



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 24

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

The House met at 2.00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

I wonder if I might be permitted to make a major announcement that affects my constituency and is of extreme importance to all Members of the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Is it your resignation?

MR. SIMMS:
No, it is not my resignation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce on behalf of the town, after a simultaneous press conference held in Grand Falls today, that the town of Grand Falls in conjunction with a number of promoters and a number of corporate sponsors will sponsor one of the biggest celebrations that Canada Day has ever seen on July 1.

In fact what will happen is that the Centennial Field in Grand Falls will become the site of the largest beach party ever to be held in Newfoundland. I make this announcement on the eve of Poppy Grimes' fortieth birthday, I might say, which will add more to the significance of this announcement. We will be bringing into the town the fabulous and famous Beach Boys on July 1. The town expects 30,000 to attend, a significant contribution to the economy, and I am told one of their first numbers will be dedicated to the Provincial Liberal Government, it will be their 1971 hit 'Wipeout.'

AN HON. MEMBER:
Are you singing?

MR. SIMMS:
I might be forced.

Statements by Ministers

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, the Province has carefully reviewed the final report of the independent review of the state of the Northern Cod Stock. As I indicated to this House on April 4 Government's initial inclination was that all twenty-nine recommendations of the Harris Report should be accepted in their entirety. It was our decision to await the views of the Newfoundland and Labrador Advisory Council on the final report before formulating a formal response.

Since then the Advisory Council has met to study the report and I am pleased to announce today that the Government has prepared its formal response to the Harris Report, taking into consideration the views of the Advisory Council. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Advisory Council to which I am referring is comprised of a broad cross section of various sector interest groups in the fishery and it concurs fully with the overall thrust of the findings of the report. I have communicated Government's response to the Hon. Bernard Valcourt, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, and I am now advising this hon. House that the Government has endorsed the recommendations of the Harris Panel Report. I am tabling a copy of a letter that I have written to Mr. Valcourt dated April 25 on this matter, as well as a copy of the Province's summary position on

each of the reports and recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to first thank the Minister for a copy of his statement and the accompanying letter sent to Mr. Valcourt on April 25, as well as a summary of the recommendations of the Harris Panel and the Provincial positions. I would just like to go on record today as saying to the Minister and particularly recommendation one dealing with the mortality rates, or mortality levels in the Northern Cod Stocks certainly has to be decreased. There is no one who could argue any differently and, of course, I would have been very surprised if the Provincial Government had not supported recommendation one.

On recommendation two, and the increase in the size of the spawning population, there is no question that certainly has to be accomplished. Tied into that I would say that the reports from the offshore trawlers and the skippers this year was that there were greater concentrations of spawning cod in the areas they fished this year, and my first reaction to that was that if there was more cod spawning then that is a very positive sign. But again, there is no question that the size of the spawning population must be increased. I guess what is most important about this as well, Mr. Speaker, is that there has to be a greater understanding developed about the old spawning routine of Northern cod and so on, as well as migration patterns et cetera.

Foreign overfishing: I echo the sentiments of the Provincial Government in that there is great disappointment that the Federal Government has not taken the foreign overfishing issue more seriously and looked at addressing it, because there is no question that if we take all kinds of conservation measures inside 200 that a lot of the work that we undertake to do will be sort of self-defeating if there is not some efforts made to eliminate foreign overfishing outside the 200 mile limit.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is too bad, Mr. Speaker. By leave.

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, in attempting to justify his new and most recent invasion into the taxpayers' pockets through the payroll tax, told this House and the people on many occasions that one of the reasons for introducing this new tax was to offset projected losses in revenue coming from the Federal Government in the form of transfer payments for post-secondary

education and health programs.

In view of the fact that only \$4 million of the \$15 million expected revenue from that payroll tax this year is projected to come from federal payroll sources, and in view of the fact that only \$6 million out of the projected \$25 million revenue next year is projected to come from federal payroll sources, would the Minister now confirm for this House that he has, in fact, been deceiving the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, that the people who are going to find the real sting of this tax, Mr. Speaker, are the business community of Newfoundland and Labrador, the taxpayers of Newfoundland and Labrador, to the tune of \$11 million this year and \$19 million next year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to correct the hon. Member. His figures are a bit jumbled there. The Federal Government, if it chooses to pay the tax, and I must remind hon. Members that the Federal Government, according to the Constitution under which we live does not have to pay taxes to Provincial Governments, nor do we to them, but they normally do and if they do, then we will collect the amount mentioned. But, in addition, the Federal Government also will be paying some of the tax burden that the companies bear, because they may deduct from their income the amount of the tax. That means they will be paying less corporate income tax, and it means the Federal Government will be foregoing

corporate income tax in addition, so there is considerably more money coming from that direction than the Member suggested.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for confirming that the people who will pay this tax will be Newfoundland based taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some very large community service groups, people, for example, like the CNIB, people like the Canadian Cancer Society, groups like the Canadian Red Cross, have payrolls in excess of \$300,000, will the Minister confirm that such community service groups will, in fact, be subject to this payroll tax?

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, everybody pays the tax. It falls like the rain from heaven, upon the just and the unjust. I might add too, Mr. Speaker, that many people do not like paying taxes and it is very difficult sometimes to perhaps even justify taxes in certain groups. For example, under the Retail Sales Tax, every day I get requests for exemptions; church groups, firemen, all kinds of groups want exemptions, and they have very good reason for being exempted. But if we exempt everybody with good reason, we get no tax. We need taxes to do other good works. The basic principle of taxation is that Government

taxes and Government distributes, and where the tax hurts, we try to do what we can to compensate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister has confirmed that community based organizations like the CNIB, the Canadian Red Cross, the Canadian Cancer Society and so on, those large organizations which have a payroll in excess of \$300,000 will in fact not be exempt from the tax, will the Minister not now confirm that in those cases this tax is in fact a tax on the sick and the blind and the disabled people of this Province, and as a result those organizations will therefore have to reduce the level of services they provide to their user groups by several hundred thousand dollars a year? Is that not what will happen, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, in order for an organization to reduce its services by several hundred thousand dollar - I would suggest at least \$300,000 would be several - that would have to be 1.5 per cent. So you have to multiple that by - what? - sixty-seven times to get a payroll. Sixty-seven times \$300,000 is about a \$20 million payroll, and neither of these organizations, Mr. Speaker, has a payroll that large.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, what the Minister is getting on with is very, very dangerous. He knows that the CNIB alone has a payroll of something around \$2.5 million, that the Canadian Red Cross would be in the same ballpark, and that the Canadian Cancer Society would be in the same ballpark. What I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is collectively will those community based service groups have to reduce the level of services they provide their clients by several hundred thousand dollars as a result of the Minister's incompetence and bungling?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Minister's incompetence and bungling nobody will have to pay any tax. The problem is not the Minister at all. The problem is with other problems. If a group has problems paying taxes, then they should discuss it with various people. Those organizations, for example, which get Government grants may very well find it to their advantage to discuss things with the appropriate Department; they might decide to downsize it a little bit, or they might decide to do some other things.

Already, Mr. Speaker, we have been holding discussions with some of these groups. I might add also, Mr. Speaker, just by way of background here to explain the situation, that next year, with the tremendous rise in interest rates we have experienced and the impact on the Federal Budget for this year and next year, the Federal Government is going to be coming after us again, assuming

interest rates continue at their high rate, for many millions of dollars more than they did last year. The situation is a very serious one with respect to the finances of this Province, and it is wrong, I think, for hon. Members opposite to try to disturb an appropriate tax.

MR. SIMMS:

Disturb a tax? The Minister is disturbed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is never wrong to question a Minister of Finance about taxation policy, Mr. Speaker, and taxation measures.

Now, let me ask the Minister this, Mr. Speaker. In the mumble jumble of the answers he has been giving in this House this afternoon, consistent with the same kind of answers over the last six weeks, will the Minister tell the House once and for all is he suggesting to those community base service groups, like the CNIB and the Red Cross and so on, that in order to meet his taxation projections he is advising them to downgrade their service to user clients in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador? Is that what the Minister is advising, or is he going to provide them with an offsetting grant to make up for the revenue he is going to swipe out of their pockets, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the

Member opposite is showing his concern. We, too, are concerned and we will be discussing these matters with the organizations concerned. I might add, Mr. Speaker, for all the crocodile tears shown opposite, I remember an organization in this city, namely the Hub, which came year after year to this crowd over there, these hon. Members opposite, looking for a grant to construct a building in order to do their work and they never gave them one copper to build the building.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is not true!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Fisheries. I wonder if the Minister will give the House the updated status on the plants formerly owned by the Universal Group of Companies?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the closing time for proposals was two o'clock yesterday. I understand the Canadian Saltfish Corporation was meeting this morning, reviewing what transpired, and I am hoping, certainly by tomorrow this time, to be able to report to the House the results of the tender call.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. Mary's
- The Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, the understanding we have is that the Saldfish Corporation met last night to assess the proposals, or bids, and the Minister has one of his key officials on that. I understand there are rumours at least, perhaps educated ones, saying that the bids were not what one would expect, and I ask the Minister, if that is the case, is he prepared to make sure these plants operate this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to react to rumours. I will give the House a full account tomorrow of what transpired. With respect to the last part of his question, the property in question is now owned by the Canadian Saldfish Corporation and I expect the decision as to what happens would rest in their hands. That is probably what they are meeting on this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. Mary's
- The Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, of the plants which were involved with the Universal Group of Companies, two plants, Belleoram and Riverhead, were not owned by the Saldfish Corporation and these plants tie in. I ask the Minister, has he made any attempt to ensure that these plants open this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. Member will be happy to learn that I visited his district ten days ago and met with the Fishermen's Committee and others in Riverhead and St. Mary's and discussed at length the two plants, the one in St. Mary's and Riverhead. I listened to what they had to say and was, as always, very impressed with the logic of their argument and so on, and I assured them, as I am assuring the hon. House today, that we will do all we can to get those plants reactivated. We cannot work miracles, but certainly we will give it a hard try.

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Forestry and Agriculture. Could the Minister confirm for the House that the soon-to-be-announced spray program for this year would be totally funded by the Provincial Government and have absolutely no funding by the paper companies involved?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

I thank the hon. Member for his question, Mr. Speaker.

No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot, with certainty, confirm for the House that the protection program will be totally funded by the Province.

MR. WOODFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Would the Minister confirm for the House that the main area for spraying this year would be primarily the Northern Peninsula area of the Province?

MR. FLIGHT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is so.

MR. WOODFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Would the Minister not confirm for the House that the main chemical to be used is this year's spray program will be the chemical fenitrothion?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, Mr. Speaker, I will not, at this point in time, confirm for the House that the main chemical is fenitrothion, or matacil or Bt. I can tell the Member that in due course, and fairly quickly now, he and the House of Assembly and the people of Newfoundland will know exactly what the plan of the Department of Forestry is with regard to a spray program for 1990.

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Education. Some four years ago, when the reorganization of the District Vocational School System in Newfoundland was being discussed, at the time I was Mayor of Carbonear and I lobbied long and hard to have that Avalon Community College Headquarters situated in Carbonear. Now, just a little over one year being elected as the MHA for the Carbonear District and, of course, representing the Town of Carbonear, my Government, Mr. Speaker, is considering moving these headquarters to Clarenville.

MR. TOBIN:

Shame! Shame!

MR. REID:

Even though I am a Member of the Government, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support such a move, and it is based on principle alone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

My philosophy, Mr. Speaker, has always been that if something is not broken, why try to fix it? Apparently, Mr. Speaker, from the number of -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is Question Period, and even though the hon. gentleman is allowed a preamble, I have given him a fair amount of liberty. I will ask the Member to get to his question.

MR. REID:

The question I have, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister and basically it is why are we moving from Carbonear, when most people in the area are saying the office in Carbonear is doing the job it was set up to do? I am also begging here, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister would consider all the presentations being made and, hopefully, the Minister will leave the Avalon Community Headquarters in Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the Member for his question. I do need a little time to answer, as it is a very involved question, a very important question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the deadline for submissions to the Department on the White Paper. I do not have a compilation of the number, but I am delighted to say we have received many submissions. I have quite a number here today to take a look at, and I will be reporting to the House on that in due course.

Overall, the reaction to the White Paper is very positive, and I am delighted with that. Most specifically to the question, there is general agreement in the submissions that we need to change

the boundaries of the colleges. Eastern was a relatively small institution which could not operate efficiently with three campuses only, so once we decided to expand the Eastern to include Carbonear and Placentia, then we had to consider the question of headquarters, and our choice, I would suggest, was to leave the headquarters for the new college in Burin, so it would then serve Burin, Clarendville, Bonavista, Carbonear and Placentia. That was one option we considered.

The second option was to close Burin and leave the headquarters in Carbonear as the headquarters, or to look at the possibility of putting it in a more central, logical location, and that was Clarendville. Now, let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that that decision was not made easily. It was a very difficult decision, but we as a Government believe it was the right decision. We will consider all the submissions later in the month, and the campuses will not be downgraded; the programs for students will be kept in these two campuses. We are considering only the headquarters, and in moving the headquarters, Mr. Speaker, we will be sensitive to the personnel needs of all the people involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of

Municipal and Provincial Affairs. Two years ago, the Provincial Special Anniversaries Committee were told in meetings with a delegation from Bristol, England, that a nine to ten year planning period was required to successfully develop a market in major international events. Now, in view of the fact that we are now assured seven years from the most historic event in Newfoundland history, the 500th. Anniversary of the discovery of Newfoundland and North America by John Cabot, can the Minister indicate his views, first of all, on the scope and potential of this celebration? Can the Minister indicate what progress has been made by his Department in the past year in planning for this event? And can he further indicate what initiatives, if any, have been undertaken by his Government with the Federal Government, the British Government and the Italian Government to obtain a commitment in principle to participate in an international festival based in this Province to commemorate this Anniversary?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are very aware of the significance of the event. We have a Committee struck to look after this particular Anniversary and other anniversaries. I would question her point about timing, and why something was not started a long time ago is a very relevant one. If you want to go back to five or six years ago, you could question the previous Government as to why they, in fact, were not further along with the planning.

We do have a Committee ongoing, planning the event, and we will make sure that it is done on a Federal/Provincial basis, because this is certainly not just a Newfoundland celebration; it is very important nationally, and the Committee will be working with the people in Bristol, with the communities involved and, indeed, with the Federal Government to make sure the agreement that is put in place, and indeed the initiatives which are put in place in the various communities which might be involved, will speak to the significance of this event.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The planning for this event, as the Minister knows, started in 1987, and there were preliminary contacts made by the previous Government. To the best of my knowledge, and I would like the Minister to confirm this, the Committee, in fact, lay dormant for an entire year and it was only last week that any action was taken to reinstitute the Committee. I would like the Minister to also indicate if the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador intends to seriously capitalize on the tremendous tourism and economic development potential of this Anniversary. What resources have been allocated or will be allocated in this fiscal year for the planning of this event?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, we recognize the tourism potential of this particular event. My Department and the Department of Development and Tourism have had considerable discussions about it and its significance. We are now in negotiation and discussion with the Federal Government as well. We will be putting funding in place. Funding is in place now on an interim basis for the planning side of it, but there is no question that the cultural tourism development and potential of this particular project is significant and we are working on that now with a Federal/Provincial Agreement. Both Departments, the Department of Tourism and Development and my own Department, are actively consulting and talking about it. Indeed, the Committee has not been dormant; it has been very active and discussions have been taking place on an ongoing basis.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Is the Minister aware that groups in Cape Breton are already expressing interest and making plans to have the commemoration of the Cabot 500 based in Nova Scotia, and that preliminary contacts have already been made with some Federal Government agencies in this regard? And will the Minister undertake to give the planning and development of this important event immediate and serious attention in order to secure this Province's ownership of the celebration, and to maximize its potential as a major tourism generator and an event of international historic significance?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, without getting into matters of history and trying to talk about the history of both locations, and the claim of Cape Breton, if you like, I think, from the discussion I have had and my officials have had, it is quite clear that the Federal Government and its involvement will show a recognition of Newfoundland and Cabot's arrival here.

Mr. Speaker, we are very much aware of the importance of the timing of this event and the fact that planning has to be ongoing. That is why planning has been ongoing since we took Government. This is not a matter that has just started, as you suggested, last week. That is totally erroneous. We have had discussions. The Department of Development and Tourism and my own Department have been discussing this since we took office last year. It is not a new issue. We are very much on top of it, and the event will be well planned and well looked after at the time it takes place.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. In recent weeks, the Premier has had meetings with the Chairperson of the Friends for Pippy Park, and the Minister and the Premier have had representations from the Mayor

of the City of St. John's and others concerning the future of the Outer Ring Road. May I ask the hon. Minister if the Government has made any decision on the possible construction of the Outer Ring Road?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a weekly question, and the answer is still no.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the Government has been sitting on their hands now for well over a year on the proposed construction of the Outer Ring Road. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, has he received representation from his Caucus Members from St. John's concerning the construction of the Outer Ring Road? If so, what is their position on the construction of the Outer Ring Road?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

I have had presentations from many people, Mr. Speaker, including the Members for St. John's, and they are all taken into consideration. When the Government is ready to make a decision, I am sure their views will be reflected in it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I understand several Members of the Liberal Caucus, for St. John's, have made representation to the Minister against the construction of the Outer Ring Road. Is it true the Minister is giving serious consideration to a proposal written some time ago by the Member for Eagle River, to take the money for the Outer Ring Road and spend it in Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member will know the position of the Government when we take all the information and put it together. We will be making a recommendation pretty soon on it.

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. Of the nearly \$2.9 million in this year's Budget for the Employment Generation Program, could the Minister tell this House how much of that money is to complete projects which were announced last summer, and how much is actually for projects in this fiscal year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The money in the Budget this year

for the Employment Generation Program is money that was spent last year. Also, we will see the money again reflected in the next Budget. Now, the projects that were funded in this past fiscal year have to be funded in this fiscal year and in the next one, so the Budgets reflect that. There is no new monies in this Budget for the Employment Generation Program. However, there will be, from time to time, applications being considered and brought forth for consideration as we have people fall by the wayside in the program; a slippage, I believe, is the term that is used.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

A supplementary to the same Minister. I think the Premier might disagree with what she just said. Can the Minister also confirm that there were nearly \$9 million in requests for that particular program, that the money is now nearly all spent, and with only one month gone of this fiscal year, there will be no new positions created in that Department?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

As for the amount of money that has been requested and the number of applications that are in, I would have to double-check that, as the information I have here has not been updated for a couple of weeks. I have forgotten the other part of the question. Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MS COWAN:

There will be no new job creation programs under that particular Budget Heading.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In talking to officials of the Minister's Department, the officials inform me that there are a few dollars left in the program but now the jobs will only go in areas of new and innovative businesses. Is the Minister aware that this is a new stipulation that has been put into the Department, and has it been sent to potential applicants throughout the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Sorry, Mr. Speaker. It is not new, it was that way from the beginning. The money was going to go to new and expanding businesses.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MS COWAN:

Yes, new and expanding businesses. That was it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, will not the Minister confirm for the House, lest she be misleading the House unintentionally, perhaps, that up until now the program did fund

existing businesses? What the Member is saying is that there has been a new condition put on now saying that the balance of the funds will only be used to fund new and innovative businesses, and that existing businesses are therefore frozen out.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of - Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The Minister of -

MS COWAN:

There is nothing new in the -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I have not recognized the Minister. I am trying to get the attention of the House before I do that.

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

There have been no changes in the program. Expanding businesses - maybe it is better to put it this way, new or expanding businesses. Innovative: I am not familiar with that word. Innovative was not a word used in the criteria that was set down by Cabinet for the particular program. Now, what will happen when we have slippage and when we bring in new recommendations has yet to be determined. What we are looking at is whether or not we will concentrate in the areas of the highest unemployment in the Province, or whether we will take

them on a first-come first-served basis.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question period has expired.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the House, the Member for Grand Bank asked a question about the possible transfer of the NatSea vessel Cape Verde to Lunenburg, and he inquired as to what impact that might have on the St. John's plant. My Deputy Minister spoke with Mr. Murray Coolican of National Sea Products who confirmed that one of the St. John's wet fish vessels, the Cape Verde, will indeed be assigned to Lunenburg. This will leave St. John's with five wet fish trawlers. However, the freezer trawler Cape Adair will operate out of St. John's, thus still leaving St. John's with a total of six vessels. Mr. Coolican advised that the departure of the Cape Verde will not impact at all on the company's plans to maintain groundfish processing operations at St. John's to August 5, 1990. In reality, the company, even with the departure of the Cape Verde, will have adequate harvesting capacity to handle projected landings.

Last December, Mr. Speaker, the company announced that it would be tying up four vessels and redeploying other vessels amongst

various ports. In this process, Burgeo will end up with five trawlers, with a greater capability as compared to the previous four vessels based at Burgeo. I can provide the hon. Member with a copy of this, if needs be.

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Motion 7, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1978 With Respect To Offshore Petroleum Development," carried. (Bill No. 34).

On motion, Bill No. 34 read a first time, ordered read a second time, on tomorrow.

MR. BAKER:

Motion 8.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting A Reduction In The Newfoundland Offshore Area Corporate Income Tax," carried. (Bill No. 33).

On motion, Bill No. 33 read a first time, ordered read a second time, on tomorrow.

MR. BAKER:

Motion 10, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation (Newfoundland) Act and The Petroleum and Natural Gas Act," carried. (Bill No. 43).

On motion, Bill No. 43 read a first time, ordered read a second time, on tomorrow.

MR. BAKER:

Motion 11, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, the hon. the President of Treasury Board to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Repeal The Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman) Act." (Bill No. 42).

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Any discussion on the bill at first reading?

MR. SPEAKER:

Pardon?

MR. SIMMS:

Any discussion on the bill at first reading?

MR. SPEAKER:

It is not normally.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why not?

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Bill is supposed to go through three readings, is it not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

This is first reading of the Bill.

MR. SIMMS:

I am prepared to debate. I am ready to debate. I am wondering if Your Honour would like to check.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. Member will just give us a little time.

MR. SIMMS:
To check it? Okay.

MR. SPEAKER:
To check. It is not normal procedure.

MR. RIDEOUT:
It is like third reading. There is normally no debate, but you can debate in third reading.

MR. SIMMS:
There is normally none on third, but we have had it before, I remember.

MR. SPEAKER:
We will recess the House briefly.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:
The Opposition House Leader did not stand in the right place, but that is not relevant to the point. We will carry on. We were just reading, 'It is moved and seconded that the said Bill be now read a first time. Is it the pleasure of the House that the said Bill be now read a first time?' I think the appropriate place for him to have stood was at the last part, so we will carry on from where we were.

It is moved and seconded that the said Bill be now read a first time. Is it the pleasure of the House that the said Bill be now read a first time? All those in favour, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:
Carried.

MR. SIMMS:
Is this the point now, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:
No, the Clerk now reads the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:
This Bill has now been read a first time. When shall the said Bill be read a second time? Now? Tomorrow?

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to first reading of this particular Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:
Now, the Chair is ready to make a ruling.

MR. SIMMS:
Oh, I see. All I have done is allowed the Speaker an opportunity to make a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:
Under our own Standing Orders, Standing Order 56 says, 'When any Bill is presented by a member, in pursuance of an order of the House, the question, "That this

Bill be now read a first time," shall be decided without debate or amendment.'

MR. SIMMS:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I was not aware of that.

MR. SPEAKER:

I still have not taken the vote.

When shall this Bill be read a first time? Now? Tomorrow?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tomorrow.

MR. BAKER:

Order 3, Mr. Speaker, the Social Services Committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 3, the Social Services Committee.

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe I had one or two minutes left. Would somebody check that out for me?

MR. WARREN:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains on a point of privilege.

MR. WARREN:

I will not interrupt the hon. Member's time, but, Mr. Speaker, in Question Period yesterday I asked the Premier a question. I have a copy of Hansard from yesterday. The question I asked

the Premier was with respect to Sunday hunting. I said: "I think during the past weekend the Minister responsible for Wildlife indicated there would be a Sunday hunt."

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer back to what the Premier said, and I will read Volume XLI, No. 23, R9. The Premier said, "I heard what the Minister said at the time, and he said nothing at all like what the hon. Member just represented. My recollection is that he said the Government had received a number of representations to consider two or three possible alternatives, one of which is they could possibly consider Sunday hunting, another of which was no, they could prohibit hunting on one day a week, Sunday, another was a possible combination of it, and that in due course the whole matter would be considered."

Mr. Speaker, in The Gander Beacon the Minister is quoted as saying he will argue to have the Sunday hunting ban lifted. 'You have my commitment that I will argue this issue with Cabinet.'

Mr. Speaker, the Minister said that he had even prepared papers in favour of Sunday hunting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my only question to the Premier was, have Cabinet decided on Sunday hunting? The Premier came back and used three or four other alternatives. The Minister is quoted as saying in The Gander Beacon that he is in favour of Sunday hunting and he has prepared papers for Sunday hunting. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Premier misled this House yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House

Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was debating whether I would rise for a few minutes, because it is so obviously not a point of privilege. The Member is simply using or abusing the rules of the House to make his point, and he has made his point.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, what the Premier said was absolutely correct. These were the statements made to the press by the Minister concerned. Number two, he is referring to a report in a newspaper which may or may not be accurate. I know it happens to be The Gander Beacon, and I realize all newspapers sometimes are inaccurate, so it may or may not be inaccurate, but, Mr. Speaker, even if it were, Beauchesne, Paragraph 31, Subsection (3) "Statements made outside the House by a Member may not be used as the basis for a question of privilege." There is obviously no question of privilege here. There may be a dispute between Members as to what somebody said or what somebody meant by what they said, Mr. Speaker, but there is obviously no question of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, just briefly to the point of privilege raised by the Member for Torngat Mountains. I say to the Government House Leader that he is not going to get off that easily by trying to just simply dismiss it. I think the Member for Torngat Mountains has raised a serious matter and as

Your Honour knows it is not Your Honour's duty nor responsibility, I guess, to rule on the question of privilege but rather to rule whether or not the matter is of such importance as to allow debate to take place. In other words a prima facie case.

MR. BAKER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I listened intently to the Government House Leader and I would appreciate it if he did not interrupt me.

Mr. Speaker, he also gave one quote with respect to newspaper excerpts and the like, but I am sure if Your Honour, and I do not have a copy of Maingot with me, or the other parliamentary reference books that are often used in matters of this nature, or indeed I do not have the transcripts of the House of Commons, but I suspect and I believe, if Your Honour does a review of transcripts in the House of Commons, he will find that there have been indeed on occasions points of privileges approved, raised, and agreed to by the Speaker, which do in fact, or have in fact, reflected upon statements made by Members in the House contradictory to public statements they have made before.

In fact the Speaker has allowed the debate and ruled that the prima facie case has in fact occurred. I submit to Your Honour that there are a number of references that could be reviewed in this matter and rather than casually brush the allegation aside it would be wise, I believe, to read the transcript of Hansard, read the documentation that the hon. Member for Torngat Mountain

has and which I am sure he tabled, the newspaper extract and the rest of it, because I believe he is making a valid allegation of a breach of privilege. I would ask Your Honour to consider it seriously as opposed to what the Government House Leader suggested and that is to just dismiss it.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will take it under advisement and rule on it before the day is out.

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess I am speaking by leave now.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair was under the assumption that the Member for Torngat Mountains expressly stated that he did not want the (inaudible).

Two minutes.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not think there is any time allocation remaining.

MR. BAKER:

Ten and ten we said.

MR. SIMMS:

I think if the Member is the first to stand today he has ten minutes, as I understand it. Does he not? The clerks at the table or the Speaker could probably tell me. It is in concurrence debate so you get ten minutes and you can stand ten times if you wish. So if you are the first one recognized you have ten minutes. We might as well get it clear.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of Treasury Board we will check that, although I am inclined to agree with the Opposition House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When adjournment was carried out yesterday I was making some comments with regard to the precious speaker who happened to be the Member for St. John's East, I believe, concerning the necessity of this Government raising extra money, concerning statements we have made that there has been a cut in federal funding, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, we are talking in terms of \$25 million in this current year.

The claim was made by the Opposition that in fact there was no cut in spending, there was no cut in federal money coming to the Province, and I was arguing the point, Mr. Speaker, that depends on how you look at it. In absolute terms, in terms of the number of dollars and cents, there was in fact no cut, but in terms of providing the service there was a very real cut. Mr. Speaker, at the time I was making that point, and I took a few minutes to do so, Members opposite were making comments to the contrary, no cuts, there were no federal cuts. Well, Mr. Speaker, last night when I got home at about 10:00 o'clock or 10:30, it was a long day anyway, fairly late at night, and I, for a little relaxation, turned on the television set and it happened to be on the House of Commons channel.

I do not know why I would choose to watch debate in the House of Commons as a diversion from what happens here, but I did. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is quite coincidental that the Federal Minister of

Finance was in the process of speaking at the time. The hon. Michael Wilson was speaking in response to questions by the Opposition. It was a rerun of Question Period. And Michael Wilson several times made the point quite strongly that there is a Federal deficit and that in doing what he did with the established program financing, what he was doing was allowing, permitting the provinces to share their responsibility for that deficit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that he is the way he put it. He was allowing, giving them the great honour of sharing in solving his deficit problem.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You should thank him.

MR. BAKER:

Now the translation of that, Mr. Speaker, obviously is that what Michael Wilson did was in fact as he said last night transfer some of his debt responsibilities to the provinces. In other words he did not give them the amount of money that they were expecting to provide the same level of services that they have been providing for years, and especially during the last year. He was not providing them with enough money to pay for these services, and he was saying to the provinces and he said so quite clearly last night, if you want the same level of services then you are going to have to pay for them yourself and you are going to have to assume part of the Federal debt, you are going to have to go in the hole more in order to provide the same services in health and in education and in social services and so on.

Quite clearly this is what Michael

Wilson was saying. So I would say to my good friends opposite that perhaps if their position is there was no effective cut in funding to this Province then maybe they better talk to their buddy Michael Wilson to find out what he says about it. Because he is the one who is responsible for the Federal Budget. So, Mr. Speaker, there obviously was a tremendous affect on this Province as well as other provinces.

In Nova Scotia quite recently we have heard a lot about the cut or the downgrading of the established program funding for that province. And it has been the same all across Canada. So in actual fact we were faced with a very difficult task this year. Money we had assumed was coming to provide the same level of services did not come. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we did not find out about this until a couple of weeks before our hoped for Budget date, we had gone through the Budget process, we had plans made, we had figures in place, we had made decisions, and all of a sudden we get this thrown at us.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we did a tremendous job -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

- in coping. On very short notice we had another look at our spending programs, we made more cuts, raised a little bit of extra money to try to compensate for this downturn in the amount of money coming from the Federal Government. It should be added, Mr. Speaker, that at the time we were also notified that the amount of money coming from the equalization formula would be less

as well. So it was a double whammy.

Now the second one was nobody's fault. I mean there is an established formula that is applied and it is changed from month to month. It was nobody's fault except maybe our own in the last few years. So it is nobody's fault that we had a further cut of over \$20 million or a projected cut of over \$20 million in what we are expecting in terms of the equalization payments. So we had a fairly horrendous problem and I feel that we dealt with it rather well.

As I said when I was speaking previously the Budget process is a very interesting one. It is a long involved process and many decisions have to be made, some of them good and some of them bad. Anybody who is going to make decisions is going to have to make some decisions that are not good. The Government that makes only good decisions is not doing its job in this Province. So we made both kinds of decisions, Mr. Speaker. I feel we came down with a Budget that was fair and reasonable and equitable and it was the best job that could have been done under the circumstances. We did particularly well in the area of social services because we recognized there were people in our society who were relatively defenseless, who we could not ignore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we recognized the fact that the percentage of our budget in some other areas is down, we recognize that, but we had no other alternative. We have to first of all try to look out to the people in our society who are sick, the people who have extreme

difficulty looking out for themselves in these times. We did that and essentially what was left over we could put into other areas.

Mr. Speaker, the objectives that we set out when we became Government and our priorities have been put in place in this Budget under very difficult circumstances. I for one are very proud of what the Minister of Finance has put together here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to the House of Assembly today forty students from the Democracy Class from Swift Current All Grade School in the District of Bellevue, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Sydney Giles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. Mary's
- The Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

It must be a pleasure for them to be here to see the Member sitting in the Chair directing proceedings. And the teachers looking upon you handling your class the way they handle their classes in the various classrooms. I would think that teachers perhaps in the classroom have a much more ruly bunch than the Speaker has in trying to handle the unruly group here in the House of Assembly.

Having said that, I would like to get into making a few remarks on the estimates. There are two

bases I would like to look at, one dealing with the hearings a couple of nights ago when we had the Minister of Education under the firing line for a number of hours much to the chagrin of the Member for St. George's. Secondly, some remarks made a few days ago by the Member for Lewisporte.

First of all, I will deal with some of the points raised in the Estimates. One of the major concerns raised during the Estimates was the lack of money in the Budget this year for the transportation of children. Transportation costs as anybody who drives a car and has to pay insurance and so on and knows are escalating, yet the amount of money in the Budget for school transportation is much the same.

Now we can argue that we have a declining population and we do in our schools, but when we spread it over the total Province you are only losing a student or two per school. So consequently it has very little effect on the number of buses that you would have carrying our children to school. When the Minister was confronted with this, he basically said that the hard-nosed Minister of Finance, his colleague, had made it quite clear that there was going to be no extra funding this year and that the boards were going to have to live within their means, and that he was going to scrutinize very carefully the whole transportation system, and if possible he was going to rid it of any inefficiencies, even if it meant kicking out the small operators, the people out there who operate one or two or five or six busses, who make a living by it, who employ a number of people. It is the biggest industry in some of our smaller

towns running, operating and maintaining the school busses, but he is satisfied to throw all of that by the wayside to save a few paltry dollars and bring in some big outside firms, if they can save the Government a few dollars.

Now this is the gist of what the Minister of Education told us the other night. He seemed extremely concerned about it all, being the Minister who is very familiar with the school system, but, of course, he blamed the Minister of Finance whose bottom line was the dollar and he does not care who falls by the wayside as long as dollars are saved.

Yesterday in an interview I heard the Minister of Education reiterate those points and he talked about the number of inefficiencies, the extra costs. What he is saying basically is boards, school boards, and the business managers who are responsible for the transportation of children are extremely inefficient, that they are running an inefficient operation. They have buses going all over the place meeting each other half filled. And I would suggest to the Minister that if he did a thorough study he would find very, very few inefficiencies in the system because boards, knowing they have so little money, they operate a very, very tight ship. And I do not think the Minister did boards justice yesterday when he left the impression - and that is on record, it is on a tape that he did on a number of the radio stations - left the impression that boards were running a very inefficient ship and that there was a tremendous amount of money that can be saved by tightening up the transportation system.

The Member for Lewisporte a few days ago in speaking talked about all the tremendous work that the new Government had done in the field of education and he talked about the equalization program. The equalization program, as he well knows, was instituted by the former Government. It was instituted as a five year plan whereby boards were notified on many occasions that over the five years they would receive an amount to make up for the deficiencies in the school tax grants that they collect in certain areas. It was called the school tax equalization grant actually, and they were told that at the end of five years they would receive as much per pupil as the students in St. John's, a school boards area where they receive, because of the large school tax authority or the large amount of money collected by the school tax authority, they receive significantly more per pupil than they do in rural Newfoundland.

This became a big election issue, in fact, and I remember seeing a picture of the Premier in the newspaper at one time, when he was down speaking in Lewisporte where a lot of the pressures for equalization came from, I remember down speaking to a number of teachers one night, a tremendous night down there, in fact. And they were very high on equalization, and we agreed with them, of course, and brought in the program and had our five year plan and moved towards that aim, and they knew that we were going there. The Government came in and adopted a program that we had in place brought in \$10 million last year even though if they had researched you would have seen we would have agreed to go to full equalization. But \$10 million was quite good, and we thought that

this year when the budget came in they would go the full equalization, it is the fifth year. But low and behold they froze the amount at \$10 million.

They did not bring in full equalization despite the fact that the Premier went around the Province waving his arms as did many Ministers, decrying us for not bringing in full equalization immediately, even though the boards were fully aware that it was a five year plan that was put in place. And in the Liberal propoganda that they circulated during the campaign: a Liberal Government will provide students with equal educational opportunities regardless of where they live in the Province. And over and over the Premier and the Members of his party talked about full and immediate full equalization. And they still have not moved in that direction, Mr. Speaker.

The grants to the school boards this year were increased by only four per cent which basically only offsets the amount of money lost by the boards in relation to the declining enrollments. So instead of keeping up with the cost of living, which four per cent would do, all things being equal, the boards find themselves with fewer dollars than they did. Now the argument might be they have fewer students and that is the case. But if you lose three or four students out of the school it does not take away from the operations of that school. The school, the plant must still be maintained. So the money spent on the plant, which is the operational grant, is not decreased because you lose three or four students out of your school, but you do lose dollars in relation to every student that you

lose. So consequently boards this year have been shafted. In fact the primary, elementary and secondary section of the Department of Education has been scuttled by the Government opposite. And the school trustees, of course, have said it, the NTA have said it, more mildly than they would have said it formerly, because they are embarrassed, the members of the Newfoundland Teachers Association are extremely embarrassed.

For three or four years led by two members who have political ambitions, they stressed the fact that the schools were being short-changed. Now when they see that they were getting a fair deal and that they were consulted in the planning and that together an overall plan for improving education in the Province was being put in place, with their assistance and their co-operation, they still thought that they would get a better deal because their leaders promised that they would get a better deal. Then they saw what it was all about, it was an election gimmick to get themselves elected and once they did they forgot about their friends in the teaching profession, and this year we see that section entirely scuttled. It was scuttled after the election when the Departments were amalgamated. When one of the most efficient educational people in the Province was scuttled as deputy minister; and a number of the other people in the Department were given the axe and now we see the post-secondary section which is top heavy being built up, money being poured into it and the other section which deals with the kids all around the Province is gradually being downgraded in relation to personnel, in relation to funding and especially in

relation to the funding that goes in the schools.

So perhaps the Minister should have a chat with his friend and colleague the Minister of Finance and really explain to him how important it is to put dollars where they count most, and that is into the foundation.

MS VERGE:
(Inaudible).

MR. HEARN:

I remember praising the Minister of Finance even before he came in, saying that perhaps the hope for Newfoundland if this Minister entered politics rested on his shoulders, because over the years he talked about rural Newfoundland building up a strong vibrant, rural economy. And now we see the people around him completely forgetting rural Newfoundland, suggesting to people that, in fact, not suggesting, forcing people to burn their boats, and to come in and live in the larger centres.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. HEARN:

The amalgamation process, the closure of fish plants, not helping people in need, all of these things completely wiping out rural Newfoundland.

MS VERGE:
No proposal to the Federal Government.

MR. HEARN:

Absolutely! No proposal at all to the Federal Government to help to any degree to keep rural Newfoundland alive, and this Minister must be completely frustrated. He in turn has

completely frustrated his colleagues by the way he has handled the finances of the Province and now he in turn must be completely frustrated by the way that they are zeroing in on building the old type of Newfoundland - industrialize or perish which the Liberals were known for. Of course, if people are foolish enough to support a Government like this, which they are not, because we have a strong vibrant workforce out in rural Newfoundland that now see that the people they elected have gone back to the old Liberal ways of industrialize or perish. They are going to make sure that the only people who perish around here are the people in the present Administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. HEARN:
I would just like in concluding, Mr. Speaker, to answer a question from the Member for Lewisporte when he talked about bringing the Minister of Education into his town, visiting his schools, he said, when was the last time a Minister went into the schools in Lewisporte and sat down and talked to the principal and students? And I will say to him when this Member was in power, not only in Lewisporte, but in Norris Arm and other schools in his District also.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, it has been almost one year since this Government came to power. It is amazing what has happened in one year. It is amazing how quickly time goes when you are having fun.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:
Over the past year, Mr. Speaker, we in education have reviewed many programs. We are planning for the 1990s. We are not looking to the 1950s, the 1940s, we are planning for the 1990s.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:
All of the reports that come out of the Department of Education from now on are going to be labelled towards 2000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:
Making an educational system that meets the needs of the twenty-first century, I can assure you that. Our Triple E Education Agenda, Equality, Excellence and Efficiency. That will be the theme of the papers which are going to come out of the Department of Education in the programs.

Greater equality of educational opportunity, not only between rural and urban Newfoundland, because not all the best schools are in the urban centres, there are some excellent schools in rural Newfoundland as well. But

greater equality of opportunity, greater equality for male and female, greater equality for the disadvantaged and the gifted and the creative students. Greater equality for Christians and non-Christians, that is what we mean by equality of educational opportunity for all, and that is the first theme.

Let me indicate what we have done already. In just one year, Mr. Speaker, this year, the education Budget overall was increased by about seven per cent. Last year - I do not remember the percentage - but even the Opposition praised the Government last year for what it did for capital, for school tax equalization, for grants - our first year. I will give you some figures in a minute about how much we put into Education last year and this year.

The total Budget this year was about 775 million, we add to that 775 million the 3.7 million we took from last year's Budget and spent on this coming year, when we knew we were going to have financial problems. Before, when we knew the Federal Government was cutting back, we scrounged every cent we could get from last year's Budget and there is 3.7 million added to the 50 million increase for this year in Education. They got a 7.4 per cent increase.

In Elementary and Secondary, we went from \$501 to \$534 million this year. Add the 3.7 million and we have an increase of 7.4 per cent in the Budget for Elementary and Secondary education this year, the same as for post-secondary, exactly the same, Mr. Speaker, so when our friends talk about what gets priority we want to ensure that the Elementary and Secondary schools get their due. These are

the basic years, in fact, Mr. Speaker, this Government is looking at the possibility of extending pre-school. We have to look at early childhood, child care and many other things over the next few years, we have to do better in these areas, so we had a pretty healthy increase.

Let me take school tax equalization, let me indicate what the former Government did. 1986-1987, they put 2 million in the school tax equalization, just listen, just listen now, 1987-1989, they went up a half million, 2.5 million in school tax equalization, and then, I must say that the next year they did better. In 1988-1989, they went from 2.5 million to 4.5, now that was a good increase, I must say, that was a pretty good increase, but just listen to what this Government did one month after it came to power.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Who was the Minister?

DR. WARREN:

Who was the Minister? Well I will let you decide who the Minister was. We went the first year, one month in power, we increased school tax equalization from 4.5, not to 6.5, not to even 8.5 but to \$10 million in the first year. We could have played politics and put it up to 6.5 and then 8.5 this year, but last year we needed a major input and we kept it at 10 million this year. We kept it at 10 million this year, what an increase!

You know when they were in power - the last year \$4.5 million for school tax equalization and we went to 10 million, in one year that is what we have done. Let us take Capital, let us take school

buildings. Rural Newfoundland were concerned about school buildings and libraries and laboratories. In one year we have increased the Capital Grant for Elementary and Secondary education from 20 million to 27 million last year and 27 million this year. Not enough but we are going to get more as we look into the 90's, we are going to get more, but I tell you we have made a tremendous start and I can assure you that our plans for the future ensure we will do even better. Student assistance, extra materials for instructional materials this year. Let me give the Opposition a little bit of news that they will not want to hear. They will not want to listen to this and I wish they would tell the trustees and Dr. Vokey this, tell Dr. Vokey and the trustees this simple fact: that this year we took \$2 million extra, over and above the regular grant for instructional materials, and we put it into new materials for teachers, computers, Newfoundland books. We could have given it to school boards, I suppose. We could have said to school boards, here is an extra \$2 million for your maintenance grants, but we decided as a priority of this Government that we should put \$2 million into instructional materials, books, and computers, and the reaction in this Province is just something else. I was at a meeting last night, and it was just fantastic - but the Opposition never mentions this.

I met principals last night and they said, thank you, this whole idea of light house schools with the latest in computers, hardware and software, is just a fantastic idea. New materials for teachers. By the way do you know which task force recommended that

instructional materials grants be categorical grants? The famous task force appointed by the former Government. They appointed Mr. Roebathan to head up a task force. There was another guy on it, Warren - and the first name was not that of my colleague and they recommended that we take a categorical amount of money, a categorical grant and put it into instructive materials, and that is what we did.

Let me give you a few other ideas of what we have done this year in the area of equalization. Perhaps I should come back to the student aid because I need to explain what we have done for student aid in the university for greater equalization. I need to talk about the decentralization of the university - I need to talk a little more about that. Let me stick with elementary and secondary education. Let me get to excellence, the second 'E', excellence. I am delighted with what the officials of the Department are doing in this area in curriculum development - tremendous initiatives, scholarships. Mr. Speaker, do you know we have gone, this year, from \$82,000 for scholarships - scholarships which were \$600 for the last twenty years - we have gone from a total of \$82,000 last year in scholarships to \$282,000 this year, a tremendous increase. We are going to give those students who deserve it more scholarship money. How many years were the Opposition there? How many years was the hon. Member for Humber East the Minister? How much did she increase the scholarships? Not one cent! And in one year we are going to more than double the scholarships. Tremendous!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

We have new programs, real programs for guidance and counselling, new programs for economic education, new programs for co-operative education. Excellence is a key part of our agenda for the 90s.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of special needs - let me be very serious about this area. I attended a conference last week where they talked about special needs students. We had people there from Ontario, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia - where they are going through a very difficult time right now - they are talking about laying off 400 teachers in Nova Scotia. At this conference they talked about special needs education and do you know what the Ontario representative said? She said, Mr. Minister, you are ahead of your time in this Province. What you are doing in special needs education is you are leading Canada. I am delighted with what we are doing and we are going to do more for special needs students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, we are going to do a lot more in Science and Math. I will tell the House later on what we are going to do with respect to the Crocker Report.

Now, I hope I have a minute left. I hope I have a minute or so to talk about efficiency. I must be straight with the House. I must be direct with everybody here. In these tough economic times we have to ensure we get the best value for every dollar we spend. I want

to be frank with the people of this Province. We are going to examine the bus system. We are going to look at the bus system because I have been told - the hon. Member for St. Mary's - The Capes did not quote me accurately, I might say - I have been told there are areas where you still have substantial duplication and triplication of busing. I want to examine that. We are going to examine the bus system to see if we get better scholar for the dollar and better value for the money. We are even going to examine the denominational system. Mr. Speaker, I know how sensitive this issue is. I can assure you I have studied the issue, I know the history of it, I know the importance of it to many Newfoundlanders, and I think I support many aspects, or some aspects of the system, but I feel, Mr. Speaker, we have to ensure that we eliminate some of the duplication that exists. We must promote interdenominational sharing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

And this Government will do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

We want to work with the churches. But I can assure you we are going to work on a plan for the 1990s that ensures instead of building two small schools in an area, we have sharing. Perhaps one denomination can build the elementary school for everybody and another denomination can build a high school. I am delighted that the people of McKays and St. Fintan's arrived at an agreement

where they are now going to share. We should share at the school board level. Share the consultants.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was done on Fogo Island first.

DR. WARREN:

Fogo Island, I am delighted you raised Fogo Island. I was a principal at Joe Batt's Arm and I look back with very fond memories on those years. And what a great group of people they are. They are ahead of their time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about Wabush?

DR. WARREN:

And Wabush. They are ahead of their time. There are five or six very good examples of sharing. But this Government is going to promote sharing throughout the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

Consultants at the school board level, busing - there is a lot of sharing being done now - sharing at the school district level, sharing at the school level. This Government is going to promote that in co-operation with the churches so that in these difficult financial times we get the best value possible for the dollars we spend.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave!

MR. WARREN:

By leave? One minute. Let him finish up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education, by leave!

DR. WARREN:

By leave?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

DR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a few more thoughts on post-secondary education. Mr. Speaker, I know how difficult it is for some students. I have worked with students over the past few years and those people that I have heard in other parts of Canada who said let post-secondary students pay their pay, I reject that most strongly.

Many post-secondary students - and I must tell you if I had not had some student aid I would have never gotten through university - many students in this Province need a little bit of funding to get started. Once they get started - away they go. So I am very supportive of a good student aid program. Part of the student aid program is Federal and we have tried to get the Federal Government to change the student loan portion of the student aid program. We are urging the Federal Government to do that. We have a person in our Department on a Federal Committee. I have written the Federal Ministers, I supported the students who

protested to improve the Federal student loan program. But we could not wait for them to do it. They have not changed the program since 1984. So what we said as a Government is we must do something ourselves. And this year we have increased the student grant portion of the student aid program by \$1.7 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

Five hundred thousand of that, I am delighted to say, will be given to students who are single parents, mostly females, single parents and people with dependents. I am delighted to announce that. And I am optimistic. The Minister of Finance is not here in his chair, but I am hoping that next year we can even do more for students and so on. The Minister of Finance I hope is listening to me, and next year we will increase that \$1.7 million substantially for students. Because we must give Newfoundlanders every chance to develop as individuals first of all, and then to be contributing members of our society so that this Province and this country will be better because Newfoundlanders will be well educated.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, this is what you would call delayed action. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I guess in speaking to these Estimates I may during my ten minutes touch some other Departments that may not be under the Social Services Estimates, but that is I think allowed in particular when I refer to wild life because wild life is a very social service issue.

AN HON. MEMBER:

In Social Service Estimates?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, in fact, when you talk about wildlife in Labrador, it is tied into social services, very much so.

Mr. Speaker, I just came back on Friday from my District, and I want to read, for the record, a notice -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Table it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

It will be tabled.

- a notice that is placed in public Buildings in my District. And I would think, with the policy of this new Government now, this notice may be placed in all public buildings throughout Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the top, it says, 'Notice': Please be advised that any person requesting social assistance must report any and all earnings, including' - now, Mr. Speaker, let us see what it includes: 'part-time work, selling wood.' Mr. Speaker, on many, many occasions, people in my District and in other Districts

throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, senior citizens are unable to go and get wood to keep their houses warm. And, many times, it could be relatives or anyone else who will go fifteen or twenty miles. As you remember, Mr Speaker, as do those of us from Labrador, in a lot of the communities, you have to go a long way from the community in order to get wood. And, Mr. Speaker, the guy comes back and the old senior citizen who cannot get the wood himself gives the guy ten dollars to help offset his gas, or something like that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this person has to report to Social Services that Uncle John or Grandfather John gave me ten dollars to help offset my gas. 'Monies from handicrafts and carvings; hearings done for pay, rental income boarding.' Now, Mr. Speaker, number six: This is going to affect about 80 per cent of the people in our Province. Do you know what number six says? Winnings from Bingo or any other games of chance such as Nevada tickets and lotteries.

Mr. Speaker, Social Services have sent a notice out to all of Newfoundland and Labrador that, you know, if you are on social services and you go to Bingo, if you spend twenty dollars for buying the cards and you win ten dollars, you have to report it tomorrow morning. And the person lost ten dollars, even though he won ten dollars, but he still has to report it. So, Mr. Speaker, let the word be out that the Department of Social Services now is going to the extreme, to the extreme altogether.

MR. SIMMS:

The next thing they will bring in the army.

MR. WARREN:

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering why the Minister of Social Services said he was hiring on an extra 60 staff.

MS DUFF:

Bingo cops.

MR. WARREN:

That is exactly right.

MR. SIMMS:

Bingo cops.

MR. WARREN:

That is right, Mr. Speaker. We now have new people hired in the public service called bingo cops. We have Bingo cops in our Province, Mr. Speaker.

Now, that is coming from the Minister of Social Services who, yesterday, got up in this House and said - How compassionate! - how they are looking after the people. Looking after the people by sending Bingo cops down to St. Mary's Hall or the Church Lads Brigade or the Parish Hall?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

You are not even in your seat you should not be shouting out!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Also, Mr. Speaker, it says here, 'income from the sale of furs and skins.' Now, that is fox skins, beaver skins, sealskins, anything like that. Now all of a sudden the people out in those remote areas - you know, Mr. Speaker, if they are on welfare tomorrow, they are frightened to death. They are scared, Mr. Speaker, they are

scared. They are afraid to go anywhere. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised when a person came to me in Nain on Friday and said to me, 'Mr. Warren, what will happen if I go to Bingo?' This person goes to Bingo three times a week, okay?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. gentleman over there saying if she goes to Bingo three times a week, she should not be on welfare. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentleman if someone wanted to give that lady \$10 or \$12 to go to Bingo, that is her privilege. It is her privilege if she wants to go to Bingo or not. It is not her fault she is on welfare.

MR. KELLAND:
No, it is your (inaudible).

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I knew I was going to get something out of it eventually. The hon. gentleman should remember that only yesterday the military had aircraft flying within ten feet of a caribou herd inside Hopedale, where three hunters were nearly knocked off their skidoos by the sound and the motion of those three aircraft. I tell the hon. gentleman he should be watching what he is concerned about with wildlife in Labrador. He should be putting a halt to low level flying in Labrador. That is what the Minister should be doing. And no funny remarks either, because I can say enough to you. In fact, I can show a note in this House the hon. Minister wrote, a note he wrote a while ago that is very interesting. In fact, it may be interesting for some of your new Members to see it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to continue by saying I think this Government

took a very backward step by publishing a notice in all Government buildings advising people that from now on we are going to have Bingo cops -- the Bingo cops will be coming.

MR. WINSOR:
Is that only in Labrador?

MR. WARREN:
I do not know. I got it in my District.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Is it next to your picture?

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I have to say to the hon. gentleman -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tell us about the Bingo cops.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I would think the Bingo cops might be the extra fifty or sixty new staff the Minister of Social Services may be hiring on in his Department to look after all the people on welfare who go to Bingo, because the notice is up now.

AN HON. MEMBER:
He was not here.

MR. WARREN:
Oh, the hon. gentleman was not here. A notice has been posted by the Department of Social Services advising people that if they go to Bingo, spend \$20 and win \$10, they have to report it. So the Department must be looking at having Bingo cops throughout Newfoundland and Labrador to ensure that social assistance recipients are not abusing -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Oh, Mr. Speaker! That would be an interesting one. In fact, when the hon. gentleman wants to know that, I will be only to glad to tell him. I will be only to glad to tell him at the appropriate time, of course. And I am sure there are a number of other issues I would be only to glad to tell him about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since I mentioned wildlife, is the hon. gentleman responsible for wildlife? Yesterday the Premier did not give an answer on Sunday hunting. Today there is no answer on Sunday hunting, but it is interesting to note that there is a 25,000 name petition around.

AN HON. MEMBER:

40,000.

MR. WARREN:

40,000? Mr. Speaker, that is a lot more than I thought. I was told 25,000. Surely goodness the Minister should come in here and advise us that there are at least 40,000 people interested in Sunday hunting.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has just gone out, but I want to say a couple of words about education. I think my time is almost up.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Minister of Education has insinuated that there will be cost-sharing of different school boards. I say to the Minister, I think if you look at the three school boards in my District, and in the District of the hon. the Member for Eagle River, I think you will find there is overlapping by all Boards.

I noticed an interesting event

taking place in Port Hope Simpson. Five or six, or probably ten years ago, the integrated school was the largest school there and now it is vice versa, the Pentecostal School is the largest. In fact, I understand they are now having difficulty getting good teachers for the smaller school. Again, I think it is time to look at this as a fully integrated community and school. I guess this is just a thought of mine, but I think if this is what is happening, where one school is not getting the fully qualified teachers that school deserves and the other school has better teachers, better accommodations, better facilities, then this is an area you can look at to co-operate with each other. That is a good example.

At the same time, there is some talk of another School Board starting a new school in Happy Valley, Goose Bay. If that is the case, then I would think it is going to defeat the purpose the Minister has in mind. I understand there was some consideration given in the past year or so to a new School Board setting up in Goose Bay, and if that is happening, then I think we may not be doing the same thing all over Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, I know my time has elapsed, but I am sure the Minister will want to answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

To answer the hon. Member's question, I have not heard of a new School Board, because some of our School Boards cover the whole Province. But I can assure the hon. Member that before new

schools are built in the future in areas where you have schools with empty classrooms, we are going to be asking the Denominations to look at it very carefully before they open new schools in areas where you already have vacant classrooms. I think you may be referring to that. But I have not heard of a new School Board, no, which is going to be operating in Goose Bay. I will check it out for him, though. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to enter the debate for a few brief moments. I am not quite sure, but I guess there are only a few minutes left, eleven minutes remaining. Do I understand the Minister of Health wants to make a few comments? I will be happy to take a few minutes and let him -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Do you think so? But you do not care. It does not matter. Well, if there are only eleven minutes left, I have ten of them. I will be happy to leave the Minister a minute to clue up a little later on, assuming the Government House Leader is not trying to tease me into thinking that there are eleven when, in fact, there are fifteen or something. How much time is left, may I ask the Clerk? Eleven minutes? One minute past four, I presume, is it?

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief remarks in the debate. I have learned from experience, in dealing with the Government House

Leader, that whilst he puts forward the impression that he is very co-operative and very easy to get along with, I have learned, Mr. Speaker over the past year that he has pulled a few little Hank Snows, as we used to call them in the old days. He has pulled a few little Hank Snows. I will not go into them in detail; he knows which ones I am talking about. I do not know if he is taking his advice from somebody like the Minister of Health, who is probably the most partisan Minister over on that side of the House, followed by a close second, the Minister of Social Services. Now, the rest of the Ministers over there generally try to deal with their activities in a well-reasoned fashion, and most of them do not get too partisan. I am sure at the Cabinet table and so on there are lots of politics talked, and in the caucus room I am sure there are lots of little bits of politics talked about, but over all, most Ministers - the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations is certainly not a vindictive partisan individual. I do not think she is. The Minister of Education is a little more sneaky in his approach. He likes to give you the impression he is not too partisan - the Minister of Education I am referring to now - but in reality he is able to dig the knife in when the time comes. He would like to have everybody believe that he is easygoing, nonpartisan and everything like that. But I will tell you that behind that angelic exterior there lies a partisan individual, Mr. Speaker. I believe that. The Government House Leader, of course, takes his advice from people like the Minister of Health, who sits close to him, and the Minister of Health is the most partisan, nasty, bitter Minister

over there in that Cabinet.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Health,
on a point of order.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have a copy of Beauchesne, but I am sure if Your Honour were to look in Beauchesne there must be something there which would protect an hon. Member of this House from being so totally abused and humiliated and insulted and dragged over the coals. I think Your Honour should call the hon. the Member for Grand Falls to order, because what he is doing is totally unbecoming of any Member in this House. I would like to be protected from such an abusive person as the hon. Member, who would do that to his friend who is by no means partisan, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

This Member is probably the most apolitical Member of the House of Assembly, and I am sure hon. Members know that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As usual, I was pleased with your ruling which, just to repeat for those Members who were not able to hear, was that the Minister of Health did not have a point of order. I repeat it for the benefit of those who were not listening.

Mr. Speaker, what gall! Imagine the like of that, the like of those comments coming from the most partisan, nasty, bitter, vicious Minister in the Cabinet - vile! What was the word we talked about privately the other day, that we determined was a parliamentary term, it was okay to use it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sleeveen.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the Minister of Health is an hon. sleeveen, and I say it publicly. Because we have researched that matter and that term, and we find -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who used it first?

MR. SIMMS:

The former Member for Bell Island, was it not?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, John Crosbie started it.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, John Crosbie used it on Mr. Neary, was it? Anyway, we did our research, Mr. Speaker, and the Speaker himself, the man who occupies the Chair normally, which you now reverently occupy, told us that in his research of Hansards of days gone by he found the word 'sleeveen', as long as it was

preceded by honourable, was totally parliamentary. Therefore, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to other Members of the House, that in matters of budgetary consideration, which take place around the Cabinet table, when Ministers over there for the most part, except for the Minister of Education, who likes to give the impression that he is nonpartisan, the old 'yes, I agree with you Phil', the Minister of Education, is actually a bitter individual and a partisan individual, too, let me tell you that, but the dirtiest, the vilest, the most nasty, the nastiest Minister -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I wonder if the hon. Member could keep his remarks relevant to the topic under discussion.

MR. SIMMS:
I am talking about decisions around the Cabinet table of a budgetary nature, Mr. Speaker. When these matters are considered, and I appreciate Your Honour's gist -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The Chair is having difficulty in determining the relevance to the topic under discussion.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I understand your comments very clearly. I will keep my comments relevant.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, this debate we are discussing now and going through today is a debate dealing with budgetary decisions related to the Departments of Education, the Minister of Education; Health, the Minister of

Health; the Minister of Social Services, and one other, the Minister of Justice, whom I have not yet had an opportunity to address any remarks to in this brief appearance, because Members opposite continue to interrupt me.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, just to explain how the relevance is there, these Ministers, when they sit around the Cabinet table making budgetary decisions related to health services, education services, social services and justice, these Ministers, unfortunately, are the same Ministers who are the most partisan in that Government over there. That is all I am saying. And the Minister of Health is the biggest hon. sleeveen of the whole lot of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Now, that is the point I was making, and I am sure Your Honour understands the relevance of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a couple of specific questions if I may, or make a couple of specific points. Ministers will not have much of an opportunity to respond, but maybe they will do it on another day, who knows?

The Minister of Justice pokes his head in. I asked him yesterday about security for courtrooms, courthouses. Secondly, I asked him about the opening of the courthouse facility in Grand Falls.

MS VERGE:
And whether we are going to be invited.

MR. SIMMS:
And whether we were going to be

invited.

I wanted to ask him about new court facilities for the rest of the Province. For example, I believe the Town of Gander deserves a new courthouse facility, Mr. Speaker. I strongly support it. I want to make it clear, and I want to make position clear on that issue here in the House of Assembly. I was disappointed, however, today, when the Minister of Justice did not take advantage of the opportunities given him for the last hour and a half to stand up for five minutes and talk about and respond to those kinds of questions I asked. But I guess there is a reason for it, whatever it is; we will see another day.

With respect to educational matters I have been asking the Minister of Education, of course, in the House and outside of the House, about priorities with respect to education. Particularly I have an interest in where the new Central Newfoundland university campus might be located. I am a bit disappointed to see the St. John's Board of Trade - I am not sure if the Minister addressed or responded to those public comments by the Board of Trade, but they certainly have been tearing the Government apart on that particular issue. Even though initially my own position was I thought probably that might be a better way to go, to offer first and second year university throughout the Province, even though that was my original position, since the Government made the decision it has made, to locate a campus in Central, obviously I am going to lobby and support it, along with my colleague, the Minister of Forestry, who represents Windsor -

Buchans, and my colleague, the Member for Exploits. We are going to lobby hard to support the proposal put forth by the communities involved in the Exploits area.

However, I had not heard the Minister say anything and it made me think, when I saw the statement by the St. John's Board of Trade, here we go again, everything goes to St. John's. That was the argument they were trying to make, and I did not agree with that particular argument. I do not mind saying it publicly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the more pressing issue of an educational nature which bothered me was the one we became aware of in the last day or so, and that is with respect to this Government's callous decision which will affect sick children in hospitals throughout this Province, particularly in Grand Falls, Corner Brook, and St. Anthony, in the Minister of Health's own riding, this Government's callous decision to eliminate the funding -

MS VERGE:

The Minister of Education did not consult anybody.

MR. SIMMS:

No. I am going to get to that.

- to eliminate the funding, to provide for those schools -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, Mr. Speaker.

MS VERGE:

By leave!

MR. SIMMS:

There is only a minute left. Do I have a minute? No leave for a minute? One minute?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

MR. SIMMS:

Okay. Mr. Speaker, since there is nobody else standing, I will stand again for one minute.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will say now -

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

- having been recognized again, I say to the Minister of Forestry, who is not even in his seat, over there interrupting, I will continue my comments with respect to the Minister of Education and their callous decision to eliminate the funding for the education being provided to sick children in hospitals.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There is no leave.

MR. SIMMS:

It is not by leave now, I have been recognized again. Nobody else stood.

I hope the Minister would reconsider this particular issue, because I can tell him from talking to people, the teachers out in the area involved, the people involved in the hospital,

nurses out there who are all very concerned with this particular decision, that I do not think this decision is the right decision. The Minister may have made it based on some information he had provided to him by officials in his Department, but, I say to him, it might be wiser for him if he were to somehow arrange to meet with representatives of these groups -

MS VERGE:

He should have done that beforehand.

MR. SIMMS:

- and just have a further discussion with them. I think they will put forth a strong argument and a strong case to reconsider this matter. And it did not save a lot of money in the budgetary process.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The time is up. The time for Concurrence debate on this particular Committee has elapsed.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh! I will get back to it on another day, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

On motion, the Concurrence Debate on the Report of the Social Services Committee, carried.

MR. BAKER:

Order 3. Concurrence Motion, the Resource Committee.

MR. PENNEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Lewisporte.

MR. PENNEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very pleased to have been the Chairman of the Resource Estimates Committee this year. Our Committee reviewed the Estimates of the Departments of Environment and Lands, Development, Fisheries, Mines and Energy, and Forestry and Agriculture. I would like, at this time, to thank the Members of the Committee, the hon. the Member for Mount Pearl, the Members for Green Bay, Mount Scio - Bell Island, and Eagle River. I would, as well, like to thank the hon. Members who filled in on one or two occasions. That would be the hon. Member for St. John's East Extern, the Member for Bonavista South, and the Member for LaPoile. Each of those Members to whom I just referred, all of them, without exception, conducted themselves in a manner of respect and courtesy. I was very proud, Mr. Speaker, to have been the Chairman of such a Committee. I would like, as well, before I go any further, to give special recognition to the hon. the Member for Mount Pearl who was Vice-Chairman of the Committee. He was most helpful and most co-operative with the Chair. As you can appreciate, he has considerable experience in the area of legislation, which the Chair did not have, and I took advantage of his knowledge. He was most helpful and I would like to have that recognized. So was, of course, the Member for St. John's East Extern, when he filled in in the capacity of Vice-Chairman when we reviewed the Estimates for the Department of Environment and Lands. I would like, as well, to give mention to the hon. the Member for Humber Valley. The Member for Humber Valley sat in on at least three of the meetings, where we reviewed the Estimates, and he conducted himself as a gentleman throughout

the questioning for each of those Committee meetings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PENNEY:

It goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that the political rhetoric we hear quite often here in the House of Assembly is not necessary. Now, I know we all get carried away at times, and I know in the heat of debate we have a tendency to get political, and I guess that is understandable. We have to recognize how we all got here. We all got here because we won the election under the banner of one political party or another, and I guess it is easy to stand and defend the views and the party platform of that -

MS VERGE:

(Inaudible).

MR. PENNEY:

Well, in the case of some they probably got elected under the colors of more than one party, but most of us ran for one or the other. Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that the manner in which the Committee conducted itself at the Estimates hearings proves that this sort of rhetoric, this political rhetoric is just not necessary, that the Legislature can work effectively without it. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased at the way things went and I was very pleased I was the Chairman.

I would like to make a couple of comments on each of the Departments we did. Under the Department of Development, \$800,000 of new money, cost-shared with the Federal Government, is being spent in tourism in Labrador under the Labrador Subsidiary

Agreement this year. There will be a tourism marketing video which portrays the Province as a distinct tourist destination, and probably as a distinct society as well, because Newfoundland is definitely a distinct society, as are probably nine other provinces in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, like a lot of my colleagues here in this House, I have had the occasion to travel extensively over the last few years, and I have visited some of the tourist attractions throughout the Caribbean and throughout Europe. It is nice to be able to get away. After spending ten or eleven months here in the House of Assembly, it is nice to be able to go away for a break, go down to Florida or go down to the Caribbean. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a tourist industry right here in Newfoundland that is totally unrealized. We have a resource that has been untapped. The Minister is now producing a video which will be sent throughout Canada, the United States and throughout Europe, which will prove to everybody that Newfoundland is another one of those places to go on vacation. And I am very pleased to see that. That is going to cost somewhere in the area of \$150,000, but I do not think the \$150,000 should be considered an expenditure, it should be considered an investment.

The tourist budget, Mr. Speaker, is at an all-time high - \$9,246,000 this year. That is 33 1/3 per cent higher than what was budgeted for last year. As well, Mr. Speaker, \$640,000 is to improve tourist facilities in the Province. I think this is commendable, and I think the Minister responsible for the

Department should be commended.

As well, \$450,000 to promote Newfoundland as an investment opportunity in Asia. And let us not forget the new Crown corporation we have called NewCorp, to amalgamate the services of the Department of Development and the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation to simplify and streamline services for rural Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear the Minister announce at the meeting that there was going to be a NewCorp Office in the Town of Lewisporte. Mr. Speaker, as well there will be an additional \$2 million spent on the Economic Recovery Commission. Members opposite have said it is a waste of money.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
It is shocking!

MR. PENNEY:
The hon. the Member for Kilbride says it is shocking. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, maybe the Economic Recovery Commission will not work, but we are trying because we know the situation we inherited; we know we inherited a \$5.2 billion debt, and we know the state of the economy when we took over twelve months ago. We are trying to correct that, Mr. Speaker. We maintain that is one possible way to do it, and we are delighted that \$2 million is again being given to the Economic Recovery Commission to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, fisheries: We acknowledge that there is a crisis in the fisheries, despite what the Prime Minister said in a press release some time ago. The Prime

Minister says there is no crisis in Atlantic Canada. We know different, Mr. Speaker. There is a crisis in the fisheries, and it is affecting every sector of society, not just the fishermen and not just the fish plant operators. Mr. Speaker, we realize we cannot catch fish that are not there, and we cannot process fish that are not brought ashore. That is why the Department is spending \$5.4 million under Industry Support Services for aquaculture, resource assessment, experimental fishing gear, vessel design, and operation and initiatives associated with a fleet revitalization program.

Mr. Speaker, the future of the fishery in this Province depends on such things as aquaculture and resource assessment. Now that we no longer have the quantity, Mr. Speaker, and I think we all acknowledge the quantity of fish is not there like it was when Mr. Cabot described an abundance of cod around our shores, it is just not there, but now that we no longer have the quantity, we are going to have to start concentrating on quality. That is why the Department is spending \$2.8 million under the Processing Sector of Industrial Support Services toward improving processing technology and expanding in-plant quality control procedures.

Mr. Speaker, the future of the fishery in Newfoundland depends on secondary processing and depends on value-added processing. We have a Minister in the Department who recognizes that fact, and the Budget reflects that recognition as well.

Forestry and Agriculture: The Minister has announced that his

Department has prepared a twenty-year forestry plan. The Department has completed a study on wood supply and demand. It revealed an impending supply crisis. The Minister has devoted his energies to the Department properly and with proper planning we will prevent an impending disaster. We have a crisis in one Department right now, we do not need a crisis in two. Thanks to the Minister and proper planning I think we can avert one. The Minister announced that his Department has planted the fifty millionth tree this year, and he has also announced that the spray program last year, using bacillus thuringiensis, commonly known as Bt, was successful.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What?

MR. PENNEY:
The Minister announced that the spray using Bt was successful, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite do not like to hear the truth. It bothers them.

MR. PARSONS:
Is he going to continue with the Bt this year?

MR. PENNEY:
The Minister has not announced that anything other than Bt will be used. I have no idea. The Minister announced that last year's Bt spray program was successful.

Mr. Speaker, \$400,000 is being spent this year in new technology and fire control; \$700,000 is being spent on forestry products under the three year Labrador Development Agreement. The Department has accepted that controls are needed and we must not continue to allow

indiscriminate cutting. We cannot allow that anymore. The Department of Forestry must be managed in the same way as any agriculture should be managed; we must manage our trees the same as we would any food crop. We finally have a Department, Mr. Speaker, which is managed by a Minister who recognizes this and has set controls in place to see that that happens, and that is reflected in the Budget.

Environment and Lands: Every Member of the Committee I chaired was very impressed with the performance of the Minister of Environment and Lands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PENNEY:

How could they not be, Mr. Speaker? They asked the hon. Minister questions, but they did it with little or no criticism because they have recognized that the Minister has handled his portfolio well. The subheads carried without amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that particular meeting went in record time, and it went with compliments coming from all Members of the Committee.

One example I would like to quote, Mr. Speaker, about that particular Department is that under the subhead Caribou Management, the expenditure for 1989-1990 was \$54,500, and the Budget for this year is \$589,000. That is \$54,500 to \$589,000. I believe a significant portion of that is to do a proper assessment of the population of our big game species we fondly refer to as caribou. It is only after we have properly and thoroughly assessed the population that we can properly manage the

resource. Because bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what it is, a resource, and it must be managed properly. We can only manage it after we thoroughly assess the population, and we have put the monies in place in the Budget to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would remind hon. Members of this House that one of the three areas of emphasis in our new Budget was economic development, and the Resource Estimates Committee did, in fact, study the subheads as it related to economic development.

Mr. Speaker, this truly is a Liberal Budget, and the Estimates of the Departments we studied truly reflect the fact that this is a Liberal Budget, it truly reflects the fact that we have a Liberal Minister of Finance, we have a Liberal Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, a Liberal Minister of Environment and Lands, a Liberal Minister of Development, a Liberal Minister of Fisheries, a Liberal Minister of Mines and Energy, all of whom are backed by Members of a Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, Mr. Speaker, I think, should have a few words and extend courtesies with regard to the Committee and its functioning. Our Chairman did a good job and was, of course, ably assisted by the hon. the Member for Mount Pearl, and, on one occasion, by the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

My colleagues on the Committee, the Member for Eagle River, tended to put a Labrador perspective on things, and my other colleague on the Committee, the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, I think did a very diligent job in defending the Government's interest and inserting plenty of points of order, etc., whenever we were pressing points too hard.

I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, as well, that I think at every single Committee meeting at least some members of the press did show up, and that is gratifying when you are doing that sort of thing late at night.

We did, I think, the Development Department first, Mr. Speaker. I just had a quick look at the Estimates book, and that is a Department with a budget of around \$35 million, \$35 million for a Department that at times you wonder if it is required any more, a Department which seems to be being replaced by a new corporation and by a new mandarin, I suppose, for want of a better phrase, Mr. House. The Minister of Education talks about triple something or another, and there is triple E in the Senate, and I guess development is double D, you have Development and Doug.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:

They are going to spend, Mr. Speaker, \$2 million in the double D Department on Dr. House's Recovery Team. In the Estimates the Minister was kind enough to table with us a list, albeit a long one, of all the meetings Dr. House has had all over the Province. I do not think, apart from his own staff, there has been

a single job created by that particular crowd of people, and this year, again, we are setting aside \$2 million to do something, but we are not quite sure what.

We have a crisis in the fishery. Out of that Dr. House sends a letter to Ottawa dealing with a large wish list, some projects very expensive, none of them relating, for the most part, to the fishery. The future of Newfoundland was supposed to be in small business, and a \$90 million project refitting Egyptian submarines in St. John's somehow fits into that particular thing. So, Mr. Speaker, I have my doubts about success. The Chairman of the Committee himself indicated he was not sure if the Economic Recovery Team would do a good job or would succeed.

We have a couple of million dollars in tourism promotions. I noticed from a newspaper article the weekend that three particular Liberal public relations firms are vying for that contract. It is rather curious that all three firms appeared to have Liberal connections.

So there we are, Mr. Speaker, \$35 million for a Department that has been negated by a new Corporation and by a new mandarin; a Minister who has had his position totally usurped by a Premier who is going to run the Province a totally different way.

We did Forestry and Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. I must confess I know very little about agriculture, but my friend from Humber Valley added considerably to that particular matter. In the questioning of the Minister, we questioned him on his spray program. He was extremely pleased

that Bt had been used last year and, all of a sudden, in the last few days we find the Minister getting more and more evasive as to what particular chemical they are going to use in the upcoming spray program. It would appear that certain infestations are becoming more and more critical, and even though there are a number of environmentalists in the Cabinet, I do believe this Government is going to have a very difficult decision and may well have to use a chemical spray other than Bt. The Chairman of the Committee mentioned a twenty year plan. What he did not stress, however, is that probably ten years down the road there is going to be a very serious wood shortage problem in this Province. There is probably going to be insufficient wood to keep three mills going. And a twenty year plan will not grow enough trees in that particular time to take care of that problem. Planting fifty million seedlings is all well and good. Most of those were planted, no doubt, by the PC's, but it is something that should have started twenty to forty years ago.

The Minister of Forestry was questioned as well at length by the Member for Grand Falls about his Cabinet Committee and basically the lack of action on the part of that Committee in dealing with the troubles at the Mill there and the concerns of the workers. In my own District of Green Bay forestry is probably the major industry employing upwards of a thousand people. Unfortunately it is a shrinking industry. We are probably okay for the next year or two, but in a couple of next years time there is going to be a considerable down-turn in the number of loggers employed, and there is going to be

a lot of layoffs in that area of the Province in forestry. It is rather sad really that the fishery crisis has been so dramatic. It is receiving so much attention - when I see the forest industry in my particular District sort of being whittled away and the people being pushed onto the welfare rolls or off to the mainland with no special programs to help them because, I suppose, their situation is not as dramatic and not on the news every night. Many small contractors in the Green Bay area right now are literally suffering, begging, scratching and clawing for twenty or thirty chords of wood just to give themselves and a couple of their buddies their stamps. It has gotten that bad. So in forestry, Mr. Speaker, we need a twenty year plan. We also need a Minister very dedicated because you do have real problems coming up in that Department. It is just a matter of time.

We did Mines and Energy and I do not think the Chairman of our Committee dwelled on it very much. Again I do not profess to be a great expert on Mines. Although when I was a boy in school in Springdale we had three mines operating in the general vicinity and now we have none. We have three major diamond drilling companies in Green Bay operating Province-wide, really. They employ about 100 people locally, and I am told that unfortunately a Federal support program for exploration may be phased out in 1991 and that spells bad news for that particular industry. So the Provincial Government might do well to look at some support for that industry. I am also pleased that there has been a recent gold find in my District and I do hope something good comes of it.

The Minister was deliberately evasive in dealing with Hibernia the same as he was in Question Period the other day. He would not indicate, even though all the newspapers and all the business communities seem to indicate that we are after the accommodations/service super module, but the Minister will not even admit that. He will not tell us what such a creature does, how many people it employs, what sorts of things are serviced out of it, what sort of technology is required, what sort of technology transfers we obtained from that, we got no hint whatsoever and that is a cause of concern because the design change in Hibernia could cost us considerable jobs and a long term offshore technologically sound industry.

Power rates, obviously my Chairman did not mention power rates under that particular heading at all. This particular Government through the actions of the Minister of Finance has made the life, I think, of the Minister of Mines and Energy somewhat miserable in that through budgetary actions in two years in a row we are probably going to see a power rate increase of fifty per cent over the next seven or eight years. And that from a Liberal Party that thought power rate increases were a crime when they were in power, Mr. Speaker.

My colleague indicated this is a Liberal budget well, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have changed considerably in the last little while, but to give credit where it is due, to the Minister I will return credit, Come by Chance refinery came up in our estimates committee meetings, the Minister of Development, at times has indicated he has had some real

problems with who is behind this Come by Chance thing and the Liberals in Opposition were very curious about it, but the Minister of Mines and Energy looked us straight in the face and said: 'Come by Chance, a real success story', take a bow, give credit where it is due. That is a Tory success story, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister.

Environment and Lands Department, Mr. Speaker, I notice the pollution Budget, the clean up Budget is down from a couple of million a couple of years ago, to \$87,000, I understand there are problems out around Makinsons that could do with some addressing but obviously the money is not there. With regard to Parks, there is still a considerable amount of capital funding set aside, but a point that I had to make, I suppose, many times in this House on behalf of my own District, the Crescent Lake Park, the Lake Monster notwithstanding, gets no money again this year and that is rather unfortunate because the nearby Triton fish plant is in trouble if there is another round of quota cuts, which according to the Minister of Fisheries letter today certainly seems imminent, and the Government's Dr. House, the double D Department, could do well to put a little money in the P Department, the Parks Department and promote the Lake Monster and create a few jobs where there is going to be real devastation in a few years time. The one sort of testy thing we had, Mr. Speaker, in the Environment and Lands Department is when I asked the Minister about the Crown Lands Bill that we have been talking about so much about the so called private beaches, and I ask basically why? With all the public outcry that has been

against this particular thing, why, why, why does this Government insist for some reason that it is going to go ahead with some form of a Bill which will give the Cabinet, the option at least, albeit somewhat restricted, but will give Cabinet the option to give people private access to beaches and rivers, ponds and that sort of thing.

The Minister in his answer walked all over every beach in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, he did not address the question, he got to the point where he embarrassed the Chairman, who is with his own Party, and the Chairman had to call him to order because he was just wandering all over the universe and just refusing to answer the question as to why, why, why are they doing it? I asked him, are certain high connected people with their mansions in the pines going to keep the local peasants off the beaches, I got a vague assurance, Mr. Speaker, but so far, I got no answer why. And because that was a tense situation, the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, as I said, was the Government's watch dog on the Committee defending their interest, he brought up the subject of the harmonious moose, let me say, on Bell Island and the need for a mate for the same and that took the attention or at least the serious attention of the Committee away from why this Government is insisting on private beaches for people.

Fisheries, what can you say on Fisheries? My friend from Labrador west indicates to me that the Quebec Government announced the other day a \$50 million support package for their fishery which is certainly not the largest industry in their province. We

have a Provincial Government here that just sits idly by and is only too happy to say that Ottawa is handling the matter or Ottawa is mishandling the matter, but I cannot imagine the ten years I worked with Brian Peckford, him being allowed by the press, the people, the Assembly, to just sit around and do nothing as the whole place fell apart around our ears and that is exactly what this particular Government is doing.

They are doing some work in aquaculture and various other things, but the major part of our fishing industry right now, they are watching it go down the tubes, they are not lifting a finger to help. They have deliberately poisoned the Federal/Provincial relationship. It is very difficult, I am sure to get anything going with Ottawa in these circumstances, and that is really, really sad, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Forestry, I should point out has a whole bunch of numbers in his Budget estimates - they are assuming a Federal/Provincial Forestry Agreement. Given the current Federal/Provincial climate over Meech Lake which has been deliberately generated by this Administration, I do hope that something good will come of that, but do not hold your breath, Mr. Speaker. So all in all, Mr. Speaker, it was enjoyable.

MR. SIMMS:

The Minister of Energy has done nothing either, he has not opened his mouth.

MR. HEWLETT:

Well he was very forthcoming in the Estimates. He was honest on Côme-By-Chance and praised the Tories; on Hibernia he would not say a word.

MR. SIMMS:

He is about the only one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HEWLETT:

And Lower Churchill. Yes, of course, Mr. Speaker, he assured us the fight we had with Quebec, the blood row that we had going on, so to speak, is in no way going to affect the very businesslike relationship with Quebec on Churchill Falls.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave!

MR. HEWLETT:

I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Chairman and the Members of my Committee and I thank the Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Lands and Environment.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

It is a pleasure to participate in this very meaningful debate in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker. And I suppose it is almost traditional that we do thank the people who participated in the Estimates process, in particular

the Chairman, my colleague for Lewisporte, and the acting chairperson for that particular evening, was the hon. Member, colleague from St. John's East Extern. The other Members who were there, the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island; the Member for Eagle River; the Member for Green Bay; and I think that pretty well covers it, I believe these are the Members who attended that evening. And I must say in the Acting Chair, the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern did a good job. I thought the questions were good. They could have been a little bit more detailed, a little more far-reaching. I had a relatively easy time I suppose in the sense that when the subject matter got tied up in things such as Bill 53, the hon. Members seemed to want to dwell on that quite a bit. And I informed them at the time that I love that particular piece of legislation and with the modifications that are forthcoming from the Legislative Counsel that will be a fine piece of legislation to put into the House of Assembly and put through and put into law. And I made that point quite clear.

I do really appreciate also - if I can say so, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Green Bay. Because the Member for Green Bay I take as a colleague and there is no doubt that he does represent the efforts to have a provincial park in Crescent Lake and he has raised the issue many times in the House of Assembly and I gave him credit in Committee and I will give him credit here as a good District MHA, he stresses the point. It is unfortunate, and I told him that evening, it is unfortunate we do not have enough money to do everything we would like to do in provincial parks. But I did

inform him also, Mr. Speaker, as the record will show that he does have a park, Indian River Park in his District and there are a number of Districts and areas in the Province that do not have provincial parks. So even though we cannot open an additional one for him this year, he does have a park in his District. That is more than we can say, let us say Torngat Mountains District. I am thinking of my favourite place in the Province, Labrador. Naskaupi District does not have a park yet, although one has been designated. We do have one in Pinware River; we do have one in Menihek District, Duley Lake. Now of the ninety-two facilities under this Department only two of them actually are in Labrador and hopefully we can do something about that, taking into mind the balance of money, the population and the demand and that sort of thing.

But I have to admit I listen with interest every time the Member for Green Bay speaks. He carefully crafts his phrases often and I notice when he asks questions in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, they are often written. He has the opportunity to write them down and his little witticisms and quips are appreciated on this side as I am sure they are on the other side. And I made mention, he probably did not know that I knew that he was once employed at Indian River out in his District. He spent a couple of summers working in Indian River Provincial Park and, in fact, he said in his typically witty way, that the park was in such good condition because of that. And I recall that and I appreciate it. Because I recall telling him after that when his political career comes to a quick and shuddering halt sometime,

probably not in that distant future, that I would as the then Minister of Environment and Lands responsible for parks take his former experience into consideration perhaps to find a spot for him in the summer or something like that. I know he appreciates that.

I will not go into Bill 53 or Bill 25 now, Mr. Speaker, because we will have ample opportunity to debate it in the House. But a lot of time in the Committee was spent on that. But I am of course extremely interested in the question of wildlife - Wildlife management and Development, whatever. Any aspect of wildlife. And I find it passing strange, but not unusual when you consider the types of questions raised, though not in Committee, in the House of Assembly it is all interrelated, by the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Now I would like to finish my Portfolio, whenever that time comes, having said that I did the best I could on the basis of good management with respect to our resources, and in this case we are talking about wildlife. I hope I am never accused of making wildlife decisions on anything other than good management practices. I think it is a terrible legacy, Mr. Speaker, for someone to make decisions otherwise. I can think of a couple of examples. I now have access to a lot of information that I did not have before when I was an Opposition Member, Mr. Speaker, like the polar bear hunt, always a big, interesting and topical topic in the Northern part of Labrador. Now the last time that a polar hunt was permitted in Labrador an unfortunate set of circumstances came about. There

were four polar bears permitted to be taken but it ended up with seven being taken. Seven that I am aware of, maybe the hon. Member would have made an extra trip up there, I do not know. He says there were eight. But any way notwithstanding that, more than the allowable amount at that time was taken.

Now, my information is that the Member, the Minister of the day, who represents that part of Labrador, that part of the Province, had to bend the rules somewhat in order to allow a scientific harvesting, a scientific permit. Now if that was the only way he could do it, he did it in his good judgement I would think. I am not accusing him or blaming him for that. That was the basis on which he did it. A scientific permit which allowed four polar bear to be taken, there were seven, he says there were eight taken but there were more than that taken. The interesting part about it, Mr. Speaker, is on the basis of good management that this permit was signed in Torngat Mountains District during the last provincial campaign.

Mr. Speaker, the wildlife enforcement people in Happy Valley - Goose Bay office received a blank permit just prior to the former Minister, the Member for Torngat Mountains, travelling up the coast I suppose as part of his campaign. Just prior to the last election in April of 1989, the Minister of the day travelled up the coast when a copy of the permit was faxed into the Goose Bay office for their information and action. There was no signature on the permit and it has to be signed by the Minister. It has to be signed by the Minister to be legal. So my information is

that the Minister had the permit unsigned, folded up in his pocket when he travelled up the Torngat Mountains District. Went up to check the political water up there, Mr. Speaker, if I can wrap up. I have a couple of minutes left.

When he saw that it was politically expedient for him to make the decision and put his signature on that permit, that is when he did it during the campaign, Mr. Speaker, prior to the last election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

Now, I do not really fault him for that. I make the point only, Mr. Speaker, that based on the number of calls that I am getting from Torngat Mountains District, and there are a lot and I can document them if necessary, the Member, the former Minister now representing Torngat Mountains in the House of Assembly, had to go up the past weekend and do some fence mending. I have gotten that information from three communities of the five he represents, six or whatever. People in three communities have called me and said, - if I can step out of my parliamentary phraseology for a moment, and say - 'Jim for heaven's sake come up and knock that person off.' They did not use the word person, but that is a close as I can come. Now I have such a commitment to the Naskaupi District, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly could not do that. But, you know, things being the way they are the law of averages are going to come about. And I will never follow in the footsteps of the Member for Torngat Mountains, and I will continue -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

MR. KELLAND:
- as long as I am in this Cabinet and this portfolio, I will continue to handle my Department -

AN HON. MEMBER:
By leave.

MR. KELLAND:
- on the basis of good management and good management only, not political partisanship. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wonder would the hon. gentleman kindly tell this House what transpired about one hour and five minutes ago when he said to me, 'Garfield, I am going to go up in your District and run against you.' And I said, 'Jim, why do both of us not resign today and you take me on now.' And he said, 'No, I cannot do it now.' And those are the exact words the hon. gentleman said. So, like I said to him, why does he not come now and do it if he wants to do it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:
And, Mr. Speaker, when the next election rolls around, if he does not come into my District I will go into his District and take him

on there. I am a person who will not run away from anything. I will never run away from anything, Mr. Speaker. And to really put the icing on the cake I agree with the hon. gentleman. He got three calls from my District. Mr. Speaker, I was up there the week and told them to call the man and ask him to take me on.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, it was only just three weeks ago on a Sunday night the Liberal Association in Happy Valley, Goose Bay, had a meeting that they are deciding now to look for another candidate. So you can see that is the reason why he wants to come to my District. There is no trouble at all, Mr. Speaker, to find out what the gentleman is up to.

And, Mr. speaker, let me say just one other thing. Unfortunately Question Period was short today or it was only twenty-nine minutes or thirty minutes whatever it was, but the hon. gentleman must have known that I was going to ask him a question about the polar bear hunt. Because, Mr. Speaker, last year, there was a polar bear hunt, and the people in my District were happy with the hunt. Mr. Speaker, as of now, this year, there is no polar bear hunt, and everybody is upset with the Minister. That is why he had three calls to come up, because they want to get rid of him!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is always doing the same thing, always telling only half the story.

Now, I am sure the hon. gentleman would like for me to tell from whom he got the three calls. I could even tell him from whom he got the three calls. Mr. Speaker, the last surname begins with one of the first letters of the alphabet.

I was glad last year to have the opportunity, as a Labrador Member, to convince my Cabinet colleagues of the importance of allowing the Inuit people in Labrador to do something they have done all their lives until Government, in the last forty years, have brought in so many regulations. All of a sudden, we begin to look at some of those regulations that were affecting the livelihood of so many Native people. And, eventually, we were doing the right thing to help the Native people. Unfortunately, the hon. gentleman now is causing people - and I agree with him, by the way, in that I do not agree with anybody breaking the law, neither does he, neither do any of us, but, Mr. Speaker, politicians in this House of Assembly make laws and we can also cut out some of the unnecessary laws that affect the Native people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said he likes to make his decisions on good management.

I believe when we saw the people of Quebec in the last twelve months, going into Labrador territory and killing eleven polar bears and, Mr. Speaker, seeing the hon. gentleman, who has a vacancy in Nain now for over a year for a wildlife officer. That is what I call good management. Mr.

Speaker, that is what I call Ministers who are concerned for good management.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in all of Labrador, in my District there is just one with 500 miles of territory, only one wildlife management officer. Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. Gentleman, take my advice that I left with the deputy minister and the associate deputy minister last year, you can easily have wildlife or protection officers in the Torngat Mountains, but why not say it to the Labrador Inuit Association for them to contract out wildlife officers. That is the answer, give a contract to the Labrador Inuit Association, and give the LIA the opportunity, and I tell you this much the best people in our Province to protect the wildlife is the native people. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that and -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

I have to say this, the hon. Minister of Development went into the store - jeepers when a store is opened by a Minister, I mean like in the rec centre, like in the Elizabeth Goudie Building, there is a picture up of the Premier opening the building, myself as Minister opened several buildings, and the pictures are up. As soon as the Minister saw my picture up in the Government Store in Hopedale he advised his staff to get that picture down as fast as you can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, no, no! He is not like that.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, not only that when I go through my District now the people who go to the Government stores, the biggest thing they miss is my picture on the wall. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the biggest thing they miss.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I know I only have another minute or two, and I get carried away, but I want to say something to the Minister of Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. Minister of Education, I do not think it is really the picture, probably the name had something to do with it also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Development, and it is a serious question, I understand his Department has asked for proposals or submissions from those interested in taking over the Government stores in Makkovik and Nain. There are committees set up looking at possibilities, as I understand it, so I would like the Minister to make clear to the people up there if the Government stores are on the chopping block. Mr. Speaker, I want to say one thing to the Minister, and I will use the quote Bill Rompkey used in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. When the military were going to put the gate up for NATO, Mr. Rompkey was

quoted as saying, 'That gate will go up over my dead body.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this much, as long as I am a Member of this Legislature for the District of Torngat Mountains, those stores will only go into the hands of private enterprise outside the district over my dead body.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. PARSONS:

You have had your warning. You have had your warning, and he is not a violent man.

MR. WARREN:

Probably not after today. I may need to hire one of the bingo cops to look after me.

Mr. Speaker, I say those stores were built there with money from the Federal/Provincial Native People's Agreements, they were built in conjunction with the native people and, therefore, the only way this Member will allow those stores to be sold to private enterprise from outside the District is if the sale is okayed by the people whom those stores are serving. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. Minister I would like to rule on the point of privilege raised by the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains relative to a question he raised with the Premier, respecting Sunday hunting.

The major thrust of the Member's point of privilege was that in so answering, the Premier misled the House. As I have ruled in the

past, and previous Speakers before me, supported by various authorities, Beauchesne and Maingot included, misleading the House is not a point of privilege. Of course, deliberately misleading the House is something quite different, but in this case we were not dealing with that.

I rule that what we have here is a difference of opinion as to what was said or what was alleged to have been said, and does not constitute a point of privilege either. I quote Beauchesne, paragraph 31, section 1: "A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege." I rule the hon. Member did not establish a prima facie case of privilege.

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is always a pleasure to hear my colleague, the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains, Mr. Speaker. I find it really interesting, just about every point he brings up. I only have a few minutes left and I would like to make some reference to them.

I think sometimes he does delve into the area which could be classified as being humour. He made a slight mistake, or probably misunderstood me. I said I received calls from three communities. Now one community has 350 people in it. I did not say I had one call from one person in each of these three communities, nor am I saying I had one from each of 350 people in

that community, but I had calls from three communities in his District within the last couple of days. The point he raised about three people he had asked to call me has no bearing on what I had said earlier, Mr. Speaker. I want to make that point. But it was interesting enough. I guess he knows where his support is and where it is not, because he said he could almost name who the callers were. Of one he said the person's last name starts with one of the first letters in the alphabet. Now, I gather from that the Member was not sure which one it was, but one of the first ones. So it could be any one of the first thirteen possibly, I am not sure.

He talks about what we on this side have not done in the last twelve months; he talks about a vacant wildlife position in Nain. It was vacant when he was the Minister. And because of the job description promulgated by that Minister's Department, we have not been able to fill the position. Now we are going to change the terms of reference in consultation with the Labrador Inuit Association in order to fill the position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

But it was a problem propagated by the former Minister, who, by the way, will never be a Minister in this House again.

Back to the calls, Mr. Speaker, the calls from his District. And he talked about his picture being removed from the Government stores. I believe, if I were to check my telephone records, some of the calls were requesting

pictures of the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains. I believe so. It is not that they particularly admire his looks, but I heard that about a dozen or so were short of dart boards up there. I do not know if that is correct or not. I cannot confirm that, Mr. Speaker.

But I will tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker, that during the summer of 1985, just following the election of 1985, the Public Accounts Committee made a trip up the North Coast of Labrador. Talking about pictures of the hon. Member, this is a fact which was related to me. I did not see it personally, I can assure you. But a person in the group, a person who made up the whole context of the Public Accounts Committee, went into a commercial establishment, an accommodation in one of the North Coast communities, to make use of the facilities and when he raised the cover - this is a fact as reported to me - there on the cover, somewhat spattered and worn, was a picture of the Member, and it said right on there, handwritten I believe, 'Garfield, your Member in Northern Labrador.' Now, I did not see it myself. But he talks about pictures, and he should not get into that, because there are a lot of stories on the North Coast of Labrador.

Notwithstanding that, I do take it that in the forty-three days the hon. Member was the Minister responsible for Wildlife, I think what he did was make good attempts, so I cannot fault him there. I do believe, though, as I said a few minutes earlier, a lot of his decisions gave the impression that he may very well have made them for other than good management reasons. Now, I respect the Inuit. I spent a lot

of time, perhaps a lot more time than the hon. Member, in the far North.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are out of time.

MR. KELLAND:

By leave, of course.

MR. SIMMS:

I will give you leave next month.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You have a few more minutes.

MR. KELLAND:

Until the Speaker calls it.

I respect the Inuit people, very ingenious people, and I respect their need to get back to their traditional way of hunting the polar bear. The method they use, by the way, traditionally, when a hunter was out on a hunting trip and came across Nanook, the polar bear, he would take that polar bear as part of what he thought was his right to harvest nature. Now, it is not always possible to do that these days because of the limited resource and the fact that it has been abused - a lot of our resources have been abused. So, that scientific permit was issued to the LIA to take four polar bear. As the hunters went out on that collective permit, the first four to get the polar bear were to report in. But the communications system broke down, and in a very short period of time, in less than forty-eight hours I believe, they killed more than four. It was very unfortunate, but Justice decided, in their wisdom, that there was no illegal intent and there were no charges laid at that time. Any other permits or any future permits could not possibly be issued on that method. We have had ongoing discussions with the

LIA to find a better method to administer permits for future polar bear hunts.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I realize I have gone up to my time now. I am sure the hon. Member will take what I have said in the same vein in which I took what he said. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, if we could stop the clock for a minute.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

First of all, I would like to point out that on Thursday we will continue on with the Concurrence Debates. Tomorrow being Private Member's Day, I would like to remind Members of the House that six weeks ago I announced to the House the next Private Member's motion to be called would be the one from the Member for Pleasantville on the GST, and that will be the motion -

MR. SIMMS:

Six weeks (inaudible).

MR. BAKER:

Six weeks, yes.

- being debated tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow, and that this House do now adjourn.