



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 53

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

5 November 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling Statements By Ministers I would like to deal with a question of privilege raised by the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

Each member has the use of government stationery and facilities to conduct the affairs of his or her constituents. A member has this right because of the fact he or she is a Member of the House of Assembly. This right does not extend to the use of these facilities in the name of any political party.

The stationery was printed with the initials of the political party on it and indicated the office address was that of a political party. This should be discontinued.

In my view, there is no prime facie case established that the hon. member's privileges have been abused or that the privileges of the House have been affected.

Statements by Ministers

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I wish to inform the hon. House today of the

appointment of Ms. Elizabeth E. Marshall of St. John's to the position of Assistant Deputy Minister of Transportation (Finance and Administration). Ms. Marshall succeeds Mr. David Oake in a position, which has been vacant since Mr. Oake accepted the duties of Assistant Secretary to Cabinet.

Ms. Marshall, a native Newfoundlander, is a graduate of Memorial University of Newfoundland, having completed her post secondary studies in 1973 with a Bachelor of Science - Mathematics degree. In 1978, Ms. Marshall received a Chartered Account designation from the Atlantic Provinces' Association of Chartered Accountants.

Since September of 1983, Ms. Marshall has held the position of Director of Government Accounting with the Department of Finance. In this capacity, she has been responsible for the general administration of the Government Accounting Division.

Ms. Marshall has also served as Director of Internal Audit with the Department of Finance from 1981 to 1983 and, prior to that, she was Manager of Internal Audit with the Department of Finance from 1979 - 1981.

From 1976 - 1979, Ms. Marshall was employed as Senior Auditor with the Office of the Auditor General, Province of Nova Scotia. She has also worked with the Accounting Firm of Thorne, Riddell, and Company in both New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in the position of auditor.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Ms. Marshall's educational background and work history will

be definite assets in her new position as Assistant Deputy Minister (Finance and Administration) with my department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Ms. Marshall on her appointment. I have every reason to believe that she is an excellent person and will certainly bring all the necessary qualifications to that job.

However, I must say Mr. Speaker that I am extremely disappointed. When I saw this statement on my desk I became excited, as members opposite did when the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) stood and they all thumped their desk. The reason for this is we expected something more than just the appointment of an ADM.

This Province still does not have a secondary roads agreement; this Province is in doubt as to what is going to happen to our railway.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:

It is accepted that in responding to ministerial statements a member is confined to commenting on the

statement itself. What the hon. gentleman is doing is getting into the realm of general debate and there is another time and another place for that.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) was responding to the statement, he was not debating the statement. He was just expressing his disappointment in the ministerial statement that was made.

I suspect that what he was about to say is that it is a nothing statement really and that is really what is it because appointments go on everyday.

When you see the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) standing up the way he stood up today, wasting time in the House, it shows that members on this side are getting under his skin and that his skin is really thin.

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the point of order is well taken. The hon. member has one minute left to finish up his comments.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are appointments within the Department of Transportation day after day. There are truck drivers and there are tractor operators appointed everyday. If the minister is

going to waste the time of this House by bringing in announcements everytime someone is appointed to a particular job, I think it is a disgrace for his department, Sir.

What we are waiting for is a secondary roads agreement and we are waiting for the department to do something, not just to take up the time of this House with, as my colleague says, "nothing statements".

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Any further statements by ministers?

MS. VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge with regret the death of Dr. Eric Pike, which occurred on Sunday, November 3, and to move that the House send a message of sympathy to his wife and family.

Dr. Pike was born at St. John's into one of the oldest Newfoundland families. He graduated from Memorial, Dalhousie and Cornell Universities. At the time of his death, Dr. Pike was a senior physician at the General Hospital and was the Chief Provincial Forensic Pathologist with the Department of Justice - a position created earlier this year. For years before, he worked as a pathologist with the Department of Health.

Dr. Pike was recognized as one of the leading authorities in the field of forensic pathology in all of North America.

I wish to acknowledge on behalf of

the government the outstanding contributions made by Dr. Pike to his profession and to the administration of justice in our Province.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Members on this side of the House would want to associate themselves with the motion presented by the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge).

Dr. Pike was indeed an outstanding Newfoundlander. He made a very worthwhile contribution to his profession and to the Province. In fact, as the minister said, I think he was one of the leading pathologists in North America.

Mr. Speaker, we would want to associate with the minister and also ask that a letter be sent to the family. The death of Dr. Pike is a great loss to the medical profession and to the Province.

Oral Questions

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Does the minister feel that the importation of Canadian beer into Labrador or into any other part of the Province is a strike breaking measure on the part of the

government? Yes or no? Is it or is it not?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, a simple answer, no, I do not think it is a strike breaking tactic.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is how can the minister pretend to be bona fide or to be neutral when his Cabinet colleagues, particularly the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), approved the importation of beer into Labrador? Is the minister part of this decision to bring a union to their knees, Sir? Is he part of this decision or is he not?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, under normal situations where there were more than one company and the product was being produced, it is logical to think that one company would go on producing. It is almost like saying that somebody bringing beer in or taking beer to Labrador, I suppose, or, for that matter, to any other place, if there is going to be a strike then the other companies that were producing that

product ought not to produce that product. I guess I am looking at it, Mr. Speaker, from the vantage point that we all heard what the Minister of Finance said about the beer into Labrador. Most sensible thinking people would have thought that this strike would have been over and because of climatic conditions in Labrador, beer was sent there to avoid having a shortage perhaps at a later time. I was asked a question, Mr. Speaker, on CBC last Friday and I am sure the hon. member heard my answer which was no, it was not intended as a strike breaking tactic.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

In that television programme to which the minister refers, the Minister of Finance, Dr. Collins, said the strike was the fault of the union, he blamed the union for this strike, and I am wondering whether the Minister of Finance was then articulating the view of the Minister of Labour, whether he was articulating the view of the government that the Minister of Labour does not have the courage to espouse, and I am wondering if this is probably the reason why we have had these long-drawn-out strikes, because the Minister of Labour does not have the courage to speak his views.

So will the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) now tell the House whether that was the view of government, whether it was his view, or whether the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was expressing his own personal view?

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, that is a rather academic question and although it may not deserve an answer, I will answer it in any case. Obviously Dr. Collins is the Minister of Finance and he speaks for the department that is responsible for the distribution, marketing, and pricing of beer or whatever. I speak for the Department of Labour and Dr. Collins was in no way speaking for me. As a matter of fact, I was asked about that statement and I said from my viewpoint it takes two to make a quarrel, that negotiations went on and a strike occurred. And nobody was expressing my views, Mr. Speaker, I express my own views.

MR. LUSH:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I always thought that there was a principle of Cabinet responsibility in the British parliamentary democracy. Now I am just wondering whether or not we operate here in some other form, whether we have a democratic form of government or whether it is some other outlandish form of government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said that the strike was caused by the union, that the union was to be blamed for this strike. The question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) is, is this the

way he feels? Does he feel that this strike is the fault of the union?

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, again this is a case of opinion. There might be a variety of opinions among ministers as to whose fault the strike may be or who bears the brunt of the blame for a strike going on. This strike has gone on too long and many people in the public may have their own ideas as well as any minister in the Cabinet or any person in this House. My own view was, and I expressed it, that it takes two to make that kind of a quarrel. And while I may have my own views, which I am not going to express publicly about this strike, there are two parties in the dispute. Sometimes there is more blame on the company and sometimes there is more on the union.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. LUSH:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:
I will yield to my comrade, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Several times during that particular programme the Minister

of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) indicated that he was not a part of the decision-making process. Now, Mr. Speaker, again that is a strange situation in a Cabinet, that a minister is not part of the decision-making process. Now, maybe this is why we have so many long-drawn-out strikes in this Province, the minister is not a part of the decision-making process. So I ask the Minister of Labour, when he was talking about that programme, which part of the decision-making process was he not part of, was it the part of the process to import beer or was it the part of the process to resolve labour disputes in this Province? What part of the decision-making process was he not part of?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) wants to get that tape and have a look at it. I said, I am not part of that decision-making process,' and it was followed by a statement relating to the distribution of beer, where it goes, the marketing, and I followed that by saying, 'I have a responsibility for labour relations matters, the Liquor Corporation, which reports to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), is part of the whole process in that.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. I was in the town of Come By Chance on the weekend attending a meeting of concerned citizens in that area - they are still wondering about the future of their hospital. A year ago, Mr. Speaker, I asked several questions here of the Premier and the Minister of Health, and one of the questions I asked the Premier was if there were any set of circumstances that would change government's mind about their plan to shut down the Come By Chance Hospital once Clarenville came on stream.

Mr. Speaker, in way of preamble, I should mention, of course, that recently we have heard that the Come By Chance area has been chosen by Mobil Oil as one of the sites for the fabrication relating to concrete platforms. We are talking probably about 500, 1,000, perhaps even 1,500 workers in that area, so I want to ask the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) if that is a new additional circumstance that could possibly change the mind of government, or is it still the intention of government to close down the Come By Chance hospital when Clarenville comes on stream.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, there have been no recent change or decision made by the Department of Health. The news release that we published last year is my reply to any of the questions that you ask in this House. I think we made it very clear in that news release, yes, we would keep it under

observation, and obviously the implication was if there were certain circumstances in which other things had to be done, we would always review it in a very careful, very conscientious and very human way.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

I am not exactly sure what the minister said. I think, Mr. Speaker, the minister said that there is some possibility that it is going to be under review. In addition, Mr. Speaker, to the fabrication of concrete platforms that will be taking place at Adam's Head, which is closer to Arnold's Cove than it is Come By Chance but is in the same general area, with the news recently that Mr. John Shaheen has expired, perhaps there might be some new hope for the refinery and therein might lie an added reason for a need to keep a hospital in that area.

But let me ask the Minister of Health this: Next year, 1986, marks the Fiftieth Anniversary of the start of the Come By Chance Hospital. Some people in the area are wondering what celebrations may mark the Fiftieth Anniversary. It seems to me as though the minister is saying, that the Fiftieth year will be marked by sorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Maybe the hon. member would pose his question.

MR. CALLAN:

Would the minister then confirm that the possibility of the refinery being reactivated in six months or a year's time be another added circumstance that could change the government's mind and keep the hospital?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to clarify one statement. I said last year that it could be reviewed and, I do not know if I mentioned it in this House, I mentioned utilization. We intend to have a primary medical clinic there.

As to the opening of the Come By Chance oil refinery, I think it is a hypothetical question and I feel you should ask one of the other ministers in this House.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, assuming that what the minister is saying is correct, and assuming that the Premier and the other ministers he refers to all concur and the hospital does close within six months or a year, what sort of medical facility will people then have in that area? Will it be, as the minister points out in recent letters to some people in that area, that after 5:00 o'clock and on weekends there will be a nurse and a doctor on call? What will that mean? Would

the minister not agree that what we would have then is a similar situation to what they had at the Whitbourne clinic before a tragic accident took place and the rules had to be changed? What exactly will they have there?

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
I said last Spring the clinic will be open from 9:00 to 5:00. I also said last Spring there will be a doctor on call. I also said last Spring there will be a nurse on call, if necessary. I said last Spring we would review the workings of the clinic after it had been open for a period of time.

I think you asked the question last Spring, what would happen after 5:00 o'clock? I gave you the answer then and again I give it to you now. Yes, we will review it. But I did not say we will review the use of the hospital as an acute care hospital. I did not say that.

MR. CALLAN:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, we saw what happened at Whitbourne when the brand new multi-million dollar facility opened there, the medical clinic. We saw what happened, we saw the federal member, Captain Morrissey Johnson, on television being buttonholed by a lady who lost a son as a result of a car accident and then we saw the rules

changed. The minister is saying there will be a review, is he saying that he is going to let the same thing happen at the Come By Chance Medical Clinic as happened at Whitbourne, that the door will be barred after the horse is gone, that after an accident takes place then the rules will be changed and a nurse will be kept on duty all weekend, every day after five, and a doctor will be on call? That is the situation at Whitbourne now. There is a nurse on duty seven days a weeks, twenty-four hours a day, why will the minister not say that is what they will have at Come By Chance when it becomes a clinic?

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
I will state it again and I will repeat, we said it will be open from nine to five, I said there will be a doctor on call for emergencies after five o'clock. I said that there can be a nurse on call. And to go further, yes, an x-ray technician, a laboratory technician. I cannot talk nor will I give you an answer on any hypothetical case that you might ask me.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
I can see my friend from Bonavista North is standing, Mr. Speaker, I defer to him.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

It has been common practice in this House, Mr. Speaker, that if a person is recognized and he sees someone standing in the House that he wants to defer to, that that person be allowed to do it. Now, let me understand clearly the rules of the House. Are we operating under different rules now or what is happening here? Because it has been a common rule in this House for years, as I understand it, that anybody who stands can defer to anybody if they so wish. I was recognized and deferred to my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). Or do I get a chance to ask my question?

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, there is no rule in this House that somebody defers to anybody, the only rule is if the Speaker catches the eye of the person who stands. Mr. Speaker, I do not see that hon. gentlemen, for instance, would defer if somebody on this side of the House stood up. I think we would probably feel a bit despoiled if they did. And the same way with the hon. the member for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick), I can hardly see the Opposition deferring to him. And neither the member for Menihék

or anybody over on this side of House is going to speak by fiat of the members of the Official Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. Any hon. member who is recognized does not have a right to pass that right on to another hon. member. I have recognized the hon. member for Menihék. There is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on another point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Now that the Speaker has made that ruling we will abide by his ruling, of course. But let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, another question, a point of clarification. Since you recognized me and I deferred and that is not allowed, am I now to take it that I am now the person in this House recognized by the Chair? If I am not allowed to defer, then I want to ask my question.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is out of order. The hon. gentleman does not get up in his place and ask questions of the Speaker. The Speaker enforces the rules of the House. We cannot help it if the hon. gentleman is a little bit sore pressed today and a little bit out of sorts. The hon. member for Menihék was recognized and we

will have to allow the hon. member to ask his question.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Let me make it quite plain to the man who would disrupt this House, take it on his back, take it out of here altogether, that I am not questioning the Speaker, I am just asking for a point of clarification. The point of clarification is this: The Speaker recognized me, the Speaker has said that I am not allowed to defer, but having been recognized, do I lose my turn or what?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has no point of order. I have recognized the hon. the member for Menihék.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Archives, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews). My question is, in 1974 Mr. Gordon, who is chief of the manuscript division of the public Archives, in a report that he presented to the provincial government as an advisor for it, indicated that the Colonial Building, in which the Archives are presently housed, is completely inadequate for the purpose of housing an Archival collection, essentially that the foundations are not strong enough to take the weight load, that it is an inappropriate place for putting shelving, and that the heating system at that time was totally inadequate.

My question to the minister is, are there any plans in the works or any plans that you see in the immediate future for removing the Archives from what is clearly an unsatisfactory condition in the Colonial Building to an appropriate building?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the hon. member's question under advisement and report back to him within a few days.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihék.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, a further report called Canadian Archives 1982, done by the public Archives of Canada, indicated that Newfoundland has almost the worst record of archival spending of any Province except Prince Edward Island. Indeed, over the four or five years prior to the 1982 report, there was a considerable drop in the amount of spending.

My question to the minister is, is there any intention on the part of the provincial government to reverse this unfortunate trend and increase the amount of spending on our Archives so that we can protect our cultural heritage?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I guess it comes back to the same old question of dollars and cents. It is not that as a government or as a department we do not have priority to the Archives and to our culture, it is a matter of the budgetary process and budgetary allocations whereby the government sets priorities. And, as I indicated in answer to the hon. member's first question, I would like to take it under advisement and give him an answer within a number of days.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

A question for the Minister of Labour. A few minutes ago, in reply to a question from the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), the Labour Minister said that he would not express his opinion of whether the union was to blame or just who was to blame for the brewery strike, as did the Minister of Finance. Let me ask him a question. Was he aware of the decision being made? Did he make his views known to Cabinet on the effect this could have on labour relations in this Province, or is he still acting like the deputy minister that he was?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

I am not really certain, Mr.

Speaker. When this particular decision was made, I believe I was not just out of the Province, I was out of the country. But, I guess, if what the hon. member is asking is would I have strong views against that, I have to stand up and be counted. I would have no strong views against that. I would view it as being a decision that was made to assist the people of the area in difficulties that they might find themselves in later.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) now telling us that he agrees with the statement made by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), that indeed the union, in this case, is responsible for the strike? Just where does he stand on that? Is that the case?

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, it is here in the rules that you are not allowed to multiply or repeat a question. "Multiply, with slight variations, a similar question on the same point." Page 129 of Beauchesne. The hon. gentleman is repeating what the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) was asking the minister a little while ago.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I feel

that the question the hon. member was asking was somewhat different from the previous one so there is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I will again put my question to the minister and the question is, quite simply, was he aware of the decision, did he communicate that to the Cabinet, and is he saying this is the fault of the labour movement in the Province?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I was not certain what your decision was. I am quite prepared to answer the question. There is no connection between the two things that the hon. member is asking. He is asking if I agree with Dr. Collins that the union should shoulder the greater part of the blame for the strike. I do not necessarily share that opinion. He is asking if I was part of the decision or did I agree with the decision. I answered that question earlier, Mr. Speaker. I said that I had no strong differences with that, but to ask me if I am blaming the union, I have already stated to this House, Mr. Speaker, that it takes two to start a dispute and there are two parties involved. It is as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, what the ministers were saying and what came through loud and clear at the interview,

whether the minister agrees or not, is that he was playing second fiddle to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and had no say in that decision. And we are wondering, and the labour movement is wondering, whether the minister was out of this Province by coincidence or if he was out because he knew a decision was coming that was going to be averse to settling that strike? Did the minister take himself out of that decision deliberately?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, when I play my fiddle I always play first fiddle and I did so in this case. The answer to the hon. members question, Mr. Speaker, and I would have to check this, I stand to be corrected, but I think I was on a short holiday at the time of that particular decision and I learned about it on my return.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister obviously did not have himself very well briefed because he looked very much like he was playing second fiddle on that interview and he looks very much like he has been fiddling with the labour movement since he became minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, would the minister be kind enough to tell us whether or not the action of making that shipment to Goose

Bay has improved?

MR. SIMMS:

You do not have yourself briefed very much, either.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) has enough problems with his councillors, trying to get the right ones elected, without trying to help the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). Now, would the minister indicate to the House whether or not the action taken by the government and endorsed by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and the decision made by the Minister of Finance to make that shipment to Goose Bay, had an adverse effect on labour relations between himself and the unions representing the breweries?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister for Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very subjective question. I do not know whether it has made any difference or not. I had a meeting last Friday with Mr. March and he is supposed to get back to me either today or tomorrow to let me know where we are heading with this dispute. But to say that it made difference, the whole matter was not even mentioned when I had my meeting with Mr. March. So it is very subjective and I do not know the answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Would the minister tell the House who speaks for Labour in this particular dispute, is it the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or is it the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard)? That is the question the labour movement is asking in this Province today, who is speaking for Labour in this particular dispute, is it the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Finance?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not certain where the hon. member is getting his information about the question that labour is asking, who speaks for labour. They know very well. As a matter of fact, this very week I had a very informative meeting with the President and Secretary/Treasury of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. We discussed a number of issues of concern to the Federation of Labour. They will be coming back to me again to talk further about it, they just grounded those issues with me. There are not complaints, Mr. Speaker, about the Department of Labour these days. I am not sure where he is getting his information. I have got a good relationship, Mr. Speaker, even with Mr. March who is very embroiled in the strike, the subject being discussed here in the House now.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). I want to know why he finds it so necessary as the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands to threaten, in a press release, the voters of Grand Falls that they should elect a Tory Council next Tuesday. Why is he carrying out this gross interference in the Municipal Election process?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has to ask that question, then it is no wonder he is sitting over on that side and not over on this side. What I did in that release was simply indicate that I was looking forward to working with people who were able to co-operate with the government. I stand by that.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

In his press release he said that it was important from his perspective as Minister of Forest Resources and Lands that candidates who get elected are people, 'I will be able to work with.' Now, that in itself is a

veiled threat to the people of Grand Falls to elect a Tory Council. I would like to ask him again is he saying that he, in fact, cannot work with the present council, as indications seem to be, and he is starting a campaign against the incumbents in Grand Falls?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the whole question is out of order, of course, as Your Honour is aware. But since you are letting me answer, I will try to answer it. First of all, I think it is important for all of us to hope that people who are elected as members of town councils will be people whom we can each work with. That is all I said in my statement. There was nothing more to it than that. He can try to make a mountain out of a molehill, he can ask me a question about my particular portfolio, if he wishes, or he can continue to ask silly questions, such as the ones he is asking here today.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister put out the press release as Minister of Forest Resources and Lands and that is why I asked him as Minister of Forest Resources and Lands about this threat, because Grand Falls is very closely tied

in with forestry. I would like to direct my supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). Does he condone this kind of gross political interference in the municipal election process, this Tory interference in the municipal election process which is now going on?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I have not seen any statement that was made by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, so any comment that I would make on it I would be making completely in the dark. However, it is necessary for all members to establish a good relationship with whomever is elected on November 12.

MR. BAKER:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
I recognized the hon. member last time for a final supplementary, I now move to the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn). In light of the fact that there is clearly political interference in municipal elections, will the minister assure this House and the people of Newfoundland that, unlike the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), he has taken steps to ensure that there will be no

political interference in school board elections?

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, I can say quite truthfully that there will be absolutely no political interference in school board elections.

MR. DECKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, it obviously seems to be a laughing matter as far as members on the other side of this House are concerned. But will the minister concede that the possibility exists that political interference can take place in school board elections just as it takes place in municipal elections?

MR. FLIGHT:
What?

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, I presume that what the member is getting at is if politicians want to get out into the communities and lobby support for people of certain political stripes. Of course that can take place in any kind of election. Nominations for the school board elections are closed and have been

closed for quite some time. We have more people running for election to school boards this time than ever before. Two-thirds of our boards will be elected this time, whereas only one-third was elected previously. There is a lot more interest, but certainly I have not received any reports of political interference, and I am sure that there will not be any from this side, at least.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:
I have an answer to a question asked by the hon. the member for Menihek, October 31. His question was for me to give a list of all school tax authorities in the Province; to indicate the number of employees that they employ in total; the total of payroll paid to them; the total operating costs of these school tax authorities over the last fiscal year and the last couple of years going back at least three to four years; the amount of revenue raised by each of the school tax authorities and table any guidelines that exist for expenditure from school tax authorities in terms of the money that they have raised.

I have all that information here. It is quite lengthy. I can

certainly read it for the member but perhaps it will do to table the report.

I would like to refer to last year when school tax authorities raised \$22,573,369 in the Province. It is a concern, I think, of some people that a lot of this might be spent on administration. Eighty-six per cent of this funding was put in or distributed among the school boards. Besides that, out of the money that was spent on administration, over \$300,000 was spent for computer equipment, which was a one time shot. So a very high percentage of the funding goes directly into the local school boards. Without the \$20 million that went into the school boards, they certainly would be hurting in the various areas around the Province.

We are very appreciative of the work done by school tax authorities and they certainly receive very little thanks for the job that they are doing out there.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will table the answers to the questions for the hon. member.

Petitions

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from 182 residents of Main Brook on the Northern Peninsula. I will just read the final prayer of the petition.

I would like to mention at this time that I have discussed this petition with the member for the district and the petition arrived to me, not as a result of any dissatisfaction with the member at all, but just because I happen to know the individuals involved.

The prayer of the petition is: "Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon the House of Assembly to use its best efforts to convince the Government of Canada to reinstate full indexation of universal family allowance and to rescind the unfair tax increases."

Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to raise the issue of the fact that the family allowance payments are in the process of being de-indexed, and that will erode the purchasing power of parents and of low-income families to a horrible degree.

We have raised that issue before, and we have yet to get a clear statement from the government opposite on where it stands on this. The answer that we received from the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was equivocal at best and did not indicate whether there was support for the petition. So I raise it again, present it; this is a petition from a different community. It is totally in order, I assure you, it is even addressed to the House of Assembly, and I wish to hear some response from the government side.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. DECKER:

I am pleased to support the prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker.

This matter has been of some concern for the people of Main Brook for some time. I have discussed it with them on many occasions, let me assure you. The people of St. Anthony also, the people of Goose Cove, and people all over this Province are concerned about this.

I did not get around to sending out a blank petition to the people of Main Brook soon enough that they could sign and mail it back to me. Maybe I should do that at some future time.

As the petition states, Mr. Speaker, if we de-index the family allowance, we are going to be taking money out of the pockets of families in Main Brook, and this is true of families all over Canada. As the cost of living continues to rise, it will mean that the families are going to have less money with which to buy food, clothing and what have you. So therefore, it is very clearly a concern to the people of Main Brook.

I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is a concern, not only of the families of Main Brook, but also of the business people in Main Brook. And this should be especially interesting to the members of this Tory Government, who are always coming down on the side of business. If we take money out of the pockets of our people, the mothers or children, whatever the case may be, we are taking the money out of the businesses in this Province

and this nation.

I heard the figure given some time ago of how many million dollars will be taken out of the economy as a result of the de-indexing of the family allowance. I just forget the figure now. By the year 1990, I think there was something - I just cannot remember the exact figure - but it was an astronomical amount of money, Mr. Speaker, and this is a concern.

So, in support of this petition, I agree with the mothers who presented it, that it is going to give them less money to spend. I also speak on behalf of businesses, that there will be less money in the economy, which will affect all of us, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like at this time to present a petition on behalf of 208 residents of the town of Fortune and surrounding communities, residents from the town of Lamaline, Point May, Fortune and Grand Bank, with the majority of signatures on the petition from the residents of Fortune, who are petitioning this House and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro on the high electrical rates that are being assessed.

This petition, by the way, Mr. Speaker, was sent to me in mid-August and I informed the people that I would present it at the earliest possible chance in

the House of Assembly. Of course, it is one of many petitions that we have seen presented from all around the Province as it pertains to the high cost of electricity that our residents are experiencing.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this government has taken a number of initiatives to try and reduce the burden on the taxpaying residents of the Province. As I said, there are some 208 signatures on this petition and as the MHA representing these people, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present this petition and say yes to the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I am certainly supporting this petition as signed by some 208 people from my district.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I certainly, as the critic for Consumer Affairs, go along with the minister and the MHA for the district in supporting that petition, but I do not agree with him when he says that the government is doing everything it can to help people reduce their high electricity bills.

What is happening is the electricity bills are continually decreasing. We just found very recently that PEI, through their efforts, earned a good response with the government in Ottawa and now have their rates decreased this Winter at least 25 per cent. We find that a province such as PEI can have their rates decreased 25 per cent and we find our rates here on the Island are continually increasing.

So the government sitting in power and holding all the purse strings is certainly not doing anything whatsoever to help the people with electricity rates. We certainly have nothing to commend them for on this matter. While we support the people of the district, all over the Province there is a continuous problem. We have people on very low incomes, people such as senior citizens and people such as widows are receiving an amount of money such as \$250 a month plus a small supplement from Social Services of \$79 a month and they have to pay electricity rates of \$250 to \$300 a month. I think this is totally disgraceful.

We have offered no solution whatsoever for this coming Winter and it has been brought to the government's attention time after time after time. They say they cannot come up with a solution, yet the Province of PEI came up with a solution where they decreased their rates 25 per cent.

I find this totally disgraceful. There is no concern for the people of Newfoundland.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
I would like to support the petition. I do not want to point it out but I might as well, it is the original of a copy that I tried to present several days ago.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
Is there someone else who wishes

to speak?

MR. SPEAKER:
I recognized the hon. member because I thought he was presenting a new petition.

MR. FENWICK:
No, no, it was to speak to the other one.

MR. SPEAKER:
In presenting petitions, it is one member from each side who can respond. So the hon. member is out of order.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, can I ask for a ruling on that. I am not sure what side means in this context.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member is out of order.

MR. FENWICK:
Okay.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 6, first reading, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University (Pensions) Act," carried. (Bill No. 53).

On motion, Bill No. (53) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Finance Act," carried. (Bill No. 56).

On motion, Bill No. (56) read a

first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 55).

On motion, Bill No. 55 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend the Financial Corporations Capital Tax Act," carried. (Bill No. 37).

On motion, Bill No. 37 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
The bill itself, Bill No. 26, lists on page 3 the Head of Expenditure, Department and the aggregate amount of Supplementary Supply for that particular department.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that that

is the format that has been used for a number of years in this House to just list the department and the amount for that department opposite. I realize also that the minister on Friday, the 25th. of October, in speaking to this motion, gave some breakdown of those particular expenditures. I thank him for that.

The point I want to make nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, and I say it as a suggestion to the minister for future occasions, is that perhaps the time has come to bring the contents of this bill into line with the format used in the budget itself.

For example, Mr. Chairman, I find it a bit contradictory that, on the one hand, when we are dealing with the regular budget estimates, we are given a breakdown as, for example, on page 29 of the estimates, a breakdown as small as \$200 for supplies or \$1,000 for employee benefits.

First of all, let me submit, that is as it should be because if the House is to hold the administration to account for expenditures it needs the kind of detail that is provided in the estimates.

So the point I make and the suggestion I make is that the administration give consideration to doing a similar breakdown. I repeat, I realize it would be a departure from the format that has been traditionally used for this particular type of bill. But given that the minister proceeds in his introductory statement to do a fair amount of the breakdown anyway, it would be helpful to individual members of the House, I say to him, if he would undertake to at least take under advisement

the suggestion I make to him, the suggestion that he provide in the bill a parallel breakdown, parallel to the kinds of breakdowns you have in the regular estimates for the fiscal year so that, for example, Mr. Chairman, instead of looking at an aggregate of \$8,686,000 Supplementary Supply, we would have some detail of that particular expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, I want to come to a couple of matters of detail. I hope the minister might respond to the suggestion I have made in a moment or so. Before I sit though, two other items:

One, only half tongue in cheek. I see the Minister of Education here and I would hope that none of the extra \$4,329,000 that they are asking for is paying for those ads. I am delighted by the ads. As a matter of fact, I would move that they be run all year 'round. That is me, the politician speaking. I would hope they would run then all year around.

Another suggestion, of course, that I would make to him is that he talk to his seatmate, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) and see if he could not persuade him to do the ads for him. He would be miles ahead. But I would hope that none of the amount of the \$4 million is for that very particular TV ad campaign.

Mr. Chairman, let us come to a comment that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) made in this Chamber on October 25. In talking about the warrant for the Department of Development of \$3,400,000, the minister indicated that \$2.5 million of that amount was to provide capital funding for the Newfoundland and Labrador

Development Corporation in absence of an agreement with the federal government.

He went on to say that "as the hon. members will recall, the federal government has decided not to continue participation in that Development Corporation." Now, for the record, Mr. Chairman, the government he is talking about is the former Liberal administration in Ottawa which at that time, for its own reasons, had decided that it did not want to participate further.

The question I have for the minister, and I ask it bearing in mind that at the time the former Liberal administration in Ottawa decided to opt out of this agreement, there was a fair concern expressed by the provincial government including the Minister of Finance about that option, about the decision of the federal government not to participate further in the funding of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. My question to the Minister of Finance is now that the administration in Ottawa is changed and we have a Tory administration up there and everything is cheek to cheek, hand to hand, jowl to jowl, because of that, has the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) or the Premier raised this issue with the new federal administration with a view to having the funding restored, with a view to having federal participation in the capital funding requirements of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation?

It has now been thirteen long wearisome months for most

Canadians since the Tory administration in Ottawa took over and I would hope in that particular time the Minister of Finance and/or the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has raised this particular issue. Perhaps he would indicate to me that that is the case and that funding will be forthcoming?

So I leave for the time being, Mr. Chairman, two questions with the Minister of Finance relating to the issue I mentioned to him about giving a little more detail in the bill by way of informing members, and secondly, the issue of possible federal funding once again for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation? What initiatives his administration has taken in that regard?

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
I was going to defer if there is somebody on the other side who wants to get up since it has been a habit of going back and forth, but if you do not mind, that is fine.

Mr. Chairman, I want to address a number of points that were raised by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) when he brought it up. I would like to have some feedback on it if he will be up in a little while.

Looking at Hansard for October 25 on Page 2514 where his comments were initially recorded when he entered the bill, there are a number of items there I would like to point out.

One is \$211,000 he indicates for the Executive Council required to meet the expenses of offshore negotiations. This is for offshore negotiations. Mr. Chairman, I recall just a few days ago in this House where we asked for a committee, that is this side of the House - unfortunately I have to group myself - we asked for a committee to be sent to Ottawa to protect our inshore fishing industry which would have required a piddling few thousand dollars in order to finance this committee. It was turned down by the other side, yet close to \$25,000 is being involved here with offshore negotiations.

I do not say that it is not an appropriate expenditure but what I do say is that it seems to me an financial indication of the level of interest this government has, one in offshore oil, and in the protection of our fisheries, which seems to be a bottom priority.

MR. WARREN:
(Inaudible)

MR. FENWICK:
That is a very appropriate comment that he made. Somewhere along the line you have got to stand up and say what you believe and mean what you say. Fortunately these gamesmen to my left do not always say that.

The next comment, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make is further on down that column and that is the \$1,500,000 for equity financing of St. Lawrence Fluorspar Limited. I would like to mention a few things about that company because it has become apparent, I think, to the members of this House that there are a number of things going on in St. Lawrence with regard to the introduction of this company that

are very, very worrisome.

All of us know of the dramatic and tragic history of that particular operation, but if early indications are any indication of what is going to happen in the future, then it looks like the future is not going to be any better. I refer, for example, to printed comments that the Town of St. Lawrence in some way has arranged with the particular contractor to set actual pay scales for the people involved. One of the questions that I would have liked to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) or the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) is when this Town was certified as a collective bargaining agent for anybody? That is a question we have not been able to ask but is one that I certainly welcome if the Minister of Municipal or the Minister of Labour is willing to take part in it.

The other one is saying, of course, what kind of a union it would be? I would suggest that that is a violation of a fundamental constitution of Canada which says you have a right to join in -

MR. DAWE:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker would you please protect me from the catterwalling across the hall there? Oh good, the catterwaller is leaving.

MR. DAWE:

Yes, I have got to go out and throw up.

MR. FENWICK:

I am glad to say that the minister is doing something productive.

The other question that I have concerns page 2515, in case the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is following along. He is listening, it just does not look that way. He talks about a warrant for the Department of Development amounting to \$3,400,000, some \$2,500,000 is to provide capitol funding for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Association in the absence of an agreement with the federal government. This is a very striking thing, I thought we put in a Tory government in this Province so that we would have agreement between the Tory levels of government and here we have a clear indication that the federal government is saying either that they cancelled it, and I am not sure if they did, it might have been the Liberal government.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was.

MR. FENWICK:

Obviously, what they are saying is that they will not renew it. I am wondering if there is any possibility of this joint funding being renewed on a federal/provincial level. I thought I might indicate that while we are going through it and when the Minister of Finance gets a chance to speak on it, he might give us some indication. It is the Department of Development. Is it coming back?

The other one is one the same page 2515 on the right side and that is the one that I find interesting, to Transportation \$12,800,000 made up of \$5,600,000 approximately for high priority road improvement and construction problems. Really I think, that we have a pretty bold face here. I would suggest that if you people on the opposite

wanted to be a little bit more honest, perhaps you should say, "for buying the election" because really that is the kind of purchasing we are looking at here.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:
You were still putting the whole works together up to two days before the election. The last comment I would like to make is on page 2516 and it is less of a partisan one. It is \$6,000,000 for additional funding for Community Development Programs and I ask about that because, quite frankly, it is a program that when I first saw it - the idea of putting people to work for ten or twenty weeks in order to throw them on unemployment insurance - I thought this was a cynical program and one that should be discontinued and so on. Since then I have modified my position having seen a lot of the programs in effect, I have seen, what I consider, some good coming from it.

But I have also talked to a lot of people who have a tremendous amount of concern about that program and these are people like people running day care nurseries who are concerned that they get a person in for ten weeks, just get them trained in that period of time and all of sudden they are laid off and a new bunch of rookies come in. What I would like to suggest to the minister is because we are pumping so much money into this particular social service program and it is becoming tens of millions of dollars per year, that we take a much closer look at how we are spending the money, what we are accomplishing with it and figure out if there

may be a better way of doing the whole thing because, quite frankly, a lot of the recipients are complaining that just after they get them trained, they are gone and, as a result, they do not get the effect of the money. I agree with putting money into the social services, into day care schools, into nursery schools, and into a number of things that I have seen it put into but I think that if we are spending that much money we should have more concern than just dumping people on unemployment insurance which is the immediate short-term objective of this program. We should have some concern, not only for the individuals, who I think we want to see looked after, but also for those employers that they are being put with to see if perhaps there is a better way of operating this program.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:
Oh I know and I am not complaining. The fact is there are some good aspects to it but I think there are enough dilatorious ones that we should look at the programme closely.

With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:
After hearing my colleague to my physical right and political left, I wondered how you could talk about Mr. Cashin's representative in the House of Assembly. It is

nice to see that he is here and alive.

It reminds me that a few days ago he stood up and was warning people to beware of standing in the middle of the road because you get hit both ways. I have a feeling that he is in that position right now. He does not seem to be improving his situation. Every time he gets up he seems to get further into the middle of the road.

Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on Bill 26, "An Act For Granting Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Five And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service".

First of all the thing that strikes me - and like my colleague from Gander (Mr. Baker) yesterday, I am a new member - it is a little strange that here we are, after we had a budget introduced in May of this year for the current fiscal year that was lauded by members opposite as something akin to the Magna Charta and maybe a little better, at least the most serious and honest piece of legislation since the Magna Charta. But now I find that when we passed this budget we not only passed the budget for operating this year but we were left with \$56,361,600 on the Table that we had left over from last year. Now this, to me, is a strange way to operate but I suppose they told me that government operates in a strange and mysterious fashion. When you pass a budget to operate for the current year and then you find that you have \$56 million left there to be voting on now seven

months after the last budget came in, it seems a little strange to me.

I suppose when the minister starts to correct me for being a new member now, he will certainly do it in fine style, as he did my colleague from Gander yesterday. I will sit here in awe and wonderment when I hear the correction because of the wisdom I will hear from a person who brought in budgets for the last five years with whopping deficits every year. We have not heard this year if there is any deficit or maybe he has learned the old secret, he is going to budget his deficit high enough that he will not have a deficit.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is going to be more accurate.

MR. GILBERT:

After five years he should be more accurate.

So I am prepared to sit here and listen to his explanations and be willing to learn from him. I hope in his explanations he might learn a little something too so that he will come in a balanced budget after a while and we will not be left here next year to debate a \$56 million deficit that was left over from the previous year with all those fine items that are left outstanding in this thing, including why it was there.

When we look at the actual bill and what we are doing with the money and where it is being spent, there are many things you can question. Municipal Affairs is one that is always an interesting one when you see that we have communities in Newfoundland that have fire-fighting equipment that they cannot find money to send

people out to show them how to use, communities that the only bit of fire fighting equipment they have actually is a respirator. Here it is, a community like Francois, struggling to set up a volunteer fire department and you ship them out the only bit of equipment they can use besides a water pump, which they have to carry on their backs. Then they were going to send someone down to show them how to use this but, unfortunately, there is no money.

Yet here we are talking on a bill that you want passed so we can approve the spending of \$56,361,600, all that in one. Just imagine! And we have communities in Newfoundland that you cannot find enough money in the Department of Municipal Affairs to send someone down to train people on how to use a respirator. There is something wrong with the system that we would have stand here in this House and be asked to approve monies that were spent without any thought going into it. We had passed a budget for this year yet, you are asking us again to approve this money that is spent.

We also have a situation where there is no way that we know when this is spent or how it is going to be spent and then you come and blatantly ask to approve a piece of legislation after the money is spent. You can go down through this again and you can walk into any of the communities in Newfoundland and they will tell you they cannot get money from government. It is not there for the Department of Municipal Affairs. Yet you are overspent by \$7 million and nobody knows where it is gone. It certainly was not into any of the Opposition districts. I am sure it must be

into the the old days of the 1/45th split I would imagine that we heard referred to yesterday. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, you are aware of that one.

What we are speaking on about now goes back to March 1985. This is money that is left over from the previous years. So what I am saying now is that it must have been in the split. Again what I find so confusing to me is the fact that here they are able to ask us to approve a bill for a \$56 million in overspending, and then you will find that there has been no control on it, as to how it is spent or why. Then we are supposed to approve it. We have seven or eight items here, here is how it was spent. What is the breakdown on it?

In the Municipal Affairs one there is \$6,783,300. Where was that spent? How was it broken down? I know yesterday the minister was telling my colleague from Gander (Mr. Baker) that he could not spend money in Twillingate if it was spent in St. John's. I would like to know in this Municipal Affairs one where exactly it was spent? Was it spent all over the Island? Was it spent in one or two special places?

Again, in Transportation is another \$12,885,000. Was that spent in St. John's or Ottawa, or was it spent in various districts throughout the Province? Was it spent just in one? Could you tell us where?

This is where, on this side of the House, we find it extremely difficult to support the bill.

As much as we would like to be able to support the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this,

we find it extremely difficult when we discover that all we get is a bunch of figures passed to us for money that was spent nine, ten, and eleven months ago. We do not want to be critical of the hon. minister. But unfortunately when we do not have the explanations - and this is the thing that we need - so as a new member, I am asking because I really do not know how you could do this? So if you would tell me, Sir, how that money for Municipal Affairs was spent, I would be quite happy to have the breakdown of it and, maybe, the one for Transportation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening)
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Chairman, I have a few words to say on this bill. This warrant, by the way, is to cover expenditures up to and including I believe March 31, 1985. I wonder can the minister tell us how many more such warrants can we expect in this session? How much more money has been spent since that date for which no provision was made in the budget and can we expect more such Special Warrants soon?

The minister has become noted for poor budgetary forecasting. We all know that any similarity between what the minister forecast and what actually happened is becoming purely coincidental. One of the problems, Mr. Speaker, obviously, is in the advice he is getting from his department. The

thing that worries me is one of the persons who was responsible for advising the minister in his budget forecast, that person I believe was his deputy minister or assistant deputy minister, is now one of the people who are doing the forecasting for Fishery Products International.

MR. TULK:
Oh, no.

MR. W. CARTER:
Having learned that fact my hopes for the future welfare and success of that company I must say were somewhat diminished.

That is the kind of advice that the minister was getting. We all know what has been happening of course in the past few years with millions of dollars out in forecast. Like I said, any similarity between what has been budgeted and what actually happens and is spent is nothing more than a coincidence.

I notice in the bill, Mr. Chairman, there is an amount for Transportation, almost \$13 million. I would like to bring to the minister's attention the situation in my district of Twillingate where, prior to the April 2 election, a promise was made by the Premier, through the then member for that district, that certain capital works would be undertaken in the district of Twillingate that were subsequently ignored. The promises were not kept. I can refer the House to a letter to the Premier on July 4 from the Town of Twillingate. It was published, by the way, in the local press wherein the town brought to the Premier's attention the fact that certain promises were made with respect to roads, with respect to water and sewer

that were subsequently ignored - broken promises.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), Newfoundland's latest \$3 million bionic man, and that is what his election cost -

MR. YOUNG:
(Inaudible) Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that the hon. member won his seat by 200 votes and I think that cost the people \$3 million, \$35,000 per vote.

MR. YOUNG:
(Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Newfoundland's \$3 million man, and I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, there is inflation for you. There is inflation for you. That is inflation of the worst kind.

MR. CALLAN:
Don (inaudible) will get you.

MR. W. CARTER:
If anybody in this House would agree that the hon. member's election is worth \$3 million, then I do not know what -

DR. COLLINS:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is interrupting my hon. friend, making interjections against the hon. member. So I would ask you

to ask the hon. member for Bellevue to restrain himself.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To that point of order, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:
I would also ask you, Mr. Chairman, to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), if he is going to be speaking at all, at least he do it from his own seat, but he should not be interjecting anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
To that point of order, I will ask all members to be silent while the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is speaking.

MR. W. CARTER:
A good idea, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
A good ruling.

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
It is an excellent ruling, Mr. Chairman. The \$3 million bionic man, Mr. Chairman, should following your ruling. He has an obligation to do that.

AN HON. MEMBER:
\$19 million.

MR. W. CARTER:
\$35,000 per vote to get elected.

Mr. Chairman, in the estimates, I have a letter here which would concern my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), two letters, in fact. One letter came from the Ministerial Association in that

area, signed by Lieutenant David Sparkes, who is the Acting Secretary of that Association and also a letter from the Gateway Senior Citizens Club, signed by the president and secretary and so on. They bring to the government's attention, Mr. Chairman, the serious situation that exist in that area, having to do with the Dr. Charles Legrow Health Centre. I am surprised that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) has not raised the matter in the House, because it is a very serious matter.

The letter, of course, refers to the fact that one of the wings in that health centre, I think, containing around twenty beds, is closed. The hospital is understaffed. The staff is overworked. To make a long story short, Mr. Chairman, things are not as well as they should be in that hospital.

The authors of these letters are not -

MR. MITCHELL:

To a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To a point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment just for a second on what the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) has raised.

For years in the LaPoile district we have had to suffer with an inadequate hospital. Just over a year ago this government dedicated \$13 million hospital in the LaPoile district. In that hospital there are facilities for a chronic care unit. It is a turn-key operation.

I have not been a member who does not do my work in the House of Assembly. I do it in my office with proper representation to the proper departments involved. I can tell the people of the LaPoile district that it is top priority to have the chronic care of that hospital open in the near future. I hope it will be in the new estimates and in the new budget.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order. The hon. member will have a chance to speak, if he wants to. But certainly that is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, the records should show and, of course, the people of LaPoile should be aware of the fact that the only way that they can get their representative in this House to speak is for somebody like the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) to get up and make certain points about his district and then he gets up on his feet in a rage because he really has not done his job.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To the point of order. There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

With respect, I would certainly suggest that the member get a copy. In fact, I think, it has been copied. Yes, there is a copy gone to the hon. member.

MR. MITCHELL:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. MITCHELL:

For the hon. member's information, yes, that copy was sent to me. I have already dealt with it. I have already addressed the Department of Health and I have answered that letter. I do not have to bring it into the House of Assembly to deal with it. I have dealt with it at my own time, immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I would strongly suggest to the hon. member if he has taken action and if he has gotten positive action on the request, he should start informing the people in that district. We are still getting the word back, by the way - and if he wants to

call some of these people liars, he can. That is his prerogative, I suppose.

MR. TULK:

It is his constituents.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is his constituents -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MITCHELL:

I do not know if I am hearing right here today -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Is this a point of order?

MR. MITCHELL:

- or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is this a point of order?

MR. MITCHELL:

A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

We had the Opposition talking about eavesdropping and everything else. Here we have the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) getting up and saying, I am lying to the people in my district.

MR. TULK:

He did not.

MR. W. CARTER:

No, I did not.

MR. MITCHELL:

Or he insinuated.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He did not.

MR. MITCHELL:

He insinuated that I was lying to the people in my district that I was doing something on their behalf or not doing something on their behalf. I would like to set the record straight. I do represent the people of LaPoile and I believe that I do it adequately. I represent them very well.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, it is a matter of clarification on behalf of the hon. the member for LaPoile.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, if I have offended the sensitivities of the member I suppose I should apologize. Maybe I should not, on second thought, because in that district, they say in these letters, there are a number of people who are in need of chronic care.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How many letters?

MR. W. CARTER:

Two letters. There are people who are in need of chronic care. They point out, Mr. Chairman, in this letter that there are -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, could I have silence?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member wishes silence.

MR. W. CARTER:

In this letter, Mr. Chairman, they point out that there are no

nursing homes within the area from Rose Blanche to South Branch and that there are a number of people in the area desperately in need of chronic care. They point out that there are twenty beds in the Dr. Charles LeGrow Health Center that are now not being used. They point out that the service in the hospital is not up to scratch, and that is no reflection on the workers and they say that here. But because of the shortage of money or the Department of Health cutting back on their funding, the hospital is not operating as well as it should and that there are twenty beds lying dormant that could be used by people who are in need of chronic care.

I bring this to the House's attention. I think this is the sort of thing that the Department of Health should be looking into. Surely there is a need for it. I am sorry that the hon. the member has taken exception. I am trying to help you.

I wish that you would get up some time and make a case for the Premier to keep his promise to the people of Twillingate, the promise that was made in the last election. Why do you not, tomorrow, reciprocate. Be a man! Give me a break!

MR. MITCHELL:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. MITCHELL:

This is ironic. Within the last two weeks we have had two of the parties opposite over there, the NDP Party and the Liberal Party, harping on the chronic care wing of the hospital. Now I appreciate

this. I think that this is wonderful because it is helping my cause. But do you know why they are doing it? Because they know that the people in the district of LaPoile have good representation in this House and they know that I have been working on this problem and that those beds are going to be open next year and they want to get the credit for it. That is all they are doing it for, Mr. Chairman, is to try to steal a bit of credit.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

The member for LaPoile, I think it is, or the part member for LaPoile or the member for part of LaPoile should remember that what we are trying to do is we realize the people of LaPoile have a very weak member, that he does not stand in this House for his constituents and that he usually stands up to tow his party lines.

MR. MITCHELL:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK:

I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo is speaking to that point of order.

MR. TULK:

The member for Twillingate, both in pity for the member for LaPoile and his constituents, has made good representation on behalf of LaPoile. He has been a gentleman

about it and asked the member for LaPoile if one of those days he would stand in his place, if he can get up -

MR. MITCHELL:

Next year.

MR. TULK:

Not next year but this year and support him in trying to get the Premier of this Province, who made millions dollars worth of promises to people in his own district in Twillingate. He is being a gentleman. I do not know what makes the hon. gentleman so touchy. Mr. Chairman, there is obviously no point of order. We are just trying to help a very weak member survive and we want to get him elected again the next time because there are only going to be one or two left.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

I would like to inform the House that I am not touchy on those issues. I am not touchy at all. But when the Opposition says that the LaPoile district has a weak member, I do not know if they know what they are talking about because it was only last week when I stood in this House on different occasions and I fought for the fishermen of my district when it came to fishermen's unemployment insurance. Where was the Opposition then? Where were they? Wallowing over there in their newspapers. I rose and I fought against the factory freezer trawler application.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion among three hon. gentlemen.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, another point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman should realize that when it comes to UIC his government, the people that he sits with over there, the forty-two and a half of them or whatever is over there, he should realize that we are not out to waste the time of the House talking about UIC regulations when we have made the point months before, when we put together a report. When is he going to catch up to what is happening? On FFTs, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) says he opposed it the day it came out, well the Premier took a couple of weeks, maybe the Minister of Fisheries in some far corner of Newfoundland did oppose it, but the Premier certainly did not. When are you going to catch up and learn that there is a House to be in? You should stay on top of it and not have the member for Twillingate come in here and represent your constituents for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this debate has taken this turn. I certainly did not want it to do this but I will say this, Mr. Chairman, that tomorrow morning I will be free to sit down with the

hon. member and I will help frame some questions that he can put to the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

I need your help. Just as I am trying to help you now, I hope that tomorrow you will reciprocate and help me. Tomorrow we will sit down and frame some questions and we will ask the Premier, by the way, about the senior citizens home he promised Twillingate. We will ask him about the water and sewer system that they promised Twillingate, that they promised Durrell, Back Harbour, Indian Cove, and Newville.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL;

Mr. Chairman, it is a little bit ironic that on a bill such as the one we have before the House, Bill No. 26, the money bill, that the Opposition over there really cannot find anything to debate it on or to debate about. Now, what do they have to do? Pick on a backbencher.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh.

MR. MITCHELL:

Now, that is basically the input of their debate in this Bill 26. I would like to probably inform the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) that I really do not need

his help in trying to represent the people in the LaPoile district. I would suggest to the hon. member for Twillingate that if he wants to spend his time more appropriately representing his own constituents he does not have to come down and sit down with me and try to get some ideas from me as to how I am representing the people in LaPoile. Why does he not go directly to the people involved, the ministers, the department and put his representation before them like I have done and try to make sure that his requests will be into the estimates and into the budgets that are going to be coming before this House next year? This is the type of representation that I have given the people of the district of LaPoile. This is the type of representation that I want to be able to give them.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, let me try to straighten this hon. gentleman out now. He is up now trying to give my friend for Twillingate (W. Carter), I do not know what you would call it, I suppose you would call it, out around where I come from, a tongue lashing. He has him scared to death down there, he is trembling in his seat, just look at him.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell him that there is some relevancy in this bill, it is a money bill. That is the one fact he stated which is true. Would he please, then, use this opportunity to do what my friend from Twillingate (Mr. W.

Carter) told him he should do, and that is, to represent the people of LaPoile, otherwise, we are going to be forced to ask, 'Where is Neary when LaPoile needs him?' So would he stand up and make some representation? We do not have to tell him what to do. He knows what to do.

MR. RIDEOUT:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the point of order allegedly raised by the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) is that the gentleman from LaPoile should be relevant to the debate.

Now, I would remind Your Honour that the question of representation was raised in this debate by the hon. gentleman's colleague. All my colleague is doing, Mr. Speaker, is taking the opportunity, under a money bill, under which, as you know, Your Honour, you can speak about anything under the sun, to reply to that kind of representation. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that all the hon. Opposition House Leader is trying to do is to waste the time of my colleague, who is making such a fine speech to this House, outlining his tremendous efforts on behalf of the people of LaPoile, one of the best members that the people of LaPoile have ever seen in this legislature, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr.

Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, let me tell the hon. gentleman that I am not trying to waste his time or put him down, or anything like that. I just say to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) that this gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) needs all the help he can get. That is all I am trying to do, be very helpful. He needs all the help he can get.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. the member for LaPoile has been besieged with requests from the Opposition to help them out. The hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is begging my colleague to take him by the hand and bring him down to the Premier and try to help him out, because he is so inadequate in representing the needs of the district of Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

To that point of order, I would ask both sides of the House to co-operate and be silent while the hon. the member for LaPoile is speaking.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There is so much confusion here from the other side that it is very hard for me to hear Your Honour's rulings.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very important bill before this House today, and that is Bill 26. When we look at what this bill contains, we find it contains money. I will just name some of the departments under which it will affect my district: Mines and Energy, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, Transportation, Education, Social Services, Labour and Manpower and Municipal Affairs.

Just the other day, a member of this hon. House was quoted in the newspaper as having said that this government was not doing anything by way of putting money into my district. Now, this is a very important bill, and if we are going to try to improve the situation for our districts with respect to essential services, then government must be able to have access to money. And that is what this debate is all about today.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is already spent.

MR. TULK:

The money is gone, boy! Read the bill! That money was gone last Fall.

MR. MITCHELL:

I did not say that the money was there or the money was gone, I said they have to have money, and that is what this bill deals with.

In my own district, between the provincial government and the federal government in the last year, we have had \$4.4 million spent towards an industrial mall.

We have had \$9.5 million over a three-year programme, cost-shared by the provincial government and the federal government for an adequate water system in the district of LaPoile.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank God for Neary.

MR. FUREY:

You are there praising the former Liberal government in Ottawa.

MR. MITCHELL:

No, I am not praising the former Liberal government in Ottawa, not at all! I am talking about the commitments that were made and the commitments that have to be fulfilled and will be fulfilled by this government. And, because they have adequate representation, those commitments will be looked after and will be fulfilled as time goes by.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

Neary and the federal government did those two things you mentioned. Tell us something you have done.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MITCHELL:

Another area in my district, Mr. Chairman, that is going to be very important, and, I suppose, the Liberals would like to take credit for this, too; you know, they like to take credit for everything.

We have a little bright spot on the horizon, it is not all doom and gloom but there is a bit of a bright spot as far as the district of LaPoile is concerned and that is the gold strike down there, Mr.

Speaker. We have had the hon. member for Buchans (Mr. Flight) rising on his high horses every time he gets an opportunity and he is continually asking the ministers of this House, 'When are you going to give us those jobs down in LaPoile for the people of Buchans? When are you going to give us those jobs?' Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say as the member for LaPoile that we are Newfoundlanders first, we are not from Buchans, we are not from Stephenville, and we are not from Corner Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

We have to build and we have to create jobs in this Province for Newfoundlanders first. The jobs that are created in the different districts around this Province depend on the type of representation that is in this House of Assembly. Let me say that if all of the districts in Newfoundland has the representation that they have in the LaPoile district, they will see accomplishments, Mr. Chairman.

I am looking forward to B.P. Selco down in the Cinq Cerf area opening up that mine and employing 200 or 300 people in my district, Mr. Chairman. I know that they are going to do that because this government is going to co-operate with that company to do everything that they can to get another industry going. We have seen it happen in Corner Brook with Kruger, we have seen it happen down in St. Lawrence, Mr. Chairman.

I am proud to be sitting on this side of the House and to be working not for the people of

Buchans, but working for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Chairman. One of the things that you will never see from this hon. member, Mr. Speaker, is when there is an issue as important as the jobs for the people in my district to be able to sit here and not support a motion, or not to support legislation that is going to drastically affect those people. Mr. Chairman, we have seen it happen. We have seen it happen last week.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. MITCHELL:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No. No.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to interrupt. We just saw a tremendous battle here in parliament. The whole weight of the Opposition was thrown on the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell). He not only withstood the vicious storm, the tremendous attacks, but he beat them and cowed them into submission so that no one could even get up on their feet afterwards. What a spectacle! What an example! I hope we all get Hansard and read it in our homes tonight.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to some of the points that were raised. The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) brought up a point about the format of this bill and I think he made a good point there. He wanted more breakdown in the schedule attached and I guess the reason why it has not been given to now is that this bill is really a compilation of Special Warrants that were tabled in the House and those Special Warrants do have the breakdown. Nevertheless, I think it makes a good point and we will certainly take it under advisement and hopefully next time such a bill has to come into the House the schedule we will have further breakdowns.

Another point he brought up was the \$3.4 million in the Department of Development and he wondered as this was for capital funding for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation whether we had made representations to the federal government to contribute again an amount to the capital funding of this organization. I can say we certainly have. Unfortunately we were not successful. We ran into the restraint program of the federal government; a restraint program, I am afraid, that had to be put in because of the overspending of the Liberal administration for the last five or six years. They were left in a invidious position when they took over government and at this point in time they felt that they could not accede to our wishes, but we have hopes for the future.

The member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) questioned the amount in Executive Council, he said that there was \$211,000 for offshore negotiations. He was a little bit

wrong there, there was \$150,000 for the offshore negotiations and there was \$61,000 for the Social Policy Committee Chairman's expenses, when the late the hon. Mr. House occupied that position. We have no apology to make over the \$150,000 for the offshore negotiations. This was a titanic battle to get the offshore agreement that we got - The Atlantic Accord. I believe that many, many people did not for one minute think that this small, rather impoverished, thinly-populated Province would be able to succeed in this when we had the whole weight of the federal government, the Liberal administration at the time and we had the judgements of the Supreme Court of Canada against us. I think that everyone said, 'Look, you may as well lay down and die and accept something like Nova Scotia's ratty old agreement and just be pleased that you are struggling through by your fingernails.'

Nevertheless, we persevered and we have got an agreement that other Provinces are now trying to emulate. It is interesting to note that the federal government recently promised the Province of Nova Scotia that they will change the agreement that the Nova Scotian government was happy to accept to include the provisions that are in our agreement. So that is the explanation there.

The hon. member also questioned in Finance \$1,500,000 for St. Lawrence and he wondered why we were doing this because, in his mind, there are certain difficulties with the labour situation down there. All I can say to that is that the people in St. Lawrence are absolutely delighted, absolutely enthralled

that the mine is opening and it is going to open in such a way that there will be more processing in that area than ever before. We see nothing but plaudits and praise for putting in that \$1,500,000. I am afraid that the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) has got his messages wrong somewhere.

He also questioned the \$5,500,000 in Transportation as did the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert). I can just point out that we get requests for road building, improvement and construction. It really is not a departmental program in terms of starting the process. The process is started by the municipalities themselves, they make requests and we respond to those requests. So that \$5,600,000 was a partial response. We wish we could have been able to put in more but that is all that we could manage at the time. We put in \$5,600,000 to respond to some of the requests put to us by the municipalities.

In Social Services, he questioned whether the Community Development Program, into which an additional \$6,000,000 was placed, whether that was a good program. I am sure that there are improvements that can be made to it. We are making them all the time. One of the improvements made, was a point that the hon. member brought up that in some cases the length of time individuals are on program is insufficient or is thought to be insufficient. We have found that to be so in some cases and we have increase the length of time that certain individuals can stay on the programs, especially individuals dealing with handicapped children and so on.

The member for Burgeo - Bay

d'Espoir wondered why we were bringing in Supplementary Supply. I think he may have partially been labouring under the impression that the Supplementary Supply related to this year, because he said, "We brought down the budget in March and why are we now bringing in Supplementary Supply?" I think, in actual fact, he corrected himself later on and as he is aware this Bill relates to the previous year. The reason why there is a Supplementary Supply Bill is that you cannot predict always what expenses you are going to face in a year. Many emergencies arise that are unforeseen and so on and you have to have a mechanism whereby you can respond to those. We can only respond to those with the authority of the House. Now, the arrangement under the Financial Administration Act is that we can respond if it is required of us to these emergency and urgent situations and get the concurrence of the House afterwards. That is what the supply bill is all about.

I think he also brought up the point that we may into troubles with our budgetary situation this year. I can inform the hon. House now that next week, hopefully, I will be able to bring in a half year report on the present status of the budgetary situation and he will be able to get his answer to that question at that time.

In regard to Municipal Affairs he wondered why we put in \$6.7 million when some municipalities are deficient in certain equipment which I am sure are very desirable and, he indicated, might be very critical. Well the \$6.7 million was put in for very critical purposes I can assure him. It was put in for the sleet storm we had at that time, or certainly before

hand, and it was also put in to take care of flood damage that occurred in Central Newfoundland. So surely that was well justified.

The hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) wanted to know how many warrants we can expect for the current year. I am afraid I cannot answer that because, as I indicated, warrants are put in when unusual and unexpected situations arise. Some have arisen to date and we have had some Special Warrants. I cannot foresee how many more such situations will arise between now and the end of March but we will certainly only bring in warrants that are justified and, of course, we will table the warrants in the House and we will subsequently wrap them up into a Supplementary Supply bill for this year later on.

He also commented on poor forecasts. Well I can assure him that I have answered that question many times and I am sure no matter how many times I answer it he will not be satisfied. We do get advise in terms of our forecast. We get the best advise we are capable of getting. We get it from our own people. As we get the transfer of funds from the federal government, we get it from federal authorities and so on. We just do the best we can I am afraid.

I do not have to answer, I think, about the situation in LaPoile - the hospital down there. My hon. friend down there answered that in full and complete detail to the extent that every tongue was silenced on the other side. So I cannot add anything to his very incisive remarks.

With that I move the bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess you have not got the time in and the practice to roll it off your tongue like the Speaker. However, it was a good attempt, a little delayed. Thank you very much for recognizing me.

I find the whole thing, as I said a couple of different times before, quite a learning process, Mr. Chairman, in many ways. Of course, I am a rookie insofar as my time in the House of Assembly is concerned. But in dealing with the gentleman and others across the way, I am far from a rookie in that I have known many of them in a municipal capacity for a number of years. I have seen the way they handle things and how they accomplish or do not accomplish certain objectives. But the learning process goes a little beyond on that. There was quite a wide range of manifestations of the government on that side.

For example, when the Minister of Labour was getting a little sensitive over the fact that he was accused by one of my colleagues of playing second fiddle, he became very florid, not an unusual occurrence as we have noticed and rose to make the clear statement that when it comes to playing fiddle he never plays second fiddle to anyone, he always plays first fiddle. Perhaps he should be reminded that Nero also had the same philosophy on life and he got his posterior par

boiled more than once.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

So he should keep that in mind.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) Nero.

MR. KELLAND:

I will write it down for you, 'Len'.

And it goes from that extreme, Mr. Chairman, to the extreme of the member from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) who bounces to his feet every time he hears what he perceives to be some sort of a personal insult to him. You know the pomposity of the man, unbelievable, bounce now. Anyone who has to get up in the House and tell the other hon. members that he is doing a good job surely Heavens must be experiencing some form of insecurity. I mean he has to know that insecurity is a fact of life, especially as it relates to the member himself.

I think those extremes, by way of bracketing what I have had to say, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MITCHELL:

Once a Liberal district and you cannot take it.

MR. KELLAND:

You come on up to my district and we will see what we can take.

Anyway I would be more than happy to sit down if he wants to raise a point of order or something like that.

Mr. Chairman, just to sort of bracket what I have to say by those extremes that I noticed in

my learning process here in the House, I would like to support my colleague from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) in his suggestion for more detailed information under the heads of expenditure and thank the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for his concurrence that he will look to that and perhaps take it under advisement and with a view to consolidate it. Even though it is already available in other forms, perhaps a consolidation might make it a little more accessible to us, would lead to more meaningful debate and cut out a lot of the rubber ball tactics used by LaPoile's member over there.

It is interesting to look at some of the figures here, and they are in head form of of course and not in great detail. Rural Agricultural and Northern Development, for example, gets \$3.1 million. What interests me there is that that is a concern that relates to my district, not only my district of course, I think the LaPoile member mentioned some of those aspects were in his as well and many, many others. I wonder in thinking about this, particularly as it relates to Labrador, I would like to know what kind of a split and what kind of a division of that \$3.1 million would have a direct affect and is it being channeled properly?

For example, I strongly object as a citizen, a taxpayer, and an MHA, to the method that the government frequently uses in getting information out to the public in Labrador specifically, because I am familiar with that. For example, if a minister calls a press conference and issues a statement should it be necessary for the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to charter

an aircraft, flick into Labrador so that he can make a simultaneous statement in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, jump on a Queen Air charter and dart back to St. John's? That is a very expensive operation and I am wondering what sort of proportion of that funding is being directed towards that kind of an activity?

MR. DECKER:

It is shameful.

MR. KELLAND:

Compare this, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) is making a statement relating to Labrador. His parliamentary secretary, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) charters a Queen Air - an expensive proposition - goes into Happy Valley-Goose Bay, calls a press conference and reads the identical statement at the identical time, given the half hour time change of course, and then a charter back out. The hon. member, if he was here would tell you that, "Gee Whiz, one time the Naskaupi member," myself, "came out on that aircraft." I got a ride out -

MR. DECKER:

You will not come out on her anymore though.

MR. KELLAND:

- and probably that will terminate my access. I got a ride out, but the interesting thing is that Queen Air is a fairly large aircraft.

MR. SIMMS:

Who offered you the ride, Garfield or Bob?

MR. KELLAND:

I do not refer to their names. Which members? The Bobbsey twins

is that what you are talking about?

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. KELLAND:
Oh that does not really make any difference, who offered me the ride. I came out on the aircraft and there was about three or four people aboard and three or four empty seats. Now that is terrible. I mean, was the Queen Air necessary to start off with? Was the entire trip necessary in the first place?

MR. SIMMS:
Did you ask him that before he got on the flight?

MR. DECKER:
Shameful.

MR. BAKER:
Now, 'Len', boy, if you want to talk stand up.

MR. SIMMS:
Did you?

MR. BAKER:
On a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:
Can you answer the question?

MR. KELLAND:
What was the question?

MR. SIMMS:
Did you ask him all that before you got on the plane?

MR. KELLAND:
Of course. I could not ask him how many seats were empty until I looked, you see.

MR. SIMMS:
But you asked him whether this was all necessary?

MR. KELLAND:
Oh, yes. Of course. Just like you would. With all sense of integrity, honesty and without my hair curled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
But you still went?

MR. KELLAND:
Anyway, Mr. Chairman, as a professional heckler who is a little shaky in his own district we will attempt to ignore him and go on ahead with what we are saying. I could ask that you apply the order rule, but nevertheless.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. KELLAND:
The hon. minister looks a little different than when he was Speaker, but he does not act a hell of a lot different. Nevertheless, let him go.

Okay that is one question in Rural Agriculture and Northern Development. Now if it was necessary and, say, other government officials on official business for whatever reason who could make use of that aircraft, perhaps, it could be more justified, Mr. Chairman, I suggest. I would like to know how often that has been done, perhaps? Why is it necessary when you could use a Teletype, of course, for much less cost than a Queen Air charter both ways.

MR. BAKER:
On course they use teletypes at Newfoundland Information Services.

MR. KELLAND:

That is wonderful stuff.

Another thing I would like to raise some points on Transportation, which is a fairly large chunk of this, of course. I am not going to go into the Churchill Falls Road and all that sort of thing. The minister is well aware of that. But what I am concerned about is will any of that money, the \$10 million plus, be directed to a level of safety as it applies to employees of the Department of Transportation, in particular reference to the Highways Division. Frequently these people are required to be at road camps somewhere remote from their actual homes. Are they, the beneficiaries, let us say, of adequate safety precautions in sometimes not the world's best accommodations? We are talking about trailers and things like that. I have had information from employees of the Department of Transportation that they are very distressed that this is not taking place. By the way, this issue is a little advanced notice so you will not have to use your glass on the wall, that it will be raised again under another portion of this particular Fall sitting of the House.

I am concerned about that because when you talk about safety of people and you put them up on the road twenty, fifty, one hundred miles from their home and they are required to stay over many, many night and they are living in poorly lighted, poorly ventilated, poorly heated accommodations, we are wondering if some more funding should not be directed to their safety and comfort while they are away from home in that kind of a status instead of flying the ministers around and their parliamentary secretaries on

charters and things like that?

So something like that should be looked at. I will again, as I mentioned, bring that particular item and related items up in the House at some future time.

On Mines and Energy, the minister who has the responsibility for housing has also something that deeply concerns me and concerns many people in our Province both in Newfoundland and Labrador, as has been expressed in the House. I guess the minister has a concern about housing or the lack of it and so on, because in a recent presentation of a petition in the House the minister agreed that he would provide funding for a tenants committee to have direct input into his department.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK:
What a pity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave! By leave!

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for St. John's North.

AN HON. MEMBER:
By leave!

MR. J. CARTER:
No, no leave! No leave!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I would not have bothered to get up to speak because I thought that this matter might be passed fairly quickly, but I see from the way the Opposition are acting that they intend to keep this debate going for a long time.

If that is the case, I think then it is a debate that one should, perhaps, get into because a very interesting point has come up. Fortunately, a very wide-ranging debate is allowed at a time like this because we are on money matters, not only money that has been spent, money that should be spent, and money that may be spent in the future.

I would like to talk for a moment not about money that has been spent or misspent, but about money that ought to be spent in the future and money that could very well spent.

I would like to draw the House's attention to a book that is the property of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that he was passing around and it is entitled Seal Wars: An American Viewpoint, by Janice Scott-Henke, I think she pronounces her name, and it is an extraordinarily good defence of the seal fishery, of the necessity for it to continue, and of the danger of giving up, even at this point when we think that all is lost. I would recommend it to hon. members opposite and not only to hon. members opposite, but I would suggest that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), or the government, purchase many, many copies and distribute them far and wide. Not only to members and to communities in Newfoundland but particularly to interested groups outside of Newfoundland. I am

sure we could all come up with a fairly lengthy list of people who ought to get this book and who would benefit from receiving it.

It is called Seal Wars: An American Viewpoint, by Janice Scott-Henke. If I might, without risking having to table this book since it is not my property, just read a couple of bits from the flyleaf.

"No issue in Canadian history has been as volatile as that of the seal harvest off Canada's East Coast. Practically every nation on earth has been involved in this heated controversy. Foreign movie stars, motivated by whatever values, have taken up the moral cudgel and met the barbaric Newfoundlander on the ice. As with every issue of this magnitude there has been distortion, excessive propaganda, and, in this case, big bucks. An annual occurrence, both the seal hunt and the protest has a story. Now for the first time an animal wildlife consultant has put it all together. This book will be followed, if not read, by millions. It is an important work, important for Canada and the world."

The author sounds a very stern warning note towards the end of the book when she suggests that the anti-seal hunters are not only anti-seal, they are anti-hunt, they are really vegetarians in disguise. Having presumably won the battle for banning the seal fishery, they are now going on to other so-called endangered species and they are even suggesting that animals all together not be killed. They would turn us all into vegetarians.

I suggest myself that the reason

for some of these groups existence is the fact that they can con money out of the public and I think they do very well.

MR. TULK:

I notice now that they have gone off the seals and off the fur and are going for the nuclear.

MR. J. CARTER:

They are professional protestors, but the danger is they are going to try and turn us all into vegetarians. It seems laughable at this point just as their attempt to ban the seal hunt was laughable ten years ago but we know now that it is anything but laughable.

I really would urge the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to take a serious look at getting possibly many hundreds of these books and send them to appropriate agencies, people and places. I have only had a chance to skim it. Hon. members have been somewhat distracting and I have not been able to give it my full attention this afternoon but from the few little bits that I have read, I think it is probably one of the most important books to have been written about and for Newfoundland in this decade and, perhaps, even in this century. I think it should be distributed, it should be highlighted. I cannot speak too highly of it because I think the points it makes and the arguments it makes are extremely important.

I recommend it and I hope the Minister of Finance will exceed to some of my recommendations.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me say to the hon. gentleman on the other side that it is not very often that we find something to agree on in this House because it is not very often that the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) gets up and says something as sensible as what he just said.

I happened to have met, at the Royal Commission hearings in Montreal last year, the author and she does have a very extensive knowledge of the seal fishery. I am sure that we on this side of the House would concur with him, and I hope the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was listening to his colleague and to me, as well. It would probably be a very good expenditure if this book were to be distributed around Newfoundland in particular, particularly in our schools. Because one of the things that I detect happening with this whole controversy on the seal hunt is that we have given up in Newfoundland on a right that belongs to us, we are letting it pass. And I think the mechanism that has been put in place by the federal government to do that is the Sealing Commission itself. I think there are a great many politicians around, both in this Province and in Ottawa, who would love to see us go away, who would love to see the seal fishery go away, and I think that what is happening in Newfoundland is we are letting that happen.

I think that the book the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is talking should be read by a great many Newfoundlanders, particularly in our schools. The member for St. John's North says that we should all become vegetarians. That is a point of

view that certain people are putting forward. A more important issue than that is that there seems to be developing in Canada and, I suspect, in the Western World, the fact that all of our food comes out, if I might, of a cellophane bag, out of a vacuum packed bag. We do not realize that there is a chain of food releasing processes that go on and the animal kingdom is part of that food releasing process.

I would have to concur with him because, as I said before, I think one of the very real things that is happening, and it scares me, is that we are giving up on the seal fishery, that we have said it is a dying issue and there is nothing else to be gained by pursuing the objectives that we had, namely, to sell our seal and seal products.

I would also like to say that while we may agree with the objectives of Green Peace, if they have objectives in terms of nuclear disarmament or nuclear testing, the point of the matter is that those people are money grabbers. They create cheap publicity, sensationalism, so that they can make a buck for themselves. I suspect that they think they have now won the battle over the seal industry in this country, and they think that they have milked it for all it is worth. Having done that, they are now turning to some other pursuits. They say they will stay with the seal fishery, but they will cease their operations with regard to the fur industry in Canada.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would again say to the Minister of Finance that he could spend money in a great many worse ways than purchasing several thousand copies

of that book and putting them in Newfoundland schools, putting them in Newfoundland public libraries, and, indeed, distributing them to all key areas in the Province.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a few questions of the Minister of Finance, when he is finished talking to the member for Menihek.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I am not certain I got all the remarks of the member who sat down, but I do have certain responses to make to the hon. member opposite and also to the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland). I might say, before I get into that, that what the hon. member for St. John's North brought up, he has the advantage over me. I read a book review of Seal Wars and, again, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is also ahead of me here, and I was so struck by the review and by the sort of tone of the review that I said, 'I must send for this book.' I just got it in today and I have not had a chance to read it, but I had a chance to very quickly skim through it. Certainly, if the book is anything like the review, which was either in *The Globe And Mail* or in *The Financial Times*, it is, I agree, a very worthwhile book and, if nothing else, perhaps it should be considered as suitable for circulation through our educational system, through the schools and so on.

Obviously I cannot make a commitment now, but I certainly will discuss the suggestions brought forward by the hon. member for St. John's North and the hon.

member for Fogo in that regard.

I think it was the member for Naskaupi who made some comments regarding the RAND funding in this bill, and he wanted to know if any of the funds were directed to the Labrador districts. I can assure him that I think some of them were. For instance, of the total amount there was \$175,000 there for the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation, particularly to assist hog farmers. Now, I do not know, quite honestly, if there are any hog farmers in Labrador, but if there are, they would have gotten some benefit from that aspect of it.

There was also over \$400,000 directed towards interim funding, operating grants to the provincial Rural Development Associations. I am quite sure that there are Rural Development Associations in the Labrador districts, so they, certainly, would have benefitted, in part, from that funding. There was also just over \$1.7 million in regard to the rural development subsidiary agreement, number two, and again I am sure the Labrador districts benefitted from there.

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. KELLAND:

I am very familiar with some of the provisions of the funding within the framework the Minister of Finance just mentioned. The point I was raising was really what I feel to be unnecessary allocations of money for travel, which seems to be duplicating efforts, when a presentation is made, for example, on the Island

and simultaneously made in Labrador at the cost of a couple of charters and meals and accommodations, that sort of thing. That is really what I was directing it to. If it was not clear, I hope I have made it clearer.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to comment on that, too. The hon. member questioned whether there was much value to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Alyward) going to Labrador with important announcements. I suppose there are many expenditures that government makes that you can argue about, but I think you have to look at the benefits as well as the negatives.

I think one benefit that we have to face in this Province, and we have to fund it, is to maintain a feeling of cohesion in the Province. In other words, there has been a feeling in Labrador for many years that they are not getting sufficient attention. There is the feeling, 'There are only 30,000 people here and we are only a very small proportion of the total provincial population and even though we occupy an extremely large land area, large proportion, we are not getting the attention we deserve.' It is very difficult to counter that. But one way we have attempted to counter it is to make sure that we do as much as we can to bring the good news to them when there is good news to spread to the people of Labrador. They live in a

difficult environment. They are an extremely important part of the Province and I think it is the job of government, even if it is a bit costly on times, to make sure that regions, especially the rural regions of the Province, do not feel neglected. It is easy to get that impression, even though neglect is not intended. Even though it is expensive, I make no apology for our trying to bring the people in Labrador, the people on the West Coast, the people of the Great Northern Peninsula, or whatever, as much as possible into what government is doing on their behalf and on behalf of all the people of the Province.

So I am sure the hon. member would not really criticize us too heavily. He is making a point and I have nothing against making the point, but I am sure he would not criticize us too heavily if we bend over backwards to make sure that the people of Labrador see government ministers when there are programmes to announce, or when there is good news to spread around. So with those remarks I again move the adoption of the resolution.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I heard the minister say a minute ago that he only puts up warrants when warrants are needed. Mr. Chairman, I just arrived back from my district. I arrived there Wednesday night, spent Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday in my district, Mr. Chairman, and one of the things

that got me back there was the need to get a clean glass of water.

I am sure the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) has heard The Rhyme Of The Ancient Mariner, "Water, water everywhere and not a drop to drink." That is the way it is in his district, Mr. Chairman, that is the way it is in the Minister of Health's (Dr. Twomey) district, and that is the way it is in my district, no water.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands and the member for Exploits got elected, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands in 1979 and the member for Exploits, I think, in 1975, and there was then a bad water supply in those two towns. Both hon. members are now ministers, and have been for so many years, and they now find themselves in the position where there is a municipal election coming up in Grand Falls and in Bishop's Falls, Mr. Chairman, and their inactivity, their disinterest, and their not caring has left at least two councils hung out to dry. The poor people on the ground in Grand Falls, and in Bishop's Falls, in those districts, are taking the flack for -

MR. DAWE:
Maybe the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) should tell you about when the people of Bishop's Falls were left short and all the work was done as a result of flooding and all the money that government pumped in there.

MR. FLIGHT:
As a result of the flooding? I can talk about flooding, I can move upstream to Badger and talk about flooding if the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) wants to

talk about flooding and what he has not done. Now, Mr. Chairman, there better be a special warrant around because we are going to need a \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 warrant to provide a clean, pure, decent water supply for the 20,000 people who live in Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop Falls. Those people have decided, Mr. Chairman that they are not interested in the water that they are drinking right now, they are not interested in the cosmetic way the minister has arranged to spend money, a good job cleaning out the pipes, that is not satisfying them, they are not interested in having the cabin removed from Northern Arm, they are not interested in having the intake fenced, they are not interested in tests being done every now and again and somebody assuring them that there is no coliform, they are interested in a clean water supply. They know it was purely cosmetic and a stopgap measure. Mr. Chairman, the town of Windsor has had a water supply for fifty years, ASARCO established it in the early thirties. They used it as a sea plane base. It is a pond not much bigger than Northern Arm Pond. There were more moose poached around that lake than any other lake in Newfoundland - so much for the coliform from animal waste - children swam in it, dogs swam in it, the best water supply in Newfoundland, in Buchans. So how can the minister stand up and say, 'We spent that \$300,000 to clean out the lines because it was needed' when that was not the problem? The reason we will need a special warrant, Mr. Chairman, is that after the minister is finished with his polypicking, as he calls it, and he can explain that, after he finishes cleaning out the lines, and after they move all the cabins, and after they

build fences around the intake, the people of Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop's Falls are going to say, "But what caused the coliform? Where did it come from? What was the source?" And unless the Minister of Health, in particular, can have his officials tell the people of the area what caused the coliform, they will not trust that system, they will not drink the water. So, Mr. Chairman, the minister had better have a warrant that will cover the cost of that water system. We need a \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 warrant.

Mr. Chairman, when you go into that water system you can really get into some very serious things. In mid-July an order to boil the water went into effect in Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop's Falls, and it is still on, Mr. Chairman. Officials of the Department of Health were telling the people in Grand Falls that when the cold weather came it would take care of it. Well, we have had cold weather, we have had frost, but the tests taken yesterday in at least two areas in Grand Falls, in the member's district, show that there is still coliform. So Mr. Chairman, he is going to need warrants. And if ever a warrant was needed for emergency purposes, it was needed to provide the people of Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls and Windsor with a decent supply of water this summer. And I do not mean a treatment plant or a new source, I mean a way to provide the senior citizens, the school children, the sick people, people who are not able to haul their own water with good, clean water. That is when the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) should have been going to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for a

special warrant.

MR. DAWE:

(Inaudible) trying to do.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), Mr. Chairman, does not know what he is talking about. He does not know what he is talking about in his own department! There is the man who was going to save the Newfoundland railway!

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the minister to tell us about the Newfoundland railway. Does he have some warrants for that? The minister should keep quiet and talk about something he knows something about, and it is not the Newfoundland railway. Where is our highways agreement?

MR. DAWE:

I will talk about that at the appropriate time.

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister is well known for talking about things he knows nothing about.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how about a warrant to guarantee the schools clean water. Children in schools are entitled to clean, pure water. Mr. Chairman, there are thousands of students in Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls and Windsor who are bused in from outlying areas. You can make the argument that parents could provide children from Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls and Windsor with little bottles of water to take to school, but how about a child in kindergarten who gets bused into a school which has a contaminated water supply, arrives there at 8:30 a.m. and does not leave until 4:30 p.m.? What about that problem? Why did we not have a

warrant, Mr. Chairman, some time during the Summer to provide that kind of service to the schools for when they opened in September?

MR. BAIRD:

Why did you not ask for one?

MR. SIMMS:

What is he talking about?

MR. FLIGHT:

I am talking about the indecency of allowing school children to be bused to school, arriving at 8:30 a.m. and leaving at 4:30 p.m. with not a decent cup of water. That is what I am talking about. Does the minister see anything wrong with that?

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, no. I just wondered what you were talking about.

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister knows what I am talking about as does the Minister of Health.

Mr. Chairman, I would assume that the member for Grand Falls and the member for Exploits will get up when I sit down and ask the Minister of Finance if he is going to provide a special warrant right now to help the people of Central Newfoundland, twenty-odd thousand people, Mr. Chairman.

How would the Minister of Finance like it if tonight his total constituency could not turn on the taps and draw a decent glass of water? How would he like it if they had to drive five miles to a provincial park to get water? How would he like it if they had to go to some industrial institution in his riding with buckets? The towns of Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls and Windsor, the industrial heartland of Central Newfoundland,

are without water.

They are not worrying about the potholes in the roads, they are worried that there is no water to drink.

Mr. Chairman, the effect there has been unbelievable; the bottling plant has closed down, hotels are turning down business, the hospital administration is worried about what could happen, schools have no water, teachers are writing letters, concerned that children -

MR. DAWE:

That is doubtful.

MR. FLIGHT:

Some doubts! I heard the word 'doubt' from the minister. Go to Grand Falls and find out about the doubts. The Minister of Transportation should go and find out about the doubts. Go to Grand Falls and find out about the doubts the people have about the water system.

MR. MITCHELL:

Doom and gloom!

MR. FLIGHT:

Doom and gloom! The member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) should go to Grand Falls and drink some of the water.

Mr. Chairman, when the member for LaPoile stood up in this House of Assembly and seconded the Address in Reply, I know there were people in the Gallery saying, 'He is going to be some member.'

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. FLIGHT:

Could I ask the minister if he has considered issuing a warrant to take care of the problem that I have talked about in Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop's Falls? Would the minister indicate whether or not he is prepared to look at special funding to clean up that situation we have?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

I have been prompted to speak in this debate by the inaccuracies contained in the hon. member's speech.

MR. FLIGHT:

There were no inaccuracies in it.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, there were a lot of inaccuracies in what the hon. member had to say. I do not intend to get into debate with respect to this matter because obviously he is trying to somehow entice me into debate in the hopes that I will say something in a negative way that will somehow reflect on what I had to say in my press release to people who are seeking election in the upcoming Grand Falls municipal election, which is a point that I would like to address for a couple of minutes now that I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

(Inaudible) today in Question Period.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) did not have much to grapple with today, nor did any of the members on the other side of the House have anything to do today, other than to pick a sentence out of a press release that I issued a few days ago which, putting it in perspective, was simply a release expressing my absolute delight with the fact that we have twenty-one candidates seeking election to the municipal council in Grand Falls.

MR. DAWE:

Super! It shows a very healthy attitude towards municipal politics.

MR. SIMMS:

Now, I thought that was very, very good, especially in light of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that several months ago, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), in particular, who was leading the onslaught, and all the members opposite gave the impression that nobody was going to run, nobody was going to seek election to any municipal council in this Province.

MR. DAWE:

There was not going to be anybody. You would have to appoint all the councils, they said.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I was delighted with the fact that there are twenty-one candidates in Grand Falls. Now, in addition to expressing my delight at the fact there were twenty-one candidates, I also took the opportunity to say that I looked forward to the election of a new town council and that, indeed, from my own perspective, I was looking forward to people getting elected with

whom I was going to be able to work closely for the benefit of the town of Grand Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with a simple, straightforward statement like that?

MR. YOUNG:

Nothing.

MR. DAWE:

A super statement!

MR. SIMMS:

Of course it was! I wanted to commend those who had sought election in Grand Falls on their initiative.

MR. GILBERT:

Were there people on the last council that you could not work with?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, now, Mr. Chairman, let me answer that direct question: Were there people on that last Grand Falls council that I could not work with? Yes, there was one.

MR. TULK:

Is that right?

MR. SIMMS:

And I will name him. It was the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Everything the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir ever said as a member of the Grand Falls council was politically motivated and everybody knows it.

MR. GILBERT:

That night people were asking me to come back, they said, 'We know you will be elected.'

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, and I gather the people who were asking you to come back were the same people who wanted to show you at the polls what you should have been shown the last time. The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir would not get his nomination fee if he ran in the municipal election in Grand Falls. He knows it and that is why he is not running again. He had his mind made up long before he ran in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, I can tell you.

MR. DAWE:

That is the reason why he did not run against you, I take it.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, he would not dare!

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I want to address just briefly the comments made by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) with respect to the problem in Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop's Falls.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a known fact that there are a number of areas in those three communities, as shown by the testing done by the Department of Health officials, where the water is indeed okay. In fact, I think they do a total of seventeen tests in that whole system and, for months, in fact, in a large number of those areas, the counts were zero, or very, very low, so it is not accurate to say the water is impure everywhere in that system, as the hon. member said. That is not accurate. In fact, my colleague, the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) tells me that in

Bishop's Falls the counts are all very, very clear and there is no problem.

MR. DAWE:

And in Windsor.

MR. SIMMS:

And Windsor, too. So the hon. member gave the impression, he certainly did. If he did not say it he gave the impression. That is what he was trying to do, leave an impression, and, unfortunately, a wrong impression. Now, Mr. Chairman, he alluded to the fact that this government acted quickly and responsibly to respond to a request by the Exploits Valley Services Board. They were the ones who asked for the \$327,000. They were the ones who asked for the money to do all the polypicking and everything else that he talks about; and that was to carry out recommendations contained in a consulting/engineering report that was requested. And, in that report, all of these factors had to be taken into consideration. In addition to that, of course, there was a request for a water treatment plant, and the government responded to that by providing \$75,000 to have a study done as to the type of water treatment plant that might be required. The hon. member surely knows there are different types. You just cannot say you are going to put a water treatment plant there and that is it, you have to assess the types, where it might be located, look at alternate sources of water supply - that is in the criteria, that is there - and do a bunch of other things, in particular assess the cost of such a treatment plant, capitalwise, and more seriously perhaps, the cost of operating such a water treatment plant. Because it is

the municipalities, of course, that are going to have to respond to the costs associated with operating such a plant and that could be considerable, that could be very, very considerable. I know there are members on certain councils out there who are a bit concerned about that.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, proposals have been called to undertake that particular study and when those proposals are in - I gather there has been an extension of a few extra days, the proposals were supposed to be in today - then the government, I can assure you, and our colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), has assured us he will respond very quickly in deciding what independent engineering consulting firm will be asked to do the study as outlined a minute ago by myself in reference to the terms of reference of that particular Board.

So, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member can try to ignite the fears of the people out in Central Newfoundland all he wishes. He is well known-

MR. FLIGHT:

The facts are there.

MR. CALLAN:

Incite.

MR. SIMMS:

No, no, I did not want to use the word 'incite', ignite the fears. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is known throughout this Province, throughout the entire Province, Mr. Chairman, for his ability to get people emotionally upset, and he is known to be flippant with respect to the points that he often uses in his arguments. He cares not whether he is right or wrong, it is a matter of him

saying something to get some exposure and to try and get as much publicity as he can. Today, Mr. Chairman, he is upset because his colleague, the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), stole his thunder and asked me a question about political interference in municipal elections. The member for Gander and I got some news coverage, the member for Windsor - Buchans got none. That is the whole thing that is wrong with him today. He is just upset, he is visibly upset, and I predict, Mr. Chairman, that he will get up again to respond to what I just said. I predict that, Mr. Chairman, and there he is.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman, I will only take a couple of minutes, but I want to tell the two ministers that nobody needs to upset the people of Grand Falls. I will guarantee you that his constituents, Mr. Chairman, do not need the member for Windsor - Buchans to upset them about that water supply. They have had to boil water in Grand Falls since the middle of July. They have not been allowed to drink a drop of water in Grand Falls without boiling it.

Now, the people of Grand Falls do not need the member for Windsor - Buchans to incite them. The minister sat at public meeting, the only time that I have ever heard of a minister in this Province being booed, Mr. Chairman, and I did not incite them, I did not speak. It was the only time I ever heard a minister

being booed in a public meeting, Mr. Chairman, and I sat there and I felt terrible for the minister. But I watched his constituents and I watched him when he tried to slough the blame for the mess the water is in in Grand Falls off on the civil servants. The minister was booed by his own constituents, Mr. Chairman. I sat there and I did not say a word.

The minister accuses me of inciting. Mr. Chairman, I am using this House as a forum to pass along to the minister what everyone of his constituents have been saying this past five months. I am not trying to excite or incite, I am simply stating the facts, Mr. Chairman. I am stating the facts. The minister is not in touch with reality if he does not believe that every constituent he has feels this way. Mr. Chairman, he knows that I am simply using the House to confirm for him and the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), the man who has gotten away scot-free in this thing, who chose to be in Spain-

MR. CALLAN:

The rain in Spain falls mainly on the plain.

MR. FLIGHT:

His constituents, Mr. Chairman, mistook his executive assistant for the minister. Now what does that tell you? At that public meeting, where there were dozens and dozens of the minister's constituents, when his executive assistant was introduced as standing in for the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), his own constituents thought that he was indeed the minister. Now that is how often they have seen the minister and how often they have heard him address himself to the water situation in Bishop's Falls,

Mr. Chairman. So the minister need not have any concern about my inciting the people. Nobody needs to say a word, the facts speak for themselves. Practically every doctor in Grand Falls has come out and complained about the water system. Every constituent in Grand Falls, Mr. Chairman, has been hauling water all over Newfoundland this Summer, the minister knows that. I am not inciting anybody. The question being asked in Bishop's Falls, Mr. Chairman, is, 'Where is the Minister of Health?' If this were Catalina, if this were LaPoile, the Minister of Health would have been the person out front making statements on the situation. It would be the Minister of Health who would have to explain why his officials could not identify the source that polluted the water. But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health has been silent. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) has not been silent, Mr. Chairman. He tried to keep his head down and duck the issue, but he had no choice, he was forced into a public meeting in Grand Fall where he felt the wrath of his own constituents. Since then he scurried into the House and presented a petition to try to prove to the people of his constituency that he had their concerns at heart. But the question they are asking of the minister is, 'Why did you leave us on a system that is not a decent water supply for the past five years, and why is the Minister of Health going along with it?' It took a coliform scare, a bacteria that is injurious to health, to cause the two ministers to speak out on it.

If that is an indication of my inciting or exciting people, Mr.

Chairman, I will tell the minister

MR. DAWE:

Your time is up.

MR. FLIGHT:

My time is not up - that when he gets up to speak this time he had better be careful of his language, accusing me of inciting. One can go into any barbershop, any church, any club, any public meeting in Grand Falls and the water situation is the topic of conversation. I tell the people the member is doing the best he can. I defend the Minister of Health every chance I get, and then the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands stands up and accuses me of trying to incite the people in Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop's Falls about their water supply.

I am here, Mr. Chairman, as a spokesman on behalf of those people. They are entitled to a decent water supply. They are entitled to decent representation. They should be able to expect their member to come to Cabinet and demand that they be provided with the funds that it takes to provide a decent water supply. Mr. Chairman, that is all they are asking of the two ministers, the two heaviest ministers in the Cabinet - literally maybe, I do not know - the two heavyweights, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands. They have let their constituents, twenty-odd thousand people, Mr. Chairman, dangle since July, using only boiled water. They cannot tell them what caused the problem, they allowed \$300,000 or \$400,000 to be spent cosmetically, not knowing whether it is going to solve the

problem or not. Not only does the minister not know it, the engineers do not know it, the town does not know it, the doctors in Grand Falls do not know it, as he well knows, it was said at the public meeting. Maybe we need the system cleaned out.

Mr. Chairman, let not the minister stand here now and accuse any member on this side, particularly the member for Windsor - Buchans, of trying to incite the population of Grand Falls. The population of Grand Falls have been incited to the point, Mr. Chairman, that they have been looking for the minister.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Grand Falls need not try to slough off this argument and say that the member is trying to incite. All he needs to do is go out in his district, spend some time with the people, see how they are suffering, see how the senior citizens are suffering. And, Mr. Chairman, while the minister is up, would he tell us what the two ministers will do to provide decent drinking water to the people of those two towns if that coliform continues to exist in the water?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, if ever I heard rubbish and foolishness and stretching every possible word, I just heard it from the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). Mr. Chairman, first of all let me point out clearly to the hon. member what he should know. I have to point out

something clearly because he is continually giving out misinformation, inaccuracies, but most of all, Mr. Chairman, he has accused me of saying that he is inciting the people of central Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. As a matter of fact, it was his own colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), who used the word 'incite', I used the word 'ignite'. I said igniting the fears of the people, it was your own colleague, the member for Bellevue, who used the word 'incite'. So the hon. member should have a word with his colleague, the member for Bellevue, because he should not be saying that about the member for Windsor - Buchans.

In retrospect, I am not sure the member for Windsor - Buchans has the capabilities of igniting or inciting the fears of the people. I am not sure.

MR. DAWE:

You just watch, before too long the member will ask his annual question to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) to find out when the patridge season is going to begin this year.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member is known as a sincere young man around Central Newfoundland, there is no question about that, but who probably speaks too frequently before thinking. He is known for that, too, and I think he is aware of it. So that is why I would caution him, since he cautioned me, to carefully consider his choice of words when he speaks on this particular issue, because this is an issue, Mr. Chairman, that goes much beyond political

partisanship. That is what the member for Windsor - Buchans is trying to do with the issue here today and that is unfortunate. I would caution him very, very seriously not to proceed too much further along those lines.

Now, Mr. Chairman, he also indicated that at the public meeting I incurred the wrath of the three hundred people in attendance. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, if ever there was an exaggeration that had to be it. I am sure that if the member was honest and straightforward, he would retract that statement. He knows he is exaggerating it. I certainly did not get up at that meeting and try to accuse the public servants of anything, I simply stated what government had done in response to a request from the Board, the Board which has the responsibility for providing that service - the water supply. They asked us to do those things and we have done them.

The final point that I want to get to before I let the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) take a crack at me, because I know he is going to say something savage about the comment I made about him being on the council and so on, and this is in defence of my colleague who needs nobody to defend him, but that is the main reason I got on my feet a second time, because the comments that the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. FLIGHT) made about the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), the Minister of Health, not being recognized, not being known.

MR. FLIGHT:

You were there.

MR. SIMMS:

First of all, the Minister of Health was elected in 1976, not 1975 as the hon. member said. He has been re-elected every time since.

MR. FLIGHT:

You were there. You were at the meeting.

MR. SIMMS:

Now the member for Windsor - Buchans cannot say the same thing. He was elected in 1975, but he was also defeated in 1982.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I think, if you compare the recognition factor you would have to admit that he has a bit of a narrow lead, at least, in that respect without any doubt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I say to the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans who has had his chance, now he has been on his feet twice. Give me a chance to say my few little remarks. The other point he made, Mr. Chairman, in the same context, talking about the member for Exploits and the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). If the member for Windsor - Buchans had one half, if he one-fifteenth or one-thirtieth of the credibility of the member for Exploits, then he would not have to worry about being re-elected to Windsor - Buchans for the rest of his life, because he could not hold a torch to the member for Exploits or as the Minister of Health, both of them. The member

for Windsor - Buchans could not hold a candle. The member for Windsor - Buchans could not carry the Minister of Health's suitcase, has not got an iota, an ounce of credibility in comparison to that which my esteemed colleague the member for Exploits and the Minister of Health has - cannot hold a torch, cannot hold a candle to him.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is almost as bad as (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans as I cautioned him should be careful, he should think a bit before he speaks. As I said he is known as a sincere well-liked young man who would not harm a soul.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Young man?

MR. SIMMS:

Okay, old man, who would not harm a soul. But he frequently has a habit of putting his mouth in motion before he puts his brain in gear. He also has that reputation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

So that applies to what he is saying about the water supply problem. It applies to what he says about the criticism I was giving. And it certainly applies to the comments that he made about the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and the member for Exploits not being very well known or well liked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As a former councillor in Grand Falls and as a resident of that town I feel that I should be entitled to say a few words on the water supply that is there right now.

MR. TULK:

Could you answer one question. Are you going to re-hire him when he is defeated?

MR. GILBERT:

We will talk about that when he is defeated, the next time.

MR. SIMMONS:

When you are defeated as well, is that what you mean?

MR. GILBERT:

No, no. I still run the business there, you see.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to put the record straight because my colleague for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) was telling me this morning that as he was going around to now famous barbershops in Grand Falls yesterday, the cry that was going out was that out of the former town councillors, the only one that would stand a chance of being elected again would be me, because of the fact that I stood up to you. I will remind the member that when I asked him for support, I was all there to support him and I asked him to support me when the federal government announced they were going to put a forestry centre in Newfoundland. I asked

him would he support Grand Falls, and he and his colleague, the hon. Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) came out, and he never said a word when I presented the brief on behalf of the town council. He sat there with the Premier and the hon. Minister of Forestry at the time, and he never said a word.

I move the adjournment of this debate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

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

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

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

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

November 5, 1985

Handwritten signature

Tabled 5 Nov '85

Answer to Question #10

Appearing on Order Paper #49/85; Thursday, October 31, 1985

Asked by The Honourable The Member for Menihek, Mr. Fenwick.

QUESTION: Mr. Fenwick (M.H.A. District of Menihek) - To ask
The Honourable The Minister of Education to lay
upon the Table of the House the following
information:

- (1) A list of all school tax authorities in the Province;
- (2) Indicate the number of employees that they employ in total;
- (3) The total of payroll paid to them;
- (4) The total operating cost of these school tax authorities over the last fiscal year, and the last couple of years, going back at least three to four years;
- (5) List the amount of revenue raised by these school tax authorities;
- (6) Table any guidelines that exist for expenditure from school tax authorities in terms of the money that they have raised.

ANSWER:

Attached.

Number of School Tax Authorities - 21
 Total Number of Employees - 81
 Total Payroll Cost 1984 - \$1,885,085.

	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	
Total Collections	\$12,811,921	\$14,589,377	\$18,036,582	\$18,082,901	\$22,573,369	
Expenditure	(1,552,382)	(1,925,923)	(2,716,422)	(3,074,551)	(3,479,013)	(1)
Amount Distributed	<u>\$11,259,539</u>	<u>\$12,663,454</u>	<u>\$15,320,160</u>	<u>\$15,008,350</u>	<u>\$19,094,356</u>	
Amount Distributed as a % of Revenue	<u>87.9%</u>	<u>86.8%</u>	<u>84.9%</u>	<u>83.0%</u>	<u>86.0%</u>	(2)

Section 43(3) of The Local School Tax Act outlines the basis on which the apportionment and distribution of School Tax is made. It is as follows:

"Every Authority shall...apportion to each School Board in the appropriate Tax Area from all moneys raised by the Authority under this Act (less administration costs) and not previously apportioned and distributed, an amount bearing the same ratio to the aggregate of all such moneys as the total enrollment at the schools conducted in the Tax Area by that School Board bears to the total enrollment at all schools in the Tax area..."

- (1) Includes a special non-recurring cost of \$313,000 for computer equipment.
- (2) Percentage of distribution after adjusting for item (1).

NOVEMBER 4, 1985

NEWFOUNDLAND SCHOOL TAX AUTHORITIES
SCHOOL TAX RATES

	<u>RATES APPROVED</u> <u>1985</u>	
	<u>POLL</u> <u>TAX</u>	<u>PROPERTY</u> <u>TAX</u>
Channel-Port aux Basques	\$ 65.00	4.2 Mils
Port au Port	85.00	4.0 "
Corner Brook	85.00	5.5 "
St. Barbe South	60.00	3.0 "
Deer Lake	90.00	4.0 "
Green Bay	90.00	4.5 "
Exploits Valley	100.00	5.5 "
Notre Dame	85.00	3.0 "
*Regional District No. 1	107.00	3.4 "
Trinity-Conception	96.00	4.5 "
St. John's	105.00	4.2 "
Ferryland	60.00	5.0 "
Placentia-St. Mary's	60.00	4.0 "
Burin Peninsula	85.00	6.0 "
*Central Labrador	85.00	6.0 "
Labrador West	108.00	7.0 "
Vinland	85.00	4.0 "
Bay d'Espoir, Hermitage, Fortune Bay	100.00	3.0 "
Conception Bay South	90.00	3.5 "
Bay St. George	75.00	3.0 "
Strait of Belle Isle	85.00	4.0 "

*Applicable to industrial, commercial and residential properties.

Note: All other property tax rates apply to industrial and commercial property assessments but not residential.