



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 47

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

25 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers I would like to welcome to the galleries six students and their teacher, Mr. Harnum, from McKays, Newfoundland, in the district of the hon. Ron Dawe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Also, sixty students and their teachers from St. Edward's School, Placentia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

o o o

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Mr. Speaker, before we get into regular business, I have to rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance on a point of privilege.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege relates to a press release that was put out on Thursday, May 21, by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). I am quite willing to table the press release to underscore my point, but before doing so, Mr. Speaker, if I may just make my case for a prima facie case. The press release

refers to Bill 40. Now, Bill 40 has been given first reading, it has been circulated in the House and, therefore, it is in the possession of the House. The remarks in this press release, in my view, constitute, therefore, an abuse of the privileges of the House because, as I say, the Bill is in the possession of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points about this press release. First of all, its language is, in my view, slanderous. Quite apart from anything else, the language in it is slanderous and it is slanderous, therefore, against the House. For instance, it says here, "The provincial government, since January 1987, has been stealing from their pensioners." Now, in my view, that is slander. Now, quite apart from that, Mr. Speaker, this release is factually inaccurate, incorrect. It is not only slightly incorrect, it is 180 degrees incorrect. The release states that this Bill will take away from pensioners whereas in actual fact the Bill will give to pensioners something that they now do not have. Not only is it slanderous, it is totally false and inaccurate information.

Mr. Speaker, I also think that this is a point of privilege because, I suggest, the hon. member did this quite knowingly. I have in my possession, Mr. Speaker, the copy of a letter I wrote to the hon. member some two weeks before this release laying out government's position on this whole issue, and I am quite willing to table this, also, at the proper time.

So the hon. member cannot say that he did not know what the provincial government's position

was on this. He had a very good packet of information on it. Despite that, this release, as I have stated, gave totally, 100 per cent, 180 degree false information.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this release was circulated, was given out, to cause alarm and distress and, indeed, it has. I have been informed by certain people that they have been approached by pensioners who, having seen this release, are extremely disturbed and are extremely upset.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore think that this cannot just be retracted on the basis that it was a difference of opinion between the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and anyone else in the House. This clearly is a slanderous, irresponsible statement, a totally inaccurate statement, a statement that is based on something in the possession of the House. It was clearly designed to, in my view, and it certainly has, cause distress amongst people of this Province who, if anyone, should not be distressed, retired people, people living on pensions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I put it forward that I have made a prima facie case. I will table the release for Your Honour's information and Later on, if it is appropriate, I will be glad to table my letter and be prepared to make the appropriate motion.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek, to that point of privilege.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I have two points to make. The first is to the substantive issue, and the second is to whether it is a point of privilege or not. The substantive issue, I would claim, is a difference of opinion between two gentlemen. I have read the legislation involved and clearly the 1967 legislation establishing the Public Service Pension Plan intended that the plans be integrated at age sixty-five. And for the provincial government to continue to take money away from pensioners between the ages of sixty and sixty-five if they take early retirement, in light of actions done by the federal government solely, is an act of robbery on the part of the provincial government from its own pensioners. On that basis, I have no problems with the thing.

What has happened, of course, is that a strict interpretation of legislation could have gone either way. One is the intention of the legislation clearly at age sixty-five, which is the way I would have expected it to be interpreted, and is consistent with the actions the department itself has made by not taking it from individuals who are between the ages of sixty and sixty-five and have retired and have not claimed their Canada Pension Plan. It is slightly complicated, Mr. Speaker. But the point is that it is a matter of interpretation whether or not the provincial government had the right to do the things it has been doing since January 1, 1987. I maintain they do not, and I think there is a decent argument for it.

On the procedural issue I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the reason it was released as a press

release rather than a question in the House, which would be more appropriate, is that it was on the Order Paper and, clearly, with the rules of the House one cannot ask questions of legislation on the Order Paper. There is a chance to debate it later on, when it comes up. So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that despite the fact that the hon. member has tabled the press release in the House, it is certainly no cause whatsoever for a question of privilege, since it has nothing to do whatsoever with actions in the House. And when it comes time to debate the legislation itself, then, of course, whatever is said then can be, if the minister wants it to be, the subject of any kind of actions he wants at that time. But I suggest to you that a press release completely separate from what is going on in here cannot be the subject of any kind of question of privilege on behalf of the minister.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

This matter, Mr. Speaker, I feel is important enough not to be just sloughed off. The member should not be able to pass it off as easily as he has. To suggest that articles in newspapers are not necessarily a case for a point of privilege is not accurate. I would like to refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, the Fifth Edition, Paragraph 45, which says in part "Traditionally, articles in the press reflecting badly on the

character of the House have been treated as contempts." It goes on to give some examples where members of the staff of the House and so on had been accused of contempt.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I refer you to Paragraph 51 which is, perhaps, the most important one: "It is always the responsibility of the House to decide if reflections on Members are sufficiently serious to justify action. In 1974 and again in 1976 Members complained about newspaper reports and the Speaker allowed that a prime facie case of privilege existed."

I suggest to Your Honour that there are other references here that we could find if we had the time, and that Your Honour might wish to take this particular matter under advisement. It is not a simple case of a member being reported out of context or anything else, it is an admission by the member for Menihek with respect to information that has been tabled in this Legislature in the form of a bill and very inaccurately reported by the member for Menihek. I think it is serious enough for Your Honour to take a serious look at it.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, further to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it does reflect on all our privileges because we have a right, I think, to come and go to this House of Assembly without having to run a gauntlet of irate

pensioners on the streets. Now, I have been approached by a number of people saying, 'What are you doing to our pensions?' Now, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition might say too little too late, not enough, but certainly this act is designed to improve the lot of pensioners and, yet, the member for Menihek - and I clearly heard him on CBC on Friday morning - says that this was designed to take money from pensioners. I am very disappointed, by the way, in CBC. I would have been a lot happier if they had had the sense to read the legislation and say, but, Mr. Fenwick, this is not so. As usual they take -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They do not have enough research money.

MR. J. CARTER:

They did not bother to research it, and, I suppose, they have not bothered to research it now.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yet, they can run all over the Province spending money.

MR. J. CARTER:

I think we have a right as individual members to come and go and not have our actions misinterpreted. It is one thing to face down a difficult act, an act that may be unpopular but one we have collectively decided to uphold, but to be forced to defend something which is not even so is an invasion of our rights and our privileges as members.

MR. FENWICK:

One final point, Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

Just to refer to the sections quoted by one of the many House leaders for the government, if you look at section 45, it says, "Traditionally, articles in the press reflecting badly on the character of the House have been treated as contempts." Mr. Speaker, this is purely a comment on a piece of legislation being introduced by the government and I do not see how commenting on a piece of legislation from the government can be misconstrued as making a reflection on the character of the House.

Similarly, the other section quoted, "It is always the responsibility of the House to decide if reflections on Members are sufficiently serious to justify action. Mr. Speaker, there is no reflection whatsoever on members here, just on government policy as it is being drafted in terms of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of privilege, I do not think a prima facie case has been established. I think the matter of difference is in interpretation and it is certainly not the function of the Chair to decide that.

I refer hon. members to Beauchesne, page 12, section 19. "A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the condition of parliamentary privilege." So I do not think a prima facie case has been established.

Statements by Ministers

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if by leave, before getting into Orders of the Day, I could bring to the attention of the House -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio-Bell Island, by leave.

MR. BARRY:

- something which I am sure all members would agree is worthy of note and commendation. The Boys and Girls Club of Canada award ten \$1,000 scholarships across Canada every year. For the information of hon. members, this year four of the ten scholarships were awarded to Newfoundland students, and three of the ten were awarded to students on Bell Island. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, by leave, that we pass on the congratulations of this House to the Wabana Boys and Girls Club, and to the boys and girls clubs of Newfoundland generally, and to recognize the excellent work these clubs are doing and to congratulate the three students.

I am sorry I do not know the name of the fourth student, but the three students from Bell Island are Barry Dobbin, Robert Walsh and Lauria Rees. It is quite an accomplishment. The Boys and Girls Club on Bell Island does a tremendous job under very difficult circumstances, not very much in the way of funding, although I know government has been generous to the club within the limits of its financial capability.

That club does a tremendous job and I think all members would like to acknowledge this and congratulate them on their most recent efforts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we on this side would like to be associated with such an indication as described by the member for Mount Scio. I recall personally, when I was Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, having dealings with the Boys and Girls Club on Bell Island. In fact, I was over there and visited their facilities and met with their organizers, and, in fact, it might have been around one of the times when some funds were provided that the member talked about. So they are a very aggressive organization. The young people involved there are some of the best in the Province, I know, and are interested in bettering their own lives and the lives of people on Bell Island. We would like to be associated with any such communication that the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island suggests be sent.

Oral Questions

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn), but in his absence I will ask the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, when we saw the crisis in Flat Bay with the Domtar situation, we saw the government react in twenty-four hours. Again, in St. Lawrence when we saw that crisis, they reacted in forty-eight hours. I would like to ask the Premier why his government has reacted so quickly to these two particular crises in two different districts, and why this unforgiveable delay of thirteen months in the district of St. Barbe, where there are still 165 miners out of work? Why this unforgiveable delay and what is his government doing to put these people back to work?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we did not delay in Daniel's Harbour. We were onto the company immediately when they announced that the price of zinc had gone down in the marketplace. We tried valiantly, with the company, to put a package together to see the reopening of that mine. As a matter of fact, the company did, at one point after they had announced the phasedown, present us with a proposal, but the proposal was one that we just could not go along with. It wanted government to go much further than we could afford to do under the circumstances of the economics of that mine. We have been in constant contact with the company ever since. Zinc prices have improved somewhat and the Minister of Mines has been working on trying to get that mine reopened and get the people back to work in Daniel's Harbour. We will continue to work to try to see that it reopens. There is a deposit of zinc still left there which can be mined. It was a question of price.

It is different than the Flat Bay situation where the company wants to walk completely away from the situation. The company in Daniel's Harbour does not. They cannot open it at a given period of time, given price, but want to reopen it. We are in constant contact with the company, and hopefully we will be successful in seeing some improvement to that situation and seeing the mine reopen.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the suffering up there is running pretty deep. In fact the local parish priest has said publicly now that the company and government cannot continue to play with the emotions and the very lives of these people. He says that he has seen the anguish and turmoil this indecision has caused the families in this area.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Now, I would ask the Premier, in light of the suffering that is happening in this area of chronic high unemployment and the negative impact this closure has had in this area - the Premier and his government have had the company's Teck Corporation's counter proposal for nearly a week now - can the Premier tell us when we can have a response to this company's counter proposal so that we can put these people back to work?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as soon as possible. The Minister of Mines is not here today and no doubt he is dealing with it. If he has had it for a week, no doubt Cabinet will be apprised of the latest counter proposal and the department's analysis of it. We will then be able to give a response and, hopefully, we can expedite that matter and have it done either this week or early next week. We will move as fast as we can to get a response back to the company on their latest proposal to us. I undertake, as a result of the question from the hon. member, to do that and expedite that as soon as we can, hopefully within the next few days but no later than next week.

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, twenty days ago I asked the Premier about a \$900,000 election promise to pave the roads in the Northern section of my riding and he promised to get back to me as soon as possible. Has the Premier researched that \$900,000 paving grant and can he report to me now what happened to the promise of that pavement for 1985?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is not a final supplementary to the two questions that the hon. member has asked.

MR. FUREY:

So says Len.

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 an ad that I hold here. I am sure the Premier is familiar with it as it has appeared, I think, in practically every newspaper in Newfoundland.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Everyone, I hope.

MR. TULK:

Yes, I know you hope. The Premier, of course, is trying to justify his existence, is conscious, perhaps, of promising the Newfoundland people, in 1982, 40,500 jobs when in actual fact he has lost 3000. He has lost 3000 since 1982. I want to ask the Premier just how much these ads cost and who paid for them?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what the cost is, I will have to take that as notice. But they were paid for by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier will know, of course, that there is misleading information in these ads. For example, in St. Lawrence the Premier has advertised that there were 100 jobs created when

in actual fact the projections were only for 81 and we are now down to 50. I would, therefore, ask the Premier would he now, in view of the fact that he seems to want to publish his so-called achievements so well, if he would now undertake to tell the people of this Province the real truth with another series of ads across the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like for the hon. the member for Fogo to also indicate to me how many jobs were put there for Come By Chance at the time? I think it was a lot less than are there now, so the argument can be made in reverse, that a week or so after the ad went in the paper there were a lot more. How many are there for Come By Chance on that ad, I ask the hon. the member for Fogo? Was it 200 or 300? I think 300 and it was about 527 so it is wrong in that sense, that there are more there than was said in the ad. So if you add up the totals there you will see that there are even more than the totals indicate. The situation in St. Lawrence is that they have run into some problems in the mill, but there will be well over 100 working in St. Lawrence when the thing is going full blast, both the mining and the milling. There is a problem now with the grounding in the mill and technical experts are in St. Lawrence right now looking at that situation to see if they can correct it. They believe that they can and, after that is corrected, then of course the level of jobs will go as high or higher in that whole operation. There will be so many in the mines

and there will be so many in the mill, making a total of over 100.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, St. Lawrence may, of course, or may not go, but we hope it will. Let me ask will the Premier now take out an ad telling us about the jobs that we have lost, for example, in Flat Bay? I understand we lost 80. I understand we are down 50 in St. Lawrence from his projection, in Daniel's Harbour we are down, I think it is, somewhere around 165. Will the Premier now take out an ad to tell the real facts of the unemployment problem in Newfoundland that he has created with his government? Will he now tell us, will he now confess, will he now tell the people of the Province through advertisements, which if he is going to tell one side or the other -

MR. DAWE:

Tell the people about (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I can tell the hon. gentleman about a few more things, too. He should be quiet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Will the Premier advertise the truth so that the people of this

Province know where they stand, and know that indeed they have the worst unemployment situation in Newfoundland's history, or is he going to continue using the same people's money for his own cheap political purposes?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there may be other ads, and if there are it is quite likely that the numbers will have to be revised upwards, as I indicated, because of more jobs, because the Come By Chance situation is much more positive than was indicated in that ad. The private sector employment programme, which was just launched about two weeks ago, and for which we have now announced fifteen or twenty projects, will continue. We have announced some other park projects and fishery projects and rural development projects, so, yes, that ad is inaccurate -

MR. TULK:

Of course it is!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- because the net situation now, even considering -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- Daniel's Harbour and Flat Bay and St. Lawrence, would mean that we are over the numbers that are in that ad. We might have to go with a revised, updated ad because the numbers now are greater in job creation than they were in this ad.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question would have been for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), but is for the Premier in his absence. It has to do with the question of the operations of the Young Offender Review Board. We have heard over the last week that a considerable number of people have had to come from the West Coast of the Province in order to appear before it. My question to the Premier is, in view of the fact we may see a considerable number of people coming there, could he give us some information about how much it costs to send a social worker, the young offender, or the other person escorting the young offender to St. John's and stay in a hotel for a couple of evenings in order to appear before this Young Offenders Board? In other words, Mr. Speaker, could you give us some indication of how much more it is costing us to review these things with this particular Board than it would bring them before provincial judges?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This is really delightful, Mr. Speaker, because members on the opposite side of the House, when we established the board, said it was not going to have anything to do. Now, thanks to the question from the member for Menihek, it is going to have considerable numbers of people appearing before it. This just might be another socially progressive step by this government to assist people who really need assistance, and those are the young offenders. And, once again, we are breaking new

ground. No other province yet has activated this provision under The Young Offenders Act. I am pleased that the member for Menihek is now on side and now appreciates the socially progressive nature of the establishment of this Board.

Now, with the resignation of the Chairman, we will be filling that position very, very soon. But in the meantime, in order to get on with the considerable "number" of people who can take advantage of this extra socially sensitive Board to help young offenders, so they just do not have to go through the morass of a legal system and where their families and their social context is taken into consideration, we have appointed one of the people as interim chairman or temporary chairman so that the work of the Board can continue while they are waiting for the third person. And it just so happens that that interim chairperson is a person from the West Coast who has been appointed to act in the chairman's position, so that we can get on with the work of the Board.

Now I do not know how much it would cost to do what the member for Menihek says, but I am sure, once the Board is up and running, they will try to get around the Province to hear some of these and not just do it all out of St. John's. So that part of the hon. member's question I will take as notice and try to get the information. Because I think it is their intention that if there are a number on the West Coast or in Labrador who have to appear before that Board there should not be any problem, that they will try to ensure that the Board does travel around the Province, which therefore allows for that kind of openness and that kind of

geographic sensitivity to come into play. I will take that under notice from the hon. member.

I thank him for complimenting the government on the establishment of this Board, now, realizing the value that it has to the young people of this Province. I will undertake to get the additional information. But I can say to him now, in a general way, that we will leave no stone unturned to try to ensure that the people who have to appear before that Board, either the young offenders themselves or their parents and other people, that we will try to move around the Province as much as we can.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek, a supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:
My supplementary is, of course, what we were told by the Minister of Social Services awhile back is not what we are hearing from the social workers in the field.

My question to the Premier is this: Since the parents of the individuals who came from the West Coast to have their hearings have already asked for funding from the Department of Social Services and have already been turned down for funding, how does it become more socially sensitive when the parents of the young offenders themselves have no means whatsoever to get to the Board itself in order to have the hearing? In other words, Mr. Speaker, the question I have is: This board is not working, it cannot possibly do the kind of circuits in any kind of time, and

therefore since the money is not coming to allow the parents there, would the Premier do the honourable thing, dismantle the Board and allow the judicial system to handle it, as it has for the last number of years, as it does in every other province of this country?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker. No way will we dismantle the Board. If there may be instances where a young offender and his parents are supposed to appear and there is a problem with the parents getting to the Board, wherever the Board happens to be sitting at that time, that is no reason to throw out the baby with the bath water. This is going to assist in a way, unlike the judicial system, in helping these young offenders. That, in my view, overrides. The objective of that Board, to have that kind of an outlet for young offenders, is far better than their appearing before a judge in a totally judicial situation.

Now, if there are particular cases where parents of a young offender have difficulty getting to the hearing, well, we will take a look at that. That is all. All the member has to do is give us those cases, case by case, name by name, and we will investigate it and try to eliminate any social stress that may be caused by transportation for that particular young offender.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

My final supplementary is that I am afraid the Premier is not too conversant with the Criminal Code. Otherwise he would realize -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

My question to the Premier is this: Does the Premier realize that this Board is only in interim Board in terms of making decisions, that every decision they made can be and could be reviewed by the local provincial court within about a ten day period of time? In other words, this does not extricate them from the judicial system. Does the Premier realize it does not extricate them from the judicial system? All it does is establish another intermediate, inconvenient step in the process of being reviewed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is foolish and stupid, Mr. Speaker, and does not deserve an answer.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). In view of the vast difference between the recent economic forecast by the Conference Board of Canada, which predicts an economic growth of 1.2 per cent for this Province for this fiscal year, and that of the

minister, who predicted an economic growth rate of between 2.4 per cent and 2.7 per cent, in view of the tremendous difference between these two sets of figures, 1.2 per cent of economic growth as predicted by the Conference Board of Canada, and 2.4 per cent taking the minister's lowest prediction, will the minister not admit that he has again made some large and glaring miscalculations and has therefore misrepresented the accurate financial and economic picture of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the proof of the pudding will be in the eating. I will stick by our projections. I might say that the Conference Board of Canada historically had not had a very good record themselves in making predictions. They tend to underestimate what is going on in Eastern Canada, especially in Newfoundland. They are far from the action here, and they use things that are going on nationally and extrapolate them for Newfoundland without actually looking at the situation in Newfoundland. For instance, they are not giving correct weight to what is going on in our pulp and paper industry, in our fishing industry and so on. It is really a Central Canada type of projecting that they are doing, and they really are not very accurate for down here. Anyway, we will see at the end of the year who is more correct, and I am not at all nervous about it.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the

member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Let me remind the minister that last year his predictions were 2.7 per cent for economic growth when in essence it was 1.9 per cent. The Conference Board of Canada was more accurate in its predictions than the minister last year. Now, Mr. Speaker, either the minister is right or the Conference Board is right. Both cannot be right, Mr. Speaker. So would the minister not admit that if the figures of the Conference Board are correct and that his figures are so grossly out of line with those of the Conference Board, that this will have a dramatic impact on the financial picture of this Province as given by him in his recent budget, that it will result in an increased deficit and increased unemployment in this Province since his figures are so much out of line than those predicted by the Conference Board of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I have to disappoint the hon. member. Last year we made a prediction - I do not remember the exact figure - as to what our expenditures would be. We came in almost on the nose. Even taking into account the hon. member's statement - and I am not quarrel with that - that there was difference at the end of the year in what the economic growth in the Province was, our expenditure total came in almost right on the nose and, as far as our revenue figures are concerned, they came in even better than we predicted, quite a bit better. I might even tell the hon. member that the full figures that have come in since

the budget was brought down - because hon. members will remember, of course, that the budget was brought down in early April or even before the beginning of April, so we had to make some projections for what happened in March since we did not have the full figures in - and I can tell the hon. member that our deficit for last year is less than what I said it was at budget time, because we have these more accurate figures.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Let me remind the minister, Mr. Speaker, what saved his neck last year and that of his government was the windfall money that they got from the federal government in transfer payments, monies that they knew nothing about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, would the minister not admit that if the Conference Board is correct he may be accused of cooking the books of this Province in order to paint a more favourable economic picture for the financial agencies and institutions with whom this government deals with financial transactions? Would the minister not admit this, and that he was attempting to misrepresent the economic picture of this Province to the people of this Province?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is just out on his own. I do not wish to boast in any way,

but I have in my hand here a document called Mandate put out by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, and it says, 'The good, the bad, and the ugly.' Who should be the top of the good in terms of budget but Newfoundland?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Manitoba, the NDP, is the ugly.

DR. COLLINS:
'They have handled their budget and their projections' and so on. So I do not have the lack of faith in the provincial budget that the hon. member has.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
My question is to the Premier. I wonder can the Premier tell the House if he has made any special representation to the federal government with a view to having Newfoundland's position with respect to the Canada - France fishery problem and dispute discussed with the President of France during his visit? I believe it starts today.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I thank the hon. member for Twillingate for his question. Over the last two or three months we have had extensive talks and discussions with the federal government. Those talks and discussions, really, I guess, can

be categorized in three ways. One, at the senior officials level, Intergovernmental Affairs and Fisheries from here, with External Affairs, Fisheries and the PMO in Ottawa. Secondly, at the ministerial level with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) here with his counterpart in Ottawa. Thirdly, with myself in ongoing talks with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie), the Minister of External Affairs (Mr. Clark), the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon), and the Prime Minister.

I am pleased to report that the presentations that we have made over the last six or eight weeks, the Minister of Fisheries and myself, with really almost a Cabinet Committee in Ottawa, made up of the External Affairs Minister, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, the Minister of Transport, and representatives of the Prime Minister's office, that this matter will be high on the agenda for the Prime Minister in his meetings with the President of France, and that the position that Canada will be taking is one that we have put forward to them.

MR. W. CARTER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Twillingate, a supplementary.

MR. W. CARTER:
My supplementary is to the Minister of Fisheries. I wonder can the minister tell the House if he is in the process now of monitoring the possible affect on some of our fish processing plants that the reduction in the offshore quota, the 10,000 metric ton reduction will have on the traditional offshore plants in

terms of employment this year?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, we are always continuously monitoring the affect of fisheries management policies on the plants, in this case the offshore plants. We will also be interested to see, as a result of sharing the effort over the three major zones, 2J+3K+L, whether or not that will have a beneficial effect on the inshore as well. So the answer, Mr. Speaker, is that we are monitoring very, very carefully both the inshore and the offshore as a result of the 1987 management plan.

MR. W. CARTER:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
I thank the minister for his answer, but it appears that it will have some effect. I am told that in the plant in Burgeo, Mr. Speaker, there will be approximately twenty trips less this year by virtue of that reduction in quota. My question to the minister then, Mr. Speaker, is that in view of the fact that this will have some affect - and obviously it must a 10,000 ton reduction - has the minister given any thought to encouraging more activity, for example, in the 2GH area? Will some of the deep-sea, ice re-inforced vessels be harvesting fish in that area? And if not, Mr. Speaker, why not?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker obviously, categorically yes. If there is a reduction in the amount of offshore fish available to the offshore companies, then it has to have an impact on processing plants that these companies are operating. The hon. gentleman mentioned a good case in point, National Sea Farms, the operation in Burgeo. The fact of the matter is that National Sea Farms leaves several thousand tons of good fish in the water each year, some in 2J and some in 2GH, and they have a lot of turbot, in particular, that they are not landing and they can very well land it because it has a good price. There is a good market for it.

MR. W. CARTER:

I am talking about cod.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I mean, you talk about the whole offshore operation, Mr. Speaker, and we are encouraging those companies to go further into 2GH and take the 2,000 tons of fish that is available there for Canadians, first of all, that those companies, and others in Newfoundland and in Atlantic Canada, have not seen fit to access in previous years. So if you did that, Mr. Speaker, and they harvested it totally, as they technically could do, you would actually have an increase in the amount of fish available to the offshore companies.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question also is to the Minister of Fisheries. I just want to have a short preamble. Two years ago we had a major crisis develop in Newfoundland because of the failure of the inshore cod fishery and because of the poor market with Japan for caplin. This year all indications is that the same thing is going to develop again, in 1987. I want to ask the minister very clearly is he aware of this? And has the minister done anything or had any negotiations with Japan or with the boys in Japan to overcome this problem?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I remain optimistic that there will be a very successful inshore fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador this year. It certainly is very early on in the season to become a prophet of doom and gloom and I do not intend to engage in that.

Secondly, the caplin producers, through their associations, are in negotiations with the Japanese. As a matter of fact I had a meeting only about forty-five minutes ago with the Caplin Producers Association, so the government and the department, Mr. Speaker, is on top of it. We are assisting in any way we can. We do not carry out the negotiations, obviously, but there are some things we can do and have done and will continue to do. Only about forty-five minutes ago I left that group.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
The minister may say very clearly that he is monitoring the situation, but let me tell the minister that the inshore fishery already is doom and gloom, because there have been many, many cod traps in the water for the last six weeks and to date they have not landed one cod fish. And the markets are bad, because in talking to all processors they say they cannot get any markets at all. So I would ask the minister, considering the fact that Japan has very heavy trade relations with Ottawa and with Canada, cannot we do something to secure at least a good market? And will the minister not see that that could possibly happen that we can secure a market from year to year instead of waiting until the markets fail and then we have to have hunger strikes?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, today is May 25, 1987, and the caplin have not landed yet. If the hon. gentleman knows anything about the inshore fishery at all he will appreciate that in terms of the cod trap fishery, if the fish does come to shore it comes ashore basically in conjunction with the caplin. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman also will know, if he wanted to check around the Province, that there are areas of the Province where there have been some excellent signs of fish already this year, spread over a half a

dozen or more areas of the Province, where landings have been unusually ahead of what they were this time last year.

So you cannot just make those blanket statements, Mr. Speaker. I have already said to the hon. gentleman that I, only just a few minutes ago, came from a meeting with the representatives of the caplin producers of this Province. We are aware of the positions that the Japanese are taking, and we stand ready, willing and able to assist in any way that the representatives of the industry would like us to assist them as those negotiations go forth.

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

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

MR. MORGAN:
He is wishing and hoping for a bad fishing season.

MR. EFFORD:
The man is back from Africa.

Let me tell the Minister of Fisheries that I do understand the inshore fishery, but the problem is not the supply of caplin, the problem is the market. Will the minister tell us how much the Japanese are going to buy less in 1987 than they did in 1986? If the minister has just finished negotiating he should be well aware of that.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
The hon. gentleman can try, but he will not get away with putting

words in my mouth. I did not say that negotiations are finished. I said negotiations have been ongoing and I just had a session with the representatives of the industry. Now let that be clear, that is what I said. I did not say negotiations are finished.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there have been better landings and better purchases in Iceland this year than there was last year. I would think that the amount of caplin taken by the Japanese will be similar to what they took last year, but might be a few thousand tons one way or another. What the price will be is still a matter of negotiations and the negotiations are going forth, Mr. Speaker, and any way that this Province and this department and this government can help, we will be there. Now let it be clear what I said, not what the hon. gentleman thinks I should say.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:
You know well that is wrong what you are saying.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is time for just a short question and answer.

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

MR. LONG:
My question is for the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) and it is in light of the remarks that she was making in the Legislature on Friday concerning the situation of family violence. In light of the acquittal of Ms Judy Ryan and the

public attention given to that case, especially in this City in the last couple of days, I want to ask the minister is the Interdepartmental Committee, of which she spoke in the House on Friday, considering putting in place any kind of public education programme, and is either your own department or the Women's Policy Office going to be given money to fund both a staff person or more than one staff person, and money to conduct a public education programme around the issues of family violence and especially the abuse of women and wives?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, that is a good question. The whole issue of public education on the subject of family violence is one that I, as Minister of Justice and Attorney General, am working on and, as I explained last week, one on which I have received very good, sound practical recommendations from a committee I have met with comprised of representatives of groups on domestic violence. One person I have been working on is a Crown Attorney who is on the Interdepartmental Committee on Family Violence, which is Chaired by the Associate Deputy Minister of Women's Policy, an official of my colleague, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), and I understand from those sources that the Interdepartmental Committee and the Social Services and Career Development Departments, which have mandates in the area of adult education in the one case and public education on family violence in another, are cooperatively looking at initiatives on educating the

public about the problems of domestic violence and about the services that are available to assist victims of domestic violence.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Petitions

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition here from 812 residents of Burgeo. It reads:

"To the hon. House of Assembly and Legislature Assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents of Burgeo humbly showeth that we forever pray that the government consider the Burgeo Action Committee's response to the discussion paper on commercial hunting and fishing camps in Newfoundland, and that the government enact the recommendations presented in said response."

The prayer of the petition is that: "One, big game licenses should be allocated to non-residents on the basis of the number of licenses left over after all residents have been given first change;

"Two, outfitter cabins for hunting big game should only be

established in areas too remote for resident hunters to get in;

"Three, outfitter operations should not be allowed to negatively affect public access to hunting and fishing in any way - example, buffer zones -;

"Four, outfitter operations for fishing should be established only on rivers where no resident anglers fish and on those rivers where agreements between outfitters and resident anglers can be reached as to the method and extent of the operation;

"Five, enact yearly salmon quotas of fifteen fish with tags, including one tag for large fish that could be used for grilse, no license or harvest quotas for rivers;

"Six, established private cottages should not be adversely affected in the future by government policies arising from the discussion paper;

"Seven, established outfitters operations should not adversely interfere with the processing of applications for remote cottages in areas where remote cottages existed before the outfitter operation was set up;

"Eight, co-operative camps should not be established in areas where private cottages are located;

"Nine, government should keep licenses and land fees for outfitters at a minimum so that the outfitter can be economically viable, based on the least number of paying clientele; and

"Your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray."

Mr. Speaker, this is a very grave concern of a lot of people in Newfoundland, while they realize the fact that it is not enacted in law. However, they know that when you see the discussion paper out, there is going to be some type of change in the regulations which are presently in effect. It was for this reason that the people of Burgeo formed this committee. As you can see, they are very concerned about the proposed action of the government concerning this discussion paper on commercial hunting and fishing.

To them it shows a lack of concern for the ordinary Newfoundlanders. Traditional fishing and hunting rights could be pushed aside. The major concerns of this discussion paper and report are resource management, land use, and tourism. Now, what about the ordinary Newfoundlanders? That is the thing that the action committee in Burgeo are concerned about. What about the ordinary Newfoundlanders, many of whom by hunting and fishing subsidize the cost of food on their tables, as their fathers did before them?

Is the government aware that without access there will be families hungry in Newfoundland, if this situation goes in? We could find ourselves in the position of our ancestors, many of whom came from the British Isles because of the fact that they were denied the right to fish and hunt and were actually arrested and deported for fishing and hunting in areas and lands owned by the aristocracy of England. This is the thing that the ordinary Newfoundlanders are now concerned about with this discussion paper which the government has out.

The fact that it is there and the

fact that the cutoff date is May 31 is one of the areas of concern. Ordinary Newfoundlanders were not given access to this. You can take out ads to publicize the creation of jobs, yet this affects the very heritage of Newfoundland and it was very quietly done in a discussion paper.

If a group of public-spirited citizens, like the people of Burgeo, had not gotten hold of it, there would have been very little feedback to the government concerning this. They could have went on and enacted this legislation which, if the recommendations of this report are accepted, could have meant a drastic situation for Newfoundlanders who enjoy the rights of fishing and hunting that they have traditionally used.

It is fine to increase the tourist potential of wildlife and there is nobody going to fight that. It is fine to protect the outfitters who must run a profitable and viable business in order to survive, but must it always be on the backs of the ordinary Newfoundlanders? This is what these people are concerned about, the ordinary Newfoundlanders who pay the taxes which this government is using to mismanage this resource in this particular case as far as those people are concerned and as far as I am concerned.

The prayer of this petition was drafted by ordinary Newfoundlanders who have a grave concern about hunting and fishing in Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

May I just finish, please?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. GILBERT:

They ask that the government accept and use the recommendations of the petition if they are going to incur any changes in the wildlife laws of Newfoundland.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a comment on the petition. I am sorry I was not here on Friday to deal with the question from my friend for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) which related to the same topic, I guess.

May I say, first of all, I have not seen the petition but I tried to listen to the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) as he presented it and I personally have no problem. I think it is an excellent, excellent response to the Green Paper.

Now, the only thing I do hope is that they have submitted that same response to the department as per the request in the discussion paper and what this whole process is all about. There is nothing wrong with the petition to the House, I guess, but the really appropriate place for it to go is to that committee and I hope that they have done that. He nods, so I am sure that they have.

I want to make just a couple of comments with respect to some misunderstandings, I think, that have developed, perhaps not misunderstandings, but perhaps not properly explained. I do not know. If there is criticism for that, I am prepared to take it. I have big enough shoulders for that.

However, the member mentioned that this Green Paper was not available to the ordinary Newfoundlander or the average Newfoundland. Well, I would hasten, Mr. Speaker, to point out that I tabled this Green Paper with a lengthy Ministerial Statement around the middle of March and therefore every member of this House of Assembly had a copy of this Green Paper two months ago. So, if hon. members had enough concern, I guess, about groups in their areas, then they should have made sure that those groups had copies of that Green Paper. In addition to that, I made public statements. We have had over 500 requests for Green Papers so somebody must have heard about it.

The other clarification I want to make is the member makes reference to, if the recommendations in this report are carried out. I have to tell him there are no recommendations in this report. That is precisely the reason why there is misunderstanding. It is a Green Paper. Over the last couple of years there have been discussions about how we can enhance the outfitting industry in this Province to make it more attractive and also to be able to employ more Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as guides, cooks and the like. I do not think anybody could see much wrong with that.

The Outfitting Associations had

made certain comments as to how it could be improved. The general public had made certain comments as to how it could be improved. Relevant departments like Tourism or Wildlife people had made certain comments as to how it might be improved. What we said and decided was, okay, 'We will take all these comments and we will put them in a discussion paper.' You will notice in some of them, the comments, in fact, are totally opposite to each other, some of the references in the Green Paper, if members read the Green Paper.

So it is simply a process whereby we took all suggestions that we received over a period of time, put them in a Green Paper, put it out to the public and let them have some input into the development of government policy, for which we think we should be commended, not criticized, because I think that is a healthy process. I have said myself personally as the lead department in this particular matter, and made it quite clear on the one issue with respect to restricting access to Newfoundlanders to the wilderness or outdoors, I want to say categorically that there is no intention on government's part to do that, none whatsoever.

I only hope that all of those that have taken the time and used the energy to publicly criticize the government and me or whatever over the last few weeks, in letters to the editor and all the rest of it, have also taken the time to refer those negative comments that they have or positive, we hope there might be some positive ones, to the Department of Forestry or my own office or somewhere else. It is fine to say it publicly, but what will happen is we will review

all of these opinions and responses in due course and try to develop a policy that will be fair and acceptable. But there is no intention, none whatsoever on that one issue, Mr. Speaker, of restricting access.

So I thank the member for presenting the petition. It will be referred to my department I suspect, but I also hope that he makes sure that it is sent to the department to go with all of the other responses that we are trying to encourage back to the department.

MR. GILBERT:

Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. SIMMS:

I would certainly be willing to entertain a question. It is up to the Speaker, I guess.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. GILBERT:

Now that we have presented the petition in the House, will the minister undertake to make sure that the committee and his department gets this statement now?

MR. SIMMS:

Sure.

Is my time up, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

MR. SIMMS:

Okay, I will do that. Sure.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome a chance to speak to this petition.

I wonder why the minister is going to be the spokesman. If he intends to be the spokesman that defends that discussion paper, I do not understand why because there is nothing relevant to his department in that discussion paper, Mr. Speaker, unless it is tied to his policy on remote cottages because there is an area in the discussion paper that talks about remote cottages. One could believe that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) would be the minister that would defend this discussion paper, if it needs any defense.

I would tell the minister now, the minister can stand up all he likes and say there is no recommendations in this Green Paper. There may not be any recommendations but the minister will admit and have to admit that the very people who authored this discussion paper, it may have written based on feedback that they were getting from outfitters,

MR. SIMMS:

And the public.

MR. FLIGHT:

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is very little input from the public.

I have read the paper, Mr. Speaker, and I have highlighted the concerns of Newfoundlanders and there are many. It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker. It is a discussions paper where every suggestion or every policy suggestion in that paper is protecting the rights of the outfitters, the present and potential. There is not a line in that discussion paper, Mr. Speaker, that in any way relates to the better interest or guarantees the interest of resident Newfoundlanders.

So, Mr. Speaker, the minister might as well know, if he is going to be the minister to defend this discussion paper, then he has a hot potato on his plate. Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for the minister to stand up and say that there were fifty-one members, so therefore fifty-one members had the Green Paper and they should have gotten them out to the general public. That is not the role of the M.H.A., Mr. Speaker, it is the role of the M.H.A. to read the paper.

MR. HISCOCK:

I have asked for thirty and I am still waiting.

MR. FLIGHT:

There are dozens of M.H.As in this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, who do not have in their constituency anyone that is concerned. There are no moose hunting lodges in Labrador, there are no buffer zones going to be created in Labrador. The White Paper does not tell us what buffer zones mean to exclude.

The minister is sitting there now watching for something to take out of context so he can stand up and make a point.

I ask the minister, if stands up, to tell us how many copies of that White Paper was distributed in this Province? How many representations were made on behalf?

MR. SIMMS:
By leave.

MR. FLIGHT:
No, not by leave. I am making my speech. The question is going in Hansard and the minister can answer when he reads Hansard, if he feels it is necessary to make a statement, because he is going to have to make a lot on this issue.

MR. SIMMS:
Over 500 went out.

MR. FLIGHT:
So, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Newfoundland, I would like to know how many - on the first printing, there was 50 White Papers, Mr. Speaker. Anybody who wanted a copy of that had to go to the printers. I had to go to the printers, Mr. Speaker, to get a copy of that paper. So that will tell you how widespread the White Paper was. Mr. Speaker, when one reads what is in that paper, it is no wonder the government was not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to make the White Paper or the discussion paper available to the general public of Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are recommendations -

MR. HISCOCK:
I asked for thirty.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
Let me finish or are you going to stand up and do it?

MR. HISCOCK:
No.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, there are recommendations in that White Paper that is frightening, worrisome and scary, Mr. Speaker. There are policy suggestions in that White Paper that talks about designating defined areas where residents will have no access, guaranteeing outfitters rights in areas that it has been traditional for the general public of Newfoundland or hunters and fishermen to have access.

Mr. Speaker, if this minister thinks that he will ever fly something in this Province that would deny Newfoundlanders their traditional historic rights to fish rivers or to hunt and fish in this Province, then he is out to lunch, Mr. Speaker. He should remember that this was tried and talked about in the 1960s and when the great Mr. Smallwood, with all of his power, Mr. Speaker, tried to float it and it was shot down as this is going to be shot down. The minister will find himself all over Newfoundland trying to defend this.

MR. SIMMS:
(Inaudible) shoot down.

MR. TULK:
Why did you put it out for then?

MR. FLIGHT:
What did you put it out for then, if you floated the balloon?

MR. TULK:

You thought you were going to get it by.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:
So, Mr. Speaker, the minister better be prepared. In closing, Mr. Speaker, the minister had better be prepared to defend this policy. It is indefensible. This policy and those policies is indefensible and will never wash in this Province.

MR. SIMMS:
Five million mistakes (inaudible), boy.

MR. SPEAKER:
Are there any further petitions?

MR. SIMMS:
You are deliberately trying to mislead the public.

MR. FLIGHT:
I am deliberately going to make sure that does not work.

MR. SIMMS:
Of course, (inaudible).

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from some 100 people from the great community of Bartletts Harbour on the Northwest Coast of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, that particular

petition comes from the district of St. Barbe where these 100 people are expressing their deep concern for the need for a new water system in the community. The concern arises, Mr. Speaker, from the fact that the source of water that currently is there, the existing water supply, is too close to the residential area of the community and has, therefore, become contaminated.

What these 100 petitioners would like to see, Mr. Speaker, as would I, is a plan to use an alternate supply of fresh water to provide the community residents and the community fish plant with a safe supply of drinking water which will also maintain the 40 seasonal jobs in the community and in the general area of Bartletts Harbour:

So, Mr. Speaker, we petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador with a view to seeking financial assistance and support necessary to undertake such a project to correct this water supply.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition reads quite simply: "We, the people of Bartletts Harbour, petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to install an adequate water supply for the needs of the community."

Now, Mr. Speaker, a lot of talk has been going around these days about the quality of fish and Bartletts Harbour is an area that has survived for a great number of years where a small fish plant has been operable there by Eric King Fisheries. There have been thirty to forty jobs, seasonal jobs but nonetheless important jobs, Mr. Speaker, in this area of high chronic unemployment. And we talk

about the quality of fish, and there are two things that come to mind in this particular area which is a branch off the main Viking Trail, West towards the coastline and the water line. Two things come to mind.

How can we establish and protect and indeed promote the quality of fish through this fish plant when we are using, (a) contaminated water, and (b) when we are trucking this fish over a gravel road, a road that is not paved and, in fact, is poorly maintained, Mr. Speaker.

I have raised in this House a number of times Premier Peckford's election promise to the people of this particular community, Bartletts Harbour. The Premier said in 1985, 'I promise to commit \$900,000 to paving this road this Summer.' Now that was in 1985, Mr. Speaker, that Summer past, no pavement; 1986 passed, that Summer past, no pavement; 1987, we are into the Summer. There is nothing on the drawing board. There is no money earmarked. We suspect there will be no pavement. All of which leads us, Mr. Speaker, in that great and historic part of this Province to question the credibility and, indeed, the honesty of this Premier.

If you are going to say something, if you are going to commit something, if you say it specifically and at a specific time, and in front of a specific group, there is no U-turning, no back tracking, no walking away from it because it is into the record, into their minds and into their hearts and they see, they saw, and they heard what this Premier said and did.

But he did absolutely nothing in

the aftermath, Mr. Speaker, nothing. Now we come before this General Assembly of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and we beg this government, for the sake of the people, the jobs, and the children in this community, to at least examine the potential and the possibility of a decent supply of drinking water so that we do not have to use contaminated water in the fish plant, so that people do not have to continue boiling their drinking water and putting meshes on their taps to weed out the impurities from this particular contaminated water and then boil it. This is a disgrace, an absolute disgrace.

We call upon the government to put in place the necessary funding to protect these forty jobs, to give a decent supply of drinking water to our people there, to the hundreds of petitioners on this particular document presented here in the Assembly, and more importantly to our children, Mr. Speaker because in this day and age it is absolutely unbelievable, unfair, despicable and just too ridiculous to talk about in this day and age to have young children being forced in their homes, in their own hometowns in this Province, to be drinking and dealing with contaminated water.

It is absolutely ludicrous, unforgivable and it demands that the government do what is just and morally right, forgetting all of the partisan politics, forgetting the games they played with municipal grants, forgetting the games that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) plays with pavement, forgetting all those games, place those games on hold and look at the children, Mr. Speaker, because that is what is important, the future of our

children.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. FUREY:
I conclude by calling upon this government to do the hon. thing, the just thing, and the morally correct thing, and put a decent supply of fresh drinking water in that great community of Bartletts Harbour to protect the jobs and enhance the futures of our children.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of the petition so ably presented by the member for St. Barbe. There is one thing, Mr. Speaker, for sure and certain, you can say about the member for St. Barbe, and that is that when he rises in his place to make a point on behalf of his constituents, there is not in this Legislature a person better able to communicate the feelings of his constituents and the problems that they have.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition that the people of Bartletts Harbour sent to the government, the approximately 100 people who have sent this petition. Of course, they are suffering from a problem that is found in many of our Newfoundland communities. That is contaminated water. We have a government over there, that I will return to a little later, that seems to do

very little to ease that contamination. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in many of our communities around the Province - and this is, I suspect, true in Bartletts Harbour - good drinking water which we have, as Newfoundlanders, by and large enjoyed for hundreds of years, ever since we settled here, is practically becoming a thing of the past.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that this government, when they see a small business, such as Eric King's Fisheries in Bartletts Harbour, a community fish plant, employing some thirty to forty people, it is amazing they cannot find a few dollars to put into seeing that that fish plant has the kind of water supply that it needs to put out a good quality product. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly complex in this Province to put out the kind of quality fish that is desired by the market place. There is a continual drive on for quality fish.

It is amazing that this government can, at the flash or blink of an eye, find \$13.9 million in taxpayers money to build a cucumber farm, a tomato farm, out in Mount Pearl, space-aged - and make no wonder the Speaker nods his head. He realizes what is happening. He realizes that communities in his district are suffering in the same way that the member for St. Barbe's district is suffering, from a poor water supply. Your district is suffering because the Premier gets hot flashes and decides that he has got to have a little bit of technology on the go to try and save his political skin.

MR. FUREY:

A tomato brainwave.

MR. TULK:

A tomato brainwave. That is a good way of putting it.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the district of Fogo this weekend, on Fogo Island, in Seldom, and I have to say to the government side of the House that the next thing now we expect to see, according to the people of Fogo Island and the people of Fogo district, is a pickle factory. We would not be surprised at all now if the Premier decided that he had to put out a few pickles. He would probably mix in a few tomatoes and try to make a Newfoundland recipe into pickles to be sold. If that happens, Mr. Speaker, it will have to come from the Mainland of Canada and it will have to be a big project inside St. John's, with probably some connection to Lougheed.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that the people of Bartletts Harbour, with this present government, have a contaminated water supply. If this government had its priorities in the right place, as suggested by its own Commission, the two point something million commission, the House Commission, they would see the Premier make it a top priority that the people of Bartletts Harbour had a good water supply so that that private enterprise, private entrepreneur, Eric King Fisheries -

AN HON. MEMBER:

A good man.

MR. TULK:

A good man, no doubt, indeed he is. I have met him myself. A good man.

MR. MORGAN:

A good man, oh yes.

MR. TULK:

The former Minister of Fisheries, never to be Minister of Fisheries again, knows that for a fact.

Mr. Speaker, my point is that if this government had its priorities right, instead of going out there - is there any estimate on the water supply in Bartletts Harbour. How much would it cost? It would probably cost \$500,000 or \$1 million.

MR. FUREY:

No, not that much.

MR. TULK:

Not that much. A quarter of a million dollars maybe. If it cost \$1 million and kept thirty-five to forty seasonal jobs in Bartletts Harbour, the Premier would be well advised to make a little bit of a guarantee to those people, rather than guaranteeing \$7.9 million to Mr. Sprung from Calgary so that he could come in here and set up the raw materials for pickles. He would be well advised to do that, if the government had its priorities right.

My friend for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) spoke about patronage. Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been enough said about this Premier and his desire to buy a few seats for some of his Tory members on the other side. We had a time in this Province, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, when if you got elected, you got a certain portion of the budget, depending on how many members on are the government side of the House. You could have got 1.45 or something of that nature. The Speaker will remember that era. I think it was somewhere around 1981-82 when that was the cry of the day, you divide

everything up between the Tory members. The Speaker remembers that. I am sure he remembers it in his own district of Terra Nova.

We live in a Province where our Premier professes to believe in equality but he has a queer definition of it. The Premier definition of equality is that all people are equal but some people are more equal than others. If you are in a Tory district you are supposed to be more equal than others. If you have some highfalutin technology, if you come from Calgary, then you are far more equal than a farmer in Lethbridge, you are far more equal than a young fellow who has hydroponic establishment down in the London Bargain Basement, and you are far more equal, of course, than if you are a person from rural Newfoundland, and in particular in this case, we are talking about the people of Bartletts Harbour.

Mr. Speaker, having said that along with the member for St. Barbe, and pointed out the need and the economic sense that it makes, to put this bit of infrastructure in place in Bartletts Harbour, to give those people a clean water supply so that they can develop a high quality fish and develop the resources that they are so used to developing and know so well how to develop, having pointed this out to the Premier - and the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) will agree with this - do not go wasting your money on cucumbers and tomatoes, do not go guaranteeing Mr. Sprung from Lougheed country, do not put the Province, as my friend for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) says, in a pickle, rather use the funds that

you have to develop a small based industry in Newfoundland, such as we find in Bartletts Harbour.

Mr. Speaker, having said those few words, I again want to say that I support the petition that was presented and I would urge the Premier and the government - where is the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), old pork barrel, he is not here, he has gone out, but I would ask the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) who is a good friend of the member for St. Barbe to continually remind, and perhaps indeed rise in his place and support it, to continually remind the Minister of Municipal Affairs that he can help save thirty-five to forty jobs for good rural Newfoundlanders in Bartletts Harbour by just giving them perhaps \$250,000. Yes, he should help his former campaign manager to do that. At least he owes him that one favour' and he owes the people of Bartletts Harbour that one favour.

So, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will stand up, a far more powerful member, of course than the member for Port au Port, that he himself will go to the Premier and see that this petition that those people have put in here for a very essential service, that he himself will intercede on behalf of these people and see that indeed they get the small amount of money that is required to see that they have a good supply of drinking water and they have a good water supply to put out a good quality fish, as they desire.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, just a very few words. We on this side of the House have no hesitation whatever in supporting any community which wants to improve its public services.

MR. TULK:

Throw out the money.

DR. COLLINS:

As the hon. member opposite says, money does come into it. I was interested, Mr. Speaker, in just counting the number of guarantees in the Local Authority Guarantee Act which Your Honour knows we pass in this House just about every year. In this one year alone there are how many? Twenty? No. Fifty? No. One hundred and fifty? No. Two hundred? No. There are two hundred and two guarantees to local authorities for water services and road services. That is an indication of the dedication this government has toward the local government in this Province, toward municipalities and so on. We are doing more for municipalities in this Province at the present time than was ever done in the history of this Province.

Now, it is not enough. I wish we had more and I am sure hon. members on both sides of the House wish that so. Many communities have justifiable demands that will only be met as time goes along. We really cannot do everything all at once, but we are doing our darndest to accommodate the requests that come in and I think we have made a very good shot at it. We certainly support the good people of Bartlett's Harbour in their desire to get better

services, and we will reach on it just as soon as is possible. Thank you.

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Order 3. Concurrence Motion. Social Services Committee.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

During the Department of Health estimates I presented the Minister of Health with twelve questions. I have been in my district attending several graduations and I only got back yesterday. But those twelve questions, if I am correct, have still not been answered by the minister or his officials. Under the rules of this House no department are allowed to have their estimates cleared when questions go unanswered. We can put them questions on the Order Paper and have them ignored, and we can ask them in the House of Assembly and have them brushed off with repetitious answers, and for that reason I gave the minister written questions well over a month. I am sure he should have the answers to them by now. We only have an hour and ten minutes left and I would say that if the Minister of Health does not answer these questions in order to have his estimates approved, then it is a breach of privilege in this House.

Some of the questions had to do

with ambulance services: One of the questions was, why has the government not introduced legislation governing minimum training levels for all ambulance personnel? Why has the government not implemented a training program at the community college level for example the Cabot Institute as is done in many other provinces? Why has the government not implemented a licensing board for ambulance personnel which requires satisfactory passing of certification exam before practicing as an ambulance attendant? We now have people driving ambulances who have no training, no certification whatsoever. Why has the government not introduced legislation requiring that every ambulance be manned by two ambulance personnel, a qualified attendant and driver? Why has the government not introduced legislation limiting the number of people allowed to travel in the ambulance with a patient? Often ambulances turn out to taxis, you have a single person in the back and several family members going along with them. The minister got up and said that three quarters of the patients are accompanied in the ambulance, they have people in the back. Many times, of course these people are family members.

Question number 5: Why has the government not introduced an adequate subsidy system for ambulance operators, especially those with private services? Why is there no direct government control over ambulance services with regard to capital expenditure?

7 (a): Is an ambulance service in Newfoundland required to have a Medical Director?

What I mean by that is the General

Hospital here have their ambulances and they have a Medical Director to whom each ambulance driver and attendant has to report - they have to fill out certain forms - which keeps the service at a high level and makes sure that mistakes do not occur. In all the other parts of our Province this is not the case, there is no Medical Director. For example, the Minister of Health used to be the Medical Director for St. John Ambulance.

St. John Ambulance just got another five year extension to teach first aid in this Province. The Red Cross also teaches first aid, yet the Minister of Health will not give them certification. If they were certified, then, of course, their courses would be acknowledged by any reputable institution. The Red Cross does provide first aid, but they are not recognized as being certified. Of course some people feel that because the Minister of Health used to be the Medical Director of the St. John Ambulance he gives preferential treatment to St. John Ambulance. He made the statement in this House, in the Committee, 'Let the Red Cross do what they are good at, disasters and blood donating, for example, and let St. John Ambulance handle first aid. Surely, Mr. Speaker, and members of this House, if there is one thing we need in this Province, it is more trained people. If we have more trained people, more people with first aid, then, of course, it would cut down on medical costs. If the Red Cross wants to be certified as first-aid instructors, I really see no reason why the Minister of Health should object.

7 (b): If not, then how can an ambulance service be ordered to

ensure that proper emergency care has been performed?

By having a Medical Director, the Medical Director is in charge of checking on expenditures, checking on the lists that come in, and overseeing ambulance operations.

7 (c): Is there a medical record, for example, a patient assessment form or an emergency run form that has to be completed by ambulance attendants when transporting a patient to a health care facility?

7 (d): What type of medical auditing, if any, is done by the Department of Health on ambulance services to ensure that patients have received the best treatment possible?

8 (a): With regard to total numbers of ambulance personnel currently in the emergency medical service, EMS system, what are the numbers and percentage of ambulance personnel at each of the various levels of training? For example, ambulance level one and ambulance level two, and emergency medical attendant, including only those who hold valid certification?

Again, the Minister of Health stated that there are over 500 people trained in this Province at various levels, but again he did not indicate how many of those certificates have now lapsed. If the Speaker does a course in first aid and then does not practice it, and does not reapply for certification, then he is no longer qualified because he did not go through recertification. So, we may have many people who have obtained first-aid certificates but who have not had them renewed.

8 (b) In order to monitor and

maintain current training levels, does the Department of Health have a list of all ambulance personnel, their level of training and the date recertification is due?

9 (a) How often and by whom are ambulances inspected to ensure that proper equipment is stocked and functioning properly?

This is a great problem, Mr. Speaker. Often patients with back injuries are transported to hospital without being placed on the type of board that is required by the Department of Health and that should be in all ambulances. You will find that people with neck problems are being transported without a neck collar. And there are X number of other examples.

Medical students at the Grace General Hospital did a survey on that type of thing and they were absolutely amazed at the number of patients coming to emergency without the very basic equipment being in place. The question is, who inspects these ambulances to make sure that the equipment is there and is being properly maintained? Is it possible that when a person is transported to hospital by ambulance the hospital takes their equipment and when the operators get back to their own areas they find out that they have left behind value equipment which they may need when transporting another patient?

9 (b) Who decides what type of equipment is required for an ambulance? Do these individuals have medical training? What type of training does an ambulance inspector have?

This is another thing. We have people inspecting ambulances just

as you would inspect an elevator. They have no training, they just check what is in the ambulance against what is on a list they have.

10 (a) Does the Department of Health require all ambulances to be radio equipped so that pertinent patient information can be transferred to a hospital by an incoming ambulance?

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that this would be automatically accepted. In life and death situations sick people are being transported in ambulances for as long as two and a half hours and the hospitals have no idea when they are coming or what is wrong with them so that the emergency ward set up. The majority of the ambulances in our Province do not have radios. As I said many times during the Estimates Committees, I was absolutely amazed that they did not have at least a radio on board.

10 (b) If not, how does the hospital know that the patient is being transported to the location and the severity of the illness or injury?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. HISCOCK:
By leave, Mr. Speaker? I have just two other questions to ask the Minister of Health.

Number 11: Of the total number of ambulance runs per year, how many did not have a qualified ambulance attendant in the back? Number twelve: What is the percentage of cardiac arrest victims brought to our hospitals alive and

successfully brought back?

These questions were given to the Minister of Health well over a month ago and I believe he should be tabling written responses to them. Because what we have now, Mr. Speaker, in our Province are ambulances which are, in actual fact, coffins on wheels. If the minister does not straighten up his department, then the situation can only get worse.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak on the estimates of the Social Sector, there are many concerns that one can put forward when we talk about the services that are provided under this sector and the many that are not provided. The problems that are there, I guess, stem from the fact that we have a government that is prepared to blame someone else for their ills rather than trying to set out to solve the problems that they were elected to solve.

I will just be brief this time, because I will be back again, I would say, many times before we finish with this sector. You take health, which is a serious concern. We have a budget which says there is no money for health, yet around this Province one of the most crying needs for health services is in the senior citizens sector of our population. I know that in the district that I

represent, in particular, the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, this is a very, very serious situation and one that is created because of the fact that there are no senior citizens homes from the area of Grand Bank to Port aux Basques, along the South Coast.

Now, previous to the last provincial election, there was a study done by Community Services which recommended that because of the area involved and because of the lack of senior citizens homes there, there was certainly a need for senior a citizens home in the Bay d'Espoir area of my district. A case study recommended that it be done as soon as possible.

Now, I have tabled in this House from time to time promises made by a member of the government in the last election, namely the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews), who was the member there previous to the 1985 election. As a member of government I would assume that the promises he made were a commitment of government. I have not gotten any response from this, but I feel that the Minister of Health should be aware that it was a promise that was made.

Now, government has taken the opportunity to say that they did not have any money, they do not have any money and there is a freeze on senior citizen's homes.

But we have a situation in that area of the Province where you have to move senior citizens from Bay d'Espoir to as far away as St. George's. I have had people in my district calling me about very serious problems with their relatives, mothers and fathers, people they just could not care for in their homes anymore and

whom they wanted to get admitted to a senior citizens home but the answer was, 'I am sorry! There is a waiting list!' People who were demented were being left in the care of relatives who were unable to provide the care that was needed but were reluctant to have their loved ones sent so far away from home that they would never get a chance to see them again. As I said, we have had cases in Bay d'Espoir where people had to be sent to St. George's or St. John's. I have had cases in the Western end of the district where we have had to take people from Burgeo and have them sent to nursing homes in the St. John's area.

Like everything else this government has undertaken, the density of senior citizens homes is on the Avalon Peninsula. It seems to me another example of this government's lack of caring for the people of rural Newfoundland, particularly, in this case, the South Coast of Newfoundland where there are no senior citizens homes anywhere along that South Coast.

In talking about the estimates of the Department of Health, it is a shame to see that our senior citizens are being left in such a condition, left to more or less fend for themselves, or left for their children to look after them, who, in most cases, are not able to provide the care that their parents need. It is sort of a blow against society, I think, a black mark on society, when senior citizens, after working all their lives, have reached the stage due to the aging process where they must have some type of care and we have a government which is unable to provide that care for them. This, to me, is a shame and it is

one of the things that should undoubtedly be a major point in any Department of Health. To stand up and blame the federal government for the lack of transfer payments, I think is a shame. I have even heard of examples where the federal government offered to provide funding in some districts and were turned down by the provincial government because they did not have the money to operate the homes once the federal government put them there.

Now, maybe the Minister of Health would like to comment on that. Because it is a crime against society to think that there was funding available for senior citizens homes - I understand the one in Bay d'Espoir comes under this category - but the provincial government refused to accept it on the excuse that they could not afford to operate them if they were there.

Now, I could understand, Mr. Speaker, if this had happened and there was not a demonstrated need for a senior citizens home in the area that the funding was made available to, but in this particular case, yes, there was a demonstrated need. The study had already been undertaken, the patients were there.

In this particular area that we are talking about, the Bay d'Espoir region of my district, the senior citizens are taken out of there which make visiting them an undue hardship for their relatives. Because of the terrible economic conditions that exist in that part of my district, where you have an unemployment rate of about 90 per cent and average incomes somewhere in the \$7,000 to \$7,500 range per annum

for a family of three or four, which is certainly way below the poverty level, to move senior citizens out of that area and take them hundreds of miles away gives them little chance to be in contact with their loved ones because they just cannot afford the money it takes to go to visit them and, therefore, they are cut off from everything and everyone they have known down through the years.

Before the Health budget is passed, I think there should indeed be recommendations and provision made to provide adequate care to the senior citizens of this Province. It is a shame to see such a blot on society, a black mark on society, to see a government that is unable to provide care for its senior citizens. To me it is a crime that government has failed in the purpose it was elected for, to provide social services to the people. It is great to come out with a budget which says, 'We blame the federal government', but this government has failed to provide the basic services to the people.

In the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, in Milltown, St. Alban's and Morrisville, that area of the district, there is a very serious problem and I am sure everybody is aware of it. As I just said, we are talking about an unemployment rate of 90 per cent. We have a system where Social Services are providing employment for a ten week period to get people away from social assistance and onto UIC to have them collect money from the federal government rather than the provincial, through welfare. Now, to me it is terrible that this government would develop and encourage and

foster a system where employment in an area is based on creating jobs for ten weeks to get people who are currently on social assistance off social assistance and onto the lowest kind of unemployment, in other words, they are taking families and making them exist on maybe less money than they would have been getting if they were on social assistance. To me again that is another example of a government that is bankrupt of ideas. Again, they can blame the federal government for the lack of transfer payments, but they were elected to provide initiative, which they have not done, and this is a serious problem.

Now, in the Department of Welfare there is very, very serious problem. In areas of high unemployment, and I can relate very quickly to the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir where we have, I suppose, the highest unemployment rate in the Province - the highest unemployment rate among youth anywhere in Newfoundland would be in the Bay d'Espoir area - we find -

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Well, just to finish, we are finding that single people who live in this area and who are living with their parents whose salaries are below the poverty line and who are just not able to exist, they are not getting any help from social services. I will conclude at this point and come back later on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few brief remarks on one of the topics raised by my colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, namely the need for more and probably better chronic care facilities in the Province, and I am thinking specifically of the Twillingate district where, of course, as the hon. minister knows, we do not have any such facility, a district that consists of about, I suppose, 10,000 or 12,000 people, a proportionate number of senior citizens, some of whom need chronic care facilities, yet, despite promises that have been made now in one or two elections and other commitments made by government, the district of Twillingate, as is the district of my hon. colleague here, Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, is without any such facility.

Now, last week I raised the matter in the House and I brought to the hon. minister's attention, Mr. Speaker, a recommendation that was contained in the Provincial Bed Study report and, of course, that recommendation had to do with the matter of chronic care facilities, and it also had something to do with respect to the Notre Dame Bay Memorial Hospital.

Now, in that bed study report it is recommended, Mr. Speaker, that the Twillingate Hospital and the Notre Dame Bay Memorial Hospital be downgraded, that the pediatric ward in that hospital be removed and that the intensive care facility be reduced to a two bed unit. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, I presume is being done in order to facilitate the rather

substantial number of senior citizens in the district who now require special chronic care.

It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that government chooses to solve of its financial problems on the backs of the aged, and on the backs of the chronically ill in this Province, and that is exactly what is happening. Let me remind the minister, Mr. Speaker, of some of the commitments that have been made down through the years with respect to the Twillingate district and the need for chronic care facilities.

At one point in time, Mr. Speaker, it was stated in this House that Twillingate was number three on a list within the Department of Health for the provision of chronic care facilities. We were number three at that time, behind an extension to the home in Bonavista and an extension to the Agnes Pratt Home here in St. John's. As we all know, last year these two, the Agnes Pratt Home and the home in Bonavista, received funds in order to extend, as promised, and then, of course, Twillingate became number one on the list. I do not have Hansard here now, but I am sure that the Minister of Health, who is an hon. person, will admit that such a commitment was made in this House. I recall in the last session putting the question to the hon. the minister, reminding him of the priority list that existed within his department on which Twillingate was number three, and again reminding him that now that the other two were accommodated would he confirm that - this was my question to him. I am reasonably accurate I think in the wording - 'Would he confirm now that Twillingate would be next in line for a chronic care

facility?' to which the minister replied that he had no reason to think that such was not the case. Of course, I very gladly and immediately forwarded that information on to the people in my district who have been spearheading the drive to have such a facility provided.

Then, of course, there was a little waffling on the minister's part subsequent to that question, and he was then, I think, pinning his hopes on the results of the provincial bed care study. Well, now, we all know what happened. I say to the minister now, Mr. Speaker, that in the Orsborn Royal Commission study into health costs and health care in the Province, a report and a study that I understand cost the Province probably in excess of \$3 million - that is the figure that is being reported - there was reference made to the need for such a facility in Twillingate district behind the other two that I have already mentioned, Bonavista and the Agnes Pratt. It would almost lead one to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the commissioning of the so-called provincial bed study was done in order to get government off the hook, because some of the recommendations contained in the provincial bed care study report are diametrically opposed to some of the recommendations contained in the Orsborn report. So the credibility of the latter, of the bed care study, Mr. Speaker, in my view at least, is very much in question.

Be that as it may, I am not here today to argue with the minister or the government as to the method employed by them in order to maybe get themselves off the hook when it comes to chronic care facilities and other health care

facilities in the Province, but the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that in Twillingate district, as in many other districts in this Province, there is a dire need for chronic care facilities. People in my district who reach the point where chronic care facilities or professional chronic care becomes a must, they have to go to Lewisporte, which, of course, is an hour's drive from Twillingate, or to Gander, which is an hour and a half's drive, or, worse still, maybe come all the way into the Avalon Peninsula, into St. John's.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that I feel it is a shame for an aged person or a couple in the declining years of their lives, many of whom are chronically ill, not to have the benefit of their loved ones close at hand. And that is exactly what is happening in my district, and it is exactly what is happening in many districts. Through no fault of their own and not because their sons or the daughters do not want them around, there comes a time when chronically ill people, aged people, cannot get the kind of care, the kind of medical attention, for example, at home that they require and have no choice but to admit themselves or have themselves admitted to a chronic care facility. My mother, who is a diabetic and has health problems, has been forced, for example, to take refuge in a chronic care home, and were it not for the fact that she is in that home, having good medical attention accessible, I doubt very much if she would be alive today. So, despite the tender loving care that is available in most cases at home for aged and chronically ill people, the time comes when they have no choice but to submit themselves to a chronic care

facility.

Now, in Twillingate, as I said, when that time comes they have no choice but to go to Lewisporte, an hour's drive away, or to Gander, an hour and a half's drive, or, worse still, to St. John's, which is a five hour drive. That is why I think it is nothing short of shameful that people in this Province, people who have given their lives almost, I suppose, working towards the development of this Province paying taxes, should be subjected to that kind of treatment by their government, especially when one considers, Mr. Speaker, that commitments have been made. Now, I know the minister will probably be rebutting, in speaking in this debate, say that no such commitment was made.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. W. CARTER:

May I have just a moment or two to conclude, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BAIRD:

By leave.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you.

I am in the process now of compiling a dossier of various letters and documents, commitments that have been made by the government going back to the time when chronic care facilities were administered by the Department of Social Services.

I had a call last Friday from the Chairman of the Chronic Care Committee in my district, Ernie Manuel, who called to

me how disappointed he is that the minister last week, in reply to my question, categorically stated that there would be no chronic care facility provided Twillingate district. That gentleman, Mr. Manuel, called me to say I should remind the minister that there is a consulting firm in this Province that was engaged by the Twillingate Chronic Care Home Committee - I presume with the full endorsement of the provincial government - to undertake certain work with respect to the provision of a chronic care home, and I am told that considerable work was done for which they have not been paid. With the approval of the Department of Social Services under whose auspices chronic care homes fell prior to their being taken over by the Department of Health, in the full knowledge of the Department of Social Services, aided and abetted by them, a piece of land in Twillingate was designated as a site for that facility and, as I said a moment ago, certain work was commissioned to be undertaken by a consulting firm to that end.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it has been clearly established and I shall, within the next few days, maybe, table in the House documents that will leave no doubt whatever in the minds of any member, or any of the government members, that the people of Twillingate were promised - I repeat were promised - a chronic care facility.

I now call upon the Minister of Health to make good on that promise and to come forward and state what his intentions are in that respect, given the fact that a promise was made. Now, I will ask the minister through you, Mr. Speaker, to give a further

undertaking, that if they see fit to ignore the commitment made and the need for a chronic care facility in Twillingate district, if that is the route they are going to take and it appears that is the one, that at least they should leave the Twillingate hospital alone; do not interfere with the hospital; do not downgrade it; do not remove the pediatric ward; do not, for example, interfere with the intensive care unit, because circumstances and governments change. With the polls the way they are and with certain things happening within the Liberal Party, we can be pretty sure that next time round there will be a change of government. If it is then my privilege to serve in this legislature on behalf of the people of Twillingate, as I think it will despite the burgers of Cottlesville, then I can tell you now that any government which I would be part of, or support would not allow that kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker, to continue.

All I ask is this: Let the minister make good on his government's commitment to the people of Twillingate. If not, let him give an undertaking that the Twillingate Hospital will not be interfered with, it will be allowed to stay as is. Because we all know that once an institution or a hospital or any government facility is downgraded and interfered with, especially a hospital, then it is awfully difficult to restore it to its former self. As I said, if he is not prepared to do the right thing and build a facility for chronically ill people, then leave the hospital alone and when the Liberal Party takes over in another six, eight or twelve months, then, I am sure, the good

people of Twillingate will get their just rewards, they will get a chronic care home, something to which they are fully entitled.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I must say I was impressed by many of the commendable and laudable statements that you made in your speech, because it encompasses the best of all of us in this world. Who could say that you were wrong in saying that there should be a chronic care institution in every community, where you would have that high level of care, and that you would cover the entire Island to meet the satisfaction and approval of all human beings?

MR. CALLAN:

What about every district?

DR. TWOMEY:

Every district? That is fifty-two chronic care nursing homes. I could not say no to that, and I doubt if there is anyone in the Department of Health, or anyone who had even a vestige of interest in social policy who would be critical of that statement.

It is strange to say that your cry is not an unusual cry or a plaintive one in many of the Parliaments of the world where a lot of attention is given to chronic care or where it is even considered. As I try and read on the subject matter from the various countries of the world, including the other provinces of our Nation, I find that all the Ministers of Health and all the governments, no matter what stripe, are facing this horrendous problem.

Recently there was a change of government in the Province of Quebec, and, as you know, they happen to be of your political stripe and your political philosophy, but still they are having these problems. I do not think that philosophy or stripe or anything else is going to change this picture overnight. It is a matter of how much can we afford for health care in all its aspects.

They is a very wealthy government in the Province of Alberta that had a 3 per cent reduction in its health care budget. This has caused them horrendous problems, because over the years they have been accustomed to milk and honey in the world of finance. They have been able to fund all their hospitals and all their institutions to the degree that it kept most people happy.

These are things that have happened. And you want to say that we, in this Province, should make a certain exception, when, at this present time, on the bed study - and I have a disagreement with you about the Royal Commission - my interpretation is, but I would have to look up the Royal Commission Report again, that I did not think it specified certain areas in the Province where chronic care institutions should not go. I thought it put emphasis on chronic care. When they wrote that report they said about 700 chronic care beds, at level 2 and 3, should be built. At this time the exact figure is 495 that have either been built or are in the process of being built. That is not a bad achievement. It might not please you, and it might not please everyone else, but we always have to make a start. If you look back in the history of this Province, twelve years ago I

do not believe they had chronic care, but they had senior citizen homes. Now it has happened because of changes in demography. And because of the remarkable change in the age of our senior citizens, we have to find not just shelter, but we have to find shelter where they can receive nursing services and medical services.

This year, I believe, we put in \$56.5 million, which is up \$5.5 million over last year's budget, into the chronic health care system. Governments, not alone us but I believe all over the First World, are trying to find ways and means with which they can care for our chronic care populations. They have devised various ways and means. None of them will meet the expectations of those who are socially active. When I say socially active, I mean those who focus into a particular subject matter, and say, 'We go on from here.' I think that this impossible.

The Royal Commission did recommend that more emphasis be put on home care and home support services. Then they went on from that; next to be developed, licensed boarding homes and, finally, chronic care centers, which we know as our chronic care homes or our institutional homes for the treatment of level 2 and 3. That has gone on.

I disagree with you again that I used or that government used or the Department of Health used their professional study, done by an independent group, to in any way change or modify the results of the Royal Commission on Health. If you go back in your memory, they made a recommendation; we had 355 excess

acute care beds and we needed to build about 700 chronic care beds.

They recommended - you can read your report, it is in black and white - that we appoint a special committee to do an investigation and to advise us in the Department of Health, knowing full well that if it were done by the Department of Health, since we have the expertise in the department, we would be accused of being partisan. That is being factual, because we would have been.

Now they have reported it and it causes somewhat a certain amount of discontent and disquietude. You feel the same, and I believe that you feel the same when you talk about Bay d'Espoir. But remember, when Canadian Mortgage and Housing offered us money to build chronic care, they only gave us money for shelter component, and the shelter component does not provide for the corridors that are necessary, for the wide doors that are necessary, the large kitchens that are necessary, the physiotherapy units that are necessary, the occupational therapy units that are a necessity, the examinations rooms for the patients that are a necessity, storage rooms for an institution that are a necessity, out-patient or day care units which are a necessity. I can tell you that the amount of money given for these shelters is not equivalent to 50 per cent of the cost.

Also the government, in its wisdom, or lack of wisdom as you would say, has said for the next three years there is a moratorium on the development of chronic care institution or any capital work programmes. We have followed that. We have to follow it. If you got up and you were talking

about any other department it does not really matter whether Fisheries or Municipal Affairs, you will say enough money has not been put into it, and you would be quite right. There is not enough money to clean up the environment. You are absolutely right. There is not enough put in recreation and youth. So anyone can have a cliché and they can fly a kite as high as possible and say, why are we not compensated in this particular field? Over the years I think we have done remarkably well in this Province. It is a personal judgment, but that personal judgment is supported by many. And I can go back over almost forty years in the health care system. And I have been very active both on the clinical side or the academic or the business side of medicine. I have known many people in the health care system, not alone in this Province but elsewhere, and I know that at the present time we receive quite a number of enquiries as to how we have handled our problem. And there are many people in the health care system who have been envious of our success in recent years.

Furthermore, you spoke about closing the Intensive Care Unit in Twillingate Hospital and closing the Pediatric Unit. I think it was last Friday that I rang you at your home and I gave you the assurance that nothing would be done without consultation. I will say it now publicly, and that is factual. I said it in the House and you can quote me from here to eternity. Whatever else has happened, I must say that I share your interest in health care the same as that of many other people on your side of the House as well as on this side of the House. We would like to be able to wave a

magic wand and say, 'Here is a Camelot of health care, here is a Camelot of all the social services that any country needs.' I would love to be able to support you in that. But I have to face reality, I have to face the dilemma of decision making. I cannot say when that will ever come, because I doubt if it will ever come in your time, should we ever change places. It will not come a hundred years hence, because the expectations of all people are going to get higher and higher every year. New discoveries are going to happen in health care, possibly new diagnoses. All these things are going to happen. Can we ever maintain an environment that is absolutely pure?

These are the questions that I will give you. These are the questions that you, in your own heart, will have to answer. These are the questions that everyone who has heard me speak on this subject matter will realize. We will never reach that epitome of excellence in our lifetime, no matter what government, no matter what social structure, no matter how much money is available.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. Minister's time has elapsed.

DR. TWOMEY:
Thank you.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
I just want a couple of minutes,

Mr. Speaker, to make reference to a few comments made by the Minister of Health. The minister stated, of course, something that we all know, that there is a moratorium on the provision of chronic care facilities, but regrettably, Mr. Speaker, there is no moratorium on aging and there is no moratorium on some of the illnesses that afflict the aged. Consequently, I do not know how the government, in conscience, can place a moratorium on chronic care facilities.

The Minister of Health, in referring to my earlier comments, outlined just how impossible it would be to provide such a facility in every single community in this Province. Then when I reminded him that I was not suggesting that every community be provided with a chronic care home, that maybe certain districts should be, the minister then said that it would not make sense, for example, to provide fifty-two such facilities around the Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, again I am not suggesting that there be such a facility provided to every provincial district. As we all know, in certain areas districts are more accessible than others and where there are major chronic care facilities that are, again, much more accessible to some districts and some people than they are to certain other districts.

Twillingate district, Mr. Speaker, geographically has not changed one iota since the government first made a commitment to provide a chronic care facility. Like I said, I will be tabling correspondence and documents hopefully before this session adjourns wherein it is promised by the Department of Social Services and by others, by the Premier and

by my predecessor in the area, the MHA, that such a facility would be provided.

Now, like I said a moment ago, when that promise was made there was a facility in Lewisporte and there was a facility in Gander and there was a facility in Grand Falls. However, there was a promise made to undertake the provision of a facility of that nature in Twillingate so that the situation is no different now than what it was when that commitment was made. Twillingate, like I said, geographically we are still in the same latitude and the same longitude that we were then, and I suspect we are going to stay that way.

I should remind the good doctor, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health, that there is a facility now being built that was not on that list of priorities at the time, namely, Botwood. Now I am not against the good people of Botwood and the senior citizens of Botwood being provided with a chronic care facility. Of course they need one and they should have one. I am glad the Minister of Health has seen fit to provide them with such a facility.

But we must not lose sight of the fact that there are people in other parts of Newfoundland who are equally deserving and equally need such a facility. That is what I meant a moment ago when I made my pitch for a chronic care facility for Twillingate district.

Before I take my seat, I want to thank the minister for his telephone call to my house last Friday. I can tell him now and I can tell the House, and I told him on the telephone, that I accept his word. I know the minister is

an honourable and a decent person. There is no man on the other side whose word I would accept before I would accept his.

But ministers come and go, Mr. Speaker, ministers change. While I have no great desire to see the hon. gentleman removed from that post prior to the next election, and then, of course, he and all of his colleagues will be removed, but until the people remove the government of which he is part, then I have no great or strong desire to see them removed. But, in the event he is moved, Mr. Speaker, then how well will that commitment stand up, the one he gave me last week to the effect that there would be consultation for example, before the Twillingate Hospital was downgraded? I take his word for it but, like I said, I hope that his predecessor will also live up to that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, again I state and I say that the people of Twillingate were promised a chronic care facility. We have letters to prove it. We have documents to prove it. Certain work was undertaken. Certain commitments were made by the Chronic Care Committee in Twillingate, and again I have to ask the minister and the government that he supports to make good on that commitment and to announce, hopefully before this session ends, that a chronic care facility will be provided in the Twillingate district.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The normal process I guess is back and forth, and since there is only twenty minutes or so left on the Social Services Estimates Concurrence Report I did want to take the opportunity for just a few minutes at least to address some interesting topics as it relates to my own constituency in Grand Falls and as it relates to all of those departments that are covered under the Social Services Estimates Committee.

I am referring to the Department of Social Services itself, the Department of Health, Education, Justice, Environment, and Career Development. In addition to that, I want to talk about some forestry-related issues for the benefit of my friend for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) to see if I cannot try to educate him a little more on the broad, broad issues that face the Department of Forestry, the department he tries to attack every day.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) talked about health-oriented issues so I want to just for a second commend my colleague, the Minister of Health (Dr. Thomey) for the excellent job he has done as the Minister of Health in this Province. I think he has a deserved reputation in the health care field, without a doubt a deserved, good reputation. At a time when decisions are very difficult to make, I think he has handled his position very, very well. I am delighted of course, as the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) so rightly points out, we have finally been able to obtain the necessary funding allocation, Mr. Speaker, to expand -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

- the Central Newfoundland Hospital, to carry out -

MR. FLIGHT:

No expansion, re-development.

MR. SIMMS:

No expansion he says, Mr. Speaker, no expansion. You are talking about a \$20.4 million expansion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) to give me the courtesy of trying to get out what I am trying to say because I am suffering from a cold and I cannot respond as quickly as I would like to today to him, but I do want to say what I say and I want to have time to say it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your protection.

Mr. Speaker, there is \$20.4 million now been approved and allocated for an expansion of the Central Newfoundland Hospital.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

More, in fact, more money, \$20.4 million for an expansion to the Central Newfoundland Hospital, and the new wing included in that, Mr. Speaker. That is more than the entire hospital facility cost, by the way, back in the sixties when it was built.

So the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), along with his many, many other responsibilities, has been good enough to push through and to argue and to lobby for, along with myself, this hospital expansion. So that is as it relates to the Department of Health.

As it relates to the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), I want to say how delighted I am with my colleague the minister for announcing the first year university programmes in that new reorganized vocational school system, the community college system, will be located in Grand Falls and Lewisporte in the coming September 1987, the first year university programmes. That, Mr. Speaker, will be a great asset to at least 150 young people, I suspect, who will be able to avail of this new opportunity brought in by this government under the new Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies. I am sure that that first year university programme will be expanded in time, given the financial resources that are required to undertake this. I think people opposite and people on this side are going to see a lot of big improvements to that community college programme as time goes on. It cannot all be done overnight, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure everybody is aware of that.

Mr. Speaker, under the Department of Justice, of course there has been a fair hue and cry from the legal profession in particular but certainly from the public generally in Grand Falls for some new court facilities.

MR. BAIRD:

For where?

MR. SIMMS:
For Grand Falls.

MR. BAIRD:
We need some in Corner Brook.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, there has been some concern that this may not proceed, but I am confident that something is going to develop in the very near future that will provide these long and much needed facilities. I know the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), who is a former town councilor of Grand Falls, should be strongly supportive and looking forward to this.

MR. GILBERT:
(Inaudible) jobs down in Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMS:
Well, it might, you never know. The offshoot spinoff from a court house facility in Grand Falls, you never know what it might do for Bay d'Espoir.

MR. TULK:
(Inaudible) Tory districts.

MR. SIMMS:
It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker., it really is very, very difficult.

So that is as it applies to the Department of Justice.

Now, I was just going to touch briefly on two other issues.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:
Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
I was going to touch briefly on two issues, I have not got a lot of time because we only get ten minutes to speak but one is the Green Paper under the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth which is involved with that particular project. I want to say again for the benefit of those who might be listening and those who might want to listen. Now, I know there are some who are not listening and some who do not want to listen, but as it applies to that Green Paper on the outfitting industry, I want to say categorically again there is no intention on the government's part to restrict access by Newfoundlanders into the outdoors.

The Green Paper was developed as a result of a number of comments from the general public, outfitting industries, departments involved, tourism and wildlife and they were all combined and put into a discussion paper. We put all of their suggestions in the paper, no matter what they are and how extreme they were, and put it out to the public to give the public an opportunity to have some input into the development of public policy.

I think that is a good idea, by the way. I much prefer to do it that way than to go ahead and bring in a policy without having communicated with the general public. So it gives them an opportunity. I only hope -

MR. TULK:
Now you are backtracking.

MR. SIMMS:
No, no. I am not. I will get to that quickly.

MR. FUREY:
(Inaudible) fenitrothion.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
Yes. I will get to that quickly.
Just a second.

MR. FUREY:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
Would you give me a second please,
Mr. Speaker. Perhaps they will
give me leave, you never know.

MR. TULK:
Not a chance.

MR. SIMMS:
Anyway, on the Green Paper what I
want to do is to make sure that
those people who are out there
condemning the government,
criticizing the minister and all
the rest of it, I hope they put
all of those energies into all of
the right area and that is send in
their comments to the department
because that is what is extremely
important. We need to have the
responses and the comments to
those suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, very quickly on the
spray programme with respect to
fenitrothion, I think the member
for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) was
asking about the communication
with respect to the issue of
fenitrothion. Mr. Speaker, I am
delighted to say, in fact, just
last week I was on the West Coast
and had a couple of speaking
engagements in Stephenville and
Corner Brook. I will be in
Central Newfoundland this week, in
the next couple of days. There
has been a fair bit of support for
the spray programme. The loggers
union have supported the spray

programme. The City of Corner
Brook have supported the spray
programme.

MR. FUREY:
Is there a Green Paper on that for
public input and all that?

MR. SIMMS:
On what?

MR. FUREY:
Fenitrothion.

MR. SIMMS:
A Green Paper on fenitrothion!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, I know the hon.
member for St. Barbe is only a new
member. He is a relatively new
member. You would not have a
Green Paper on fenitrothion. Why
would you have a Green Paper on
fenitrothion? Fenitrothion is
approved by the national
regulatory agency in Canada,
Agriculture Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order please!

MR. SIMMS:
Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we have been
getting a fair bit of support from
the city council, from the loggers
union, from the Newfoundland
Forest Protection Association, and
from others for the spray
programme. Unfortunately, you
have two or three environmental
groups or individuals, and I say
two or three, who because they are
so vociferous in their opposition
unfortunately get, I think, undue
media coverage. Certainly what
they have had to say is not

factual for the most part.

I can understand why they have concerns. But it seems to me, to be quite frank with you, that some of these environmentalists have a close association with the NDP Party, and the NDP Party, of course, is well known for its approaches to these matters. They want to incite riots. They want to get people as excited as they can and as nasty as they can and march all over the world. It is typical of the NDP approach.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

It has been suggested to me that a lot of these people are associated with NDP and NDP philosophy. That may or may not be, Mr. Speaker. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what it is.

MR. TULK:

It is a free country.

MR. SIMMS:

It is a free country, Mr. Speaker, but if people are going to get coverage by the media - I am surprised the member for Fogo would say that.

MR. TULK:

Why?

MR. SIMMS:

Because the member for Fogo tells me frequently that he does not think the NDP should get the kind of coverage that they get. He frequently tells me that.

MR. TULK:

I do?

MR. SIMMS:

Of course he does. Yes, he does. He will not admit it now in a public forum. Certainly the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Fury) thinks it.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the spray programme is a programme that will be undertaken despite the vocal objections of a few. There is one major reason for it, and that is to protect the forest resource of this Province, Mr. Speaker, for those 25,000 Newfoundlanders, families and so on, who earn their livelihood either directly or indirectly from the forest resource. We will do it, Mr. Speaker. At the same time, we will protect the environment. We will do it safely. All the scientific evidence indicates to us that it can be done safely, if it is applied properly in the proper dosages and all the rest of it. That is what we intend to do.

Unfortunately, as I said, some of the environmentalist groups, some of those, because they are so vociferous, pick up unwarranted and undue media support. But I have a feeling there is going to be a lot of support from a lot of other parts of the Province in the next couple of weeks, by the way.

I see Your Honour looking at his watch. I do not know if Your Honour is about to tell me my time is up. I thank Your Honour for giving me this ten minutes. Maybe we will get a chance a little later on to get back at it.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

While the minister is still in his seat, we have the word that he is not feeling well, and he may be forced to leave, I want to have a few comments on a subject that he is very much concerned about and dear to his heart and dear to the Minister of Transportation's (Mr. Dawe) heart, but certainly dear to my heart, Mr. Speaker. I want it in the record, and that is the Green Paper, the discussion paper, Mr. Speaker, relative to policies that may be considered to help the outfitting industry in Newfoundland reach its potential.

Mr. Speaker, I am the first person in Newfoundland who will agree that to the extent it can be done, to the extent that one can find policies that will help the Outfitters Association or the members of the Association to have a more viable business, to tap the potential of this Province, then I am one who will support such policies.

But, Mr. Speaker, let it be made clear in this House that one of the ways that I am not prepared to help the outfitters increase their business is to deny access by the general public to rivers and hunting areas that have been historically and traditionally their right to fish.

Mr. Speaker, if one reads the discussion paper, a paper initiated by this government, a paper, Mr. Speaker, in which all the ideas and all the policies and all the discussion items were written by the very people who one day will write the policy, who one day will write the legislation.

The minister can argue all he

wants, Mr. Speaker, that this discussion paper came as a result of input by the outfitters or input by the general public. I doubt very seriously and the minister will have a chance before this debate is over and before this policy or any policy is set with regards to outfitters, you will have a chance to table in this House the kind of input, how much input and where it came from. How many of the general public had a chance, Mr. Speaker, to have input into the policy or into the suggestions or the observations made in that Green Paper? Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the Green Paper, I could not find -

MR. DAWE:

(Inaudible) blank piece of paper and just make a comment. You could at least tell them what you would like them to comment on.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I spent the afternoon on the telephone after I read the Green Paper calling wildlife organizations, individuals whom I know would have been interested, any organization in Newfoundland representing people who would be concerned about their rights being trampled, I could not find a recipient of that discussion paper. I could not find in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, a part from the outfitters, I could not find a person who had received or was even aware of the Green Paper or the discussion paper. The Minister of Transportation sits there and says he does not send out blank papers. I would ask the Minister of Transportation, how many copies of the White Paper has he sent to his constituents? The silence is deafening, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Education (Mr.

Hearn) how many discussion papers did he send down to his constituents? And better still, Mr. Speaker, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) who has got two things, Mr. Speaker, he has a lot of constituents who will be very jealous and very upset of any move that will restrict their right to continue to fish and hunt in the areas they fished and hunted all their lives and a right they intend to pass on to their children and their children, how many copies of the White Paper?

MR. BAIRD:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

In answer to the question there from the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans, unlike the hon. member, I get out to my district every week and every chance I can. Not only do I send out the papers, I go out and discuss it with my constituents. I would suggest maybe the member should do the same thing.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would give the member a chance to put it on the record. How many copies of the Green Paper, how many conversations did he initiate in his district to get the public input and to find out how his constituents feel?

MR. BAIRD:

About 150, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

I will tell him that his constituents are literally frightened to death at the suggestions that are raised in that Green Paper, at the possibility.

MR. BAIRD:

What about your own constituents? They do not know who the member is in your district.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

I want to say to the minister that we are all in favour of improving the lot of the outfitters. If he can come up with policies, Mr. Speaker, that will improve delivering of the goods to the non-resident hunters and non-resident fishermen, make their hunting lodges more viable, employ more guides, and measures that would guarantee and sustain the big game population in their areas, we will do anything, Mr. Speaker. But, we will not ever, ever - even a discussion about this issue scares me - we will not, and the people of Newfoundland will never stand, never allow the outfitters of this Province, whether it is Newfoundland or Labrador, never allow them to prosper at the expense of the right of access to the ordinary people. Never will the people of Newfoundland give up their historic traditional birthright, the right to fish anywhere in Newfoundland they want to fish, irregardless of hunting lodges, irregardless of the wellheeled who have hunting lodges in remote areas, irregardless of the desire of outfitters to bring in non-resident hunters, never,

Mr. Speaker, will we permit in this Province a policy that restricts the rights of the people of Newfoundland to hunt and fish anywhere in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Today there was a petition presented in this House of Assembly, a petition, Mr. Speaker, that in a effect was opposing the recommendations or the suggestions made in the White Paper. I was reading one paragraph there, Mr. Speaker, number four, "outfitters operations for fishing should be established only on rivers where no resident anglers fish."

I say, Mr. Speaker, that irregardless of whether anglers fish it or not, whether a resident Newfoundlander ever saw the river, no outfitter should ever be given the right to set up a lodge, a fishing lodge in Newfoundland and be given exclusive rights. It does not matter, Mr. Speaker, where the river is, how remote, how difficult it is to get to. No fishing lodge in this Province should be permitted, should be given permission should be encouraged, should be allowed, if one of the conditions is exclusive rights and that applies to all the rivers in Labrador that the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) represents, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if one wanted to be mischievous, if I wanted as the member for Windsor - Buchans, to be mischievous and wanted to flood this House with petitions like this assembly have ever seen, all I would have to do tonight, Mr. Speaker, is make about twenty-five or thirty telephone calls and I could tie up this House from now until the last of June with petitions from St. John's to Port aux Basques, from St. Anthony to

Francois, from Cape Chidley to L'Anse-au-Loup, a petition from every community with 95 per cent of the people in every community signing the petition. The only people who would not sign would be the outfitters and the rich buddies of the government who have already sneaked in and established hunting lodges or fishing lodges on rivers. The member for Torngat Mountains should know that if we bring in a policy that gives exclusive fishing rights to an outfitter on a certain river, then the buddies of the ministers who have already sneaked in and got lodges in the best areas of Newfoundland will come under that blanket policy and the member will find out that he cannot fish very close to them. I am not interested in interjecting any names into this debate but we all know who we are talking about, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) there grinning he knows. He fishes at this buddies lodges all the time.

That is what will happen. It is the thin end of the wedge. That is what will happen, and if the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), as he carries a lot of sway in his caucus, he should tell the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands that he is not prepared to entertain, never mind policy, not even discuss, a discussion should not be held in this Province about restricting the rights of Newfoundlanders to access rivers or hunting areas that has been their traditional right. The discussion paper should be buried. There is not a word in that paper, Mr. Speaker - I wish I had my - I was not expecting this debate today, I wish I had my green paper where I have highlighted the lines that would scare the living wits out of

anyone who is jealous or is concerned about giving up another right.

There is not a line in that paper that has got the least consideration to the rights and the need to guarantee resident Newfoundlanders the right to continue to fish and hunt, their traditional and historic rights in Newfoundland, not a line in there. Every line there indicates that the Government of Newfoundland is concerned about the outfitting industry, it is concerned about its viability and it says in effect that they are prepared to look at options. One of the major options, the frightening one, is the right to limit access, is the right to give hunting lodge operators exclusive hunting and fishing rights in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, no government in this Province would ever survive if they tried it. I am going to watch the way the debate goes, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to watch for the policy as it comes down as a result of that paper. I will guarantee you that there will be petitions on this Table from the Minister of Transportation's district, and from the Minister of Health's district, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, from the minister who is sponsoring the programme, from the member for Grand Falls, from his district. I would guess that a petition circulated in Grand Falls against that discussion paper would have at least 99 -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:
Just a second to clue up, Mr.

Speaker. I would suspect that a petition circulated in Grand Falls demanding that the rights of Newfoundlanders to access rivers and hunting areas and opposing giving designated and defined fishing rights to outfitters, I would suspect the total population of Grand Falls would be on that petition.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the government continues this foolishness and pushes this policy paper, that is what is going to happen in this House. This House will be tied up for a month with petitions opposing it, and practically every Newfoundlander will sign those petitions.

DR. COLLINS:
Order 3.

MR. SPEAKER:
Is the House ready for the question?

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

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

MR. TULK:
The time for the Concurrence Debate has elapsed, I believe.

MR. SPEAKER:
The time for the debate has now elapsed.

MR. TULK:
Yes. All right.

On motion, Concurrence Motion, Social Services Committee, carried.

DR. COLLINS:
Order 3. Concurrence Motion. Government Services Committee.

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Government Services Committee consisted of the Departments of Municipal Affairs, Public Works, Labour, Finance, Transportation, and Consumer Affairs and Communications.

The Committee spent two sessions on Municipal Affairs for a total of six hours, two sessions on Public Works; one on Labour; on Transportation, the Committee spent two sessions; and one with Consumer Affairs and Communications, for a total of twenty-five hours in all.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of criticisms levelled at the Committee system, but I have to point out that even with only one committee meeting at a time, in this particular session, there was more time that could have been devoted to committees than was used. The committees this year were not well attended, particularly by members of the Opposition, nor by the press, the exception being The Evening Telegram who, I believe, covered all of the Government Services Committee, and I think covered the other committees as well.

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

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

member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman just made a statement that the committees were not well attended by the Opposition and the press. I can agree with him on the press, but I wonder if he would table statistics showing the members of the government side who are on the committee and the Opposition, how they are broken down.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:
Yes. Mr. Speaker, that would be very easy to do since the table has the list of the names that were there at each sitting of the House. While I do not have it at the present time, I can certainly tell the hon. member that the government members were there in full force.

I only mentioned that for one reason. As the member for Fogo knows, because he was in the House of Assembly when the committees came in, these committees were decided upon by both sides of this House, the government side and the Opposition. They were agreed to by both sides.

MR. TULK:
On what kind of basis?

MR. HODDER:
On the basis that the House Leaders of both parties sat down and drew up a set of rules.

MR. TULK:

On a trial basis, as you well know.

MR. WARREN:

We had only one person against us. Steve Neary was the only one against us.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, as I recollect, it was passed by a vote in the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out one other thing, that when these committees were first set up, as the member for Fogo knows, because the member for Fogo was a compatriote of mine at that time, they were worthwhile. Members took part in them. When they were first set up, three committees used to meet at the same time. Later on it was two and now it is one. This has all been done by government at the request of the Opposition.

MR. TULK:

What?

MR. HODDER:

The fact that there was only one committee sitting at at time this year.

MR. WARREN:

But they do not even send their members.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, the early committee meetings were spirited. They were well attended. I personally, as a member, was on the first committee that was formed. I have sat on committees. I have only been Chairman of a committee for the past year and a half. I personally found that the Committee system worked very, very well. It was a chance for members to get detailed information from ministers that they normally could

not get in the House of Assembly. When a committee worked well, even if sometimes it was not as pressworthy, perhaps, as -

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible) a few grumbles from the press.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Perhaps it was not a pressworthy as the member for Fogo might like, but an informed Opposition member could certainly find out an awful lot with intelligent questioning about how the departments operated which could not be found throughout the confrontational type of system that we have here in the House of Assembly.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that these committees would work much better if members - usually this session the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) was always in his seat as one of the members of the Committee. One of the Oppostion members on the Committee - there were three - I do not think he turned up at all, not once, at a Committee hearing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who?

MR. HODDER:

The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland).

AN HON. MEMBER:

He had problems.

MR. HODDER:

Well, perhaps so.

Not only are members of the Committee allowed to attend these Committee hearings, all members of this House are allowed to attend

the Committee hearings. Now, if members want the press to cover them, and if members want proper type of press coverage, then I think members should come to those Committee meetings and attend them in a different way. One night during a Committee meeting a member of the House of Assembly stood up and said, 'There is nothing here. There is no press here. I am going home and I am not coming back any more.

MR. WARREN:
Who was that?

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
My still somewhat good, personal friend from Port au Port I have to remind him about the committees. He just said that one member said he was not going to attend and he is absolutely right. I do not waste my time dilly-dallying with the likes of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). If the press, which is a vital part of the parliamentary process are not in attendance, I am not going to have government members just waste my time and waste the time of this Legislature just to go over some absolute nonsense, to hear the minister come back with statements that he would not make if there was somebody around to report him but will make them in the dungeons of this building. I would remind the hon. gentleman about his days as a member of the Opposition when, if there was no press, the hon. gentleman - the member for Torngat Mountains is laughing to kill himself - would go right out of his skull because he did not

get an interview.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker, this is what is wrong with the committee system. The member for Fogo does not realize that if the Opposition attended he can ask whatever questions he wants of that minister, he can spend as much time as he wants asking questions of that minister, and if the Committees are worth covering, then the press will cover them.

Mr. Speaker, the member condemns himself with his point of order, because the attitude of the Opposition is the problem with the Committees. I think, Mr. Speaker, that members of this House of Assembly should realize that the committee system is here, it has been here for some six or seven years now, they worked well in the beginning and they can work well again. Mr. Speaker, whether the press is there or not, it is the Opposition's duty to question the spending estimates of this government.

MR. TULK:
Bring them back to the Legislature.

MR. HODDER:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will bring them back to the Legislature so that members can get up and spend ten or fifteen minutes shouting across the House at each other, when the committee system is designed so that members can, in a relaxed atmosphere, ask the proper questions and find out exactly

what is happening with the affairs of the Province. Whether the press is present or not, a member can and should ask as many -

MR. TULK:
(Inaudible) the word 'obligation'.

MR. HODDER:
I did not see any circumstances in the years that I have been on the Committees where ministers did not give answer. Ministers have always answered questions, whether the press was there or not. If a member asks a question and he thinks that something is wrong, certainly he has the right to bring it up in the concurrence debates, to bring it up in the House, and certainly members opposite have no difficulty in bringing issues to the forefront.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps when the Liberal leadership is over and all members are back in the House, we can look forward next year to a better Committee system than there was this year, where members had very few questions to ask and wanted to get home as fast as they could.

AN HON. MEMBER:
There is no leadership over there.

MR. TULK:
How about a new Chairman.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Do not mind him 'Jim'.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker, in our first Committee meeting we dealt with the estimates of the Department of Transportation. From questioning by members, it was revealed that the Department of Transportation

will be spending \$76.7 million on capital account this year for highway and bridge construction and rehabilitation of roads.

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

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

MR. TULK:
That is a very interesting department, the Department of Transportation. The gentleman just talked about getting answers to questions - the Opposition has an obligation to come in and get answers to questions. If the hon. gentleman will recall, the Committee asked for a list of road projects. The Minister of Transportation promised to supply this. I wonder will he undertake now, as Chairman of that distinguished Committee, to see that that road list is brought into this Legislature since it was not brought into the Committee. Do you see what I mean by a farce?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
There was no point of order.

MR. HODDER:
Not to the point of order, there is no point of order, but to the member's comments, which were out of order, I think that Committee spent six hours, in two sittings, while the minister explained to

members opposite that -

MR. TULK:

He promised to bring in the list.

MR. HODDER:

Yes, and the hon. members will get the list. You see, Mr. Speaker, it was pointed out to members very clearly over and over and over again in the Committee that different bids come in at different amounts and, if the minister wants to save as much money as possible, then the minister will call the contracts where he thinks he can get the lowest bid. Mr. Speaker, both hon. members are aware that sometimes there is major paving of the Trans-Canada Highway, say, in Central Newfoundland and that if the infrastructure is there for that particular paving and road building construction, then the bids will come in lower in that particular area. So, the minister is being very, very responsible this year in letting tenders. And, of course, the minister and the Department of Transportation cannot tell how much a contract will come in for, so he cannot give a complete list until he sees how much he can do with the money that is allotted.

And, Mr. Speaker, the minister over and over again promised members opposite that they would get the list, but it is not much sense to give them the list if the list is not complete. And the minister cannot tell if the list is going to be completed until he knows what the bids are, and as they come in he makes them known.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that came out when we discussed the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Transportation, it seems to me,

was that members opposite would like all the money to go to Opposition districts. Mr. Speaker, a district is a district, whether it is represented by the member for Menihek or the member for Port au Port.

MR. FLIGHT:

Where is Windsor - Buchans', Jim?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I do believe the member for Windsor - Buchans received funds for his district this year?

MR. PEACH:

\$1.4 million. Adjourn the debate until tomorrow.

MR. FLIGHT:

Adjourn the debate before you get yourself in trouble, Jim.

MR. HODDER:

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there was a statement made in this House that \$830,000 in municipal affairs funding was going into the district of Windsor - Buchans this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? What?

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the member for Port au Port that he not perpetrate the deceit perpetrated on this House by a minister when he made that statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. It is now six o'clock. I wonder will the hon. member adjourn the debate?

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 26, at 3:00 p.m.