



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

No. 35

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

18 June 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that an agreement has now been reached with the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, on behalf of approximately 160 staff employed by Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:
Following a vote in favour of strike action last week, further discussions were initiated immediately with a view to averting a strike planned for June 18, which is today. A strike by these employees would have been extremely disruptive to the Corporation, its employees, and particularly to the chicken and hog industries in the Province, which are already experiencing great difficulties and receive substantial subsidies from government.

A tentative agreement was reached on June 15, 1985 with the assistance of the Department of Labour, and has since received ratification by the members of the

bargaining unit. The Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) and the senior management of Farm Products were very much involved in this process and were instrumental, along with our negotiators, in working out the final agreement and in formulating contingency plans in the event that a strike did occur.

In addition to improving the terms and conditions of employment in areas relating to hours of work, technological change, seniority and sick leave, I would like to emphasize that the new agreement provides a two-year contract which is in accordance with government's two-year wage freeze.

The House will note that this will be the sixth collective agreement to be signed since introduction of the two-year wage freeze. Agreements were previously reached with the Newfoundland and Labrador Nurses Union, the Public Libraries Board, the CUPE Hospital Support Staff, the NAPE Waterford Hospital Support Staff and NAPE Ferry Workers.

It is worthy of note, from government's viewpoint, that these groups, by reaching agreements which include the wage freeze, have recognized the extremely difficult financial position in which government finds itself. Government has already announced that at the end of the two-year period, normal negotiations will resume, and has guaranteed that increases will at least equal the Consumer Price Index in the first year following the freeze. Government recognizes, however, the need even then to be very much aware of its financial constraints and will have to resist any attempts by unions to use the

post-freeze period to 'catch up' quickly. Government finances will not allow it to make up for lost wage increases in the shortterm. Indeed, to do so would negate the purpose of the policy which was to restrain government expenditures as a measure of sound and prudent financial management.

As we have said repeatedly, normal negotiations will commence on all fronts at the end of the wage freeze. Indeed I look forward to that. In the meantime, I am very pleased that another set of negotiations encompassing the wage freeze period has been brought to a successful conclusion at Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation. This new agreement will remain in effect until July 31, 1986 and replaces the previous contract which expired on July 31, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, any minister with any kind of sensitivity and any kind of pride in the collective bargaining process would be ashamed to make this statement. Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that collective bargaining does not exist in this Province. And for the minister to be here beating his chest about this kind of an agreement, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that it took the people so long to settle shows us that collective bargaining is not alive and well in this Province today, Mr. Speaker. The government is negotiating with a sledgehammer over the heads of its workers, Mr. Speaker, and until we remove that hideous wage freeze programme, the workers of this Province will not be happy.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this that I find very pleasing, let me assure you. It is just little tidbits of improvements in 'the terms and conditions of employment in areas relating to hours of work, technological change, seniority and sick leave: Mr. Speaker, it is just a pittance. These workers want an increase in their salary to be able to help them meet the high cost of living in this Province. And until we remove that, Mr. Speaker, collective bargaining, as we knew it in this Province, will not exist.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews). I wonder if since yesterday the minister has come up with the \$2,000 that was asked for, I believe, by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland). On this side of the House we would like to suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that it is the very minimum recognition -

MR. DAWE:

Do you support hockey?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, could you keep the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) quiet? - the very minimum recognition that they can make for the distinguished performance of the Carol Players in Ireland and it might represent a partial

apology for the shoddy treatment that they received from his department, the Department of Tourism and the Canadian Embassy in Ireland when they were in Ireland. Prior to leaving here, they received that kind of treatment from his department and they also received it while they were in Ireland.

I ask the Minister for Culture, Recreation and Youth, since yesterday has he found the money to at least give those people the kind of recognition that they deserve?

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, it seems that the hon. member is trying to dwell on a point that was made very clearly yesterday. I thought I explained it very well for the members of the House yesterday, and for the members of the press afterwards, that upon a request from the Carol Players, made directly to the department and to me as the minister, that I investigated the possibility of funding for the Carol Players and found that in my department do not have a programme whereby we can fund that particular venture that they undertook.

MR. TULK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat

ironic that the minister yesterday could get on television and say that the Premier of this Province had funded hockey sweaters for the Corner Brook Royals, and we have nothing against that, but he did not even know about it in his department. Yet he cannot find the money for The Carol Players who have distinguished themselves in Canadian drama for 21 years. They spent \$12,000 themselves. They won against twelve countries, not Eastern Canada, as the Corner Brook Royals did.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is on a supplementary question but he is making a speech. He is asking a question that was asked yesterday. Beauchesne, page 131, says that questions should be asked 'in respect of matters of sufficient urgency and importance as to require an immediate answer.' The hon. gentleman responded yesterday. I realize that the Carol Players are very important, but surely the matter of \$1,000 that the hon. gentlemen are looking for which was brought up yesterday, is something that can be put on the Order Paper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

It certainly, Mr. Speaker, does not warrant the hon. gentleman making a speech between supplementary questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That point of order is well taken. There is no need for a long preamble to a supplementary question. I ask the hon. member if he would pose his question now.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Carol Players achieved distinguished success over twenty-one years of Canadian drama, will the minister now go to either his sports kitty, or the one that the Premier used - whichever one that was because he did not seem to know yesterday - and reward the Carol Players for the distinction that they have brought to Newfoundland and to Canada?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the Carol Players would appreciate being classified as falling into a sports group, they are a cultural group. They are a theatrical group, and there is a big distinction, as I tried to point out for the hon. gentleman yesterday.

The Corner Brook Royals situation and the Carol Players situation are very different. It is not that we look upon cultural affairs in any less light, because we

place equal emphasis on cultural affairs and sports and recreation in this Province. It just so happens that we, in the department, have funding in place whereby we assist amateur sports in this Province. We do have a programme in place where we assist cultural groups such as Carol Players, if their particular involvement is initiated by a Canadian embassy or through the External Affairs Department of the federal government. We do get involved then with funding either by providing air transportation costs and accommodations. But that particular voluntary activity was self-initiated by the Carol Players who took it upon themselves to attend this particular competition, which we really commend them for but what I am saying is that we do not have a programme in place whereby we can assist this particular voluntary activity that they participated in.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. TULK:

I recognize that the Carol Players are a cultural group but the minister, unfortunately, does not recognize they fall under his department, which is one of the problems. Did the minister, before the Carol Players went to Ireland, do anything more than just send them best wishes? Why did he not steer them to the Secretary of State and why did he not make representation to the Canadian government, through the Department of the Secretary of State, that those people be funded? Is it just that he put them off as a group that would

gain him little political limelight, unlike the Premier when he used the Corner Brook Royals to give himself some limelight and went through, apparently, according to what the minister is saying, no department at all?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

First of all, I would just like to go on record here on behalf of all the members on this side of the House that we are very, very proud of the accomplishments of the Corner Brook Royals, and there were members on the other side who stood up and recommended that this House send a congratulatory message to the Corner Brook Royals but after they did, of course, the Royals did not win a game. The thing is that we are very proud of what the Corner Brook Royals did. We have a programme, we have funding in place within the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth, through the Division of Community Recreation, Sport and Fitness, where we fund amateur sports in this Province and the Corner Brook Royals certainly fall under the category of amateur sports when they were competing for the Allan Cup, the top amateur hockey prize in this country. Now we were extremely proud that they got to the championship, to the final game. Again I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman to see if this final time it will register, that we do not have any funding in place in the department where we can directly fund the Carol Players who voluntarily went on a fund raising effort to attend a cultural affair in Ireland. We do not have a programme whereby we can fund that. The other point that I would like to tell the hon.

gentleman is that we do fund the Arts Council in this Province to the tune of some \$232,000 a year. I am wondering did the Carol Players apply to the Arts Council? It is not my responsibility to see that they apply.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, further to the response, I have a question for the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. Yesterday the minister was asked about a telegram, whether his department had sent a congratulatory telegram to the Carol Players after they came back, as directed by the House and so on, his answer yesterday, and I quote from Hansard, he said, "And whether or not there was a message sent from the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth I really cannot answer the hon. gentleman because I do not know." At the time I thought this was a rather shameful admission but just a moment ago the minister said that in fact one had been sent. The minister has had a day now to look at it, and I want him to verify whether in fact that is true and one has been sent from his department. If so, would he please tell us what was in it and table it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, what I said was that a congratulatory message was sent on behalf of the members of this

House to the Corner Brook Royals. I did not say there was a message sent to the Carol Players. If he wants to check Hansard he can do that, but what I clearly said a few minutes ago was that there was a congratulatory message sent to the Corner Brook Royals, not to the Carol Players. I did not say that.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The question, Mr. Speaker, I now put is was a message sent to the Carol Players? If so, would the minister please table it in the Houses?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Still to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker - my answer is the same as yesterday - I am not sure if there was a message sent to the Carol Players.

MR. BAKER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Is it not true that so far the only contribution to the Carol Players from the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth has been a two word telegram which said "Best wishes", sent before they went?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, all I say to that is what is wrong with sending a message before they went wishing them all the best of luck in their excursion? I mean, what is wrong with that? If we had not done that I suggest the hon. member would be up criticizing us for that. The thing is, Mr. Speaker, I have given the answers as clearly as I can give them. We do not have a programme whereby we can fund the Carol Players when they organized themselves to raise funds to go overseas to take part in something voluntarily. It was not something that was initiated by External Affairs or the respective Canadian Embassey, and that is the only programme that we have funding under.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister says he has not got any money for the Carol Players because they are a volunteer group. What does he mean that the Royals were forced to play? The minister has a bias, it is very simple, and his bias is for sports. But when it comes to the arts or the culture of this Province he simply is not interested. And that is why the Carol Players get a best wishes card and the Royals get uniforms and a banquet from the government. What is the real distinction? Can you tell us the distinction, please?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Culture,

Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Well, I suppose the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, realizes that the Royals play on ice and the Carol Players play on stage. Does he realize that? I would like to inform him of that. The situation is, Mr. Speaker, that the Corner Brook Royals went through a competition here within the Province in the Newfoundland Amateur Hockey Association, the senior league, and they won the Herder Memorial Trophy, and they then proceeded through a number of other competitions within this country, beat the best teams in the country, and almost won the Allan Cup. And as a consequence of their having won the right to represent this Province by beating the top teams in this Province, representing the Province and all Newfoundland being very, very proud of them, there was a commitment made to provide them with a set of uniforms as they were representing this Province.

The Carol Players situation was that they had heard of a competition in Ireland they themselves chose to raise funds to go to it and they were very, very successful, as I understand it, then they contacted the department looking for some assistance. I investigated and there was no programme in place in the department whereby we could assist the Carol Players.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Barbe, a supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

I do not think we want to confuse

the issue. We on this side are very proud of the Corner Brook Royals, too. In fact we initiated the telex of congratulations so let us be clear on that. Now, rather than confuse, deflect and distract, the question is very simple: Where did the money come from so instantaneously to pay for those uniforms and for that banquet? The minister said on the air yesterday that it came from the Premier, at least he thought it was from the Premier, yet nothing came across his desk, or at least he thinks nothing came across his desk. He does not know if he sent the telegram of congratulations. He did not think he knew the name of the festival.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I quote Beauchesne, page 129, "A question oral or written must not: (b) be trivial, vague or meaningless. (c) multiply, with slight variations, a similar question on the same point. (d) repeat in substance a question already answered." Page 131, "Such questions should be asked only in respect of matters of sufficient urgency and importance." And it goes on to say on page 132, (4) "It ought to be an important matter, and not be frivolous. (5) The matter ought to be of some urgency. There must be some present value in seeking the information during the Question Period rather than through the Order Paper."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have consumed all of the Question Period today asking whether the minister sent a message or not, asking whether an

amount of \$1000 was made available and what have you. Now if the hon. gentleman thought it was important enough to warrant an answer it could be put on the Order Paper. Surely it does not warrant, during the Question Period, consuming the entire Opposition period of asking questions.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
There is no point of order there.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, that point of order is well taken. There have been a series of questions on this particular topic that are very similar. I would recognize the hon. member now for a final supplementary on that matter.

MR. FUREY:
You know, Mr. Speaker, when two Newfoundlanders from Labrador achieve international distinction on behalf of our Province and are ignored by their government, we feel that is urgent. Will the minister undertake to find out and tell this House at the earliest opportunity where the money came from for the uniforms and for the banquet, and whether or not we can tap into that source for the Carol Players who have run up a considerable debt?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, let me just reiterate once again that I am very, very proud of the accomplishments of the Carol Players also. But one thing that is very obvious from the other side over the last

couple of days, Mr. Speaker, is that the supposed leader has left over there and I think now we see a battle ongoing to see who is to be the next leader. The questions being asked by the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) are very similar to those we have seen by one of the Rat Pack members in Parliament and I think he is following in their footsteps. He is trying to bring into the House of Assembly the same type of behavior that his former boss has brought into the House of Commons. But the thing is, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate again, that the funding for the uniforms for the Corner Brook Royals comes from the funds for amateur sports in the Province. And I will table in the House for the hon. member - it does not seem like he wants to listen - I will table for the hon. member where the funds will come from and the amounts for the uniforms for the Corner Brook Royals. That is the question you asked, was it not?

MR. FUREY:
A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
I have already ruled that we have had this particular topic at length so I will recognize some other hon. member on a different point now.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews). This questions summarizes everything pretty well. The Carol Players example

shows this arts policy is in shambles.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Your Honour made a ruling a moment ago. The hon. gentleman got up in this House and he said supplementary question and Your Honour made a ruling. So he got recognized again and he is getting up. He does not say supplementary question but he is asking it again. Now he has an alternative, he either respects Your Honour's ruling or the consequences adhere. Your Honour has made a ruling on this matter and that ruling has to be respected.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. TULK:

The President of the Council should keep his ears open and his people over there quiet so that he can hear what Your Honour's rulings are. As a matter of fact His Honour ruled that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) was up on a supplementary. My friend from Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) was up on a new question concerning the Arts Council. If that relates to the Carol Players, I do not believe his Honour will rule that he is indeed on the same topic. He is on the Arts Council. It is nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, there is no point of order at the moment. The hon. member was recognized and I am just listening to his question at the present time.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I have been in conversation with the Arts Council representatives, I have been in conversation with Carol Players' representatives, and I am going to ask the question we asked earlier in this House, when you said you were going to look into the Arts Council and their mandate. I have two more editorials here which say they are totally upset and they want something done about it. I have talked to the Carol Players and they said they have tried to get money through the Arts Council, that the Arts Council has done their best but there is not enough funding. So it comes down, again, to you guys over there setting up the Arts Council, giving them a mandate and then not giving them enough funding.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I think the hon. member is getting into the realm of debate at the moment. Maybe he could ask his question.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is, will he finally fund the Arts Council properly and cease this unheard of interference

in the arts called direct funding?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, once again the hon. member is in true form, as he was yesterday, when he asked questions that he had asked earlier and to which answers were given, and he is continuing the trend today. All I would say to the editorials that he supposedly has there pertaining to people who have concerns about the present funding for the Arts Council is I am wondering why he did not bring in the positive editorials that have surfaced in the newspapers over the past few weeks, which are in support of the stand that the government has taken with regard to its funding for the arts in the Province.

The other thing I would like to say to the hon. gentleman is, yes, we are trying to resolve the situation as it exists with the Arts Council and with funding for the various groups pertaining to arts, and the publishers of this Province. And, for the hon. gentleman's information, I will be meeting with representatives of the Arts Council tomorrow at 2:00 p.m. to try to address the problem and try to resolve it to the satisfaction of all concerned. But I would like to point out to him that there is a fairly strong lobby in this Province in support of the system that is now in place for funding of the arts and publishers and the theatrical groups, etc., in this Province. It is not all negative. So what I want to do is make sure that I

listen to all the interested parties, the concerned parties to hear what their concerns are, to see what they want to remain, or to see if there are some initiatives that they would suggest. After we have listened to them all, we will then establish a process whereby we hope to bring this thing to a satisfactory conclusion.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, while we are on the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), I want to put a question to the minister with regard to youth; I am trying to determine just how relevant his department is to youth. Now, the youth in this Province today, Mr. Speaker, are hopeless, they are not contributing -

MR. BAIRD:

They are hopeless?

MR. FLIGHT:

They feel hopeless.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You said they are hopeless.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

The youth in this Province, Mr. Speaker, feel hopeless, they are frustrated, they feel they are not contributing to society, we are losing a whole generation. With the unemployment rate we have amongst our youth in this

Province, which is a provincial and a national disgrace, I want to ask the minister, and he can take the rest of Question Period if he wants to answer, in view of the lack of leadership we have seen amongst our youth, the lack of jobs, the lack of any attention from government, how is his department relevant to the youth problems in this Province today? How is his department relevant? We know how it is or is not relevant to culture, we know how it is relevant to sports - he is turning it into the Department of Sports - but how is it relevant to the youth problems in this Province today?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

For the hon. gentleman's information, Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise him that six divisions make up the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth. It is not just all cultural affairs or sports and recreation, there are a number of others. I do not want to inform the hon. member too much because he might become too flippant over there. But the thing is, I honestly think, Mr. Speaker, as I said a few days ago, in the three years I have been here and seen members come and go, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is the most negative individual that I have ever seen in the House of Assembly. I would like to say that.

MR. FLIGHT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. FLIGHT:

I follow the Speaker's rulings in asking questions, and I try to stay to the point, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the Speaker to instruct the minister to do likewise. If he finds himself on the hot seat it is because of his lack of action, it is because of his lack of knowledge of his department and what is going on there. He cannot squirm out of that by personally attacking a member. The minister should tell the House of Assembly how he is relevant to the youth in this Province today, how his department is relevant to the youth, and what they are doing for the youth in this Province today?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, see, the thing is that once again the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is demonstrating his lack of knowledge of departments of government and, particularly in this House, he rises to criticize, to be a critic of particular departments when he does not know their functions.

The thing is in our department we have a Youth Services Division that has various functions in the

department. They work solely on behalf of youth servicing agencies in the Province. We fund a number of agencies, Mr. Speaker. We are involved in youth groups from Boy Scouts all the way up. Also, Mr. Speaker, this year we are funding to the tune of \$100,000 the International Year of Youth Secretariat -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is big stuff!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, it is big stuff - which will be going around this Province, Mr. Speaker, organizing leadership development conferences. Mr. Speaker, we are funding leadership development and we consider it to be very significant. The hon. gentleman does not think it is significant, but let him ask the IYY Secretariat, let him ask the executives and leaders of the various youth servicing agencies of this Province if it is insignificant what this department is funding them for, and, I will tell you, he will get his answer very quickly.

We are involved with youth, Mr. Speaker. We are funding various youth servicing agencies which serve a very useful purpose within the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, when this member talks about youth he is talking

about the youth on the street-

MR. MATTHEWS:

I talk to them every day.

MR. FLIGHT:

- not the Youth Commission that the minister or his predecessor appointed, but the youth on the street who are not working. I quote directly from the Hansard of yesterday, the words of the minister, 'We do not want to pay lip service to youth.' What did the minister mean by that? Is he indicating that they have been paying lip service to youth? What does he mean when he stands up in this House answering a question relevant to youth, and feels he should say, 'We do not want to pay lip service to youth'?

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I rise, Mr. Speaker, really to try to protect the Opposition from themselves and try to make the House a little bit relevant. On page 130 of Beauchesne, it is not in order to "refer to debate or answers to questions of the current Session." The hon. gentleman cannot be more original than to dig into Hansard of debates that were held or answers to questions yesterday. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am raising this because technically he is out of order but also, Mr. Speaker, because the tenor of questions today are so consummately empty and stupid that they are not worthy of the House of Assembly. It is a rule.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, maybe the

hon. member would ask his final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT:

My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is I want the minister to tell the House what he means when he says we will only pay lip service to youth? We not only want to pay lip service. What else do you want to do? We know you have been paying lip service, but what else do you want to do for youth in this Province? How do you want to tackle the 40 per cent unemployment amongst youth in this Province? That hon. minister is the Minister of Youth. What is he doing for youth in this Province besides paying lip service, as he indicated he was?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, the one thing I do not need is a lecture from the hon. member about dealing with youth in this Province because I will tell you something, I will place my record against his any time as a contribution to youth in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

My whole life has been give to youth.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, in relation to what he mentioned about lip service, that statement was made because the Opposition at the time was inferring, of course, that we were only paying lip service to youth in this Province and I just wanted to make the record straight and correct that impression, to show

that we are very, very concerned about the problems of youth in this Province, we are very, very concerned about the youth unemployment rate and, as I said yesterday, for the first time ever this government this year is contributing \$2 million to youth employment through the SEED programme and we are very proud of that, Mr. Speaker, and we feel it is a significant contribution.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Finally!

MR. FENWICK:

It was a near thing. I am pleased to see, by the way, the Liberals have finally come to the support of the Carol Players. I appreciate that.

My question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn). I would prefer to ask it of another member of the House who is not a minister and I cannot ask it of him. Since the NTA have now received the vast list of charges that have been levied against the teachers of this Province alleging that they were involved in partisan political activities in their classrooms, which has now boiled down to seven letters of which I think only four have any specific complaints and all of which are anonymous, my question to the Minister of Education, since he is the only one I can ask, is does he not feel it is now appropriate to offer an apology to the other 10,000 teachers in our Province for the fact that they have been slurred by these innuendoes?

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps the hon. member when he talks about charges, and the Opposition members when they talk about investigations and so on, should certainly apologize to the teachers of the Province. Right from the start we made it quite clear that some concerns were expressed to us and when they came to us in writing we would pass those concerns along to the individuals involved. We did that. He mentioned that they were unsigned documents. The concerns that were passed along to the NTA and to the school boards were the concerns that were sent to us. Mr. Speaker, the question was whether we should apologize. We said right from the start we were not the ones to make an issue of it, that there was a mountain being made out of a molehill, and consequently we passed the concerns along as we said we would. Those who tried to build up the situation, those who tried to make a mountain out of a molehill, those who talked about investigations and whatever else, I certainly think at this time that they should apologize to the teachers for creating such a furor in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us what he was thinking, or whether indeed he was thinking by generating all of that negative publicity, tolerating his

companions calling teachers hooligans and terrorists on the basis of seven letters. What was the minister thinking or was it a case of not thinking?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, there you go again. There is a typical example of what has been happening right from the start. All we said from the very beginning is that concerns have been brought to us, when we receive those concerns in writing - we would not act upon hearsay or telephone calls - we will pass the concerns along to the agencies involved. We did just that. We did not exaggerate the figures whatsoever as the gentleman is pretending right now. Consequently they are just doing what they have always done, trying to create an issue where there is no issue. The problem that was involved was handled the proper way with the agencies involved, and consequently I presume that the people who are directly involved in this situation are quite satisfied with the way it was handled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

000

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, we just arrived at the end of the period for Oral Questions, and during that period this Opposition tried to put some questions to a certain minister in this hon. House, and four times I saw a tactic used to disrupt our privileges in this hon. House. The members opposite tried to muzzle the questions of this side of the House. Maybe the members opposite want to phrase our questions for us. Maybe they want to tell us what to ask. Maybe they want to treat us like the zombies were in the Committee meetings where you will not embarrass the government. Let me tell members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that it is our duty, it is our sacred obligation, to bring matters to the light for the people of this Province. And we will not be muzzled. We will not be muzzled, Mr. Speaker. More important, let me send the message out to my fellow Newfoundlanders that this Opposition will not be muzzled in Question Period. We have questions to put forward. Let me give fair warning now, do not try to use any silly manipulation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

By the narrow-minded member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

MR. DECKER:

- with narrow-minded people trying to prevent us from asking questions, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are angry.

MR. DECKER:

Of course I am angry. I deserve to be angry. I deserve to be angry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Let my people go, Mr. Speaker! Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the point of order is it is as empty as the questions were from the opposite side of the House, from each and every member during Question Period today.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would like to assure the hon. member that all questions that come within our Standing Orders are in order and his point is not in order. There is no point of order.

Notices of Motion

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the advancing or guaranteeing of certain loans made under the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957.

Answers to Questions for which

Notice has been Given

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I have what is really a response to a question, but I had it prepared as a statement. It is a very brief one. Would members opposite like a chance to respond to it? Because, if so, we will have to revert to Statements. If you do not want a chance to respond, then I will do it under Answers to Questions. What would you prefer?

MR. GILBERT:
Do it as a Statement.

MR. SIMMS:
Okay, and you have half the time to respond.

I will refer then, Mr. Speaker, to the matter that I wish to raise.

MR. FLIGHT:
Why did you not give us a copy, give us notice?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
I am sorry? The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans is squawking.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
The Minister of Forest Resources

and Lands (Mr. Simms) is obviously either asleep or yapping across the House here half the time. We will give him leave, but we would appreciate it in future if he would give notice to members opposite so they can be prepared to respond to his statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
Well, Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, the hon. the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) obviously does not have control of his members, because his critic does have a copy of the statement.

MR. TULK:
You sent it across to him now.

MR. SIMMS:
No, I did not, I have it to him half an hour ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, if it is the wish of the Opposition, I would be happy to just give it under Answers to Questions.

MR. SPEAKER:
Answers to Questions, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
So it is Answers to Questions, which is the proper way, and there is no response.

MR. FLIGHT:
You cannot read it.

MR. SIMMS:

I can do what I want with it.

MR. FLIGHT:

I thought you wanted leave?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

A question was raised, Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Budget Estimates on my department regarding the level of road charges levied by Abitibi-Price on firewood cut by commercial operators on its limits. The company had raised its charges from \$4 a cord in 1984 to \$8 a cord in 1985 and I had undertaken at the Estimates Committee to discuss that matter with the company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my department has now had consultation with the company on this matter, and I am glad to report that I have received a positive reply from the company. I would like to clarify, first of all, that the company does not charge any stumpage for firewood cut by people for their own personal use. It allows the local people to use, free of charge, the roads constructed and maintained by the company.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The minister is obviously reading a Ministerial Statement that he has said he is giving under Answers to Questions for which Notice Has been Given.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have Your Honour take a look at that piece of paper and see if indeed it is a Ministerial Statement and, if so, could we have the minister give it at the appropriate time tomorrow under Ministerial Statements?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. SIMMS:

I mentioned at the outset that I was prepared to revert to Ministerial Statements if members opposite wished, and they kicked up such a big fuss, I said I would be quite happy to give the response in Answers to Questions.

Now, the members opposite asked the question, if they do not want the answer that is fine, but I would suggest that the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), who keeps harping on this thing day in and day out, should not dare open his mouth in the days to come.

MR. FLIGHT:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, that question is not on the Order Paper. That point was raised in debate in the Estimates Committee, Mr. Speaker. Now, the minister is twisting the rules of the House to suit himself. That is simply an issue

that was raised, among many others, in debate, when we spent ten minutes discussing the minister's salary, and not a question. The minister is just taking advantage of this situation to draw press attention. There is no question existing in this House on the Order Paper relative to that statement.

MR. SIMMS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has been away from the House for a few years, but it has certainly been a practice that if a question has been asked in an Estimates Committee and the minister takes notice of it, he can reply in the House under Answers to Questions.

MR. FLIGHT:

You were making a Ministerial Statement.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I will not read it, I will just tell the hon. member what has happened. I have had consultation with officials.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has asked a question. Does the hon. member not want the answer?

AN HON. MEMBER:

He raised a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, there is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands can say what he likes. He stood in this House and read from what he said was a Ministerial Statement. We gave him leave to give that Ministerial Statement. But instead of that, he wanted to be cute, to let us know that he knows a few parliamentary rules that he learned as Speaker of this House. He stood in this House and said, 'Oh, no I will give it under Answers to Question for which Notice has been Given', and he stood in this House and read from a Ministerial Statement. Now, Your Honour should take a look at that statement, and, if it is a Ministerial Statement, ask him to give it tomorrow at the appropriate time.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. SIMMS:

I will send the statement upstairs to the media to get coverage.

MR. TULK:

So I do not care where you send it.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is all you want, if that is all you think about this House, fine.

MR. TULK:

We are talking about this House.

MR. SIMMS:

I was trying to give hon. members an answer to a question that they asked. Now they do not want the answer. They have to make up their minds.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, it is certainly rather confusing to the Chair. It appears to me that it would have been more appropriate to have given that statement under Statements by Ministers. As I understood, the hon. minister did have leave at one time and then there was some confusion about it. So, unless there is leave to give that statement, we should move on to another item.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, I would ask the hon. member if he would like to give leave for me to give a positive statement which will affect a number of people around the Province who will be interested in knowing whether or not I was able to accede to a question that was asked some time ago.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. When the minister comes into this House and learns to be responsible and not revert to trickery and being cute, this side of the House will indeed give leave for anything that is important to the people of this Province. But if he thinks that he is going to come in here and

play cute with the rules of this House, no way. As Your Honour has just ruled, it is a Ministerial Statement and he can give it tomorrow.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I will issue a press release.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, leave has not been granted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Answers to Questions for which
Notice has been Given

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) yesterday raised a question concerning the Department of Development not providing badges or pins to the Carol Players when they went overseas. I would like to inform the hon. member and the members of the House opposite that we had no record of any request from any person associated with the Carol Players for such pins in advance to their going overseas.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

The Concurrence Debate, Government

Services.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Concurrence Debate, the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) adjourned the debate and he has three minutes left. I would like to state now that there are fourteen minutes left in the Concurrence Debate on Government Services.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate on the last day I was making some reference to the pork barrelling departments in this particular Concurrence Debate, namely, Municipal Affairs and Transportation.

But, Mr. Speaker, there were other departments under this head and other departments that I would like to address. I want to say a few words in my remaining minute or two about the Department of Labour. Mr. Speaker, one of the points that I want to raise in the Department of Labour is related to the Workers Compensation Rehabilitation Programme.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this programme is administered in the most insensitive and the most callous way that ever any programme was administered. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with the programme. Certainly, it is a noble thing to try and to rehabilitate workers who have been injured, to try and get them back into the work force, to retrain them, to get them to school, or to finish their education so that they can go to trades school, or whatever the situation might be.

But, Mr. Speaker, there has been a

tremendous mismatching of ability to the programmes that a person will get into, even forcing people who are still suffering from their disability, from their injury, whatever it might be, forcing them to go to school, forcing them to go for miles to take courses for which they have no aptitude, or to take courses for which they are neither fit mentally nor physically, and, bringing tremendous frustration and anxiety upon these people.

I am known people to travel fifty miles to complete their education, a most frustrating situation. They dropped out of school because of very unpleasant experiences and they have had nothing but unpleasant memories of the school system. It might it have been through lack of ability or home circumstances, but in that situation, to have that kind of mismatch, to send a person forty and forty-five years old back to school starting Grade IV or Grade V when it is going to take that person six or seven years to complete high school and then, Mr. Speaker, with no assurance that the person is going to get a job. Obvious after completing high school, he then has to go to trade school, or to university. Mr. Speaker, we are bringing untold frustration and anxiety on many of these people through the rehabilitation programme.

We are forcing people against their will. There is no aptitude test, or attitude test, or interest test administered to find out the ability of these people, to find out what their level of education is, to find out what programmes they can fit into, it is just a matter of forcing a person back to school, either that or we will cut off your money.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very callous manner, a very insensitive way, a very inhumane way of dealing with the people of this Province. I am sure if the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) were here he could rise in his place and say that he has received complaint after complaint along these lines, about people being forced to go back to school not only against their will, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LUSH:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No way.

MR. SPEAKER:
Before recognizing the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I would like to welcome to the gallery four assistant managers from Nain, Davis Inlet, Makkovik and Postville, Lloyd Michelin, Carl Sheppard, David Misuk, Antone Nochasak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, as the Concurrence Debate on this part of the budget process winds down, I thought I would like to make a few remarks, and my remarks are mainly concerned with the Liberal Party. I am very concerned about the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party is a Party that has been in place in many countries of this world. It has a very long history in this

Province, as it had in this country when it was a country and when it was a Dominion.

The Liberal Party has now fallen on very hard days. It has not been in power in this Province since 1971, a matter of some fourteen years. By this time one would have expected -

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

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

MR. LUSH:
I assume we are discussing the Government Services Committee, and the departments are very clear; we are talking about the Department of Finance, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Department of Labour, I believe the Department of Public Works, and the Department of Consumer Affairs and Communications. These are the departments. I see no breakdown in the heads of these departments which gives the hon. minister the right to talk about the Liberal Party. Indeed, it does not give anybody the right to talk about the Tory Party. We talk about the government, but I cannot see anywhere here, Mr. Speaker, that gives the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) the flexibility to deal with the Liberal Party.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I am not too surprised the hon. member cannot see that. He takes an extraordinarily short-term view of everything. I am going to build an argument which ties this together and I would just ask the hon. member to be patient.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, we are debating the Concurrence in certain government services at the moment, and it did appear to the Chair that the hon. minister was getting off on a different line of debate. But, from his comments, he is about to get back to his main debate, so I now call on the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad you had the hon. member opposite see the light by your ruling. Now, as I was saying, the Liberal Party, which has not won an election in this Province for the last nineteen years, it has not been in power for the last fourteen years, it is on hard times and I think this debate we just had on Concurrence Debate shows why, and this is what I want to bring up, because I think it underlines the importance of the budget that was brought in a little while ago, and the budgets that were brought in the last few years.

The member opposite, for instance, said that the budget brought in, and he relates our budget to the federal budget, relies unduly, or relies totally on the private sector. That was the hon. member's interpretation.

Then he went on to say, and this was an extraordinary statement, and it underlines why the Liberal

Party is in such disarray at this time, and why I am now trying to make a plea for those adherents of the Liberal Party, that they get their act together and rebuild the Liberal Party, because in this Province we need an Opposition as well as a government. So it is for the good of the people of this Province that we should have at least two strong parties. So my plea is to implore those who have Liberal leanings - I do not know why people should, but if they should have Liberal leanings, I would implore them to do something about changing the approach, the attitude, the conception, the perception, and the intelligent input into the Liberal Party so that it can retain or regain some semblance of its former self.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, the member opposite made an extraordinary statement when he referred to our budget relying on the private sector and when he said the federal budget relied on the private sector. And his extraordinary statement was 'we do not have a private sector in this Province, or, at least we do not have it in rural Newfoundland.' Now that is an extraordinary statement to be made by a member from a rural riding. It shows that he is totally out of touch with what is going on around him, he is totally out of touch with the endeavors of his fellow citizens, he is totally out of touch with the energies and the entrepreneurial spirit in the communities around him.

For any member, even from a defuncted party, and I am talking about the Rhinoceros Party, the Newfoundland Democratic Party, or some totally defuncted party, to make a statement that there is no such thing as a private sector in

the rural part of Newfoundland is absolutely extraordinary. And I think it shows that all of us in our own way, and, of course, we have a lesser role than members opposite, in our own way we should do something about the Liberal Party, about the way the present members of the Liberal Party in this House conduct themselves and how they view things, because no one wants to see a one party system in this Province.

The way things are going we may well end up with just one party and a little shank. We may end up with an overwhelmingly predominant Tory Party or a PC party and a little shank of an NDP party, and the Liberal Party will have faded away into oblivion. It will if those attitudes of mind that the hon. member announced persist.

Now, I would just like to recall to the hon. member that traditionally the economy of any country, any province, is broken down into various sectors and I am going to read out some of the sectors in the Newfoundland economy.

We have an agricultural sector and I presume, if the member is from an rural riding, he has heard of an agricultural sector. We have a forestry sector and I presume, that the hon. member, if he is from a rural riding, has heard of a forestry sector. And I also think he understands that the government, that is the public sector, does not run the forestry sector in this Province. He has heard, I presume, of paper mills, and I presume he has heard of sawmill operations, I presume he has heard of foresters who cut trees and supply the material for the paper mills.

Mr. Speaker, another sector is the fishing and trapping industry. Now, that is a sector in this Province and the hon. member may say, 'oh, well, that is a government sector.' He may say 'the fishing sector in this Province is a government sector' and there is an element of truth in what he says, but only an element. The government, both the federal and provincial government, has a large stake and a large imput into the fishing sector in this Province. But, I presume the hon. member opposite knows that there are many private individuals, there are many private enterprises, there are many families, there are many single individuals, who carry out fishing activities and prosecute the fishery. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if I may generalize, our total traditional inshore fishery is a private matter. A man has equipment, he has boats and gear and so on, he goes out and catches fish for his own use and for sale to usually privately-owned or privately-operated plants. I mean that is the tradition of the fishing industry in Newfoundland. It is not the only fishery we have, but it is the centuries old traditional fishery. And for the hon. member to say there is no private enterprise in rural Newfoundland when the fact of our traditional fishery is staring him in the face is an extraordinary statement. I am amazed, flabbergasted and discombobulated by such a statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, going on from there we have a mining, quarries, and oil well sector. Now, I presume the hon. member does not think that government, that is the public sector, carried out mining operations in this Province. I

presume he does not think it carries out quarry operations in this Province, I presume he does not feel that the government in Newfoundland, or indeed the Government of Canada is doing our offshore oil drilling.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The time for the Concurrence Debate has elapsed.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I was just barely getting warmed up, but I move the concurrence of the debate.

On motion, the report of the Estimates Committee on Government Services was adopted.

MR. MARSHALL:
The Concurrence Debate on Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER:
Social Services Committee Concurrence Debate.

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

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I had the agreeable job to Chair the Estimates Committee on Social Services. The Social Services branch of the Estimates Committee is comprised of the Department of Social Services, the Department of Education, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Environment, Culture, Recreation and Youth, the Department of Health, and Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. FLIGHT:
(Inaudible) Is he speaking of education?

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has the manners of a pig, so if he will kindly keep his tongue still I will try and continue.

The Department of Social Services accounts for something like \$88 million of the budget; the Department of Education comprises \$387 million; the Department of Justice \$67 million; the Department of the Environment \$3 million; Culture, Recreation and Youth \$30 million; Health \$540 million; Career Development and Advanced Studies \$128 million; for a total of \$1,513,000,000 and that is not all, because the Department of Social Services receives an additional \$40 million of federal money which it administers.

You would think that a total of \$1,513,000,000 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have order so I could be heard?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:
The hon. gentlemen opposite are behaving like pigs.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
I am sorry I cannot recognize the hon. member.

MR. J. CARTER:
He cannot raise a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member is not in his seat.

MR. J. CARTER:

No, he is not in his seat, he cannot raise a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Does he wish to raise a point of order?

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

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

MR. BAKER:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I get carried away sometimes. I was going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, because of what is happening here, if the hon. gentleman would speak up a little bit. I was trying to listen to him, I am very enthralled with him as a speaker. I was trying to hear what he was going to say and really wanted to, Mr. Speaker, but I could not hear anything. It was not because other hon. gentlemen were interfering, I just could not hear him, so I wonder if he could speak up a little bit, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, some members speak very loudly and some very quietly, the Chair has no control over that. There is no point of order.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. gentleman realizes that people with loathsome diseases are often a little bit deaf. They are often a little bit deaf.

MR. BAKER:

No, I have my hearing aid turned up.

MR. J. CARTER:

Anyway I just finished saying that hon. gentlemen opposite have the manners of pigs since they would not listen in silence to an hon. member trying to give a sensible statement of an Estimates Committee.

By the way, the Vice-Chairman of the Estimates Committee on Social Services was the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) and since I was unavoidably absent he chaired the last meeting and from all reports he chaired it extremely well. In fact, it might be worth the House considering making the chairman of these committees members of the Opposition because it is an Opposition exercise, because it is designed so that they can study the estimates in some detail and at their discretion. Then if they want to spend all their time on a particular department, that is entirely up to themselves.

I would like also to draw to the attention of the House the complete absence, as far as I know, from any of the estimates committees of the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). He showed no interest whatsoever in spite of the fact that I casually reminded him that he would be more than welcome at any estimate committee hearings and would be able to participate fully with the exception that he would not be able to vote. But of course he decided to play politics with it and he would not attend.

MR. TULK:

Who is that 'John'?

MR. J. CARTER:

The member for Menihek. I hope that the member for the remainder of this session, and in fact for the largest part of next session, refrains from criticizing the budget.

(Mr. Lush takes the Chair.)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate you on your elevation. I am sure that your impartiality will overflow your Chair. Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to have such a distinguished member of the House in the Chair and I am sure that the Opposition will now behave themselves. In fact, it seems to be the only way to get the Opposition to behave themselves is to put one of their members in the Chair.

I was saying earlier that with an expenditure of \$1.5 billion on the social services of this Province, it was still felt this was not enough. So what do we do? What can we do? Can we increase the amount that we spend? We are still running a deficit. And what are we getting for our money? One of the things we get in the Department of Health is Medicare, but I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that Medicare is sadly deficient. Sure, if you break an arm or you have to have a minor operation Medicare serves you quite well. But try having a stroke, try having a long-term illness and see what good Medicare is to you. It will pay for your hospital bills, it will pay for some home care, but it will not reimburse you for your loss of income. It will not pay the long-term health care that you are going to require. A

stroke can incapacitate a person for years, perhaps even for life, so I would argue that Medicare is totally deficient when it comes to that kind of condition, so what is the answer? Authorities differ, but I would argue that perhaps we should all pay a little something for Medicare and get that kind of coverage because I am sure that members are more concerned with that deficiency in Medicare than with anything else, and perhaps it is worth looking at. I hope that in the general consideration of the estimates perhaps we could look at some of the shortcomings of the social services.

By the way, the other day - this is just an aside - talking about the poor use of money, rather tongue-in-cheek I criticized the opulence of the Opposition quarters here in the building. So, to be fair, I thought I better have a look. I was welcomed at the door by a suave young gentleman who obviously was in the employ of the Opposition. I have never seen such opulence in a government department. Priceless art treasures on the wall, deep, thick carpets, antique furniture, heavily overstuffed members and sofas, and I would invite the press, if they are here, to go down and take a look at the Opposition office, I am quite serious now, and compare it with the office -

MR. SIMMS:

With your office.

MR. J. CARTER:

My office is non-existent, I do not have an office here in the building.

But the offices of the Opposition are clearly miles ahead of the quarters that the government

members occupy and I think it is scandalous. I hope the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is within earshot of my remarks. I hope he will go down and investigate and do something to curb this most untoward extravagance.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

With regard to Chairman of the Social Services Estimates Committee and his remarks about space, when he came down, Mr. Speaker, I escorted him around. He said there were prints and other things on the wall. If so, they belong to individual people.

Another thing, if he would come down there today he would find that there are buckets all over the place because of leaks.

Also, the fact still remains that we have two members per office, quite small, and we also still maintain one secretary for two members. In Ontario they each have their own research staff, they have their own office, they have an office in their district. This government still takes the archaic position of keeping the Opposition in the dark, do not give them any research officers, do not give them extra secretarial staff, do not give them an office where they can have delegations in. When the member gets up and compares backbenchers' offices on the government side against the Opposition members offices, then I think one of the things that this House of Assembly has to take into account is that each member is equal in this House as each member

represents a district. If the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) think that the Opposition offices are much better than the government backbenchers' offices, then I would only say that the Opposition sympathize with the backbenchers of the government and the two ex-ministers who have been shoved into the office space that they have. Again, attitude shows the contempt that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and the Premier have towards the Opposition. I for one feel that the press can come down, anybody can come down and see our office space. We are not treated as well as some junior civil servants are, we are not treated in the same way as ministers or parliamentary assistants and, Mr. Speaker, I would invite all members of the media and all members of government to visit the government backbenchers' offices as well as our own Opposition offices.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is up and using the guise of a point of order to interfere with the time of my hon. friend in the debate, and as such he is making a long speech and is interfering with the decorum of this House, making all sorts of accusations, and hurling accusations of contempt and all the rest of it at the Premier and to myself and to other members, which I am sure is totally and absolutely abhorrent to Your Honour. So Your Honour now has the very unique

opportunity, having seen the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) misbehave himself in such a way, to do something that I know Your Honour has probably wished to do for a very long period of time, and that is to name the hon. member, banish him from the House for the rest of the Session.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order. The hon. the member for Eagle River was just taking an opportunity to clarify a point made by the hon. member from St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

I would also remind hon. members, because of the special circumstances, let us not get carried away and become frivolous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, I agree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I would grant the member for Eagle River the point that the priceless objects of art on the walls were privately owned. But it just seems to me an indication of the contempt with which they view matters that it is just a vulgar display of wealth and, Mr. Speaker, I think I have probably said enough. I hope that the press are within earshot and that they will go down and conduct an independent enquiry into this frivolous opulence that exists in the Opposition office. I would certainly compare and contrast it with the situation we had when we were in Opposition, one small room for twenty or twenty-one members.

Anyway, I probably said enough about that.

I would like to take the Opposition to task, though it is a pity the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is not here, for trying to play politics with the changes in indexing of old age pensions. I think that to try and play politics with the legitimate fears of a large section of the populace is quite wrong. I agree that there are problems with the financing of the federal government, and I wonder if in our attempt to get value for money for the three big Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, not only provincial but also federal, although there is not an exact federal counterpart to the Department of Education, I wonder if it might not be better if the federal government considered the old idea of a negative income tax. That might solve a lot of our problems. There is no doubt about it that no less a person than the hon. Mr. Pickersgill, who was a minister in several governments and parliamentary and private assistant to Prime Minister Mackenzie King, was interviewed on CBC radio some months ago on the business of the family allowance and he suggested, himself, some changes that could be made that would save the country something like \$1 billion. He said, Why should the rich continue to get it when, in fact, they get it twice? Because they not only get the family allowance, but they get a very healthy deduction. Since they pay their income tax at the highest rate, which, I think, in Newfoundland would be something over 52 per cent, then they are getting a very large tax savings when they deduct an amount for their children. So I think the

whole business of social spending could be and should be looked at.

I do not have any magic suggestions for curing the trouble with the economy, but I would suggest that in the short term, perhaps, the provincial government would consider making low interest loans available.

MR. HISCOCK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, since the Chairman of the Committee is talking about the \$1 billion that they have gone through in the estimates, it has been pointed out that there was very little media there. We also said that we concentrated on some of the departments and asked the various ministers to table information. We are still waiting for that information from the Department of Justice and the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies, information that the ministers and their officials undertook to supply to the Committee. I am wondering if the ministers are going to be responsible for their commitment. When you consider almost a week has passed, whereas other departments had the information tabled the same day or the day after, I am wondering why it is we are still debating these estimates when we do not have the information, particularly from the Minister of Justice, (Ms. Verge) and the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power)? I would hope that the Chairman will exercise his power and direct these ministers to make sure that this information is tabled before

the House closes.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I do not see it as the function of the Chairman of these Committees to demand that the ministers give this information. As far as I am concerned, they gave an undertaking to supply that information and I would be more than happy to accept their word. If we cannot accept each other's word in this House or in any subcommittee of this House, then, I think it is just pretty poor. I agree with the member that he is entitled to raise his point, but I hardly think he should raise it as a point of order, I think he should raise it more properly when it comes his turn to speak.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I rule that there is no point of order, and that the member, again, was just using the time to clarify certain points. There is no point of order.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I was pointing out that to relieve some of the distressful unemployment that we have in this Province, in the short term, perhaps some low-interest loans could be made to various enterprises. I do not think the loans should be unrealistically low, I think that they could be

within a few per cent of what you can get money for now. The unfortunate thing is that money costs too much. Not only do you have to pay something like 14 per cent or 15 per cent for capital, but if you are in the fortunate position of having capital you can invest it in the bond market and make 14 per cent or 15 per cent, so you are hardly likely to put it into enterprises of any kind whatsoever.

So I think if the Department of Finance or the Department of Development were to make some relatively low-interest loans available, this would have the effect of stimulating the economy. I would wish that the federal government would do it, because their resources are so much greater. But in the short term and the short run, perhaps, the provincial government could try it in a very small way just to see how it works. It could be carefully monitored, and I think it would be well worth looking at.

I would also like to use my opportunity for speaking to make a play for the establishment of a permanent East Coast ferry. I think it is too much to ask of tourists to drive all the way across the Province and then have to drive all the way back. It would be much better if they could make the circuit. One of the members mentioned the Burgeo road, but I do not think this invalidates the position I am taking, that a permanent, reliable East Coast ferry would do more to stimulate our economy than the creation of five new government departments. I think it would probably be one of the most important things that we could do. I am only sorry that the private member's resolutions are

all filled up, because I would certainly make that resolution as a private member and look forward to debating it. And I do not think I would have any trouble getting unanimous approval from every member of this House, that if we had an East Coast ferry our economy would improve.

Anyway, I think I have probably covered most of the points.

I find that there is not a great deal more that I can say that could not be said better by many of the members who participated in the committee, both ministers and backbenchers. Again I am sorry that the press did not -

MR. TULK:

A quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a quorum present.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I earlier said that some of the members over there had the manners of pigs to treat Your Honour this way, while a member of their own party is in the Chair. I think the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has shown an abominable lack of manners to a member of his own party.

One point more that I should make, although it does not concern any of the social services that we discussed, still, because the Concurrence Debate is a wide-ranging one, I would like to

touch briefly on the problem of electricity rates. We all know that the problem could be easily solved if we had a Labrador intertie, and that if we did have power lines stretching to Churchill Falls, in Labrador, we probably could legitimately, under the present contract, get an amount of power sufficient so that we would not have to rely upon thermal generation. But the problem is that the cost of this particular power line would be something in the nature of \$2 billion and we cannot raise this kind of money on the bond market without the assurance that we will get this kind of recall power, and we cannot get this kind of recall power unless we can raise this money on the bond market. So there is a Catch 22 situation. It has its origin in the short-sighted policies of the former, former administration. But much as I may have disagreed with the former Premier, and although we realize that his attempt to put a tunnel underneath the Straits was probably motivated more by electoral concerns than by real concerns, still there is a considerable body of opinion that suggests that we should immediately start building this line.

Even though we may not be able to do much, do a little every year and eventually, when we do reach the Churchill Falls, we will then have access to fairly cheap, stable power.

Now, I do not suppose this will enter the general debate on the Concurrence on Social Services, but still it is too good a point to miss making. Having made these few points, Mr. Speaker, I will take my seat and allow other people to more usefully use the

time allotted. I would move the concurrence of the estimates on Social Services.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I just want to have a few comments on the Social Services Committee. I have to repeat what I said late last week, when I spoke on the other Committee, that I do not believe that the committee system is working. I do not like it, personally, I do not think members have the opportunity, to which they are entitled, to ask questions. When you have two Committees, for example, going on at the same time, a member, naturally, cannot be at two places at the one time and consequently he or she is denied the opportunity to ask questions of the ministers.

When we discussed the Education Estimates, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) was very evasive, certainly when it came to answering questions concerning charges levelled against the NTA, the Teachers' Association. The minister, in my view, deliberately withheld information from that Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:
Certainly he withheld information, Mr. Speaker. And I think his behaviour in the House today during Question Period, wherein he tried to turn the tables, as it

were, and make it appear that it is the Opposition members who should apologize to the teachers, when, in fact, he knows and we know, Mr. Speaker, that it was the minister and his colleague who first of all raised the matter and who kept the matter alive in the hope, I suggest, of generating enough interest and letters from parents that they would then be able to use against the teachers. In replies to questions we put to him in Committee, Mr. Speaker, and we were pressing the matter for quite a long period of time, the minister's conduct was so unbecoming, or at least he was so evasive, that a motion was made that his salary be reduced to one dollar. Now, members of the House do not do that lightly, make a motion that the minister's salary be reduced to one dollar. It is not a simple thing to do, to impose that kind of hardship on the minister. But, Mr. Speaker, the motion was made. It was defeated, as you would expect in a Committee that was predominantly government members, but the fact of the matter is that when he was being pressed for an answer on the question of the alleged harassment on the part of teachers, students, he led the Committee to believe, Mr. Speaker, that he had letters in his possession, legitimate letters not anonymous letters as he has subsequently admitted, but that he did have hard evidence in his possession to prove the statement that was made by his colleague. Of course, we have since found out, I think today in Question Period, that no such letters were in his possession. In fact, after all the publicity that was given after the charges were made on several occasions, I think he has admitted publicly and otherwise that he only received seven anonymous letters from

teachers.

MR. HEARN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. HEARN:

I cannot let the remarks of the hon. member stand on record when he is reading into the record words which I have been alleged to have said, but which I did not say. At no time did I admit that I had in my possession letters which were anonymous letters. The only person who said anything about receiving unsigned letters was the President of the NTA, who said he received the concerns but they were unsigned. That is not to say that the letters which I received from the parents, the concerns which I have passed on, were unsigned. I never said that.

MR. W. CARTER:

Were they? Were they?

MR. HEARN:

Consequently, I would like to make sure that what the member says is at least factual, because what he has said in the past five or six minutes is a long way from being factual.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Other members were at the Committee and I am sure we heard the minister say that -

[Fire alarm sounds]
[The Chamber is vacated]

ooo

The House resumes.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

The hon. minister, Mr. Speaker, did deliberately or otherwise - I do not think he deliberately did it - but he certainly did lead the Committee to believe that he had in his possession letters backing up charges that were made by his colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland). The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, he did not dispell the suggestion that teachers were being charged with harassment and in Committee he lead the Committee to believe that he did have letters and that at some point in time he would table those letters, or at least make them public.

MR. HISCOCK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Not only, Mr. Speaker, did the minister lead the Committee to believe that the letters probably would be tabled and also sent to the NTA, but he also gave the clear indication to the Committee that there were numerous complaints coming in by phone, that they were waiting for them to be documented and that he also had in his possession several letters. He also did not give the indication that these letters were not signed and he ended up stating in the Committee that it was a major concern of government. Also, with regard to the teachers in the Province, it was a major issue. When asked, the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren), who was in the meeting also, said that he never did get a phone call, he never did get a letter, he only acted on rumor and the minister up to that time had not received the letter from the member for Torngat. I think that when a minister says that the Opposition should apologize -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

I do not think the argument or debate at the present time on that point of order is relevant. This is what went on in the Committee as such. There obviously is a difference of opinion between two hon. members, but there is no point of order.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

The minister did directly mislead that Committee and, by misleading

the Committee, he also misled the House. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) should apologize to the House by way of the Committee for deliberately misleading it and also inflaming the issue at the time.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the minister did mislead the Committee deliberately and I also feel, as a result of that, he breached the privileges of this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is correct. The minister did mislead the Committee and I think this afternoon he misled the House.

Obviously, he is part of a campaign that has been very carefully planned, Mr. Speaker, to discredit teachers. We saw what happened during the election campaign when, in my view, teachers were being deliberately incited, were being set up to protest the movements of certain politicians in the hope that it would backfire on them. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, maybe I should say fortunately, it backfired on the PC Party.

Mr. Speaker, in Committee as well we heard evidence given by the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) with respect to the closing of certain hospital beds and, again, we have seen the minister in Committee, and in the House, deliberately try to shift emphasis on what is happening, trying to give the impression that what is

happening now with the hospital beds being closed at St. Clare's, the Janeway, at the Carbonear Hospital, the Health Sciences Complex, that this is a normal event, that every year to facilitate the holiday season hospitals close up beds. The minister is unable, Mr. Speaker, to give any explanations as to how he can reconcile that position with the fact, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. DAWE:

(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) mind remaining quiet?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

The minister, Mr. Speaker, has been giving the impression that the hospital bed closings are a normal event for this time of the year, that it is done to facilitate the holiday season, but he is unable for example to reconcile that position with statements coming out of the hospitals, including St. Clare's and the Health Science, that in many cases the beds that will be closing up soon to, as he says, facilitate the vacations of staff, will remain closed after the holiday season is over. In fact, I believe in the Health Science Complex the administrator made a statement some time ago that forty-odd beds - I think they are closing sixty for the Summer - forty of which will remain closed after the holiday season, which gives a lie to the position taken by the Minister of Health (Dr. Towmey) in his efforts to try and down play what is happening by saying that it happens every year.

We have seen evidence, Mr. Speaker, of the pediatric ward of the Carbonear Hospital being closed out and, again, the minister makes a very flimsy excuse that it is being done to facilitate this, or that, when in fact the facts of the matter are, Mr. Speaker, that it is being done by a government that is obviously trying to balance its budget, and trying to reduce its deficit on the backs of the sick people of our Province. And, in the case of the Carbonear Hospital, on the backs of the youth and the children in this Province.

Somebody, Mr. Speaker, mentioned the other day about the quality of the questions being asked by the Opposition members. I would certainly be inclined to question the quality of the answers that were being given members by the ministers who appeared before these Committees.

I have a case in point, Mr. Speaker, where the Minister of Health, who appeared and defended his Health Estimates before our Committee, and made statements that are in complete variance with the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn).

In the Committee he was being questioned, Mr. Speaker, with respect to senior citizens homes, and one in particular, the one that was promised for Twillingate district and I understand there are others promised around the Province as well. In his reply, and this will eventually, I suppose, appear in print when we get the transcript of these committees, these hearings, the minister clearly stated in the presence of all members that the Canada Mortgage and Housing programme that was initiated,

supposedly as a four year programme about three years ago, has now been discontinued by the present government in Ottawa. No if, ands or buts about it, Mr. Speaker, without any qualification or equivocation. The minister stated, and I repeat, that the reason why the senior citizens home is not going to be built in my district, the reason why the extension is not going to be built on the senior citizens home in Bonavista, the reason why the extension will not be built this year on Agnes Pratt -all of which has been promised by the way - the reason is that Canada Mortgage have changed their policy. They are now shifting emphasis from homes for the chronically ill and the aged, to more of the cottage-type accommodation.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, the day following that statement by the Minister of Health, I questioned the Minister responsible for Housing. He got up and he gave a long answer about certain sections of the act and all that blarney and then he went on to say that there will be no changes made in the Canada Mortgage operations.

Which minister is telling the truth, Mr. Speaker? This minister says all is well, nothing has changed, the Minister of Health's colleague states in committee that all -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to sit in his chair and make statements like that -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
You know he is short on making speeches, but very long on sitting back making snide remarks, telling members -

AN HON. MEMBER:
At least I am making sense (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
- behaving like a hooligan, telling members, "Sit down, you are making a fool of yourself." That is a phrase by the way that he is noted for. With about as much decorum now as my hon. colleague would say, a pig, as a wet tom cod.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Do not be so foolish.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Do not be so foolish. Mr. Speaker, I am making representation today on behalf of hundreds of senior citizens in my riding and in this Province, all of whom were promised by his leader in Twillingate, a senior citizens home. In Bay d'Espoir for example my hon. friend and colleague from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was promised an extension, as was the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins), I would think, who represents the area in which the Agnes Pratt Home is located.

This is not a matter to be taken likely or sloughed off as nonsense. Mr. Speaker, we have

people in my district and I suppose the same prevails all over the Province today who are desperately in need of that kind of accommodation and we have a government that obviously is not interested in providing that kind of accommodation. Then, in order to get off the hook and to justify their actions, we have two ministers who cannot even agree on the reason why these homes are not being built.

Mr. Speaker, the answer is obvious. The fact of the matter is promises were made for senior citizens accommodations during the election campaign - obviously more promises were made than now they have money to keep - and I think the people in Twillingate district, certainly the old people in my riding, the aged and the infirm, will be the real victims of that kind of chicanery.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Dinn) maybe it is another case of covering up, of being quite willing, in fact, being anxious, to sit back and to let Ottawa ride roughshod.

I notice, by the way, the same minister who is so vocal in his seat allowed Canada Mortgage to double their mortgage insurance fee from 1.5 per cent to 3 per cent. Laugh if you will, but that means, Mr. Speaker, today, for a young person building a house, they have to shell out an extra \$1,000 or \$1,500 to this Crown agency. The minister had nothing to say about that. That went completely unnoticed.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Shame.

MR. J. CARTER:

Shame is right. He is right, Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that a member of this House representing a seat in this Province, in this city, a man who is responsible for housing would allow the federal government to take that kind of action without even reference to it, here or anywhere else. The ostrich psychology, stick your head in the sand and maybe it will all go away.

The same thing, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, happened with respect to the Canada Mortgage decision to abolish that section of their act whereby senior citizens homes were being financed and partially subsidized in terms of interest payments by Canada Mortgage. Not one word was mentioned. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if Canada Mortgage, who is a Crown corporation - who answers in the House of Commons to the Minister, Mr. McKnight - if that were to have happened a year ago, I think there would have been telegrams going out of this Province and resolutions coming out of this House condemning the government in Ottawa for having taken such callous and thoughtless actions.

I think the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) is telling the truth. I believe the reason why we are not getting senior citizens homes built, as promised, is because of the actions of Canada Mortgage. Again, it goes completely unnoticed.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot ignore these statements. These are not frivolous statements made by aspiring politicians or by defeated candidates. Former Sister Mary Power, the Administrator of St. Clare's Hospital, I do not think we can

ignore or treat callously statements made by that lady. I have had the highest respect for her and I think government, in fact, I think my friend and colleague from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) when he was Minister of Social Services had so much confidence in that lady that in a crisis situation he asked her to move in and look after Exon House and from what I hear she did a fantastic job.

Now she makes a statement to the effect that by virtue of this government's cutbacks, its fiscal restraints, budgetary restraints, that service in St. Clare's Hospital is going to suffer. Miss Power last week, Mr. Speaker, made a statement to the effect that the staff was overworked, and the quality of health care in that hospital is suffering. She expressed some grave fears as to what would happen in the hospital if the government continued on its path of cutting back on health services and reducing the budget, or at least continuing the freeze on health care in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, you do not need to be an economist or an expert or a genius to figure out that a hospital today cannot really operate on the same budget that it had two or three years ago. We do know there is an inflationary factor still in existence in this country and we know that a dollar in 1983 is not worth a dollar today, its value has reduced and its purchasing power has been affected by inflation. Despite that, the hospitals are expected to operate on budgets that were set up and approved for them two or three years ago. This, I believe, is the third year of a three-year freeze.

We have heard stories, Mr. Speaker, about what is happening at the Janeway Hospital. That is a heartbreaking exercise when you come to think about it. Little children, babies, infants, in that hospital suffering and struggling for their lives, in some cases and not enough money being provided to that hospital by the government to enable the administrator of that hospital to employ proper staff and adequate staff to guarantee a high quality of health care.

There we have a government, Mr. Speaker, that is obviously not interested at all in the welfare of the aged by virtue of their indifference to the problems, for example, in my district, and by virtue of their brazenly ignoring, trying now to slough off promises that were made during the campaign. I have documentary evidence to that effect.

Then we have a government that is telling the hospitals to tighten their belts, to cut back on services, if you have to, reduce staff, close down beds, irregardless of what it is going to do to the sick.

And then, of course, as I said, you have the situation of the Janeway and at the Carbonear Hospital where the young people, the babies, the infants are being made suffer because of the actions of this government.

Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say, I guess, on the estimates. I have one other thing, although I did not attend this meeting. I was out of town, but we did have the Justice Committee in that group of departments that appeared before Social Services.

I understand that the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) answers in this House for the expenditures incurred by the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment. Now there is something, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about senior citizens being made to suffer, when you talk about infants being made to suffer and the sick and then you see so much money being spent on this farce of a Royal Commission, a Royal Commission that was set up, Mr. Speaker, as a smoke screen to take the heat off the government for its inability to cope with the very serious problems of unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

It is impossible to follow the hon. member with conversations going from each side. So I would ask hon. members if they would keep quiet while the hon. member is speaking.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, sometimes when you witness the behavior of members of this House, it is almost an embarrassment. Last week I had a delegation here, Sir, from Twillingate, the mayor and councillors for Twillingate and the mayor and councillors of Durrell. I talked to the town clerk today in my office and he said, "You know, it was almost embarrassing to see the way the members were acting. They were like children." He said, "I have seen better behavior in a kindergarten classroom."

I think what Your Honour just had to do a moment ago is disgraceful,

that he would have to get up and ask that a member be heard. Surely members here should have more respect for themselves and this institution and the person who is speaking than to be carrying on the way they are getting on.

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation now where this Royal Commission on Unemployment and Employment, traipsing around the Province, a road show, travelling first-class all the way. I am told that in some cases they are getting as high as \$800 a day.

I believe we have a gentleman who serves on the city council of St. John's who was fired as the agent for the Nurses' Union who was a member of that travelling road show. And I believe that gentleman is reported to have told somebody, I believe publicly, that his per diem is \$800 a day plus expenses, travelling first-class, the best of hotel accommodations, best mode of transportation available I am sure.

I do not know what the Chairman is getting but I suppose it is anywhere from \$800 to \$1,000 a day at least. Certainly he is not working for less than what one of the ordinary members is working for. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, these people are travelling around the Province building up hopes. People are, in some cases, I understand, led to believe that this is the end all, that appear before this Commission, make your presentation and Utopia will be just around the corner.

I notice in one part of the Province, I believe in Marystown, the Burin Peninsula, they made their grand entrance and nobody

turned up. In order to save face, they had to take them on a whirlwind tour of the Marystown shipyard. Imagine spending money, that kind of money, \$800 a day for one member - and I think there are three or four members and a chairman - plus other expenses. That trip to Marystown probably cost John Q. citizen in this Province \$4,000 or \$5,000 all together, just to take them up there and to take them on a grand tour of the Marystown shipyard. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier should have been honest with himself and the people of this Province then and cancelled out that whole Royal Commission. It should have been abolished. It was done for political reasons. He did not want to lose face, that is obvious, and he would have lost face to have had to cancel it. It would be an admission, Mr. Speaker, that the Commission is worthless, that it will accomplish nothing, and that, in fact, it should never have been appointed.

MR. GILBERT:

Wasting taxpayers money.

MR. W. CARTER:

The fact of the matter is, it is an insult to the unemployed in this Province. It is like the Royal Commission that was chaired by my friend for Trinity North (Mr. Brett), the Minister of Social Services who went around the Province, with his entourage, checking on food prices.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Your guys were on that.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes. Whatever happened to the Royal Commission? They were on the Food Prices Committee. Call it what you want, Mr. Speaker, it still costs money.

MR. GILBERT:

It is like all the rest of the commissions.

MR. W. CARTER:

Call it a Royal Commission, call it a Food Prices Committee, Commission of Enquiry, anything, it still costs money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Now look the price of bread did not drop, Mr. Speaker, by one fraction of a cent by virtue of that Royal Commission. They were checking prices here and there, comparing prices. The report six months or eight months later was filed, and today it is in some department down in this building gathering dust. It did not accomplish anything, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the so-called Royal Commission now on Unemployment and Employment will have the same fate. It will end up in the bowels of the building, gathering dust, doing nothing. The money that we have spent on that commission, as the money we spent on the hon. member's commission today could have kept so many beds opened in the hospitals. It is a farce and an insult.

I would strongly suggest that the members opposite to impress upon the Premier and the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), the minister responsible, that this charade now be brought to an end. That they abolish that Royal Commission and, at least, admit they were wrong and save the Province a few hundred thousand dollars or maybe \$1 million. Mr. Speaker, that royal commission will end up costing the taxpayers of Newfoundland probably \$3 million

or \$4 million. And that is money today that could be better spent like I said in keeping the pediatric wards of the Carbonear Hospital open, or maybe of keeping more beds in operation in the other hospitals in the city.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on the general process, as most speakers so far have.

The comments so far revolted around the fact that the press find it inconvenient to get to the hearings and, consequently, the public of the Province is not having the opportunity to find out what goes on in these Estimates Committee hearings.

I would like to support that position and, as well add one other position, Mr. Speaker. That position is that the format for the Committee hearings involved long speeches and very few questions. This point has been mentioned in passing by some other speakers. I would like to point out that this is what the Chairman of the Committee encouraged. They talk in terms of twenty minute speeches by ministers to begin with. Then an Opposition member could make a twenty minute speech and so on. It was put to me at one point by one Committee Chairman that then each member is allowed ten minutes to make a little speech and then ask a question in the Estimates

Committee. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this mitigates against proper examination of the estimates.

It seems to me that the best process would be for very short questions and answers, so we could get in a lot of questions. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) complains about the fact that questions are not being asked, yet, the whole process that is set up in these Estimates Committees mitigates against the asking of a lot of probing questions.

However, in spite of, the limitations and the suggestions put forth by the Chairman of the Committees, presumably under the direction of somebody higher up in government, I feel a lot of probing questions were asked. That is why I would like to have seen the press there so the people of the Province could have benefitted from these particular hearings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal primarily with one department that was covered in the Social Services Committee. The comments that I have to say on this department are not going to be political comments, Mr. Speaker. They are of extreme importance to the whole Province and, members opposite would be well-advised to listen with an open mind to some of the things that I have to say. I think it is extremely important for the whole Province.

I want to deal with the Department of the Environment. We examined the estimates for three hours, then they were passed and so on, and some of the comments I am going to make now I did make in Committee, Mr. Speaker.

Before I came to this hon. House I had a preconceived notion of what the Department of the Environment should be or was. It is called the Department of the Environment. My concept, Mr. Speaker, was that we would find a department whose primary concern would be the protection of the total environment of the Province. I thought that there would be some mechanism whereby this particular department could have some kind of control over environmental damage. If things are happening in the environment that are not particularly good, that they would have some way to control this, that they would monitor what is happening in the environment - and we hear an awful lot about monitoring now-a-days - they monitor what is happening in the environment but, tied in with this monitoring would be having some power to do something about it if, in fact, things are going wrong. This is my concept of what the Department of Environment should be.

I had the concept, Mr. Speaker, that the departments of Environment and Health would work together where the health of individuals in the Province is concerned. I had the concept that the Department of Environment would be a necessary counter-balance to all of the other departments in government but, if in fact government were working the way it should, you would have a Department of Forestry that would be concerned about the efficient production of trees and having a sustained yield for the various enterprises in the Province that depend upon that resource. You would have a Minister responsible for Mines and things like that, and his or her concern would be for the proper

development of the resource and so on. And to counter-balance all this, you would have a Minister of Environment saying to these other ministers, 'Hold on, now! What you are doing has implications and, by heavens, I want to have a say in what is going on because of that.'

So, the Department of Environment, Mr. Speaker, I envisioned, would serve as a counter-balancing influence to the mentality that, of necessity, has to develop in some departments, this 'develop or bust' philosophy. And that has to be there because we do have to develop. But, at the same time, there should be the Department of Environment as a very important counter-balance, to ensure that things are going properly in this Province.

The reason that I assumed that this very important, very forceful, very influential Department of Environment would be doing these kinds of things is because, as any environmentalist knows - and I am sure there are people within the Department of Environment who would take the position I am now going to state - any environmentalist or biologist knows that in Newfoundland, we have an environment that is more delicate than in many other parts of Canada.

Our environment is much more delicate than the environment in New Brunswick or in Nova Scotia or any of the other Canadian provinces. Our environment, perhaps, has the same kind of delicacy to it as a Northern environment would have, getting up towards the Arctic.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, we have this delicate environment is

because we are an island, obviously, and there are not as many species of animals and plants that are capable of getting here, so that the feeding relationships in our environment are much more simple. If something goes wrong in our environment, it is much more serious than if something goes wrong in an environment that is more complex, simply because there are not enough alternate food sources and so on for us to deal with.

So, because of the necessity of maintaining this ecological balance, I assume that this is where the Department of Environment is coming from, that it would put checks on other kinds of development that would harm the environment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the estimates and time in the House, I found out a number of things about the Department of Environment. The very first thing that surprised me, Mr. Speaker, was that it has a budget of \$3 million. To put that in perspective, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that that is approximately one-tenth of one per cent of the total budget for the Province.

First of all, it is a very small monetary commitment to this concern for the environment that I assume the government had. To put it in further perspective, Mr. Speaker, it is half of the budget of a medium-sized town in the Province. So I find, first of all, that the department, in terms of its importance, is severely underfunded. This obviously, can only be an indication of the importance that is, in fact, placed on the department. That was the first shock that I

received, because I did not believe that this department was thought of as being at the bottom of the totem pole, but obviously, it is.

With regard to monitoring, I found out that really, when an announcement is made that the Department of Environment is going to monitor a situation, all it means, Mr. Speaker, is that they are going to look at it and simply that, they are going to monitor it and nothing else. Really, there is no power backing them up to force anything to be done after the monitoring, and in that sense, in many cases, the monitoring that is being done is kind of useless. I will get on to that a little later.

I know that the Department of the Environment has a lot of responsibility and there are a lot of things that they have to keep track of.

Acid rain is a North American and European concern, well a Northern hemisphere concern right now. We are not escaping acid rain, and this is something that has to be kept track of. We are into a programme of using herbicides in the Province, specifically 2,4-D or some 2,4-D derivative. We are still into the sixth or seventh year of spraying matacil on part of our forests, another chemical, an insecticide in this case. We are starting a programme of spraying fenitrothion, which is another insecticide. We have in this Province, as all provinces, I guess, in Canada have, a certain storehouse of PCBs that have become of great concern in North America recently. And, of course, we have to keep track of these. The Department of the Environment also is responsible of keeping

track of industrial waste. And as we get more industry, and hopefully we will, then this role would enlarge. The department also has to monitor municipal wastes and to make decisions with regard to municipal wastes.

I would suggest that it is impossible to do more than simply monitor all these situations on \$3 million. And perhaps, although I am not in the position to have locked into this, perhaps it is not even possible to do that on \$3 million, a very tiny amount of money to carry out all of these responsibilities.

I kind of pity the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) because of this, I really pity him in having responsibility for so many things that really he cannot do anything about, kind of a paper tiger. The responsibilities are there on paper and yet there is no power to do anything about it.

In addition to all this, Mr. Speaker, I found articulated by the minister and some other ministers here, a kind of overwhelming ignorance as to the effects of some of these things that they are supposed to be monitoring.

I could choose some of the things I have mentioned here, the PCBs for instance. Now, I am assuming the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) and his department are responsible for keeping track of where these PCBs are, of doing periodic checks to make sure that individual containers are not leaking, and not simply saying, well, they are stored up somewhere, we know they are there, they have not disappeared, so therefore there is nothing wrong. I am assuming that they have to

check those containers and so on to see that they are not leaking, and I was assuming that they had some indication of the danger of this particular chemical.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, in this House, I received a rude awakening on that particular point. We have what amounts to a government position that PCBs have been used as a cure for rheumatoid arthritis, that there are people, particularly in Japan, that have been subjected to them and the implication being that there was really no problem, the fact that they could be used as cleansing agents, and so on, and it seems to me a very light attitude taken by the department and by the government concerning PCBs.

We know that PCBs tend to accumulate in animal fat, somewhat similar to the DDT a number of years ago. We know that in Japan they have been linked to a lot of rather hideous things including brain damage, nerve damage, liver damage, skin disorders, that they have been definitively tied to cancer in lab animals, and that very definitive teratogenic birth defects have been shown in lab animals as well. We know that in humans the breakdown products of PCBs are extremely dangerous and cause disruption of the cell nucleus and cause problems with the liver and so on. And we know, Mr. Speaker, that there are 235 tons of this stuff stored or in use in Newfoundland. We also know, or at least the indications are so far, that there is not a great deal of concern and at least the public posture of the government and the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), is that really there is not a great deal of concern for the

reasons that I have cited so far.

This lack of concern was exhibited in the flooding in the Exploits River when 810 litres of PCBs were actually spilled into the river. Now I understand, I know, that there was some sampling done afterwards on an Island that was formed by the flood and they found amounts of PCBs and then they went and took away a lot of the soil and stored it up and now have it in safe storage because they found PCBs on that particular island. I know that there were measurable amounts of PCBs found in the water near where the transformer went into the river. I know that there was a study commissioned, the results of this study, Mr. Speaker, will not be known until August or September or October of this year, sometime along there, as to the amounts of PCBs down river and the effect that this might have had on the Bay of Exploits.

However, I would like to compare the Department of the Environment's response to this particular 810 milliliter spill to the Government of British Columbia that had a 2 liter spill. Because of a 2 liter spill they put out warnings on the river near where this spill took place. The people had to stop fishing and so on until the proper examination could be done, 2 liters. We had 810 liters.

Now the member opposite might suggest that the Government of British Columbia are being hysterical, and that might very well be, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if they are hysterical or not. All I know is that the government of this Province was very, very casual about the way it treated the occurrence.

To tie the whole thing together, Mr. Speaker, as to whether this was overreacting on the part of the Government of British Columbia, or whether in fact it is a too casual attitude on the part of our government, in checking with the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, I find that they have very stringent guidelines as to the level of PCBs that can safely be in water. They talk in terms of fourteen parts per trillion.

That is almost an unmeasurable amount, Mr. Speaker, that is an amount that is so tiny and so minute that the human mind cannot even envision it. It is an amount so minute that it would require extensive complicated analysis to even detect the traces of PCBs at the levels that we are talking about here. And yet, our government takes a very casual and cavalier attitude concerning PCBs and the Exploits River.

They say there is a study coming in three or four months and then we will see whether in fact amounts have been found. Well, I would suggest that one of the problems with the Department of the Environment is the severe lack of money. That they cannot really get into this kind of thing, they cannot really handle it. They do not have the resources or capabilities, to handle it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see that the time is going a lot faster than I thought and I would like to move on to another one of the substances that I am concerned about at this particular time.

I would like to very quickly deal with the 2,4-D that is going to be used in our forests. This has only been used experimentally now,

but indications that I have had from forestry people are that this is going to be very wide spread in use over the next five to ten years, and I am worried about it.

I will simply refer to two things. First of all, the problems with 2,4D is the level of dioxin that is found in the 2,4-D. I have been told by Environment and Forestry that nowadays there is no dioxin in 2,4D. However, when I examined the most recent literature with regards to 2,4-D I find, and this is very recent material, I find that the monitoring survey of 2,4-D products carried out during 1982 indicates that they are much improved, however, there are still measurable amounts of dioxin contained in the 2,4-D and that, therefore, the indications are that they can never produce dioxin-free 2,4-D.

So when we use 2,4-D in this Province, that substance, the most poisonous substance known to man is going to be in the 2,4-D. Small amounts, but it will be there.

I am not so sure that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) is taking this situation seriously enough. With regards to fenitrothion, which is going to be sprayed over an extensive area of our forests soon, starting the first week in July, there has been quite a lot back and forth, and there was in the Estimates Committee, concerning fenitrothion and the problems with it. The minister has already verified in the House that, in fact, the fenitrothion is very deadly on bees and wasps and pollinators of that kind, and this could create problems in our forests. He says that that is why he has a

monitoring programme being done by some consulting firm.

Now, I have two questions about that, Mr. Speaker: If it has been conclusively proven that 2,4-D will kill the pollinators, then why monitor it? We know that. We know what the results are going to be. Now is the time to do something about it. And, number two, if he had to go to a consulting firm to do the monitoring, how come he did not use people who have been working with the Department of Environment and the Department of Forestry down through the years to do the monitoring of the matacil spray programme?

MR. TULK:

Would you agree to tutor the minister in environmental matters?

MR. BAKER:

I would agree to that, yes. Also, the minister has stated emphatically in Committee as well as in this House - and he made a point of making himself clear - that fenitrothion would not affect birds. He was not saying that fenitrothion would not affect other things, but it would not affect birds. It would not kill birds. However, I would like to deal with him on his terms. He said that it would not kill birds. There was a study done in 1983, in the budworm suppression project in New Brunswick, which indicates that spray overswathing caused heavy impact, lowering breeding success to 11 per cent, surviving nestlings grew poorly, adult mortality was high. Now, to me that word 'mortality' means it kills them and 'adult' means grown birds. Adult mortality was high and behavior of the surviving adults was erratic. So if there

is an accidental overswathing, double swathing, which has to happen, and I have other documentation to show that this has to happen in any spray programme, and it has happened time after time after time in New Brunswick, then not only will there be a high adult mortality, kill, death, whatever the minister wants to call it, but, also, the ones that survive, their behavior will be very erratic and so on, and it is questionable as to whether they eventually survive.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. TULK:

I hate to interrupt my hon. colleague for Gander (Mr. Baker) who is giving such a good speech, but the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) seems not to be listening to him and I am wondering if my colleague for Gander would consent, when the minister is more in tune to listen, to perhaps give him a three or four week course in how to handle matters with the environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member for Gander finished?

MR. TULK:

There is no point of order.

MR. BUTT:

I am trying to deal with a point of order by one of his colleagues.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the suggestion made by my colleague for Fogo is a very good one, and I would not mind taking time out from my busy schedule to sit down with the Minister of Environment and go through some basic biology lessons with him.

MR. TULK:

Good! Good! I am glad to hear it. Is the minister listening? You just had the best commitment ever you had in your life, the member for Gander is going to teach you something about the environment.

MR. BAKER:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with another problem of fenitrothion that the minister should be aware of, if he is not, and that is that fenitrothion persists in the environment. Unlike matacil, unlike some of the other chemicals, fenitrothion persists in the environment. The study on stream organisms, done in 1982 in New Brunswick, proves that a particular stream organism, which is a very important one, Mr. Speaker, for fish feeding and so on, contained detectable levels of fenitrothion one year after the applications, and, in some cases, more fenitrothion than was measured seven days after spraying, which indicates that not only does fenitrothion stay around for a year, it gets concentrated. I think that the minister had better take these things into account.

However, I do not think there is any point in the minister taking these things into account, because that is the whole point of my presentation today. There is no point of him taking these things into account, because he cannot do

anything about them. If he were to list and study and examine the effects of fenitrothion, he could not do anything about it because the Department of the Environment is not considered to be an important department by the rest of the ministers in government.

MR. TULK:

That is the reason why they gave it to the only backbencher minister in British parliamentary history.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Department of the Environment will not admit its own helplessness. It is not really concerned about the environmental protection aspect, but it is concerned about its survival as a department. It is only too willing to say, Mr. Speaker, that we will monitor the situation, spreading the impression in the Province that by monitoring the situation nothing can go wrong, we have everything under control, we have our hands on the button and if something goes wrong we will push that button and stop the programme. Well, Mr. Speaker, that cannot happen because they do not have the power to do it.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to read about another chemical 2,4-D, and I mentioned earlier some of the directions that are on the can. It states that it is an offense under the Pest Control Products Act if it is not used only in accordance with the directions on the label. The directions say a couple of things that I hope the minister is aware of and this is something he has the power to do something about. It says, 'Do not

spray when winds exceed eight kilometers per hour.' Now, that is not very much wind, Mr. Speaker, eight kilometers per hour.

MR. TULK:

Five miles an hour?

MR. BAKER:

Five miles an hour. Do not spray when winds exceed eight kilometers per hour. Now the reason you do not spray when winds are over five miles an hour is that you might do more damage than you want to do. But it also says, 'Do not spray in dead calm, when there is no wind.' The reason you do not spray in dead calm is that in the amounts used here, if it drops down and is concentrated too much it will not only kill the broad leaves, the birch, and the pin cherry and all those, but it will kill the balsam fir. That is stated, you see.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

MR. BAKER:

Only a few seconds.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

MR. BAKER:

It also says that care must be taken during the application to avoid contaminating water supplies. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had another hour or two to go on about water supplies. However, you have told me my time is up,

Sir.

MR. TULK:

It will only take about a few minutes.

MR. BAKER:

Do I have leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. BUTT:

We will give the hon. member another minute or so, if he wants to clue up.

MR. BAKER:

No.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I should remind the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker), the the rookie member for Gander, the one-timer for Gander, that he is now in the House of Assembly not in a classroom in Gander, because the hon. member was just giving a lecture in Biology. I also want to say to the hon. member, in my few opening remarks before we adjourn, that I should remind him that if he wants to come back here after another election and not end up in Digby, Nova Scotia with Dr. Thurlow, he had better be careful what he is saying. Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people in this Province who depend on the forest industry for a living, and a lot of the hon. member's

constituents do, as well.

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUTT:

I hit a ticklish note with the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. BAKER:

The minister, Mr. Speaker, is trying to twist what I said. I have never, ever stood up in this House and said that I did not want the spray programme to go ahead. What I am saying is that he has to have some responsibility to monitor the thing properly, to be able to correct situations when they go wrong, and he has none.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, that is obviously no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour will notice that while the hon. member was speaking I did not interrupt him on spurious points of order. I am going to hit the nerve of the hon. gentleman, but I will wait until tomorrow. I will come back at him again in full force. I can assure the hon. member that he is going to lose on this one, because the official position of the Liberal party it appears, even though he makes his leader squirm, is they do not want to spray in

this Province.

Having said that, I will adjourn the debate and come back at it tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment, so that we can plan, I understand that it is agreed that tomorrow instead of Private Member's Day we go on to government business.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

We, on this side, have no problem with the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) trying to deal with urgent business tomorrow. It is his private member's resolution. If he wants to give up that day it is no problem with us.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 19, 1985, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 19, at 3:00 p.m.