



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 31

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

13 May 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Minister responsible for Provincial Parks, I am pleased to announce two innovative programmes the Parks Division of my department will be implementing this Summer. Both seasonal camping and camper unit storage will be initiated as pilot programmes. They will enable campers at selected provincial parks to enjoy outdoor recreation all Summer without the inconvenience and cost of hauling camping units and equipment over the highways each time you wish to "camp out". With these programmes, Newfoundland's provincial parks become an affordable alternative to a Summer cottage, and their safe, family-oriented activities - swimming areas, hiking trails, picnic areas, playgrounds and Summer interpretation programmes - make them far more enjoyable than parking a camper in a gravel pit.

The seasonal camping programme will enable campers at selected provincial parks to purchase a campsite for the Summer season and leave their camping unit there for

the duration. A total of nine parks will participate in this programme. These include Butter Pot, Gushue's Pond, Backside Pond, Square pond, Notre Dame, Little River, Catamaran, Squire's Memorial and Barachois Pond Parks. An average of 22 per cent of campsites is designated for seasonal use. Thus, regular campers will still have access to the majority of campsites in our parks.

The 180 seasonal campsites being offered in 1986 are unserviced, although Butter Pot, Gushue's Pond, Notre Dame and Barachois Park have dumping stations. The seasonal camping fee is \$300.00, covering the period from June 20 to September 1, 1986. Compared to the regular camping fee of \$6.00 per night, the \$300 stretched over the seventy-four days of the season amounts to a daily fee of \$4.05. Besides the costs and inconvenience, of course, saved in not having to relocate your camping unit all Summer, you will have the added convenience of a reserved campsite during period of high-use such as long weekends.

On Thursday, June 5, at 9:30 a.m., the Parks Division will hold a public draw for seasonal campsites at four locations, namely, St. John's, Pasadena, Notre Dame Park and Stephenville. To enter the draw, residents are asked to submit a certified cheque or money order for \$300.00 along with the application form available from park offices. Unsuccessful applicants will have their money returned immediately following the draw. The application deadline is Thursday, June 5, 1986 at 9:00 a.m., at the park offices indicated on the application form.

As a winner of the draw, residents

will practically have a "permanent" summer home. They will put up a tent or haul their trailer only once this Summer. And their campsite will always be ready and waiting for them.

The Camp Unit Storage Programme provides an area in six specified parks where campers can store their camping unit when they leave the park. Participating parks include Butter Pot, Backside Pond, Square Pond, Little River, Catamaran, and Barachois Pond. As with the Seasonal Camping Programme, this eliminates the inconvenience and cost of hauling trailers from park to home every week. Under this programme, however, reservations for campsites will not be accepted as they are on a first-come-first-serve basis.

Permits for storing trailers are available in park offices and the storage fee of \$1.00 per day must be paid before removal. Trailers can be stored in the parks specified anytime during the May 19 - September 1, 1986 period.

For further information on either programme, camping rules or the public draw, residents are asked to contact the park office nearest them or phone park headquarters in St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, we are pleased with this innovative pilot programme which will be expanded upon or altered according to the response we receive from park users. In this vein, we anticipate putting out a questionnaire that will be circulated to campers at the end of the Summer and, of course, we welcome their comments.

We are very pleased indeed to be able to improve on our provincial

park system that already contributes greatly to our way of life in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While we welcome anything that is going to help make the parks more convenient for the camper, there are a number of questions about this announcement that have to be asked. One of the questions that comes to mind, first off, has to do with the protection of these camps and trailers once people bring them to these parks and leave them. Is the minister going to be hiring more park attendants, for example, over the Summer period to make sure that these trailers are watched and cared for so that vandalism does not occur. That was a major problem in the last couple of years. Hopefully the minister is going to make some arrangements to hire more young people for Summer work in the parks?

June 5 is the date for the public draw. We are hoping that will be advertised fully so that everybody will know about it. Instead of just a few advertisements, one here and one there, make sure that it is advertised fully so that every camper on this Island has the opportunity to get involved in the draw, and maybe win a draw so that they can attend the parks this Summer in this fashion.

We would also like to see a press

release from the minister stating what his position is going to be on this new tax that the federal government is supposedly bringing in, or supposedly thinking about. Hopefully, he will have a press release which will cover his position. As it is very wishy-washy right now, we hope he will come out with a press release this week stating that he is against it totally and he will have nothing to do with it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, before we get into Question Period, if I could I would like to ask leave of the House to have the unanimous resolution of the House to send a Telex to the Prime Minister, which preferably should be signed by the Premier, expressing our strongest possible objection to the proposed fresh air tax.

MR. YOUNG:

Sit down. That is out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave! No leave!

MR. BARRY:

Which, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please!

I understand the hon. member does not have leave.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this side of the House does not give leave.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, either we are going to have the rules of the House complied with or it is going to turn into a bear pit. Now, members opposite continue to try and shout down members on this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

You are abusing the rules.

MR. BARRY:

Now there is a former Speaker, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, and you are a former minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

There we see a former Speaker who has marching orders to try and shout down members of the Opposition when we try to point out something, Mr. Speaker. Now, I asked for leave for something and members opposite do not have any concept, Your Honour does not have any concept because I was

shouted down, I was not permitted to finish my sentence.

It is a proposal which threatens a way of life, which is an attack on participation, which is an attack on the tourist industry -

MR. BAIRD:

Is this a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- which is an attack on the Native people of Labrador and their livelihood.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not speaking to a point of order. There is no point of order.

At this stage I would like to welcome to the Visitors' Gallery fourteen Grade VIII and IX students from Pistolet Bay School, Raleigh, with their teacher, Lloyd Taylor. Also forty-three students from Carbonear Intergrated Collegiate with their teachers, Mr. Irving Wareham and Mr. Herman Greening.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he is aware that there is a indication out of

Ottawa that a decision has been made to put the go-ahead decision with respect to Hibernia aside for three months, a proposed three month delay in taking a decision as to the commencement of Hibernia? Can the Premier inform us about this?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, that is completely erroneous. It is a rumour and it is totally unfounded. As a matter of fact, the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall), and other people working for the Government of Newfoundland have been, yesterday and today, in Ottawa on the whole question of Hibernia. As I indicated before in the House some time ago, negotiations are ongoing both with the federal government and with the oil companies, and these negotiations have not yet been completed, not yet finished. There is no truth to the rumour.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the Premier indicate whether the statement by Petro-Canada Vice President Mr. Wesley Twiss, as confirmed by the Petro-Canada spokesman Miss O'Brien, to the effect that a subsidy of government funds would be needed in order to see Hibernia commence, is in fact correct?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have no comment on that statement at this time, while the negotiations are ongoing. Obviously they are delicate and sensitive and I would not want to say anything about the negotiations or about what constitute negotiations or what would constitute a green light on Hibernia at this time, while the negotiations are ongoing.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Will the Premier, Mr. Speaker, confirm to this House that he is not prepared to negotiate with respect to the type of platform that will be utilized in developing Hibernia, nor is he prepared to negotiate as to the amount of work that will be done by Newfoundlanders in this Province on the Hibernia development? Will he confirm that he will not entertain proposals by Mobil or the operators to have work done out of this Province that could be done here?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There are not any such proposals on the table right now along the lines that the Leader of the Opposition is talking about. It is just a figment of his imagination. Mobil, as the lead company in the group, have decided to use gravity based structures for the production of Hibernia. They made that decision some time ago and announced it. It remains their decision. And as it relates

to the benefits to Newfoundland, they are covered under the Atlantic Accord which in one of its phrases says that Newfoundland will be the principle beneficiary to the developments offshore. Obviously these matters are now being all finalized as part of a development proposal which will hopefully see the green light given to Hibernia this year.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier and it concerns his performance on television some time during the recent NAPE strike in which he stated that if the picket lines would come down that he would have a package, particularly on parity, proposed to the union that would see a settlement within forty-eight hours. That obviously did not happen. Could the Premier tell us why we did not see a settlement within forty-eight hours and would he also tell us why he has failed to carry out yet another commitment to yet another group of Newfoundlanders, namely the NAPE strikers?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it takes two to tango. Obviously, when I said that on television, I thought the agenda that the NAPE leadership had had up to that night was Bill 59 and wage parity. I thought these were the critical elements for a settlement to the dispute because those were the ones that they had been articulating up

until then. There were no other items of major magnitude on the table or being discussed at the table by our negotiators. The ads in the papers and the statements being made by the leadership of NAPE all talked about Bill 59 and talked about wage parity. Given that that is what they talked about, that that was what their agenda was, then it was easy for me to say what I said because we delivered on Bill 59 and we delivered on wage parity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

We know, Mr. Speaker, how easy it is for the Premier to make certain statements.

Mr. Speaker, one of the union negotiators, Mr. Tom Hanlon, is quoted in today's Evening Telegram as saying that the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) have lied to them over the parity issue.

We have to assume, I suppose, that these gentlemen are speaking for the administration, unless they are like the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson). I would ask the Premier, in view of these statements and the Premier's recent admission of political posturing on the Newfoundland railway, would the Premier now tell this House that indeed the statement that Mr. Hanlon made is correct, that indeed his statement concerning the forty-eight hour settlement was another case of

political posturing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I just answered that question, that I was referring to Bill 59 and wage parity, which were the two items which the union at that time said prevented the people from going back to work. I thought, therefore, if these were the two major items that they were putting in their ads, that they were saying publicly on radio and television for days and days and days - Bill 59, wage parity, parity buttons, Bill 59 signs - that these were the only two major items that had caused the dispute in the beginning, and that, therefore, it would be very quickly solved because the next day we could put on the Table both a solution to Bill 59, which the union accepted, and wage parity within one contract, which is what the union had wanted.

So we lived up to our side of the bargain, Mr. Speaker. As far as the President of Treasury Board and the Minister of Labour go, they have acted honestly and in good faith throughout this whole dispute. They have not lied to Mr. Hanlon or to the NAPE leadership. As a matter of fact, it is the NAPE leadership on occasion which have changed their tune. It is a strike every forty-eight hours, and then finally we find out there is no strike, and then there is another strike in the next forty-eight hours and then there is no illegal strike. So it seems to me that the people who have been changing their tune is the NAPE leadership and not the President of Treasury Board or the Minister of Labour.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said in this House and outside, and so has the President of Treasury Board, that the parity issue would be resolved by the end of his term of office. I understand now that his term of office, according to the President of Treasury Board, is supposed to be the longest one in his administration, namely, 1990. I would ask the Premier to table the proposal that he was talking about on that famous television show, the one that he should have gotten some kind of an award for. I would ask him to table that proposal and will he tell us that indeed the proposal was there, that it would be within a three year term, or is he ready to admit to this House that that statement on province-wide television of a forty-eight hour settlement, along with the ad campaign that he was carrying out at the same time - and speaking of carrying out ads, I do not see where you can look at the union and say that they did it - would he tell us that indeed what we saw was the Premier carrying out another one of his provocative confrontational bluffs on NAPE and on the Newfoundland people?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the hon. member for saying that I should have gotten an award for that T.V. programme. I thank him very sincerely for that.

MR. TULK:

Only for your acting.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

As it relates to the ads that NAPE were putting in the paper, I never said anything against the ads per se; I said what the ads said was wage parity and Bill 59. I am not saying that they did not have the right to have ads in the paper the same as we did. I am not talking about that. But the member and his question sort of hinted that I was saying something bad about NAPE putting ads in the paper. I am not saying that at all. I am saying the material in the ads talked about Bill 59 and wage parity. As far as term goes, I said I know how long I have left in my term, and I had left in my term four years from the night on which that television programme was aired on CBC.

Finally, on wage parity, the proposal we have on the table for wage parity is, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. TULK:

How many years? How many years?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This administration got elected in April, 1985 and therefore it runs until April, 1990 under the constitution, under the laws of the Province. We have a wage package on the table to NAPE now which gives them wage parity in August, 1989.

MR. TOBIN:

Less than three and one-half years.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I have a question for the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett). I would like for him to indicate if he has funding allocated in this current fiscal year for the production of promotional tourism information specifically for Labrador and, if he has, would he give us a brief outline of what that might be?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, this department, of course, under the federal/provincial Tourism subsidiary agreement, has an allocation whereby funding support will be given to promotional literature materials for approved applicants. There are a number of applicants who have already been funded and there are others whom we are presently reviewing. I would have to take it under advisement as to whether or not any of these particularly relate to the area or the individual to which the member might be referring.

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

In connection with my supplementary, and for the minister's information and the information of the House, I would like to table two documents, one of which is a current news story

and the other is a full-colour pictorial depicting Labrador. I am tabling it to accompany my supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and it can be looked at later. Could the minister give a commitment to have the people within his department make a professional appraisal, an assessment of this - it is all self-explanatory - with a view to using them, if they meet standards, for the promotion of Labrador as a tourist destination, having them properly displayed in tourist chalets and other places where they would be of benefit to Labrador?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, we are quite pleased to distribute any promotional literature that has tastefully being done and properly and adequately reflects whatever it is the attraction is that is intended to be promoted as a tourist destination in the Province.

I would certainly be most pleased to look at any material that would be so appropriately prepared. I am not sure what that particular document says so I am not obviously prepared to make a commitment that it will be displayed, but I am certainly prepared to have a look at it and have my officials evaluate it as I would with any other materials so presented.

MR. KELLAND:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon.

the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Just to clarify for the minister, I was not asking for a commitment to display it, but would you have your professionals make a professional appraisal and assessment with a view to using it, if acceptable?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

I would be more than happy to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. In light of the decision taken by the hon. Sinclair Stevens and the Prime Minister that Mr. Stevens should resign despite the fact that there had been no direct involvement shown by Mr. Stevens in the Magna loan, and despite the fact that Mr. Stevens had complied with the Conflict of Interest Guidelines, will the Premier tell this House why he has not yet requested the resignation of the President of the Executive Council (Mr. Marshall) because of his non-compliance with Newfoundland's Conflict of Interest Guidelines as is illustrated again that his direct involvement in the removal of land from Pippy Park for clients of his law firm? And for the benefit of the Premier, I table two piece of new information, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is apples and oranges. We have been through this all last Fall, at which time the Liberal-Opposition lost about fifteen points in the opinion polls, so they are going to go down another five after today.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Minister of Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, in view of what happened on the federal scene, will the Premier at least agree to have the minister relieved his of duties pending a full public inquiry?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Foolishness, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stevens, in resigning, said, 'In these circumstances I wish to comply with parliamentary tradition.' In view of these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier prepared to accept a lower standard of public morality for the Newfoundland House of Assembly and his Cabinet than exists in parliament and the federal Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not worthy of an answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:
That is shocking, 'Tom'.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
Yesterday the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) tabled this list of community water service programmes for 1985-86 and assured us that it was done on a non-partisan basis for at least this particular project. I had my research people, by that you should know I mean my secretary, go and restructure it the same way as we have done the other two programmes and, lo and behold, I would like to ask the minister -

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

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. FENWICK:
No, I am asking the question now.

I would like to ask the minister if these numbers are correct in the analysis we have, that the total funding in PC districts under this programme is \$428,900 and total funding in Opposition districts is \$71,019, and the average funding per district for PCs is \$11,913 and the average funding for Opposition districts is only \$4,438: Are these numbers

substantially correct, Mr. Minister?

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

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I can keep this up as long as the hon. gentleman can. As long as he wants to ask these types of questions then I am only too happy to answer them.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very accurate list, as a matter of fact, in which is reflected quite accurately again on the list that fourteen or fifteen Liberal districts were funded out of a very small programme of about \$500,000, Mr. Speaker. In districts like Windsor - Buchans, for instance, Buchans Junction received \$5,000, Deadman's Bay received \$15,000, very similar to what Tory districts received. We have areas like Main Point, in Davidsville in the district of Fogo, which received a \$5,000 water project; Queen's Cove a couple of times; Thornlea, Tizzard's Harbour and Bellevue and Benton, all these districts were funded out of this very, very small community water service programme which only has approximately \$500,000 in it. But I think the funds were distributed quite fairly and quite adequately. And I believe, broken down on a percentage basis, there was almost as much funding went to communities represented by hon. gentlemen opposite as went to members on this side.

MR. FENWICK:
A supplementary.

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

MR. FENWICK:

The supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is I do not think the minister heard me very correctly. There was an average of almost \$12,000 in Tory districts and about \$4,400 in Opposition districts. That is 2.68 times as much in Tory districts.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

My question to the minister is - this clearly demonstrates a total bias in terms of pork barrelling on the third programme we have looked at - when will he do the honourable thing and resign from his position since he is obviously acting as a pork barreller for all the Tory districts?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, again this is a very, very small programme. There is approximately \$500,000 in that programme. The hon. gentleman again is zeroing in on just one small section of the capital programme. Last year we had approximately \$30 million distributed in capital funds, about \$29,500,000 worth of that was for water and sewer in incorporated areas, of which hon. gentlemen opposite got a very, very fair share. About twenty-seven or twenty-eight communities were funded. This is a very, very small programme, \$500,000, in which, again, on a percentage basis, communities that are represented by hon. gentlemen opposite were quite adequately funded as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, as I said

in Committee and as I have said in the House on a number of occasions, there is no discrimination being practiced at all by the Department of Municipal Affairs and these lists adequately reflect that.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

If what the minister says is correct, if there is no discrimination, then my figures must be wrong. Mr. Speaker, I would like to table now my breakdown of these things and ask would the minister look at our breakdown here and tell us where the figures are wrong? Because it clearly shows almost three times as much going to Tory districts on average as goes to Liberal districts. Will you check our figures and tell us where we are wrong, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I will check any figures that the hon. gentleman wants me to check.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The minister will know that after a year and a half of trying to correct major sewer problems in

the town of Norris Point, the mayor and council, out of frustration and anger, resigned en masse last night. I would like to ask the minister whether it is true that in a conversation with the mayor of Norris Point you told the mayor that he must raise his local taxes in order to cover a \$170,000 guaranteed loan to correct this problem?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I talked to the Mayor of Norris Point approximately two or three days ago and I indicated to him that our capital programme had not been dealt with, and as soon as it was he could be assured of the fact that Cabinet would look at the problem they were experiencing in Norris Point and quite possibly funding would be approved for that. The Mayor informed me that he did not want guaranteed funding from the Province, that we could keep our guaranteed funding, and if he was going to accept any funding from the Province it would be a straight grant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What! What!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He did not want to pay off 5 per cent of it or 2 per cent of it or 1 per cent?

MR. DOYLE:

The Mayor indicated to me, Mr. Speaker, that he would not go the route of accepting the same conditions that every other municipality in this Province accepts, and that is on guaranteed loans the Province pays off approximately 85 per cent of that

loan and the community pays off 20 per cent of its fixed revenues, not 20 per cent of the loan but 20 per cent of the community's fixed revenues as their minimum contribution toward the retirement of that debt. The Mayor of Norris Point indicated to me that he would not have anything to do with accepting funding on that basis from the government. I asked him why and he told me that I would come down and raise the taxes in the area. I asked him what was his tax rate in the area and he said; Well, we operate on two and a half mils. Mr. Speaker, the the average mil rate in the Province is six mils. The Mayor of Norris Point was unwilling to accept funding from the Department of Municipal Affairs to cure the problem, a very, very serious problem that they have down there. The money is there for the people of Norris Point if they wish to accept it on the same basis as every other municipality does in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, there are taxes, hidden taxes and Tory taxes. The minister is aware, Mr. Speaker, that only 30 per cent of the tax base in Norris Point could absorb an increase. We have high unemployment, many families there on welfare, and 30 per cent of the people cannot carry the load for

70 per cent. I want to ask the minister how he can expect the town to pay \$25,000 on a loan over fifteen years, and \$40,000 on top of that to have eight pumps operate fulltime, and to maintain them and operate them to clean up this environmental hazard?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, when I was in conversation with the Mayor of Norris Point, I asked the people in the finance division of my department to do up some numbers on how much Norris Point would pay back to the Government of Newfoundland. When you deduct their tax incentive grant over a fifteen year period, they would pay back \$1,400. That is what the people of Norris Point would pay back over a fifteen year period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

So you can tell the Mayor of Norris Point to get his act together. The funding is there for him if he wants the problem corrected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister is slipping and sliding around the aftereffects of operating and maintaining this

sewer system. It is \$40,000. I want to ask the minister, in view of the fact that this area has chronic high unemployment, and has a high number of cases of welfare, would the minister consider a one time emergency grant to correct this problem so that the people can live in dignity in Norris Point?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

We have many, many communities around the Province, Mr. Speaker, just as badly off. I refer to Tilting down in the district of the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

MR. FUREY:

What are you going to do, tax them to death?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, we will do all we can to make funding available to Norris Point on the very same basis as every other municipality in this Province receives funding.

Now I cannot help it, Mr. Speaker, if the people or the Mayor and Council of Norris Point do not want to accept that funding. We fulfilled our responsibility. We have identified the problem, as did the Council of Norris Point that they do have a serious sewage problem down there. We said we would look at it, try to make funding available, and the people of Norris Point or the Mayor and Council of Norris Point have refused to accept that funding. The average mil rate around this Province is 5 to 6 mils when

people have a property tax in the community, and the Mayor of Norris Point and the Council of Norris Point has a mil rate imposed in that community of approximately 2.5 mils.

Now, Mr. Speaker, based on the money that we would approve this year to Norris Point to correct that very, very serious pollution problem, and if it was financed over a fifteen year period, if you want to deduct the tax incentive grant that we will give to Norris Point as a result of their 2.5 mil rate, they will pay not \$14,000, they will pay \$1,400 over a fifteen year period towards the retirement of that debt. And all the Council has to do, Mr. Speaker, is indicate that they want that money, that they will, like every other municipality in the Province, pay 20 per cent of their fixed revenues toward the retirement of that debt as the minimum contribution, and we will be quite happy to look at the problem again and to indicate to the people in Norris Point that we are serious when we say that we want to do our part to correct that problem.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). I would ask the minister if he could inform this House when he first began negotiating for this recently signed Forestry Agreement and also indicate the amount of funding on the last

agreement and also the cost-shared ratio?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question. He must have missed the House in recent weeks because that matter has been dealt with on a number of occasions. We started negotiating on this agreement, I guess, a year ago.

I think his second question was the relationship between the amount of this agreement, which was \$12 million a year for four years, compared to the last agreement. I think that was his question, what was the last agreement for. The last agreement was a \$52 million agreement. It was extended and another \$2.5 million was added. So it totals approximately \$54 million. The agreement was extended by one year, therefore it became a six year agreement, or \$9 million a year over the duration of that agreement. I think that answers his question.

So the agreement we just signed is the largest agreement that we have ever signed in the history of our Province, and the amount per year averaged annually will be \$12 million, as opposed to \$9 million, or a 33 per cent increase over a four year period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the

member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Would the minister tell me and tell the House of Assembly how he managed to negotiate a new federal agreement that was 90/10 cost-shared with the bad Liberals and now is 70/30 cost-shared with his Tory buddies in Ottawa? Can he tell us how he managed to do that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies for the fact that this Province is providing additional funds. I do not care who provides the additional funds. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this 70/30 agreement is still better than the agreements that have been negotiated by the other provinces of Canada during this round of negotiations and during this round of agreements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can get picky, but the bottom line is we said it was a 70/30 cost-sharing arrangement.

MR. PECKFORD:

So is the Institute of Fisheries.

MR. SIMMS:

So is the Institute of Fisheries. We make no apologies for that. We are proud of the fact that this government recognizes the importance of this resource to the economy of this Province and

therefore we are prepared to put up a bit more if we have to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

We got \$12 million a year as opposed to \$9 million a year, which we got under the Liberals, and it is the largest agreement ever, so we are happy to be able to provide it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Would the minister also confirm that the extension to the agreement was made because he could not negotiate an agreement with his Tory buddies in Ottawa, so they had to extend an old Liberal agreement, with the monies from that Liberal agreement, for an extra year? That is why it is \$9 million a year, not \$12 million. So that is nothing but deception. Would the minister confirm that? Also, it took him a year and a half, not a year, to get that agreement. The last question: tell us why he settled for a 70/30 cost ratio? That is all I am asking him; why did you settle for it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I can answer the last question first. As I said, every other Province in Canada has negotiated a forestry agreement and none of them is any better than the agreement that we have in terms of cost sharing. In fact, I will give you an example. New Brunswick, the home province of the federal Minister of Forestry (Mr. Merithew), negotiated a 60/40 agreement with his department, and I was able to get a 70/30 agreement for Newfoundland. It is certainly no worse than that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first part of the question, no, I will not confirm that the reason we got an extension is because we could not get an agreement necessarily. I will tell him the reason we took an extension is because there was still \$7 million left in the original agreement that had not been spent for various reasons. So we had \$7 million to spend, we were trying to get the possible agreement we could, and we got an extension to it. Nothing that we apologize for, Mr. Speaker, but something that we are very proud of.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Too bad.

Notices of Motion

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Revise The Judicature Act Respecting The Supreme Court And Procedure Therein."

Petitions

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

This petition will come as no surprise since it is similar to the ones that have been introduced before, and it is one that I would like to introduce again.

MR. SIMMS:

Is it the municipalities petition?

MR. FENWICK:

No, no, it is the Encyclopaedia of Newfoundland and Labrador petition again.

This time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce three separate petitions from three parts of the Province. The first one is from the district of St. Barbe at Trout River. I apologize to the member for not having a chance to talk to him about it beforehand. However, there will be others from other districts as well. One of these petitions is from Westport in White Bay, from the Minister of Fisheries's (Mr. Rideout) district, and another one from Bell Island, which is the Leader

of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) district.

There are a total of sixty-seven signatures on these petitions, so we are increasing numbers significantly from the previous one. There is also a letter from Jakeman Central High School in Trout River which I would like to read into the record as part of the address to the petition itself.

It says: "Dear Mr. Fenwick: I circulated this petition among my staff, senior high school students, and school visitors. The response was almost unanimous. I wish you every success in this endeavour. It is not often that you will see a socialist petitioning a Tory government to complete a project started by a Liberal Premier. Sincerely Munden Coates, Principal of Jakeman Central High School."

The reason I read this is that it is obvious from this comment that the high school students find this a project that they would like to endorse and they would like to see completed. I think Trout River is the kind of community we are talking about when we are looking at the usefulness of this encyclopaedia. I know the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) from Grand Falls has already spoken to this petition. I would like the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) to speak to it this time because I would like to know, for the record, what his opinion is on the completion of the encyclopaedia. It is obvious in situations like high schools, like elementary schools that this particular work will see its greatest use.

As I said yesterday and I would

like to reiterate, there are a couple of courses offered in the curriculum on Newfoundland studies. I am not sure whether they are called Newfoundland culture or Newfoundland history, but these courses are virtually impossible to do in communities like Trout River without such a work as we see that is now only partially completed.

So, Mr. Speaker, hopefully the Minister of Education will get up to address it, if not, then maybe the senior Minister of Education, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), who is involved with post-secondary education. I hope he would be willing to get up and give us his opinion on it because I think it is important on a one-by-one basis that we get additional members of the Cabinet to stand on the record and say whether or not they support it.

I would like to point out too, Mr. Speaker, that this petition, since the Minister of Forest Lands and Resources (Mr. Simms) pooh-pooh it by saying it only came from four districts at this point, this now adds another three districts that have indicated some degree of support.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) seven names on the petition (inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

They are coming. They are slowly building up. I am expecting an avalanche in the next couple of weeks on this and I will have to bring them in in a wheel barrow.

But the point, Mr. Speaker, is we now have constituents in seven different districts in the Province that have indicated

supported for this particular petition. I would like to indicate I think that by the time we are completed with the number of petitions that I expect to come in here, we should have support perhaps from thirty or forty districts, maybe all fifty-two. I certainly hope that we can see something like that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I table the petition and I would like to see some response from the government side since I think they are the ones that will be instrumental in making the decision on whether or not we go with this fine educational project.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I would like to support the petition presented by the gentleman for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick). The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), I believe, in the last day or so gave our view on the subject. We believe the project started by Mr. Smallwood should be enabled to go forward.

We also believe it is a case where we ought to have been able to put partisan considerations aside and recognize the intrinsic value of this particular work and do what we can to see it completed while there is still time.

I said I wish that partisan consideration could have been set aside but they have not been set aside in at least two particulars. First of all, there is no doubt in my mind that the

only reason this project is not getting the assistance of the government is because of the differing party labels of the former Premier and of this administration. It is that pettiness which gets in the way of a good project going forward. Secondly, I want to say to my friend for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick) that he now is playing that same game. He now has cluttered this up with some petty politics of his own.

Had he been genuinely interested in getting this project advanced, rather than trying to seize the opportunity of playing petty politics, he would have gone about this very differently. He would have, first of all, if he had wanted to circularize the petition, sought the assistance of all parties in this House so the petition could not have a partisan label or, alternately, in his covering letter, he would have said to the would-be petitioners: 'Send it in to your member of the House of Assembly'. Then he would still get the bit of credit he so wildly craves for and, at the same time, he could have been above the politics. Now, there is still time to redeem himself.

He can stop demeaning this process by getting up with four today and a few more tomorrow and a few more the next day. Certainly the overall number of supporters out there is what is important. What he ought to do now is wait until he gets most of his petitions in and then stand up. Surely, it would be much more impressive than saying he has four here and a few more today and sixty tomorrow. It would be more impressive and much more to the credit of the man whose name he invokes every day in this process if he did it in that

particular vein.

I have a feeling, as the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) has implied, that there are more than four people out there in those four districts who would want to be identified with the project. They do not want to be identified with the politics and that is why he only finds four names in his petition. Am I right? They do not want to be identified with the politics but if they had been given a non-partisan vehicle, I say to him, he would be getting more than four from three separate districts as he did yesterday.

I appeal to him to stop playing petty politics with it and when those petitions come in, if it is the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout), give it to the member for Baie Verte, and if it is the member for another district - he mentioned just now the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) - give it to that member, and let it be seen that he is above the politics in this issue and that he really and genuinely wants the project to go forward, rather than just merely wanting to get his name before a lot of people. I ask him to stop demeaning the process. I support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

I would like to speak on the petition, if I might.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Spurred on by my cousin, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), I want to take the

same line that he just took because I think, in fact, it is a good line to take. The fact of the matter is the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) sent out and requested people to -

MR. YOUNG:

Four hundred letters.

MR. SIMMS:

Four hundred letters, was it? It was not that many, surely to God.

MR. YOUNG:

Twelve hundred dollars of taxpayers' money. Shocking!

MR. SIMMS:

To all the high schools in the Province he sent out letters asking them to sign this petition so he could bring it up in the House of Assembly, instead of a petition originating the way it should.

A petition should originate with the people. A petition, I say to the member for Menihek, should come from the heart, from the grass roots up. Right? It should not be dictated to by a member of the Legislature. I mean, that is just playing politics, as the member for Fortune - Hermitage says. That is playing politics, trying to get his name in the paper.

MR. TULK:

You could call it political posturing.

MR. SIMMS:

It certainly would be political posturing of sorts but it certainly is politics.

So I suggest to the hon. member that if a petition is presented to him and it comes from the heart, comes from the grass roots people,

then he should get up in his place in the House and present that petition. But do not send out letters to all the schools and the municipalities and try to get them to send letters back to you so you can get up on your feet and try to get a headline in the House of Assembly. That is not the way it is done, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest, as the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage did, that that shows a certain degree of insincerity. It is obvious that it is just playing politics or political posturing as my friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) says.

MR. FENWICK:

Are you supporting the petition?

MR. SIMMS:

Well now, we will get to that, Mr. Speaker. I spoke on the petition yesterday and I said in the heart - right? - there is a soft spot there for the work that Mr. Smallwood is doing. I have got no problem with that.

MR. EFFORD:

You are playing politics.

MR. SIMMS:

No, I am not playing politics. I am being sincere. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this government brought in just three years ago a publishing assistance programme for the first time ever in the Province for which publishing groups in the Province can apply for funding, including Newfoundland Book Publishers, who have, by the way, applied and received a small amount of funding. There is only \$100,000 in that entire programme for all the publishers in the Province. Now, the hon. member wants us to cough up \$1.5 million for this particular project, Mr. Speaker.

All I said yesterday is that while we have some sympathy for the project and the idea, it is just, at this point in time, not fiscally possible because we did address it, as the hon. member knows. The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) has said the very same thing publicly.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the petition is presented on a regular basis such as this, in an insincere, lack-lustre sort of way, I do not expect anybody on this side will bother to get up anymore and just repeat our position because it is well known.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

I rise to present a petition with 105 names on it from the community of Cartwright. "We petition the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador to ask the government that water and sewerage be completed as done in the original design. Services at Cartwright are totally inadequate for the needs of the elderly, the disabled and all residents of Cartwright."

Mr. Speaker, Cartwright itself is one of the oldest communities in Labrador and in our Province. It is a community that has been neglected over the years by various governments, particularly now with water and sewerage. These residents are asking that water and sewerage be provided to the point and the point in Cartwright is where the original people of Cartwright lived and still do live.

Mr. Speaker, the people in that area are somewhat more elderly than in other areas of Labrador and there are some disabled people. They have no way of getting water now. Before, they had a water truck and it served as a fire truck as well. They ended up sending the fire/water truck into this government for repairs and, after two years, it is still there. So now they have to go by a skidoo in the Winter and by truck and bring the water down to the people who are in the point area.

For two years in a row the community council of Cartwright have made a submission to the government saying, "We are willing to go with a cost-sharing agreement." The minister was just up talking about Norris Point and saying, "If they are willing to go with the rate of other councils in this Province, then the money is there." Cartwright has gone that route for the past two years and is still waiting for that to be accepted.

MR. DOYLE:

A fire truck or water and sewerage?

MR. HISCOCK:

Water and sewerage. They applied for over \$1 million last year and again this year. We will know in a couple of weeks if it is funded.

Seeing the minister did bring up the water/fire truck, he should know if they do have water and sewerage all over the community, then when they do get the fire truck, which they expect to get because they have the money waiting for that and they have had it for several years, that when the fire truck is in that community, then they will have

access to fire hydrants and be able to carry out the protection of their community in the way they see fit.

The point I want to make is for two years in a row the council has said to government, "We are willing to accept a loan of over \$1 million and we are willing to pay the interest. We are willing to take on the responsibility for this." Also, I would say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) that there are also some areas in Cartwright, after the point is done, that are still not connected. When the water and sewerage went into this community in four different phases, there were a lot of houses bypassed and not connected. I do not know if it was due to engineering problems or other reasons. I hope when the Minister of Municipal Affairs approves his capital budget of \$1 million for Cartwright that this money will also include connecting those other areas of Cartwright that have been left out when water and sewerage went through in different phases in the town.

So I ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) to support this petition. He knows by supporting this petition he agrees with the concept. If he is going to support it, one is going on the assumption that he is not only supporting it but when the money is announced for capital construction in a couple of weeks time, the problem with water and sewerage and the problem with the fire truck in that area will be fixed. Cartwright will not continue being neglected and particularly this area where there are a lot of senior citizens. They are the original people of Cartwright that have been there since the 1700s when Captain

Cartwright came down to that area. Their descendants are still there.

So I would ask the minister to make sure that money is approved for these two projects and I ask that when the announcement comes for capital construction, it will be there.

So, Mr. Speaker, I present the petition and ask that it be tabled and sent to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Go ahead.

MR. TULK:
It is his turn if he wants to go, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOYLE:
No, I will wait until you are finished.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I have no problems with speaking at this time and letting the minister go last.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support the petition so ably presented by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). The petition comes from a number of original people and that in itself is a special term in Labrador. Those people have been, as the member for Eagle River said, there since the 1700s.

So those people have experienced the Labrador Coast. They know

what isolation means. Their ancestors date back to the 1700s and they know, of course, what it means to be without a water and sewerage system, especially on, I suppose, one of the most rugged coasts in the world. The minister should take that factor into account. He should also take into account the isolation from another point of view and that is the safety of those people, and not only just a safe supply of drinking water but certainly safety from the point of view of being able to operate fire equipment in the way that it should be operated if there is a fire.

I suspect that one of the problems with even having a fire truck in Cartwright has certainly got to be finding the right supply of water in the Winter. Mr. Speaker, those people, I would say to the minister, are hard-working Newfoundlanders who perhaps - and I think the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) might indeed agree with this - because of geography or where they live in this Province have been more neglected than perhaps any other part of Newfoundland and Labrador. Those people have had to put up and, I suspect, it is purely because of geography.

There is a tendency in this Province - and this is not meant in any sense of disrespect to the people of St. John's or to the City of St. John's, it is true of every capital in the world - that the farther you get from that capital, there seems to be a greater neglect of the people and less development than there would be if it were closer to the center of things and so on. So I would ask the minister to consider that those people in Labrador are still

in the middle of the Winter getting water by skidoo and by truck and so on.

Now, there is another point to be made and that is that the minister puts out a programme every year and he has brochures printed up. He has regulations on his books which says that if you are prepared, basically, to accept your responsibility, they will be supported. He just said this to the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) in respect to Norris Point.

Now, I happen to disagree with the minister that those people are not prepared to accept the responsibility, I believe they are.

MR. DOYLE:

Check with your colleague.

MR. TULK:

I have checked with my colleague. I checked with him this morning. I tell the minister quite sincerely that what is happening is that the municipalities in this Province are being asked to collect taxes for which the government - not the minister - does not want to bear responsibility for collecting.

I want to point out, in relation to Cartwright - I do not want to get sidetracked here - that those people have applied for the second year in a row for a guaranteed loan and they have indicated to the minister that they are willing to take on their responsibility in regards to those loans.

MR. DOYLE:

(Inaudible) federal/provincial management committee, boy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, again I do not want to get into any acrimony with the minister. I do want to touch, before my time runs out, that he can talk about federal/provincial relations all he wants, he has some responsibility in this whole matter. This town I understand, Mr. Speaker, has a large number of senior citizens as well. I would point out to the minister, I want to point out to him in all seriousness - and I have tremendous needs in my own district - but I want to point out to the minister - if he will listen - that there is a tremendous need particularly in Labrador for this water and sewerage system. It is not enough for the minister to stand up and say that he supports the petition from the people of Cartwright, Labrador. He is the Minister of Municipal Affairs, responsible for water and sewer services in this Province and surely, Lord, if the Minister of Municipal Affairs goes before the Cabinet of this Province and puts forward a strong case for the people of Cartwright, if he has the will, the push, and does not allow political patronage to Tory districts to enter in but takes only the good will and the well-being of the people of Cartwright into account, surely if he makes that case, I say to him that when he stands and supports that petition, he gives a commitment to the people of Labrador that as the minister he has the confidence that he will get what he wants, otherwise, his Cabinet colleagues have no confidence in him.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition. I would like some other time, perhaps, to get into some ways the minister might start thinking a bit more creatively

about how we are going to solve the problems of water and sewer generally in this Province. But today, I want the minister to give us his support, and by that support, I presume, a practical guarantee, that the people of Cartwright will indeed get their water and sewer system. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no hesitancy whatsoever in standing to support that petition. It is a good petition. It is a petition from the people of Cartwright, a very, very hard-working people, as the hon. gentleman has said. Mr. Speaker, I have been in Cartwright and all over the Coast of Labrador, so I can testify to the fact that the people of Cartwright are indeed very, very hard-working people who not only want but who deserve to have their petition listened to and to have some action taken upon it.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, every time a petition is presented in the House of Assembly dealing with the needs of a municipality that I am placed in the position of having to say that we do indeed have many, many more requests than we have money to fill. And I guess every single department of government, no matter what department it is, would have to make a similar statement, that we have many, many more requests coming before us on a daily basis

than we have money to fill. The same thing applies to the Department of Municipal Affairs. Because last year, as I said in this House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we had requests totalling approximately \$175 million and we had a capital budget of about \$30 to \$35 million, I believe it was \$34 million, to fill those requests.

Now, it was \$175 million in requests that we had last year. This year, we have approximately \$180 million worth of requests, up by \$5 million, and we have a \$25 million capital programme. So, obviously, you do not have to be any kind of a genius or a great mathematician to know that there are going to be a number of municipalities in the Province which are going to be disappointed and which are not going to receive funding. And I cannot say that Cartwright is going to be one of these. They certainly have a very good case that they have placed before us over the last couple of years. Again, they have a good case, I suppose, for a fire truck, as well, that they have placed before us for the last couple of years.

I will be impressing upon my colleagues the need to have these requests approved but, again, I want to say that with respect to Labrador, there is a federal/provincial management committee in place that makes recommendations to my department on what projects should be approved for the Coast of Labrador.

Now, we do not have the same direct involvement as we do in other municipalities in the Province of saying this project is going to be approved or that one is going to be approved, because

this particular area of the Province falls under the Coast of Labrador DREE Agreement and there is a federal/provincial management committee in place who make recommendations to our engineering people who do an analysis on these areas and make recommendations, as well, as to what projects should be approved. So, from that point of view, we are certainly hoping that more money can be injected into that particular agreement so that we can deal with some of these priority problems that we do have on the Coast of Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT:

What is your definition of cannibalize?

MR. DOYLE:

To cannibalize: I refer the hon. gentleman to Webster. If he looks in Webster's dictionary he will find that the meaning of the word 'cannibalize', when talking about machinery, means to dismantle or dismember.

MR. FLIGHT:

Not to eat?

MR. DOYLE:

No, not to eat. That is cannibalism. Cannibalism is to eat, but to cannibalize, when talking about machinery, is to dismantle or dismember.

Mr. Speaker, not to be sidetracked by this frivolous talk, I want to use the couple of minutes I have available to me to say that I do support this petition without any reservation whatsoever because it is a good petition and it comes from very, very hard-working people of the Province, in the Coastal Labrador area. I would be only too pleased to make funding available, if there is an adequate amount of funding to look after

this particular proposal. But, again, we do have \$180 million worth of requests that we have to address, many, many more requests than we have money to look after.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully, when the capital programme comes on stream, we can look at a lot of these areas of the Province and make monies available for them. But I do not want the hon. member to misconstrue what I am saying. I am not saying that monies will be made available to Cartwright, because that will depend upon the collective process, which is decided by the Cabinet of the Province, and we have many requests to look after.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HISCOCK:

The Minister of Municipal Affairs has admitted that he needs \$180 million, when there are \$30 or \$35 million available for capital construction. The people of Cartwright have applied two years -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition. I should tell members of this House that this is not a petition for Route 432.

This is a petition for Route 437. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare privilege for me today, as I present this petition, to have in the Gallery a group of students from Raleigh, where this petition came from. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) was talking about how petitions should begin in the hearts of people, how petitions should come from the grass roots. Well, Mr. Speaker, I could not have said it better myself if I were to describe this particular petition. Because not only was this petition prepared and circulated in Raleigh but it was delivered to me by the students, who brought it in to me this morning and asked me if I could present this petition on their behalf.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

So, Mr. Speaker, in addition to presenting a petition, in addition to asking that a particular road be upgraded and paved, there is also a learning process, an educational process, where students from a certain particular part of this district can see democracy in action. I am sure they will return to their homes being completely satisfied with the way that democracy works.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is, "We, the undersigned citizens of Raleigh, do hereby request the hon. the House of Assembly to instruct the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to begin the process of upgrading and paving Route 437, the Raleigh Road, immediately."

Mr. Speaker, the road into Raleigh

is number 437. This road was built twenty-one years ago. This is when it was put through by the former Premier, Joey Smallwood, twenty-one years ago. Gravel roads have a very short life when you consider the amount of traffic that goes over them and when you consider the weather, the climatic conditions in this Province. Therefore, this particular road now, Mr. Speaker, has disintegrated practically, or certainly has sunk to a state of bad repair.

The people of Raleigh, Mr. Speaker, and Ship Cove, two communities up there together, must travel this road to reach St. Anthony. For example, the hospital for the whole region is in St. Anthony, the bank for the whole region is in St. Anthony, the shopping centre is in St. Anthony, and the garages are in St. Anthony.

Another one of the whereases says that the high school students are bused over this road to St. Anthony. All around this Province over the past number of years the trend has been to bus students from smaller towns and smaller communities into the larger schools, but the thing which is often overlooked when this is done, Mr. Speaker, is that in order to bus children from one place to another you need suitable adequate roads, and in the haste to bus children from Raleigh into St. Anthony to find what was a 'better' education - I put better in parenthesis because this does not always prove to be the case. I understand the drop out rate is higher than ever it was before they began to bus. Be that as it may, when you begin to bus children from one part of this Province to another, at least

there must be a decent road for the children to be bused over. This is not the case between Raleigh and St. Anthony. The road is not suitable for busing children over, yet it is being done.

There are several million pounds of fresh fish trucked over this road every year into St. Anthony. As my time is practically up, Mr. Speaker, I will move to the section which refers to the Eastern Brook Bridge, which is on this particular road. I know where that bridge is, Mr. Speaker, I have travelled over it. I have had a lot of complaints about it. It is a blind section on that road out to Raleigh, on Route 437. For years, there was a two-way bridge there. Last year, the Department of Transportation in its wisdom or lack thereof, decided to put in a one-way Bailey bridge which makes this road, in addition to being a rough, bumpy gravelly road, full of pot holes, even more hazardous than it would normally have been.

Mr. Speaker, bearing these things in mind, I am pleased today to stand up without any reservations whatsoever and support the prayer of this petition and to call upon my colleagues on this side of the House, as well as people on the other side of this House, to support this petition so that the Premier and the Minister of Transportation can take the action necessary to see that this road is totally upgraded and paved.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of this petition so ably presented by the young people from the district of the Strait of Belle Isle. I think it is to their credit to become involved in the participatory democracy which has evolved from our freedom to do certain things. And despite the hon. member for St. John's North's (Mr. J. Carter) attitude towards young people in politics and engaging in politics in elected office, I think it is an absolute credit to them, to their teachers, to their school and to their district, to become engaged in the process whereby they can take part in a meaningful way to try to correct some of the negative measures that impact upon their lives and the lives of their families in their district.

Mr. Speaker, the petition is very straightforward in its presentation of the prayer. We are not dealing with Route 432 today, Mr. Speaker, but we will get back to that I am sure with ten, twenty, thirty, forty, maybe even fifty more petitions until we ram into the consciousness, if there is such a thing, of this government that there are problems out there, problems amongst our people in transportation which affect and impact upon every single part of the economy in local communities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Raleigh and Ship Cove must travel this road consistently to reach facilities in St. Anthony. My hon. colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), is working very effectively and efficiently and vociferously in this House on their behalf, working very hard to ensure that this road is upgraded so that the

local economy can prosper, so that our children can have a bright future, so that their parents can have secure employment.

What kinds of employment are we talking about, Mr. Speaker? We are talking about, namely, the most significant piece of employment that this Province has known since it was discovered, the fishery. Right now, Mr. Speaker, the most emphasis placed on the fishery is on the quality of fish. Because if we can deliver to the marketplace a reasonable piece of fish which can be tested and graded and be seen to be good rather than the kinds of products that are travelled over dirt roads in this Province, which turns out in some cases to end up as offal or as dog and cat food, Mr. Speaker, if we can bring a quality product to the market, we are saying to the marketplace that Newfoundlanders can provide a great product. Not a good product, not a fair product, a great product! And by ensuring greatness of product we ensure greatness of people, greatness of employment. We can only do that, Mr. Speaker, if we attack the fundamental infrastructure in our Province that allow us to provide this kind of label of greatness in the marketplace. We cannot do it with dirt roads. We cannot do it with roads that are gouged, we cannot do it with roads that are full of potholes. We just cannot do it. So we are calling upon government to look at the transportation network, specifically for the district of the Strait of Belle Isle.

When children bring forward a petition, every adult should sit up, their ears should perk up, because they are our future and they know what they are talking

about, despite being discarded by some politicians as little children who know no better. Well, the children know better because the children are our future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

And we are talking about people, Mr. Speaker, who have to travel over this - the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), can we really call that a road?

MR. DECKER:

Not really, no.

MR. FUREY:

Would it be fair to call it a cowpath?

MR. DECKER:

A cowpath.

MR. FUREY:

A cowpath. So they have to travel over this cowpath to get to a hospital, Mr. Speaker, to get to a bank, to get to the shopping centres.

Let us talk about hospital, let us talk about traversing, travelling that road in the dark in the dead of Winter with an emergency, trying to get somebody to hospital. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle knows all too well the problems that he hears about from the people of Ship Cove and Raleigh when they have to get to St. Anthony in emergencies in the dead of Winter and the dark of night over that road, which is an absolute disgrace, probably a reflection of this government. If it wanted to hold up a mirror to itself, they would see an image of the road

between Ship Cove and Raleigh, full of potholes, craters, emptiness. And why, Mr. Speaker? Because their politics rise to the surface and politics, quite frankly, is far more important to this administration than the people, than human beings. They place politics - what is in it for me? How many Tory votes are in it for me? - way above the people, living, breathing, human beings who have to carve out and eke out an existence, a way of life in rural Newfoundland. We are begging on knees, if necessary we will do it, please, come and help us! Please, help us protect the jobs! Please, give our children a future!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I also stand to support the petition presented by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), and brought to him by students from the area. Just a short while ago, I had the honour of visiting St. Anthony and meeting with some of the teachers who are here today, and discussing problems in the area. I can personally identify with the problems presented in the petition, because in my own area, despite the fact that I am very near the center of things, shall we say, I still have many miles of dirt road, 140 approximately, over which students travel every day to and from school, and I can certainly appreciate the situation the young students from Raleigh and Ship Cove find themselves in.

We are making headway in most areas of the Province in improving our roads situation. Undoubtedly it will be some time before all the areas are taken care of, and that certainly includes the area in which I live. But it is a matter of plugging away at it, and hopefully the day will come, in the not too distant future, when students will not have to travel over such roads. And not only in relation to students going back and forth, but people going back and forth to work, to hospitals, to businesses, etc. In this day and age, to have to travel over rough roads is certainly something that we do not envy at all.

One of the facts mentioned by the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) was the fact that a lot of fish is trucked over the roads in that area. Once again, the same thing applies to my area. With quality being of such prime importance these days, we have to consider the fact that driving over a long, hard, rough, dusty road does absolutely nothing to improve the quality of the product.

So it is a concern and it is a concern that we as government face every day and hopefully, as I say, in the near future many of the areas that are deprived at present we can improve, not only road conditions but other conditions, whereby our young people from all over the Province, as well as our older people, will have a much more happy and successful time getting about this great Province of ours.

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Order 3, Mr. Speaker, the

Concurrence Debate, Social
Services Committee.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Concurrence Motion, Social
Services Committee. I call on the
Chairman, the hon. the member for
St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the records of our deliberations show that we spent some thirty hours in going over the headings of Justice, Social Services, Health, Education, Culture, Recreation and Youth, Career Development and Advanced Studies, Environment, and then once more on Education. There was one meeting that was abruptly cancelled because of the lack of members from our side. This was a mix-up that I must take full responsibility for, but it was not all bad. As a result of the recriminations and subsequent discussion, we concluded and agreed as a Committee that in future, if one side did not show up, we would not proceed with a meeting even though we might have a quorum. This was acceptable to both sides and I hope it establishes a precedent, because it means that if either through getting our wires crossed or for any reason one side does not show up, the meeting should not proceed even though there might be a quorum. This was acceptable, as I say, to both sides and I think it is a very good precedent.

I have always felt that the consideration of the estimates, especially in Committee, is an Opposition exercise. It has been put there by agreement certainly, but the purpose is to put it there for the Opposition, therefore, the first person to be recognized in

our Committee is always the Vice-Chairman, who is one of the members of the Opposition, followed by the other members of the opposition, then the members of the government side and, if there is still further discussion, the Chairman may bring up the rear, as it were. This seems to be a workable, useful procedure, and I think members opposite will concur that this is a good way to go.

By the same token, we try and bring in a sort of conversational, relaxed style so that questions can be asked at any time on the topic under discussion. This does make it a little difficult for the Hansard clerks to get down on paper, but with all due deference to their exertions, I have to say that it is very important that we adopt an easygoing, relaxed style in those hearings.

Proof of the usefulness of this procedure lies in the tremendous number of topics that we covered. We did get bogged down on some. I will not go on about them at length, I will just mention a few of the highlights: In the Department of Education there were a number of points. One of the most interesting points, as far as I was concerned, was the discussion on denominational education. We have always, perhaps, shied away from tackling the problem of denominational education head-on; perhaps we are right, perhaps we are wrong. I am inclined to think we are right because, as things have turned out, the minister pointed out that the level of co-operation among the denominations has really caused the denominational education system to evolve into, if you like, either a non-denominational system or, I

should say, a pan-denominational system, whereby the differences that exist between the various denominations is played down and the level of co-operation has increased to such an extent that a stranger would find it very difficult to know which particular denomination a particular board represented.

MR. TULK:

Would you permit a question?

MR. J. CARTER:

Yes. Please, go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

There has been a great deal of talk in recent years about the merits of the denominational education system as to whether it should or should not be. Is the member advocating in his few remarks - he is not speaking up as he usually does - that we do away with the denominational system of education, the status quo, or increase it or what?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I sense that this is a loaded question, but I am perfectly prepared to address it. What I am saying is that the denominational system, which seemed to favour the splitting of resources, seems to have developed into what I would call a pan-denominational system whereby there is such a level of co-operation that you do not get this kind of resource splitting that was the curse and the bane -

MR. TULK:

It may be less, but it is still

there.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, it is so much less that it is on the way to disappearing. The other question that came up, which was a little thornier, was the question of school tax. And the members, I do not know whether they were being facetious or just trying to make things difficult, but they suggested that a motion be passed condemning the school tax. I did not have to make a ruling on it, but I would take the position that the Committee would not be able to accept such a motion because the school tax authorities are not represented by a subhead in the Education Estimates. They do not receive money from the Department of Education, they receive money from the public through their tax system.

However, I did try to make the point that if you want to get a fat man out of bed, the only way is to put another fat man in. If you are not going to have a school tax system - and nobody likes taxes, me least of all - then the problem is what do you replace it with? I think the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) argued that it should come from general taxation. But if you do that, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is here to corroborate the things I say, I think that each percentage on the provincial income tax is \$4 or \$5 million so, therefore, to bring in the \$20 or \$25 million that the school tax authorities bring in would require something like five points on the provincial share of the income tax, which stands at 60 per cent at the present time, and that would push it to about 65 per cent. So that is not workable. You would almost have to put

another per cent on the sales tax and that would not be acceptable. The other alternative would be to charge school fees. So those are the four choices.

I would be very interested to hear from members opposite, and all members on this side, which of the four choices they would favour.

MR. BAKER:

I will tell them. I will get up.

MR. J. CARTER:

Am I to infer from the reaction of the member from Gander that he has a solution up his sleeve or under the table somewhere? I would be very interested to hear it.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a quorum call. We want some people in here to listen to the hon. gentleman, because he is making one of his more sensible speeches.

Quorum Call

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Is it agreed we have a quorum?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder, since we have an excess of a quorum here now, could the excess be carried over for the next Quorum Call so that we would establish a sort of surplus?

I was speaking about the school

tax and the denominational education system. Those were two items that occupied a lot of time.

Illiteracy and adult education: The minister pointed out that the rate of illiteracy was abnormally high, especially among Liberals, and Liberal members in this House represent an astonishing proportion of illiteracy in this Province. No matter how old a person is, they can enroll in a school programme.

MR. HEARN:

Would you say that again.

MR. J. CARTER:

Now matter how old a person is, they can enroll in a school programme.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

A little while ago, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) disrupted the whole House, interrupted the even tenor of our ways here, by calling a quorum because the hon. member was speaking. Now, having gotten all the people into the House, he totally ignores it, he carries on loud conversations over there and we cannot hear the excellent speech that the hon. member is making.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, I want to tell the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance, that I heard every word the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) was saying. As a matter of fact, I did hear him repeat something that he said a little while ago in a slightly different way when he called the people of Port de Grave scum, I just heard him say, and I think those are his exact words, that Liberal members in this House represent an astonishing proportion of illiteracy in this Province.

MR. J. CARTER:

If I might, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to the point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

If I might clarify, what I said was that the Liberal members in this House are among the more illiterate members of the community and I would refer the members to the Minister of Education's (Mr. Hearn) advice that schools are open not only to school children but to adults, and there is no reason why the school day should end at four o'clock or three-thirty in the afternoon. So any members who want to go to school after hours would be welcomed with open arms. In fact, hon. members may not be aware of this, but anyone who is not satisfied with their Grade XI marks can go back and rewrite those exams.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I would say to the hon. gentleman, and I would give him a bit of advice, that if the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) can find the salary units for ten teachers, then I would advise the hon. member to use the Department of Continuing Adult Education so that he might get somewhere above a high school education.

MR. BAIRD:

That is a spurious point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The education system in this Province, I think, is probably in good hands. There is no doubt about it, that the denominational education system seems to have evolved into an acceptable form of education and an acceptable form of organization for the Province. The school tax, of course, is a problem and I would be very interested in any solutions that hon. members might like to present to this House.

The Department of Health came in for considerable discussion, and I am sure that the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), who is here, will be able to give some very good remarks on that. In fact, it was one of the shorter sessions that we had. Because the Minister of Health was so well versed in every aspect of his department, he was able to answer all the questions.

MR. TULK:

He did not answer any questions.

MR. J. CARTER:

Is the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) suggesting for one moment that the Minister of Health is not among the most competent of ministers that he has ever had the pleasure to meet? In fact, members opposite were privileged to have the most competent ministers in government appear before that particular committee.

The Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies had no real problems. It seemed to go very smoothly. The items discussed were vocational school staff, job security, the reorganization of the vocational school system and the community colleges.

The most interesting item, to me, of that department was the correlation between employment and education. The Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) pointed out that there was a definitely demonstrable correlation between employment and education. That is to say, the more educated you are, the less likely you are to be unemployed. This seems to hold throughout every particular walk of life and to every particular job opportunity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, could I have some order, please? Because I am finding it difficult to hear myself think.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

Could we have some silence while the hon. the member for St. John's North is speaking.

MR. J. CARTER:

With the Department of Social Services, I think the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) was particularly concerned about Group Homes generally. I think he might like to continue the debate now that it is back in the House of Assembly.

The members generally have been saying we should keep the debate in the House of Assembly. I would challenge any member to stand up and say that you could have as good a debate in the House of Assembly as you can have in Committee. I would be very surprised if any member could convince me that you can have a debate as good, because you do not have the same opportunity to insert comments and ask questions. In fact, this is what caused, I think, three different sessions on Social Services.

I think my time is just about up introducing this. There were other points that came up and I will go over them, because I will have an opportunity to get up and speak from time to time for the next three hours. I do not necessarily intend to take up my full ten minutes or my full fifteen minutes. I would be very interested to see what hon. members have to say about the topics we have discussed. I will take my seat and be all ears.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRETT:

Taken as read.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, if we had to take everything that the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) has taken as read in this House, one would not have much reading. It would not take long to read what the Minister of Development has said in this House since he became Minister of Development.

MR. TOBIN:

Did you hear him last week speak about the Marystown Shipyard?

MR. TULK:

Did you hear 'Graham', by the way, that he was the top runner in the Leadership Campaign over there. That is the reason he is staying quiet and keeping his head down.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, since the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) just spoke, it falls to me, as the Vice-Chairman of that Committee, to endorse some of the things that the member said. By and large, there was a fair sense of decency and civility in the Committees.

I do have to say though, Mr. Speaker, that there are people who say that the Committee system, as we see it practiced, is a waste of time. I have to agree on the basis, Mr. Speaker, that it is not serving the purpose that we had intended. We are getting ministers coming in and making ten - fifteen minute philosophical speeches. We have members of the Opposition making ten or fifteen minute philosophical speeches. We are not zeroing in on the dollars spent and we have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where the intent of the Committees is to allow members of the House of Assembly to query and

question the minister on his expenditures.

I would not necessarily refer to them as goon squads, Mr. Speaker, but we did have in the Social Services Committee members of government who clearly came to the Committee for no other reason than to protect the minister and to disrupt. They used up hours on points of privilege and, Mr. Speaker, that was not serving the intended purpose. That type of thing would not happen, I feel, if we had the Committees held in the House of Assembly, as the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) suggested.

There were some very interesting topics raised, Mr. Speaker. I want now, for a second, to talk about one of the Committees, Mr. Speaker. I wish the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) was in his seat, Mr. Speaker, because it is too bad that his Committee did not sit in this past four or five days. There have been issues raised in this Province that would have been a prime subject for a Committee debate. Mr. Speaker, one obviously is the statement that the minister made today with regard to parks.

I would ask the minister, since he recognizes that parks like Catamaran, Beothuck Park and other parks - I do not know why Beothuck Park was left out. Some of the parks he mentioned have got 100 per cent occupancy. So, Mr. Speaker, what happens to the 22 per cent of the people who will now go to Catamaran Park and find twenty-two sites taken away? Would a better approach not have been to provide, if he wanted to start this new system, twenty new sites to see if this is going to

work, as opposed to taking out of service twenty sites in parks that we knew had 100 per cent occupancy last year? The minister is going to have some selling job to do when that draw is done, Mr. Speaker, if there are people who feel that they want to take part. Let us assume we get 100 or 150 people applying for a lot in Catamaran or any other park. The draw is done, albeit in fairness. But try to convince the person who was not successful in the draw that it was in fairness. So, Mr. Speaker, the minister is going to have a selling job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) also some other questions. I hope he is within earshot. I have watched him on television for a few days now weasling his way around this fresh air tax, this excise tax that the federal government is now about to apply. If it happens, it will apply to everyone in Newfoundland who buys anything associated with the outdoors, hunting, fishing, anything. I am glad the minister is back because there are a couple of points that I want to make.

Mr. Speaker, the minister will know we pay the highest income tax in Canada. We pay the highest SSA in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are finding another excise tax. The one that this is going to be hurt is the average Newfoundlander, the man who can afford, Mr. Speaker, to go in the woods for a weekend, fish for a weekend and hunt for a weekend.

What is the minister going to do? Is he going to permit, Mr. Speaker, the federal government, in view of the fact that we are paying the highest income tax, the

highest SSA tax, is he going to permit the federal government to stick it to the average person in Newfoundland again, Mr. Speaker? I want to hear the minister. I am sure he will take part in debate. Is he going to stand up and defend the rights of Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker? Is he going to have them priced out of the one thing they got going for them in this Province?

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) tax.

MR. FLIGHT:
It has got to do with the minister's estimates.

Mr. Speaker, there is another little, touchy issue I want to ask the minister about. There is another issue that will become touchy. I want to know where the minister stands or how he feels about what is being proposed for Conne River? In his capacity as Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), how does he feel about the fact that 1,500 salmon are going to be taken out of the mouth of Conne River? Legally albeit, it will be legal. It will be legal if the federal government continues with its plan.

The minister should know that Small Craft Harbours is now designing and making those traps. There has been no input, that I am aware of, from this Province. I am told, Mr. Speaker, and there is good evidence that this particular clause in the rights agreement being negotiated for Conne River was being discussed for five or six or seven months and when the media broke the story, it was news to everybody in Newfoundland. So I am interested in the minister's perception of this. Does he have

a concern?

The 500,000 natives of Newfoundland fifteen or sixteen years ago had the right to catch eight salmon a day per sports fishermen; then it came down to four salmon a day; now it is down to two salmon a day, and fifteen per year. There were many sacrifices in the better interest of conservation and in the better interest of whatever government agency or government department suggested that these kind of cutbacks should take place and that we should do everything we can to guarantee salmon runs in our river and to guarantee that salmon enhancement projects work. A lot of people in Newfoundland, a lot of fishermen, will be concerned about the ability of that particular river. By the way, the minister should know that the Conne River is probably the most recognized river in this Province today. It opens before any other river in Newfoundland. The fishermen who fish the Exploits or the Humber or the West coast rivers or the Northern rivers all converge on the Conne because it is opened first and there is a fast run. It will not be an issue that people are familiar with.

I have noticed already in some of the media that interest groups like rod and gun clubs have expressed concern and I noticed that a committee in Bay d'Espoir itself has expressed some concerns. At this point in time I am merely drawing it to the attention of the minister and asking the minister if, number one, as negotiations were going on in Ottawa, did he have any input into that particular concept? If he did, was he for it or was he against it? Did he make the

concerns of the fishermen in this Province who has been forced in lots of cases to sell their commercial nets known? Some have done it willingly, others have been forced to do it, again, in the name of conservation. Did he put forward or is he prepared to put forward the concerns of the sports fishermen in this Province who year after year after year have watched their rights and their abilities to take part in the sports fishery downgraded?

So, Mr. Speaker, when the minister gets up, I would like to hear what his position is. Is there in the minister's mind or in the minds of his department, insofar as it applies to recreation, any concern that the Conne River can indeed stand to have 1,500 fish, prime, migrating, producing stock, taken out of that river? Is there any concern that this may have a detrimental effect on the river?

Mr. Speaker, I raise that issue for the minister to address himself to, because I have no doubt, as time goes on, there will be a debate on the issue. The decision may be to go ahead with it. Maybe there is nothing wrong with it. Maybe the salmon stocks of the Conne runs will not be affected. Maybe everyone in Newfoundland will accept it as being proper.

MR. WARREN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

I was listening to the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr.

Flight). Maybe I should ask him, for clarification, whether he is against the aboriginal peoples of this Province, against subsistence fishing and subsistence hunting?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

I will tell them you are against them.

MR. FLIGHT:

I was taking the opportunity to draw to the minister's attention a situation that exists as of a week ago in this Province that I have no doubt will become an issue for public debate in this Province. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) might well have been listening.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, have you lost control completely of the (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Chairman, listen to bully boy there!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

Could we have silence on both sides of the House while the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans is speaking.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Minister of the Environment,

Mr. Speaker, will undoubtedly be concerned about this particular issue. Undoubtedly, his department will be asked for their views, and undoubtedly, the minister's department has already had some input into the negotiations taking place with regard to the right of the Natives in Conne River and with regard particularly to that particular clause and that particular right being given to the Natives in Conne River to take out the 1,500 fish.

I am sure the Minister of the Environment will have some concern as to whether or not, again, that river can stand that from the environmental point of view. It is his responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that before any action is taken anywhere, the environment can take it. In this case, Mr. Speaker, it is the environment of Conne River itself. I am sure the minister has had some input and I am sure that in this debate, he will get up and stake out the government's position with regard to their support the necessity of the rights there. He undoubtedly will tell us.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Department of the Environment, we had a very interesting debate with the minister. In that Committee, we got him to concur, Mr. Speaker, that the Environmental Assessment Act in this Province has not been adhered to. We got him to concur, Mr. Speaker, that all the clauses and the legislation that exists is not being and has not been adhered to. Hansard will show, Mr. Speaker, that the minister admitted that the major projects that have taken place in this Province since the Environmental Act was proclaimed has been

exempted from that Environmental Assessment study, Mr. Speaker. If there is one clause in that Environmental Assessment Act that puts teeth to that legislation and allows that minister to protect the environment it is the clause that gives the minister the right, even suggests -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

- that he appoint environmental assessment boards -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

- where there is some concern about damage to the environment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is where the legislation loses its teeth when you have a weak, weasely minister who is not heard around the Cabinet table. It loses its teeth when that clause says that it is left to ministerial discretion whether or not there will be a board. There has not been one environmental assessment board appointed in this Province since that legislation was enacted.

The Upper Salmon was exempted; Cat Arm was exempted; Hinds Lake was exempted; the spray programme is exempted; and the experimental spray programme of 2,4-D, where it is recommended that the company spray all the hardwoods in Newfoundland, was exempted. Every major undertaking that has some potential for damaging the environment in this Province has been exempted from that act. By

using his ministerial discretion, Mr. Speaker, not to appoint environmental boards -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

- the minister has by and large exempted these projects.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I missed the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) at my estimates this year. I never had one intelligent question from my critic now on the other side, the little gentleman from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). The little gentleman from Windsor-Buchans never asked one sensible question during the whole estimates debate over three hours.

Now, he succeeded in getting me to my feet, Mr. Speaker, and I want to address a couple of matters which the hon. member raised. I want to say as well that he will be red faced again today, as he was at the committee meetings because the fact of the matter was, there was an environmental assessment on the Upper Salmon.

MR. FLIGHT:

Was there a board?

MR. BUTT:

A board? What are you talking about a board? There was a complete environmental assessment done. As a matter of fact, the revegetation of that project is still going on right now. The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. Every major project in this Province, almost without exception, has had a complete environmental assessment done, with very few exceptions. There was one or two exceptions, that is all I can remember, and even in those cases, all the mitigative measures were brought in and carried out with the agreement of an impartial board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the herbicide spray because the little gentleman from Windsor-Buchans likes to get off on that so I want to set him straight again. He talks a lot but he does not listen well.

The project for herbicide spray is registered with my department for 2,4-D, 2,3,5-T and Round Up. There has been one exception to it and that has been an experimental block, a small one, 475 acres I think it was, in total. An experimental block was sprayed and the monitoring is ongoing on that right now on pollinators. There is a pollinator study going on and there is a study going on on the song birds. The hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) likes to get off on song birds but I mean -

AN HON. MEMBER:
And His Honour.

MR. BUTT:

His Honour is about to whistle up there. The fact of the matter was that the hon. gentleman from Gander (Mr. Baker) stood in his place, I recall quite vividly, and

he said we would kill these little songbirds and kill all the pollinators and we would, in fact, destroy the environment.

DR. COLLINS:

Did he exaggerate?

MR. BUTT:

Well, slightly. I do not know what it is over there. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has not been very wise in his selection of environment critics. They get up make irresponsible statements and try to alarm the public when there is no need of it. I think it is fair to say, I do not know if it is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, that they are alarmists.

MR. DAWE:

Careless with the truth.

MR. BUTT:

Yes, very careless.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BUTT:

Is everybody finished? Can I have another go at it now? Is everybody finished?

Okay, I do not mind a little bit, Mr. Speaker, but it is very difficult to address some of the things that were mentioned. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans is wrong again, 100 per cent wrong.

MR. PEACH:

So what is new?

MR. BUTT:

He has not made one correct statement in the ten minutes he was up speaking, not one correct statement! Not a shred of fact in what the hon. member said, not one fact!

MR. FLIGHT:

It is totally and 100 per cent right and you know it. Where are the boards?

MR. BUTT:

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that every single major project in this Province, with one or two exceptions, I think -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BUTT:

- under very extenuating circumstances had to go to a full environment impact statement.

MR. SIMMS:

They are exaggerating.

MR. BUTT:

The hon. member mentions Upper Salmon again and I want to make sure that this gets into the record. The fact of the matter was, Mr. Speaker, that there was a full environment impact study done on the Upper Salmon.

MR. MATTHEWS:

It was very positive.

MR. BUTT:

Very positive, and all the mitigative measures were put in place, and as a matter of fact, right now, I am sure even today the last of the work that has to be done on that project is being done and that is the revegetation in a couple of areas where they had large pits.

MR. SIMMS:

You were up there yourself and had a look at it.

MR. BUTT:

Yes, I was up myself and had a look at it. As a matter of fact, I was in the hon. member's

district in Buchans, and when I was leaving, one of the gentleman there said 'if you can get that little fellow down here to see us, please send him or otherwise ask him to send us a picture. We do not know what he looks like.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Apparently, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) had promised this gentleman that he was going to live in the town. They never saw him since the election, Mr. Speaker, never laid eyes on him since the election. I mean, I was talking to pretty high quality people in Windsor - Buchans, let me tell you that. The Committee was made up by the movers and shakers of Buchans. There is a very versatile and dynamic young mayor down there, I think, who causes the hon. member some problems from time to time.

MR. SIMMS:

A versatile mayor and he is well liked.

MR. BUTT:

Yes, very versatile and he has the interest of the people of Buchans at heart, Mr. Speaker.

I had a very productive meeting with the Buchans Action Committee. The other thing about it, Mr. Speaker, is that I did something in Buchans that the hon. member never did, I met with the Committee that is trying to get employment and get Buchans moving again. I said, 'I suppose you are sick of seeing the hon. member.' They said they never lay eyes on him. They want a picture of the hon. the member. If he has one, I will send it out; I will pay for the postage stamp.

MR. FLIGHT:
Right on.

MR. SIMMS:

The only picture the member for Windsor - Buchans has is one of his old ones, when he had the old hairstyle.

MR. BUTT:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am being sidetracked in poking a little bit of fun at the hon. member. But it is a fact that Mr. Holt would like to get a picture of the hon. member. He would like to see him in living colour, otherwise, send a picture.

I welcome the hon. member getting up and participating in this debate but when he does so, he should get his facts straight and not make - well, I will not say irresponsible and incorrect statements. Because all you have to do is a very small bit of research, call your researcher down in the Opposition office and ask him to check back into the records, and the hon. member will see, Mr. Speaker, that there was an environmental impact statement done on all these major projects that he said there was no environmental impact statement done on.

MR. TULK:

That is not what he said.

MR. BUTT:

Oh, yes, it was. That is what the hon. member said. Twice he has said that now. He said it in the Estimates Committee and he said it here today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the little bit of time I have remaining I would like to get off on a positive note and inform members of the House that my department is

about to embark on an excellent environmental programme which deals with abandoned vehicles in the Province. We are nearing completion of an agreement with a Newfoundland company who submitted a proposal whereby this company will go around the Province, Labrador included - there will be no high grading in this, Labrador will be included - and pick up those derelict vehicles and bring them to a shredding plant, which will be located in Placentia Bay - as I understand it right now, that is where they are planning on setting up - where those abandoned vehicles will then be shredded and shipped to a readily available market in Spain.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. minister's time is up.

MR. BUTT:

I will have another go at it, Mr. Speaker. I think it is important that I get this message out. Unless the hon. member wants to give me a little more time to finish up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. BUTT:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

When the minister is making sense I will give him more time. For the minister's edification - he obviously does not understand his department and he does not

understand the Environmental Assessment Act, so let me tell him what is happening with his department - if the proponent of a project, be it Newfoundland Hydro, be it any major company in this Province indicates to the Minister of Environment that they want to do a project - the Upper Salmon may be an example, Hinds Lake may be an example - the minister goes back under the Act and he says, 'Yes, we have no problem with that, but we need an environmental assessment statement.'

Now, here is Newfoundland Hydro, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BUTT:

They register it first.

MR. FLIGHT:

They register an environmental assessment statement. Newfoundland Hydro spends a month doing up an environmental assessment statement telling the minister or anybody else who wants to see it, what they see as the environmental damage or what initiatives they will take to protect the environment. Now, asking Newfoundland Hydro to submit an impact statement on a project that they are eating their hearts out to do, that they want to do, whether it is Cat Arm, whether it is Upper Salmon or whether it is Hinds Lake makes no sense, Mr. Speaker, because one knows what the environmental assessment statement is going to show; it is going to be tilted in the better interests of the proponent.

Mr. Speaker, the minister knows that since that legislation has been proclaimed there have been requests for environmental assessment boards. The general public, who were concerned about

the damage that that project was going to cause, wanted an assessment board, but the appointing of a board is at the discretion of the minister and neither Minister of the Environment to this point in time, including this minister, has ever permitted the appointment of an environmental assessment board, made up of people who had no axe to grind, who would simply look at the project, look at its potential for damage to the environment and make sure, if nothing else, that the project was carried on in a way to minimize damage to the environment. The minister can sit there and play politics and he can weasel, but the fact is that never has there been an environmental assessment board appointed in this Province. I am not sure, and the minister will tell me if there was one, but when BRINCO wanted to go into a uranium operation in Newfoundland I think there was a board appointed. The minister can confirm that. We have had major projects in this Province since that legislation was proclaimed in this House. We have had three or four major hydro projects. We have had the experimental spray programme that the whole town of Millertown, every man, woman and child in Millertown, opposed and requested through their clergymen, requested through everybody the right to an environmental assessment board so a case could be made, but it was not approved.

While I am on my feet I must ask the minister why it is that the Wilderness Society in this Province has, on numerous occasions, requested of the minister the report on the spray monitoring programme done last year and has not been able to get it? Why is the minister not prepared to make available to the

Wilderness Society the report on the monitoring of last year's spray programme? The Department of the Environment abdicated the responsibility of monitoring the spray programme in the sense that they turned it over to the Department of Forest Resources and Lands. The Department of Forest Resources and Lands did the spray monitoring report. As a matter of fact, they contracted out to a company which, in the process of doing the monitoring, went bankrupt so that there was a hiatus in there, there was a time when nothing was happening from a monitoring point of view. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands and the Minister of the Environment, one has to believe, would have that monitoring report. A body as well recognized and as well respected in this Province as the Wilderness Society has, on numerous occasions since last December, contacted the minister's office and requested that report. Now, why has the Minister of the Environment refused to make that report available to the Wilderness Society? Does the minister want to comment on that when he stands up? I will ask the minister while he is at it, since the two departments involved, Forest Resources and Lands and Environment, have refused to make that report available, a public report that every person in this Province has a right to peruse, since they have refused to make the report available to the Wilderness Society, will the minister table in this House today the report on the monitoring of last year's spray programme?

MR. YOUNG:
Sit down.

MR. FLIGHT:

Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), come in and sit down and take your hands out of your pockets. I am glad you do not have them in my pocket.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

The Speaker has ruled in this House on numerous occasions that a person has a right to be heard in silence. I wonder if Your Honour could direct his attention to Hughie, Dewey and Louie, Donald Duck's three nephews. They are leaving, and that is good, because now perhaps you will not have to do it. I ask them to be quiet and allow the hon. gentleman to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have silence please?

MR. BUTT:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, it is not very parliamentary for an hon. member to interrupt another hon. member when he is speaking on spurious points of order. That is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I ask all members to please be silent while the hon. member is speaking, or any hon. member is speaking.

MR. BUTT:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, in the Committee I asked the minister if the company, Abitibi-Price Limited, had requested the approval of his department to remove a bridge? In the first instance, the minister indicated that the removal of a bridge over a waterway would have to be approved by the minister or the minister's department because there is obviously potential for environmental damage. Was the brook cleaned up afterward? After it was blasted out, did the timbers go down and jam off the river? Now the fact is, the minister indicated that he was going to tell this House of Assembly or the Committee whether or not Abitibi-Price did indeed seek the approval of the minister, as is required under his Environmental Assessment Act. Maybe the minister will take the opportunity when he stands to indicate to the House whether indeed Abitibi-Price did request permission to blast out that bridge, and what the response of his department was upon receiving the request.

Mr. Speaker, just to end this off, the minister wanted to play a little bit of politics in his speech and he wanted to indicate how people in my district asked for 'a snap', as he puts it. Let me tell the minister this: My majority in Windsor - Buchans went from minus eighty-four to plus 864 in the last election. Would the minister want to indicate what his majority of 1,600-something came down to in the last provincial

election?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
I remember that minister, Mr. Speaker, going around the corridors of power here and telling us how he was setting up a dynasty, how, with a 2,000 vote majority, he was paving the way for his son. Well, his son had better have a better career than that, Mr. Speaker. One election wiped out 1,200 votes, one more will take care of the 400 that he is talking about. And he can send all the snaps he likes, it will not make any difference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BUTT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will carry on now, Mr. Speaker, and inform hon. members about this excellent programme that is coming into place now with the help of my department, the Department of the Environment, addressing this major problem we have now and have had in the Province for a long, long time, car wrecks. There have been a number of proposals put forward over the years, prior to my time certainly, none of which addressed this major problem adequately. So this year, Mr. Speaker, we are embarking on a new venture with a Newfoundland company, one of the real good proposals that come in, and my department will, hopefully, within a few weeks, sign a formal

agreement with them, and we will subsidize the transportation of tonnage shipped out of the Province.

This programme will work in conjunction with other programmes that are ongoing in the US, and the carriers of this shredded material will stop at a certain location in Newfoundland, as yet to be determined, pick up this shredded material for which there is a readily available market in Spain. There are a few problems with it that we are going to have to try to overcome.

Response from town councils all around the Province has been very positive, particularly on the West Coast, where I had an opportunity to meet with the Greater Humber joint councils, some twenty-seven communities, I think, represented, in that area. They are all prepared to co-operate, because this problem with car wrecks is just as much a problem for municipalities as it is for the provincial government. We are quite pleased with this agreement we are about to embark on, and we should have it in place, hopefully, in the next few weeks.

The shredding plant itself will cost something of the order of around a couple of million dollars. Some twenty-two people will be employed permanently, and another fourteen or fifteen people temporarily, going around the Province picking up these derelict vehicles being left around by careless people. So a very positive programme is going to unfold in the Department of the Environment, hopefully in the next few weeks.

I am not going to spend a great deal of time on this, but for the

benefit of the member for Windsor-Buchans I am going to explain the environmental process to him, because he does not get a clue about it.

If you are going to embark on any major project in the Province whereby you are going to disrupt more than ten hectares of a property, you have to register it. Then, an environmental assessment committee will do an assessment on it to determine if in fact a full environmental impact statement is required or if an environmental preview report is required. The hon. member is listening I hope, because I do not want him back up on his feet making silly, stupid statements.

If in fact that committee advises the minister that, yes, there should be an environmental impact statement, commonly referred to as an EIS, then the proponent, in this case it could be Graham Flight and Company, would have to go out and pay to have this done. If they did not have the expertise themselves, in the opinion of the committee they would have to go and get an expert, a consulting engineer, to do it for them.

MR. FLIGHT:

And that has been done in every case, I suppose.

MR. BUTT:

Right. Now we are coming along. Then, when the impact statement is completed, it goes out to the public for the public to review it. So any Newfoundlander or any interested group, private individuals or anyone else, can pass their comments on it, make submissions. This all goes to an Environmental Assessment Committee. This is the board the hon. gentleman is tangled up in.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, it is not. It is not!

MR. BUTT:

Okay. Well, we are moving right along. We are making progress. You are learning something, I hope, from what I am saying.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is not the board I am referring to. That is not an environmental assessment board.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BUTT:

When comments made by the general public, by organizations, by wilderness groups, or what have you, is all taken into consideration by a very independent board made up of wildlife officials, environmentalists, fisheries people - the hon. member for Gander knows all about it. He is more in tune with what is going on - then the Committee will recommend to the minister whether or not that report, that EIS, be accepted as it is, or whether it should go out for further modification, or whether it should be rewritten. I mean, that is the process. Finally, you can turn it down or you can accept it. If the minister accepts it on the recommendation from his Committee, he will then make a public statement to the effect that he has accepted it. Then a monitoring committee is put in place to make sure that all the mitigative measures put forward in the EIS is done in conjunction with the project and after the project is completed. So I have just taken the hon. member through the environmental assessment.

Now, there was one other point

raised by the hon. the member which I should address, Mr. Speaker, and that is the spray programme.

I do not know if the hon. member knows this, but there is a five year monitoring programme going on on the herbicide spray. I mean, it is registered. I believe it was done in the days of the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power). I believe he was the gentleman who requested that this monitoring programme be put in place on the herbicide spray programme. It is an ongoing process. The results of last year's monitoring will soon become available. I know hon. members are waiting for it, but I am dealing with it now as expeditiously as I can. Perhaps I will autograph the copy I send to the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans. I can assure the hon. member that he will have it in due course. But you must be patient. I have many things to deal with.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member has about two minutes left.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you, Your Honour.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the monitoring report of last year's programme is now being studied by people who have a lot more understanding of the environment than the hon. member. From a cursory glance at this report, I can tell the hon. member that there was no bird kills or anything like that.

MR. FLIGHT:

Then why do you not table it in the House?

MR. BUTT:

I have not dealt with it, I am telling you. When I have dealt with it, it will be readily available to the hon. member and the public of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would hon. members on both sides maintain some degree of silence so that the hon. minister can be heard.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your protection. You must be patient. I have many pieces of business to deal with, and this is just one of them. But I can tell the hon. member, and I particularly want to tell the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) - I might entice him to stand up now - that there was not one single - I repeat - not one single bird kill, not one! I remember the day when the hon. gentleman got up and he said, 'You are going to kill all the songbirds.'

MR. BAKER:

That is a lie.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BUTT:

He said, 'You are going to kill all the songbirds.' That is what he said. There was not one single bird kill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has expired.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately I do not want to talk about environmental matters, but I enjoyed listening to the only backbench minister in the history of the Newfoundland government misquoting things that are supposed to have happened in this House. I hope he has a better understanding of his department than he has ability to read Hansard.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, in the short time allotted, to speak about educational matters. Before I do so, I would like to comment on the way the Committee was handled by the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). I attended all three Committee meetings, experienced all three Chairmen and a few Vice-Chairman, and I must say that the member for St. John's North was by far the best Chairman that I experienced. Now, then, before the member for St. John's North bursts with pride, I should point out to him that that may or may not be a compliment, because the other two were bad. However, he was by far the best of the lot and I would thank him for that.

During the couple of sessions on Education, Mr. Speaker, there was one occasion where I thought perhaps the Chairman of the Committee could have acted a little differently than he did. So far I have really heard no formal explanation of his

behavior, and perhaps he could explain today exactly what the situation was. A motion was put forward in the Committee. That motion came after a long discussion concerning the school tax.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had a very unusual occurrence in that Committee, exceedingly unusual. I have not heard tell of an occurrence like this before. I had not experienced it myself. Of course, I had only been attending two years of committees. Now I am not sure if the Chairman fitted in with this, but at least from the four government members and the three Opposition members, we had complete agreement, three and three - I do not know if the Chairman expressed himself, I cannot remember - on one thing, Mr. Speaker, and that was that the school tax should be abolished. So the motion was put that we recommend as a Committee to the House, or point out to them, that it was our recommendation that the school taxes be abolished and that this should be looked into, or words to that effect. It was a very simple kind of motion. The Chairman successfully put it off for a while and then it seemed to die a natural death, and I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, what happened to that particular motion. It is my understanding that motions are acceptable in committees and since this particular motion was a motion of some substance and some importance, the Chairman should have at least proceeded with that particular motion before the Committee rose and reported to the House.

I am not sure, although sometimes it is rather difficult to tell with all the racket in the House

and so on, he even referred to it in introducing -

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, he did.

MR. BAKER:

Oh, I missed that. Anyway, that is something that perhaps I would have dealt with in a slightly different manner than the Chairman.

One comment he made had to do with the amount of money that this would entail - \$20 million would have to be raised some other way - and suggested that perhaps the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was not capable of handling that situation, was not capable of coming up with a solution to find that extra money. I would like to point out to the Chairman of the Committee and to the House and to the Minister of Finance that taxes collected in this Province are still taxes. Whether they are collected by a municipality, by a school tax authority, or by a government, they are still taxes. And the net result, no matter which method the Minister of Finance chose, the net result, if that burden were shifted from these school tax authorities to the Province, would simply be the same amount of money being collected. As a matter of fact, perhaps even a little less. Maybe we could do away with the 15 per cent administration cost, or some of that 15 per cent administration cost that the school tax authorities now incur.

The reasoning behind getting rid of the school tax authorities, Mr. Speaker, was simply that they were too cumbersome and unfair, were being administered unevenly throughout the Province, and were, in essence, contributing to a gap creating the situation where we

were getting two kinds of education, contributing to that gap, and it was a rather interesting discussion. I agree with the Chairman, that under these circumstances you can debate an issue properly and you can reach logical, sensible conclusions, which it seemed as if the committee did reach at the time.

Enough said about that, Mr. Speaker. What I really want to get on to is the Department of Education itself. Now, we only had the two sessions, and I would have loved to have a couple more sessions with the minister. The department itself, it seems to me, is a very mystifying one. It puzzles me. It puzzles me tremendously. Normally a government department, you would expect, like the Department of Highways, the Department of Forest Resources and Lands and so on, have control over what they are responsible for.

The Department of Education, however, it seems to me, I cannot really find what it is they have control of. They have a tremendous budget. I suppose Treasury Board controls to a large extent the salaries paid to teachers. I suppose in some way the Department of Education has some kind of control over the amount of money that is obtained from Cabinet once a year for school construction and what have you, but beyond that, their control seems to disappear.

It seems that their department hands out an awful lot of money but then has really no control over where that money goes. The monies are handed over to somebody else to administer.

Now, there are occasions, Mr. Speaker, I might remind you, in which this approach is very desirable but when almost the whole budget of that department is passed over, one then begins to wonder exactly what the Department of Education does. I know that it deals with curriculum to a certain extent but, at the same time, it cannot really control the curriculum in the school. The final say on curriculum in the school is in the hands of somebody else. It gives out money to build new schools but, apparently, can have no say in where those new schools are built. It gives out money for school supplies, maintenance and a whole lot of other things but, has no say in how that money is actually spent once it gets to the schools.

For instance, some of the money is supposed to go to libraries, some to classroom supplies and so on but, the Department of Education has no control over that at all. That money can be taken to pay the light bill and in most cases is taken to pay the light bill and is not going for what it was intended.

The Department of Education, right at the beginning, loses control over its expenditure when it passes it over to somebody else and this creates tremendous problems. In the eyes of the people of the Province, the Department of Education and the minister is responsible for what happens in education in this Province and every time there is a problem, and there are a lot of problems, they come to the minister. He has to say, 'I am sorry, that is the DEC's or that is the school boards, it is their responsibility. I have nothing to do with it.'

I have tried to analyse the Department of Education and I find that they really do not have control over very much of anything. They really cannot do very much of anything. The minister, in the estimates meeting, talked in terms of a study that was in the process of being done. This was a study of small schools.

In the light of the fact that the minister really has no control over the money that is spend in small schools; in light of the fact that the minister has no control over which small schools get repaired and which do not; in light of the fact that the minister has no control over which get closed down and which stay open; in light of the fact that really the minister has no control over teacher allocation in the small schools, it is the responsibility of the board; in the light of the fact that the minister and his department has no control over anything that goes on in the schools, not even the curriculum because, again, that is the responsibility of the school boards, he cannot even control which subjects are considered to be compulsory and which are not because that is the prerogative of the school board.

In light of the fact that the minister has no control over any of these things that happen in the schools, then one wonders what the purpose of this small school study is. It certainly cannot be for the minister. It must be something that the school boards have agreed to take seriously, the DECs or somebody has agreed to take seriously, it cannot be the minister because he has no way of controlling the things that happen. This must be frustrating

for the minister.

First of all, he gets half his department or 90 per cent of it taken away from him, stuff that can be controlled, not necessarily him, that had to happen before, but that is sort of taken away from education and given to somebody else and a new department created - Mr. Speaker, about thirty seconds. It is taken away and given to somebody else and what he is left with is a Department of Education that is helpless. It cannot affect what happens in education in this Province. It is frustrating to him and it is frustrating to me and it is frustrating to the people out there who have to put up with this.

I was very happy to get into some aspects of this, Mr. Speaker, but in the years that follow, we are going to have to get into an awful lot more problems with the Department of Education. I am sure the minister will welcome this kind of investigation that he knows is going to happen over the next couple of years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, there are just a couple of points. I am really a bit disappointed in the hon. member that he did not address the problem of school tax a little more thoroughly because I pointed out there are four ways or three alternative ways of raising money

for schools by some kind of school taxation method, besides the present method of school tax. I should say three alternatives to the school tax. One is an increase in the sales tax, which would be very objectionable; another is an increase in the income tax; and another is the imposition of school fees.

The imposition of school fees is certainly objectionable. There are plenty of objections to it. The most popular alternative by members opposite I think, because I have heard them speak about it, is to tack to few points on to the income tax, which now runs at 60 per cent of the federal tax. In order to raise the \$25 million that we are talking about, you would have to put approximately five points on the income tax. Our provincial income tax is about the highest in Canada, and I would argue is probably so high as to be a disincentive.

For instance, if you had a valued employee by the name of Winston, and you said, 'Now Winston, I would like for you to work a few hours overtime tonight. We have a big shipment to get out.' He would say, 'Well, I will do it as a favour to you, but not because it would be worth my while, even though, I am getting time and a half, it will all be gobbled up in taxes.' So we are reaching the point of no return with taxes. It is unwise to suggest that we can increase taxes any more. You are threading on very dangerous ground.

If more money is needed for education, I would argue that perhaps certain economies can be affected, and where there is not much room for many economies, I am satisfied that is a pretty well

run department.

MR. BAKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAKER:

I totally agree with what the member said a few moments ago about the over taxation and so on, and not being able to impose new taxes but, my point simply was this would not be a new tax. It would be money coming out of that tax pool and it would not change, as a matter of fact, it would lessen the money coming out of that tax pool.

But following the member's statements, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he still has the same attitude about all these increases in taxation we are seeing the federal government now pour on in all sectors of our economy. Is he against those as well?

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order, there is no point of order.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I am not on top of all these increases. I think the member is referring to the change in the excise tax structure. If it is a change in structure, not an overall increase.

MR. BAKER:

Tax on wharves, user/pay.

MR. J. CARTER:

If it is a change in the excise tax, I would argue if they are going for value added tax, there could be some problems there, but that is really outside of the scope of my remarks. I am not on top of the federal taxation structure, so I would have to do some homework before I could comment.

MR. TULK:

Raise taxes on the growing of savoury.

MR. J. CARTER:

There is enough taxes there already, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A savoury tax.

MR. J. CARTER:

I would call it an unsavoury tax.

The other point I wanted to make was why did I not proceed with the resolution. The six members of our Committee voiced active reservations about the school tax and one of them was, I think, the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker).

MR. DECKER:

Strait.

MR. J. CARTER:

No, no. It is Straits.

MR. DECKER:

It is Strait.

MR. J. CARTER:

No. Mr. Speaker, it is the Straits of Belle Isle. You do not talk about The Narrow. You only use the term 'Narrow' when you are referring to the member for the Straits of Belle Isle. It is the Straits. That is incorrect having the Strait of Belle Isle, Mr. Speaker. Anyway, I will deal with

that at another time.

I did not proceed with the resolution because I take the position that we can only make motions on the subheads and on the points that are referred to us. The Estimates Committees are very restricted Committees. They go into hibernation at the end of the fifteen days. They can only deal with the matters referred to them. I would say, except where our own procedures are concerned, we have very little room to maneuver. So I would argue, unless the members wanted to bring it up in the House, that we would be powerless to deal with such a motion. Anyway, that is the position on that and that is the position on the school tax. I will sit down and let an hon. member have some more to say.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I was having a quiet, restful afternoon when the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) intruded. He says that we have the highest taxes in Canada. He is right. I wish he had said that more often to the Premier and the Cabinet because this House is not what he has got to convince. He is right. We are taxed beyond endurance. We have the highest retail sales tax in Canada and highest provincial income taxes in Canada. We know that.

We are not advocating there ought

to be more taxes. Indeed, one of the planks in our very attractive policy platform during the last election was that we ought to lower taxes to stimulate economic growth.

MR. J. CARTER:

Where is all the revenue going to come from?

MR. SIMMONS:

I am about to say that right now.

MR. J. CARTER:

Tell us.

MR. SIMMONS:

The member for St. John's North unwittingly, I submit, touched on the solution when, in passing, he talked about economies. There are certain economies that could be affected and we just point to the more blatant ones. We have mentioned them from time to time. He does not want to hear them. I suspect he has done nothing to record his disagreement with certain flagrant expenditures. I am talking, for example, about the renovations down on the Eighth Floor. I have never heard him speak out on that. That is \$800,000 that could be -

MR. J. CARTER:

Would the hon. member permit a comment?

MR. SIMMONS:

Sure, go ahead. I yield.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The Eighth Floor, Mr. Speaker, was a mess inherited from the previous, previous regime. My understanding is that when they started on the renovations they

found it very hard to stop because the wiring was substandard and the plumbing was substandard and they just had to keep on going. I am sure it would have cost a considerable sum but I do not think anything like the sum that was finally spent. I would suggest that anywhere in this jerry-built building, if you start trying to make some renovations, you are going to run into an awful lot of money. Look at the leaks in the front door. Every time the wind is in the wrong direction, the water cascades down. You would think you were in Niagara.

MR. FUREY:

Are you talking about the fifth floor?

MR. J. CARTER:

No, the front door.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the member will know that while some of the renovations had to do with fixing the roof and the wiring, a fair amount of it had to do with replacing the furniture and the carpet. The member will also know that there can be no justification at all in terms of basic safety considerations for people. There is no justification why you fix the eighth floor on the argument it is substandard and not fix the other several floors in the building.

MR. J. CARTER:

There is not enough money.

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh, there is not enough money, he says. If there is not enough money, why discriminate by putting it all on the eighth floor and leave the public servants elsewhere in this building exposed to the alleged dangers that he has concocted for us?

Mr. Speaker, the member, when he was Minister of Education, a period that educators and children will always remember, advocated a lottery. I wonder where he stands on this lottery issue now? Perhaps he should talk to the Minister of Finance and perhaps instead, Mr. Speaker, of the conventional lottery prizes where you get a sum of money, he could have a first and second prize. The first prize for winning the lottery could be an evening with the member and the second prize could be two evenings with the member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let it be noted we have recruited today to our cause, an eminent gentleman. The savoury farmer, the ex-Minister of Education, ever the statesman, the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) now is mouthing Liberal policy. I say to my friends on this side, we should worry. We should really get concerned. He is now saying taxes are too high. He is saying the solution to the problem is more economies. I recommend his speech to the Premier. I hope that brief speech, though a substantial contribution to the debate, will be read and memorized by the Premier. Then, I hope, somebody will explain it to the Premier.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I do not mind being quoted. I do not even mind being misquoted, but I mind when I am misquoted so grossly. I said one possibility might be some economies, but from what I knew of the present minister and the department, I did not see that there was much in the way of economies that could be done because it is such a well-run department. So that is for the record.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I submit there is no point of order and I invite Mr. Speaker to rule if he would like to before I proceed.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the eighth floor renovations. I submit to him it is not all fixing wiring. If he wants another example, he should go out into the district of my friend from St. George's (Mr. Dawe) and go to Loch Lomond. He will have no difficulty getting up to Loch Lomond because the three houses and twenty-five cabins up there are serviced by a beautifully paved highway.

MR. J. CARTER:

What about the opulence of the

Opposition offices?

MR. SIMMONS:

That beautifully paved highway is the kind of wasteful expenditure I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, where pork barrelling - and mentioning pork barrelling, just look who just walked in! Look at who just walked in!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

The barrel itself just walked in, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:

He rolled in!

MR. SIMMONS:

For the record, we have just greeted the gentleman who is the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), the pork barrel itself. Now, if anybody would know about -

MR. DOYLE:

You know that is not true, even though you are saying it.

MR. SIMMONS:

- pork barrelling, he must be really, really embarrassed by the clumsy articulation he had to do to get around that charge earlier today about pork barrelling insofar as municipal projects are concerned. That will go to haunt him for many, many years to come, long after he is out of this House, long after the next election, Mr. Speaker.

I say to the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), whose intelligence we always laud, we always hold that hope that we can reach him. He is really a soul mate. He has proven that today with his coming on side with Liberal policy. We must talk to

our leader with a view to reviewing this policy because there is clearly something with it, Mr. Speaker, if the member for St. John's North has embraced it, but for the moment I am a soul mate with him, he is against higher taxes and he is for economizing government expenditures. Now, I say to him that is what we are for, that is exactly what we are for.

MR. J. CARTER:

What about the spending in the Opposition office?

MR. SIMMONS:

If he is thinking about coming over here, I beg him to wait until the next election because the public will take care of it, he will be over here and we will be over there anyway.

Mr. Speaker, stop paving roads to people's cabins; start allocating municipal funding on the basis of need, rather than on the basis of political need; stop attacking municipalities as the minister did today, attacking people who are trying without pay to provide community service; stop attacking them and blaming them for all your troubles, as he did on the matter of Norris Point this afternoon.

I see the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) is back from his meeting with Frank Ryan. Is Frank still on side? Yes, he is rooting for you. He says you will make the best Leader of the Opposition of anybody over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Barrett.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, no. He is backing Charlie. He is backing the man from Ferryland. Charlie for leader.

Anyway, he is back in the House and he has got it all sewn up which must come as some -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. POWER:

It is very obvious the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) did not realize (inaudible) Norris Point.

MR. SIMMONS:

The member for St. Barbe had his homework done extremely well and the people in Norris Point have their homework done extremely well. It is the Municipal Affairs Minister (Mr. Doyle) who does not do his homework very well. It is he at election time who is out encouraging people to run and then once they get in office, he pulverizes them, he makes life impossible for them. With he as the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I am surprised more councillors have not resigned.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate, if I may.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torn gat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps hon. members will agree to call it 6:00 p.m. If so, I move that the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00.

On motion, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 14, 1986, at 3:00 p.m.