to be spent or is being spent now should be all recalled that we did not have the authority to spend it. That is what hon. members are

contending: If that were the case, hon. members know that there is a possibility that budget will never be passed in this House of Assembly. If the tyranny of the minority was allowed to prevail in this House of Assembly hon. members know that the budget would never be passed, hospitals would close, social assistance people would never get any money, would not get their cheques, people would starve, but do hon. members opposite care about that? No, they said, "Unless the strike is over, negotiations are concluded, no money." That is exactly what they said.

MR. BARRY:

What about closure and the other rules?

MR. DINN:

What about closure and the other rules? And then the hon. member screams, "Oh, they brought in closure. The government is terrible, it is a dictator." Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is hon. members, if they had their way, would approve nothing in this House of Assembly. Now, Mr. Chairman, I intend, with the monies that have been apportioned to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation this year, that 150 chronic care units for senior citizens and old people be built this year. But, Mr. Speaker, if it was left to hon. members opposite it would never be approved.

When did the union decide to go back to the table to bargain, to call off the strike? On April 7. So for those seven days the guy who got his leg broke, went in and got a cast, if hon. members opposite had their way they would have us drag him back, rip off the cast and tell him, "No, you cannot

have that because that has not been legally approved." That is exactly what is happening here. Teachers could not have been paid if it was not approved. Hon. members said, "Unless you meet these conditions nothing will be approved in this House of Assembly." The hon. the Leader of the Opposition stood in his place, it is in Hansard, and said that unless you do this, this, and this nothing will be approved.

So, Mr. Chairman, that became an impossible situation. That is what we talk about when we talk about the tyranny of the minority. We have to act as a government. I mean, we had an election last year, and if the hon. Leader of the Opposition does not want to accept the will of the people, that is his business. I mean, he can do lots of things. He can obstruct the House if he wants to, he can do exactly as he is doing but, the fact of the matter is the government has to govern.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might have a quorum call. The minister is making a speech and he should have some people listen to him.

MR. DINN:

Oh yes, another waste of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Call in the members.

### Quorum Call

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is a quorum.

The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:

I am not going to continue this any longer. The fact of the matter is the Leader of the Opposition just did in this House of Assembly exactly what he has done over his whole career; when things are not going his way he gets up and runs off. That is exactly what you did, that is a perfect example of what you do; whenever the heat gets a little bit too much, the Leader of the Opposition whips up and runs off and calls a quorum. That is what is happening.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this government is going to make sure that the social assistance recipients get their money, that the schools remain open, that the hospitals still run, and we are going to do that because we won the election last year. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition by some quirk of faith were to win an election the next time, then he can operate the way he deems fit. But right now we deem it, as a government, to be responsible and to make sure that these people are looked after. That is why the Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think we should get on with the budget debate as recommended by the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). Mr. Chairman, with that I will quit for now.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, we see in the last

speaker from the government side the same arrogant approach that, if the logic prevails, will permit the executive branch of government, will permit a secret committee behind closed doors, namely, Treasury Board, whenever it deems fit. All they have to say is, 'It is in the public interest or there would be public harm,' to ignore the House of Assembly, to ignore Parliament, to ignore the Legislature totally - in other words, to do away with democracy in this Province. That is exactly what has happened.

Now it may be a benign dictatorship as compared to some other places but, you know, even Marcos in the Philippines went through the motions of getting Parliamentary approval. There is absolutely no difference between what members opposite are trying to do and what has been done in Argentina before the last election, in Guatamala, in Chili, Mr. Chairman, in the communist countries where they have no democratically elected Parliaments. We have, Mr. Chairman, a decision by decree, by executive fiat or executive decree, to spend \$715 million of the peoples' taxes without getting the approval of the House of Assembly as they are required to do by The Financial Administration Act, by a statute of this Province.

Now you do not have to believe me, Mr. Chairman. Believe the Auditor General. Would you believe the Auditor General who, in his report, made exactly the same points that we have been making for the last several days, that control over the public purse is the very reason for being for the House of Assembly and, if that is taken away, you have a dictatorship? Mr. Chairman,

believe the Deputy Minister of Justice who, last year, these gentlemen were taking legal opinions from, who said, admitted in the last January, 1985, Public Accounts Committee meeting, what they are trying to do now is illegal, against the law, against The Financial Administration Act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, members opposite are asking, "Well, what can government do when there are dilemmas created?" Now sometimes there are dilemmas created that are beyond the power of the administration to deal with. For example, if an election is called just before the end of the fiscal year and the Legislature, under The Election Act, cannot be called together in time to have the budget approved, then there might be some justification for members opposite saying, 'Well, we have no choice. We have absolutely no choice. We have to take the lesser of evils and a technical breach of the Financial Administration Act is the lesser evil than not having the Public Service paid and not having social assistance cheques go out,' and so forth. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the case in this situation. It was within the control of members opposite to have approval obtained from the House of Assembly. For example, if they felt that politically they were justified to do so, they could have brought in closure. They could have, Mr. Chairman, given notice that the time for debate on Interim Supply would be limited. Now they would have to take the political consequences of so doing, they would have had to have the courage to go out and explain to people why they were invoking closure after only three days. No, they did not have the courage to do that, so they went behind

closed doors and they were hoping, Mr. Chairman, that nobody would pick up the fact that what they are doing in using these Special Warrants is against the law, against The Financial Administration Act of this Province.

Now, let me make a suggest to members opposite. Whether it be in the case of where an election has been called close to the end of the fiscal year, or in other dilemma which are beyond the control of the administration, let me make this suggestion: Why would not members have an amendment or amendments proposed to The Financial Administration Act? Would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) stand up and say that? Why would he not come in here now and point out that there are these exceptional times, exceptional circumstances - which should be, by the way, very, very closely circumscribed and restricted. There will be no blank cheques given out with any such amendment - bring in an amendment to the Financial Administration Act that would legally permit government to get Special Warrants in some circumstances other than The ones that are now in the Financial Administration Act?

DR. COLLINS:

And that would mean it would veto an illegal action?

MR. BARRY:

No, not that particular action. In that particular action there was no emergency that was beyond the power of members opposite to deal with, and that is the whole point. There is no way of legitimizing what was done in this case except to say the House of Assembly is irrelevant, democracy

is irrelevant, parliament and legislature are irrelevant, and we are going to rule her by decree, we are going to go into a dictatorship mode. Maybe it is a benign dictatorship according to members opposite, but there are a lot of people in this Province who are feeling that there is nothing very benign coming from that crowd opposite, Mr. Chairman. That is the proper way that members opposite should be dealing. Instead of saying to people in this Province, 'You can go out and disobey the laws of the Province with impunity, you can go out and act illegally,' because that is what you are doing. If government can act illegally, if government can ignore the statutes of this Province, why should not every other citizen take the same approach? Whether it be in the case of speeding, ignore the traffic laws, or whether it be in the case of paying income tax, ignore the income tax laws, that is what government is teaching, that is what government is promoting. Government is saying, 'Because we feel we have our reasons, we are entitled to ignore a statute of this Province passed by the people's House, passed by the people's legislature.' That is shameful, that is disgusting, that is a decline in democracy in this Province, that is a slide towards dictatorship which is going to come back to haunt members opposite. It is shameful. Now, bring in a proper amendment to The Financial Administration Act to deal with these restricted circumstances which government may need because of matters beyond their control. Now, in some other provinces they have already done this, by the way. As was pointed out at the Public Accounts Committee last year -

MR. SIMMS:  
Good idea.

MR. BARRY:

- if the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) would listen, in New Brunswick, for example, their Financial Administration Act apparently permits government for the first two months of any fiscal year to make expenditures without the approval of the legislature. That, we submit, is too broad, Mr. Chairman, that is a blank cheque and that is unnecessary. What we are suggesting is that in these very, very few exceptional circumstances, where government may lose the ability to have the Interim Supply or other monetary bill go through, have that set out specifically in the act to authorize expenditures in those exceptional cases.

MR. SIMMS:

When the House is closed for Easter, that kind of thing?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, where the House is closed for the Easter break, if the expenditure is unforeseen, that is there now. But not when the expenditure is foreseen, only for exceptional circumstances, very narrowly circumscribed, very closely restricted.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I was sitting here quietly, I was being abused, I was being attacked, I was being called a criminal, so finally I had to get to my feet. I am sure hon. members will remember that a



person who was not a great favourite of mine, Mr. Jean Chretien, he made a remark one time. He said, 'They can never accuse me of talking out of both sides of my mouth.' And the reason he said that was turned the joke on himself, because he had a facial fault and he make this joke on himself. I thought it was quite a good joke. It was quite good for a fellow with something like that to make a joke on himself over. Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) can never make that claim that, 'I will not speak out of both sides of my mouth.' Here is a man who just now said that this government was despicable because he, in his interpretation, thinks we break the law, when there the other day there were people on an illegal strike and he was out supporting them, and the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) actually joined the illegal strike. The hypocrisy that is coming from the other side of the House is unbelievable. They were going to not only, shall we say, break what they term a breaking of a relatively small part of the Legislature that most people are not too concerned about, they were willing to compromise the peace and good order of this government and bring the courts into disrepute. They did that the other day and now they have the temerity to come before this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The minister is talking about disrespect for law. What about the lack of enforcement of the court injunction by the minister and his colleagues. Would the minister deal with that? Tell us about that!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

I take it there is no point of order, just a difference of opinion.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, an officer of the court, a learned gentleman trained in the law, a man who has studied the Constitution, who was an associate professor of constitutional law at a university, came in here in this House a few days ago, and he says, I support people breaking the laws of this Province and bringing into disrepute the of courts and interfering with the peace and good order of the Province.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS:

And he was supported in this by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) who was out there labelling himself and saying, "I am also ruling to bring into disrepute." And then they come in over this point here! Look, they are digging such a hole for themselves! The people of this Province have no respect

whatsoever for the Opposition. Every time they touch an issue they take the wrong side of it, they go off an angle, and they blow everything. They try to blacken the reputation of one of the most respected legislators in this Province, who has been serving the people of this Province for well over a decade. They tried to blacken that, and, even when the most simple person out there knew it was going to go nowhere, they kept on at it and on at it and on at it and on at it. And now over this matter here, this has been argued and was settled way back in the 60s, and they keep going on at it and on at it. Look their credibility is about minus zero. With that I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. HICKEY:

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

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the

House, as is our habit to give members notice of committee meetings, I just want to advise that on Tuesday the first meeting of the Government Services Committee will be held here in the House at 9:30 to consider the estimates of the Department of Transportation. And at 9:30, the same time, the Social Services will meet at the Colonial Building to consider the estimates of the Department of Justice. I will be repeating that on Monday, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. members.

MR. BARRY:

If I could for a minute, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We have asked the minister to give consideration to the fact that the resources available to the media as shown by last year's attendance at these committee meetings show that the committees, if they are held at the same time and outside the House of Assembly, will not be covered. We ask the minister to seriously look at the advisability of limiting the committee meetings to one at a time to permit the media, which is now severely strapped in terms of resources, to get around and cover them. We believe it is important that the people of the Province get information on the estimates from these committee hearings and it is very unfortunate if we are going to have more than one committee sitting because the information will not get out to the public.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, could I comment on that.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The schedule that we have arranged this year is under the constraints of the fifteen day rule. But the schedule that we have arranged is that there will never be more than two meetings at a time; the two meetings at a time will then be followed by only one meeting at a time, so that it is spread as thin as possible.

The schedule that we have arranged is such that there will never be more than two meetings at a time, say, in the morning, followed in the evening by no more than one meeting at a time. So there will be two and then one. So that is as thin as we can spread it and still get it all within fifteen days. The only other change would be to change the fifteen day rule, and I cannot comment on that.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

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