



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 31

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Thursday

[Preliminary Transcript]

10 May 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to inform the House of the decision to close the Coach House facility effective June 30, 1990. As you are aware, while in Opposition I had many concerns about the functioning of this facility. When I became Minister, my staff were well aware of my concerns but stressed the need for a program to deal effectively with the youth beyond parental control and having severe behaviour problems.

Great effort was made to make the Coach House program work. However, the physical building and the surroundings were inappropriate for such a program. Mr. Speaker, while there is still a great need for an assessment and treatment program, it has been recognized that the Coach House program is not able to fulfill that mandate. Thought was given to the redesigning of the program, however, it was quite evident that the existing building was not suitable. Mr. Speaker, as at this time, a number of the residents are prepared to move home and other placements can be found for the remaining boys. It is an opportune time to close Coach House and to concentrate on the development of a program that can more adequately address the needs of children coming into the care of the Director of Child Welfare. My staff have met with the Board

of Directors for Coach House and discussed the closing with them. The meeting resulted in an agreement to close Coach House by June 30, 1990. I would like at this time to thank the board and staff of Coach House as well as the members of my own staff, who worked hard and long to try to make this program a success. It has been a valuable learning experience for all of those involved and will be very useful as we develop a new program to meet the needs of children with serious behaviour problems.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the Coach House was there for a purpose and it served its purpose as long as the people in that institution were well cared for, and I hope it is not the case, as happened when the remand centre was closed, where there is a worse situation now than there was before. Mr. Speaker, care must be provided for the people who need that institution, and at this time I would like to pay tribute to the board of directors, whom, I understand were an independent board outside of Government, who have given unselfishly of their time throughout the years as well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress again, that thought must be given to the children.

I notice that the Minister says a program must be developed. Well there is a program needed for these children who have these disabilities. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister must make sure that that program is developed. And we will have more to say about it later, we have just learned of this a few

minutes ago. We will have more to say about it later.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Further Statements By Minister.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to update the House as to the present status of the deinstitutionalization of Mount Cashel. Since November, when the Christian Brothers announced the closure of Mount Cashel, there has been a concerted effort by my staff and the staff of Mount Cashel to work with the young men to develop and implement plans for their future care.

Mr. Speaker, plans are being finalized for the placement of all thirty-five young men who were at Mount Cashel. At the present time, there are only eleven young men residing there waiting for implementation of a plan for their placement. Of the twenty-four who have left Mount Cashel, seven young men have moved home or with relatives, one is being accommodated in a foster home, and sixteen young men have been accommodated in independent living arrangements. The independent living models have been developed for those who are attending university or post-secondary institutions, and they consist of shared apartments. Personal support and assistance with independent living skills such as budgeting is being provided to this group by the project team. Of the eleven young men remaining, two will be moving into foster

homes and nine young men will be accommodated in semi-independent living arrangements. These arrangements include a live-in staff person who supervises the boys and maintains the unit. These staff will be carefully selected and able to assist the boys in the development of independent living skills.

Again, the project team will provide social work support to the arrangement. Staff have been advertised for and interviews are to be held in the near future. There is a comprehensive screening process and training program planned for the staff who are hired.

Mr. Speaker, it is anticipated that all of the young men will have left Mount Cashel by the end of June, 1990. The models and supports being developed and implemented by the project team will be of benefit to all children in the foster care system. The arrangements will form part of a continuum of care which recognizes that each child is different. Mr. Speaker, a variety of placements are required if their individual needs are to be met.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, I hope it was the right decision to close. And it was the right setting for most people who went there. And I do hope that the bad publicity that has surrounded that institution will not undo the good that was done there over the years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

000

Ms. Verge: Mr. Speaker, this is not an Oral Question. I am out of place, but with Your Honour's indulgence I would like to recommend to Your Honour that Your Honour send a message on behalf of all hon. Members to each of the recipients of the Arts Council Awards presented last night.

The Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, responsible for Arts and Culture, presented the Arts Council Award to the Artist of the Year, Donna Butt, and other presentations were made to Rufus Guinchard. As well, there were inductees into the Arts Council Hall of Honour: Reginald Shepherd, Helen Parsons Shepherd, as well as Gordon Pinsent.

Mr. Speaker, my suggestion is that Your Honour send messages of congratulations to each of these outstanding artists on behalf of all Members of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Simms: An excellent idea!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Premier in an interview on the CBC program Morningside, on February 5, 1990, said that one of the reasons why Government had decided to fund an additional twenty week notice period for plant workers in St. John's and Trepassey, Gaultois and Grand Bank was because there

was no provision for pensions. That was one reason the Premier mentioned, and the other reason was that there was no provision for adequate termination allowances, both of which were accurate statements, of course.

Mr. Speaker, would the Premier tell the House whether or not the Government has decided to contribute to the \$120 million severance fund that was announced as part of the Federal Fish Aid package a few days ago, that was to be set up, as I understand it, for that very purpose - pensions and severance?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition wants to cause the taxpayers of this Province particular harm by having them take over responsibilities that are properly the responsibility of the Federal Government or not. We have already spent \$14 million to get extra time to give more extensive notice, because the Federal Government was not in a position to do what it was obliged to do at the time. Now he seems to want to take some peculiar delight in placing an additional burden on the taxpayers of this Province, to give further relief for the Federal Government. Maybe he suggests we should pay back the Federal Government what they are going to put into it. It is just an unreasonable approach.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Premier's answer, the Minister of Fisheries told this House yesterday that he was willing to negotiate with the

Federal Government on that part of the package and other parts of the package. Is the Premier saying now that there will be no participation by the Province in that severance plan, and there will be no negotiations between the Province and the Federal Government on that part of the package?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, the Government's position has been spelled out for quite some time, and I will restate it again so that the Leader of the Opposition will know. And if he will listen to me instead of his Opposition House Leader, he will hear what I am going to have to say and he will not have to ask the same question again tomorrow. The Government's position is very clear. The Federal Government has responsibility and exclusive jurisdiction for the management of the fisheries and the fish stocks. That jurisdiction gives them responsibility, Mr. Speaker, for the consequences of their mismanagement, and we have taken that position with the Federal Government all along. So it is their responsibility to deal with the financial consequences of their mismanagement. They are going to do that, at least there is some indication they are going to do that. We have also said to them, look, you are concerned with the problem in the Newfoundland fishery, as are we; you are concerned with the problem in the Newfoundland economy that puts undue pressures on the fishery, so are we. If you will participate, we will join with you in finding means of providing for the future security of the Newfoundland fishery and enhancing its performance and its productivity

and, at the same time, diversifying the economy of Newfoundland so as to relieve the pressure on the Newfoundland fishery. That is where the Government of this Province wants to put its effort. We will make sure the Federal Government discharges its responsibility to the fishermen and the fish plant workers in the communities involved, for the closures and the loss of jobs that have resulted from the federal mismanagement of the fish stocks.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: So, I assume we can say safely the Province will not be participating in that severance package, even though the Minister of Fisheries gave the indication yesterday that it would.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has consistently denied to this House and to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that his Government has supported a policy of fewer fishermen, fewer fish plant workers, and fewer fish plants. In the same program I just referred to, the Morningside Program of February 5, the Premier said, I anticipate that those plants will close, referring to Gaultois, Trepassey, St. John's, and Grand Bank, and I do not see what else can happen. Now, Mr. Speaker, how can the Premier square that statement, that admission, with the statements made over recent days that his Government does not support that particular policy?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, the first comment he made was assumption as to what Government's

policy was. Government's policy is as we have announced it, as I just indicated, and as we have announced it in the past. For example, in terms of responding to the Worker Adjustment Program, yes, the Provincial Government will be contributing some of that under the POWA Program, for example. There is a Provincial Governmental component in that, unemployment insurance and certain other CEIC payments and so on, and the consequences of their mismanagement of the fishery is for the Federal Government.

We have a big enough burden trying to make the economy of this Province work and trying to restore the quality of our health care and education services in this Province. That is a big, big job. We have to use our resources along those lines, so we cannot relieve the Federal Government of their responsibility.

Mr. Rideout: Nobody asked you to.

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say the only sensible thing for me to do now is to go back to the Cabinet Minutes of last October and November and dig out just what was recommended. Mr. Speaker, I think I will do that, and I will probably table it in the House tomorrow, a complete statement to refute totally the inferences in the comments of the Leader of the Opposition about the Government's position. The Government's position has been made clear last August, last October, and on numerous times over the last several months. The Government's position is we do not want to take people out of the fishery, force people out, and bar others from getting into the fishery. That is not the Government's policy. We

recognize, I say again, we recognize that too many of our people have to rely on the fishery, therefore, we must find some economic alternative for them so that they will have the choice to stay with the fishery if they wish, if that is what they wish to do, or to leave the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, we have to provide for the people who have dedicated their lives to the fishery an opportunity to earn a reasonable living for themselves and their families. That is what we want to do. By the same token, we cannot say to other people in Newfoundland, you cannot fish, we will not let you engage in the fishery, if we are not prepared to make sure that there is some other reasonable economic alternative available to them. That has been the Government's position from the beginning.

Now, I know the other side are not too happy with that; they are not too happy with seeing an intelligent assessment to the problem of the fishery for the first time in at least seventeen years. It bothers them greatly I know, but, nevertheless, we are going to persist.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: You might have baffled them on Meech, but you are not going to baffle them on fish.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the Premier about Cabinet documents or Cabinet Minutes, I asked the Premier about the

Premier's own words, uttered on the Morningside Show of February 5, 1990.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: CBC Morningside Show. 'I accept the fact that those plants must close.' That is what the Premier said, Mr. Speaker. Let me ask the Premier this: In preparing documents to table for this House, will the Premier table the document submitted to this Government by the Federal Task Force, the Stein Task Force, entitled Building a Viable Fishery, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Warren: Table it all.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: First let me deal with the words 'I accept the fact that those plants must close.' I do. I will not deceive the people of Trepassey and Grand Bank and Gaultois and St. John's.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: I will not deceive them. You see, Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Government said to the fishermen of Newfoundland, we will not let you catch the 70,000 tons of fish you caught two years ago, and not only that, when you look at it -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: Didn't you support that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: When you look at all the information available, it is quite clear that the Federal

Government will, in all probability next year, have to say to the fishermen of Newfoundland, we are going to cut you back still further. In all probability that is going to happen. Now, Mr. Speaker, in those circumstances, if we are to have a viable fishery, there is an inevitable consequence, one or more plants are going to have to close.

An Hon. Member: Forever?

Premier Wells: One or more plants are going to have to close, probably forever, unless there is enough fish to warrant their reopening, in which case I would be very happy to see them reopen. But I do not want to hold out to people in Trepassey or Gaultois or Grand Bank any false hope and say, just sit and wait, in two years we will guarantee your plant is going to be reopened. I would not be so dishonest and unreasonable and irresponsible to the people of those communities or to the people of this Province as to make any such statements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to go to dig out all the information, because the Leader of the Opposition has been trying to persuade the people of this Province, for some reason or other, that the Government of Newfoundland want to take people out of the fishery. It was the Opposition that endorsed the Federal measures, not this Government, Mr. Speaker. Do not overlook that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Premier Wells: And now he wants to try and infer that somehow, because we approved, or because we indicated some level of approval of a proposal at some stage, that

we endorsed or promoted this idea. Well, I will go back and dig out exactly what was said, Mr. Speaker, and I will table it in the House.

Mr. Rideout: What about building a viable future (inaudible)?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Fisheries, I have a question for the Premier. On January 5, the Premier announced the Provincial Government's funding to allow for an extended notice period for employees at Grand Bank, Gaultois and Trepassey. On March 12, I asked the Minister of Fisheries - I refer to Hansard of March 12 - if he would inform the House of the conditions attached to the funding provision to Fishery Products International. He said at that time he would undertake to inform the House. I have asked him on two occasions since. In the Estimates Committee of the Department of Fisheries, held a few weeks ago, the Minister again refused to give the conditions of funding to Fishery Products International. Could the Premier inform the House if any such conditions have been established and, if so, what they are?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Yes, Mr. Speaker, at the time the arrangements were made, there was an agreement on the broad principles that were involved, and the handling of the plant proceeded on the basis of that agreement of the broad principles. The details of it, as to how it would be implemented and how the Government would monitor

the expenditures for which the Government would compensate the companies, have since been worked out. To the best of my knowledge, only in the last two to three weeks, perhaps, the final agreements have been signed; we will table the agreements in the House, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps I should make sure there is nothing in it that is of a company confidential nature that would prevent this. If there is anything in it of that nature, what I would undertake to do, Mr. Speaker, is make the agreements available for my hon. friend opposite to examine so that he will know what is in it. I do not think there is anything of that kind of a confidential nature. If there isn't, we will table them. If not, we will make them available for examination by the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Before recognizing the hon. the Member for Grand Bank for a supplementary, I wonder if hon. Members would permit me to welcome fifty-seven Grand Ull students from the Fred Kirby Junior High School, Foxtrap, accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Pat Kennedy, Mrs. Annette Warford and Mr. Parsons. I do this because they were just leaving the galleries.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Premier. It was five months ago that this announcement was made, and I am pleased that we will finally get to see the conditions attached.

Perhaps the Premier could tell us,

on the conditions of funding, do the conditions apply to two years, 1990 and 1991, or is the provincial provision only for a twenty weeks provision in 1991?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier,

Premier Wells: It is not five months ago; in fact, Mr. Speaker, it is not even that.

In the case of Fishery Products, the general understanding was agreed upon about mid-January, at the time the plants closed, the second week in January or whenever it was. The details of the agreement have been worked out since.

In the case of National Sea Products, that has only been in the last two months. About two months or so ago, that was agreed upon. So the details have been worked out and they are either signed or about to be signed, and I will table them.

In terms of the conditions, in the case of National Sea Products, of course, it only applies up until August of this year. In the case of Fishery Products International, it applies into next year, too, it covers a two-year period.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My reference to the length of time was that your release was January 5 and this is May 10, so that is four months and four or five days.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a supplementary to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. In this particular provision, funding is provided in the

Minister of Employment and Labour Relations' budget, under subhead 4.1.11, of \$9 million, Adjustment Program for Fish Plant Workers, Grants and Subsidies. Could the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations inform the House how much of this \$9 million has been advanced to Fishery Products International?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Yes, a statement will be made in the House regarding that, perhaps tomorrow or Monday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister inform us, then, if there has been any money paid to Fishery Products International?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: I will be making a statement regarding the issue, as I said, in the next couple of days.

Mr. Simms: What does that mean, yes or no?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. As it pertains to the Burgeo situation and National Sea Products, if a deal is concluded there it seems that National Sea Products is voluntarily willing to leave a community allocation, or some portion of fish, for the Burgeo operation. Apparently, the Provincial Government is

supporting such a position. Let me ask the Premier, if similar arrangements can be made for the sale of the Grand Bank, Gaultois, Trepassey or any other plants in the Province, is it now the policy of the Provincial Government to support community allocations of fish?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: The policy of the Government with respect to allocations of fish, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not know with certainty what is the right course. We have recently written the Federal Government with a suggestion that this whole question of allocation should be reassessed, in light of the circumstances the Province and Canada find themselves in now as a result of this fishery crisis. We suggested a means of doing a reassessment, but that letter has only gone out in the last few days to the Federal Government, so I am hesitant to say any more about it. But, by reason of the question being asked, it would be less than frank for me not to indicate that fact. It is being considered.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Oh, yes, it would be (inaudible).

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to follow up on the last question to the Premier. In the event that the new company takes over Burgeo and is left with the allocation, if that allocation if there because it was with National Sea and consequently stayed with the

plant, next year the new company could be looked upon as a new entry into the fishery and, consequently, not qualify for allocation, unless it is designated as a port allocation. In that case, will the Premier support port allocations for other areas, such as Trepassey, Grand Bank and Gaultois?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker. What they are talking about is all supposition and speculation.

Mr. Rideout: Not now. (Inaudible) solution.

Premier Wells: If he wants the hon. Member's answer to the question, he can have it. If he wants mine, I would like the opportunity to give it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: The question is all based on supposition and speculation as to what might or could or is possible, and I am not prepared to comment on that kind of situation.

National Sea Products are having some discussions with a private company, and that is up to National Sea Products. Our responsibility is to ensure that to the maximum extent that it is within our power to do so, this Province, the communities of this Province, and fishermen and fish plant workers of this Province, are not adversely affected by any negotiations or discussions, or any consequences that may come out

of those discussions. I am not prepared to speculate on what might, could or should happen.

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident the Premier's stand on port allocations is the same as his stand on the Argentia ferry, he is not going to have one. I would like to ask him, then, some time ago, I raised the issue of Nova Scotian operators coming into Newfoundland and buying up licences, and then, by using Newfoundland fishermen, or Newfoundlanders with full-time fishing licences on the boats, are coming into fish in our sectors, such as 3K and 3L, bringing most of that fish - our fish - back to Nova Scotia for processing. Has the Government followed up on this, as they said they would? If so, what is the result of the follow-up?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I will take the question under advisement, consult with the Minister of Fisheries, and provide the answer at the first possible opportunity.

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier one more question. Will he confirm that a number of permits have been issued to firm from outside the Province to transship raw, unprocessed product, head-on gutted cod, actually, outside the Province to provide jobs elsewhere?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I

will not confirm that. If the Member has some particular circumstance in mind, if he will advise me of it, I will check it and I will advise him of what the Government's position is with respect to it. But so far as I know, that is not taking place and I cannot, therefore, confirm it.

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Premier because I thought he would know. The Minister of Fisheries knows very little about what is going on, and cares very little, as is evident from his answers the last few days. I hope the Premier would know a bit more about it.

I will ask him one more question related to the fishery. Is he aware that a number of areas surrounding salmon rivers have been closed to commercial fishermen this year by DFO? Will the Government lobby to make sure that proper compensation will be provided to the fishermen, or have they already done it? Because this matter has been well-known for quite some time?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, closing areas around certain rivers, where there is salmon enhancement programs underway, is the only possible solution if you are going to increase the growth and future supply of salmon. That must be done, and I have no doubt that it is being done in the case of certain rivers. Where fishermen are precluded from operating where they have for years, then I think the proper course for the federal Government to take is to buy those licences,

as they did certain licences in areas of the Maritimes, in years gone by, and on the Southwest coast of Newfoundland, where they bought licences in years gone by. It would make good sense, and, yes, the Province would lobby for the purchasing of such licences.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier, since the Minister of Fisheries is not here. The former workers from the Piccadilly fish plant are wondering what they should do, now that the fishing season is about to start, in a couple of weeks, and they have no jobs? They know what they can expect from the Federal Government response, which is nothing, and they have asked me to ask the Minister, or the Premier, what they can expect from the Provincial Government. There has been no assistance so far from the Provincial Government. Can they expect anything now, especially since the Government has known that the plant did not have an operator since December?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, the people of Port au Port can expect from the Province the same kind of effort the Province will give every other worker of this Province who finds himself or herself without a job, every possible help we can give them.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we are endeavoring to put in place an economic circumstance or situation in this Province where there will be a reasonable prospect of their having an opportunity for a job in the future. We are trying to work

this through, and with the cooperation of the Federal Government, only with great difficulty. But to the extent that they are not prepared to do so, the Province will have to continue its own private course to try and restore the economy of this Province, and we will do that. But that does not enable me to guarantee the people of Port au Port, who will not be working in the fish plant in the next few weeks, an alternative job at this stage; I hope, in the years to come, it will enable us to do so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, the Government is too willing to accept plant closures when there are solutions. This is the first time a processor has not been found, and it is the first time in almost a quarter of a century that the plant will not operate, or it looks like it will not operate. There are solutions.

Now the Minister of Fisheries said that he would visit with the Port au Port Development Association and talk to the fish plant workers. Will the Premier ask him, or direct him, to meet with the people of Port au Port, with the people who are trying to keep the plant going, to talk to them face to face?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: If it is necessary or beneficial, I will most certainly talk to him. And if it is necessary, I would even direct. But I have every confidence that it is not necessary for me to do that. If the Minister of Fisheries said he would meet with the people of Port

au Port, then I am sure all they have to do is contact him or his office to arrange for the meeting, and I am quite confident the Minister would be there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has promised but he has not done it, and it is high time he did.

Mr. Speaker, this is a plant that will surely open again. It is the only real plant at the present time, the only feasible plant in Bay St. George. What I would like to ask the Premier is, why is it support can be given workers by the Provincial Government, as happened here, and I am not against the Provincial Government because they did it in St. John's, and no support, none at all, has been given the inshore plant workers on the Port au Port Peninsula? Why is it a plant which deals with the offshore is given help, and a plant which deals with the inshore is not? No one understands that. I do not understand it. Could the Premier explain it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I am happy to explain it, Mr. Speaker. The Government will give exactly the same support to fish plant workers on the Port au Port Peninsula or any other part of the Province as it will give to St. John's or Trepassey or anywhere else. In the case of St. John's, Trepassey, Grand Bank and Gaultois, the permanent closure of those plants was announced - the permanent closure - in a way that would see

the people affected and the communities affected without any job opportunity or without any immediate prospect, in the case of three of the communities, with that being the major activity in the communities, and the Federal Government had failed miserably in its responsibility to put a program in place, to respond to this, because those plants were closed as a consequence of what the Federal Government had done. They failed miserably to respond, so the Provincial Government stepped in in the expectation, I may add, Mr. Speaker, in the expectation that the Federal Government would recognize that we were doing something which was their responsibility, and when it came time to give us credit for our contribution to dealing with the overall problem, they would recognize that we had already put up \$14 million. That is what we did, stepped in at a time when it would have been unbearably harsh to say to those communities and those employees, your plant is closed for good, and the Provincial Government has nothing immediately to offer to you. It was a different situation.

We hope Piccadilly will open again very soon. We hope it will open again. I cannot guarantee it, but we are certainly working toward that end.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. During the past year, I guess, since he became Minister, he has created much concern and anguish for many people in this Province by threatening them with amalgamation. Now, Mr. Speaker,

we all realize a lot of these hearings have been delayed, and it has caused the Minister to have to cancel hearings in some instances. In other cases, he has had to postpone them because of the frustrations of the people attending. I understand there is now only one left to be done, so I would like to ask the Minister when he will be making the results of these hearings public, and when will he be permitting the elections to take place for the councils affected?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, the Member is quite right, only one hearing remains, Clarendville and Shoal Harbour. That hearing will be held in the next week. All other hearings are complete. I fail to see what he means by delays. Certainly, with the exception of two or three that were delayed at the request of the councils, all other hearings proceeded on time.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) too small.

Mr. Gullage: That is quite correct. In some cases, councils, at our request, arranged meeting halls that were too small. They arranged the halls that were too small, not our officials. The councils, themselves, arranged halls that were too small, so we had to reschedule hearings in a larger location, and we did that; we accommodated the numbers of people who wanted to attend the hearings.

To answer the question more specifically, Mr. Speaker, the next phase is to have the

commissioners complete the balance of the feasibility process, which is quite detailed. The hearings only involve about 20 or 25 per cent of the process. They have to now look at the finances, look at the planning and the infrastructure that is in place, and all other parts of the feasibility process. They will then write a report. The two commissioners in each case will write a report, and make recommendations for or against the amalgamation being considered. After that report is received by me, I will, of course, dialogue with the communities involved. Following that, based on the results, I will make recommendations to Government. The final question asked was about the election date. We delayed elections in some cases. A lot of the municipalities went ahead with their elections, but all elections will take place, at the very latest, in November. I would think the vast majority will be held the second Tuesday in November, as is normal.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to table the Annual Report of Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services Limited.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, it was not by way of written notice but in an oral question by the hon. the Opposition House Leader, he asked questions about the ERC purchasing - his question was several dozens computers valued at \$5,000 to \$7,000 each were purchased from a mail order firm, whose office is located in Ontario, with no employees or presence here in the Province. No, Mr. Speaker, that is not accurate. What in fact occurred, is, that four separate purchasing occasions have arisen. On two occasions, December 1989 and January 1990, local vendors were the successful bidder to the Government Standing Offer Agreement for either part or all of the bid. In the initial purchase eight computers and work stations were purchased, with a mainland firm being the successful bidder for the total deal. In the most recent purchase of computers, ERC, in March of 1990, seven microcomputers were purchased through three separate bids due to three types of hardware being required. Five computers were supplied by a Newfoundland firm that manufactures and sells the computers locally, one by a national firm through a local distributor, and one by a mainland firm with no local office. The cost of all computers ran between \$3,557 each.

The second question he asked was, or he suggested - in fact hundreds of these same computers have been ordered and purchased by various Government Departments in the same way, not giving local companies who are in the business an opportunity to bid. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, it is true that hundreds of computers have been

ordered and purchased by various Government Departments, in fact 466 computers have been purchased by various Departments along with various Government Agencies, Memorial, NLDC and so on. However, in each case the Government's Standing Offer was used, with local firms being provided the normal opportunity to bid.

Petitions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to have the opportunity today to present a petition signed by 128 residents of Coachman's Cove in my constituency.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: I suspect, Mr. Speaker, 128 names that are on this petition is practically every person who is eligible to vote in the community of Coachman's Cove. It is a small community, but they have grave concern related to the management of the forestry on the Baie Verte Peninsula, Mr. Speaker. And I will read the prayer of the petition so that the House is aware of it, and in particular the Minister. The petition is addressed to the House, and it petitions the Legislature to review what has traditionally been referred to as the fishermen's claim along the northeast coast, and the Baie Verte Peninsula, in particular.

In previous years, Mr. Speaker, going back to, I do not know, the old Bowater Act, I suppose, of the early 1990's the people on the

Baie Verte Peninsula, in particular, I do not know if it is anywhere else in the Province, I am not familiar with that. But around coastal Newfoundland on the Baie Verte Peninsula there was such a thing defined as a three-mile timber limit. And within that three-mile timber limit, known locally, I do not know if it is known in law as this, but known locally as the fishermen's claim, Mr. Speaker, local residents were permitted to harvest timber for building boats, for building wharves, for building stages. In other words for the personal use of fishermen. I have attached to the petition, Mr. Speaker, a map that shows the outline of what used to be the fishermen's claim on the Baie Verte Peninsula. It used to started off at Partridge Point and come right up through the middle of the Peninsula and then go back out to the sea in the local area known as Slaughterhouse Cove. So all that three mile area between the coastline and the - this line was actually cut, physically cut on the ground, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister or to the Premier, I believe, who has indicated he is going to respond. But this survey line was actually cut on the ground decades ago marking off what was locally referred to as the fishermen's claim.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whatever has transpired in legislation or just in policy, I do not know, I have not been able to find out. Whatever has transpired, the Department of Forestry are now demanding, and only this year as far as I know according to the residents, that within this particular claim a fisherman must receive permits from the Crown. And not only are they demanding permits from the Crown, but they

are also identifying where the fishermen can go to do their particular harvesting. And in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, they have also allotted commercial cutting areas within that claim area, so that commercial logging operations on the Peninsula are now competing for the small amount of timber that is remaining within that area that used to be exclusive, I do not know if it is exclusive in law, but it was at least exclusive in management, exclusively left for the first right of fishermen, not only in Coachman's Cove, but in Fleur de Lys and Coachman's Cove and Wild Cove and other areas that would be along the coastline of the Baie Verte Peninsula.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the prayer of this petition. I ask that it be tabled and referred to the Department to which it relates. And I would hope that the Government would seriously consider what has traditionally been the right of those people to have first claim, for fisheries purposes, to that particular forest sector of the Baie Verte Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, those timber reserves came about in 1904. Originally when the Government build the railway across the Province there were exchanges of land as was done in the case of the Canadian Pacific, where the Government gave the railway builder blocks of land in exchange for building the railway. In many cases those blocks of land went right down to the seacoast, and in some cases they included title to whole lakes, the water in the lakes and everything. Then in 1904 a

statute was passed called The Transportation of Timber Act and that provided for the use of these lakes and rivers that were encompassed by these grants of land to the railway, to give people the right to transport timber on the waters and the right of access for fishing to the lakes and so on. It also did one other thing, it created a reserve for fishermen. I am speaking from memory. That Act, or an earlier amendment to The Railway Act in 1898, I have forgotten which now, created a special reserve for fishermen within three miles of the seacoast, so anywhere where these lands were within three miles of the seacoast, fishermen had the right to go in and cut timber for two limited purposes, one, for firewood, and the second for timber for building stages and boats for fishing purposes. There was a reserve, and then, Mr. Speaker, when the original company, it was not in Bowaters time, it was before Bowaters time when the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company built the mill in Corner Brook, originally the lands that had been transferred into it by the Reid Newfoundland Company were transferred in and there was an exemption given from this exemption.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: I am just speaking from memory, I would have to have it checked, but in respect to the Bowater lands there may have been an exception given to the company, but I have to go back and check it, but the lands still belong to the company, freehold title to the lands belong to the company, and there may still be a right for those limited purposes. But I believe in respect to the railway lands that went to the company

there may have been an exemption.

The lands that remained with Reid Newfoundland Company, the railway, there was no exception, the fishermen's rights still remained. That was the case until the former Government, of which the hon. gentleman opposite was a Member, introduced a Legislative change that took away the rights of fishermen from these lands and reserved and gave them to the Government. I think you will find legislation, I believe in the late 70s, the Forest Management Act was in 1974 but I do not know if it was done then, I believe it was done in 1977 or 1978, sometime in the late 70s. The Government introduced legislation and this House passed it, that took all the benefits that fishermen had in these three mile reserves and took them into the rights of the Crown.

An Hon. Member: Was that further amendment (inaudible)?

Premier Wells: My recollection is that amendment was made at the time that the Government of the day acquired all of the remaining Reid lots. Do you remember when they were acquired from Reid Newfoundland Company and there was a debate and discussion? I think the hon. gentleman was in the Liberal Opposition at the time.

Mr. Simms: It was probably in 1974 or something like that.

Premier Wells: The original Act was 1974 but this was done later when they acquired the Reid lands. I believe it was about 1977 or 1978 when that was done. Anyway, at that time, when they acquired all the Reid lands back for the Crown that were still held by the Reid Company, what Bowaters and Price held was their own

because they had bought it, but those lands that still remained with the Reid company in the late 70s were reacquired by the Province and at that time there was legislation passed that took the timber rights back.

So what he was talking about was legislation introduced by the former Government that makes it necessary now for anybody to get a permit. As to what the companies' rights are, it is a little vague. I did know it one time but I would have to go back and check. I believe the companies' have the right themselves to the timber.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words in support of the petition on behalf of the petitioners from Coachman's Cove on the Baie Verte Peninsula. I just say in passing that my recollection, my limited knowledge of it, my recollection of it when I was in the Department of Forestry is that the changes that the Premier referred to were not changes implemented by the former Government, nor by the former, former Government, but changes that were implemented by the former, former, former Government. I understand it was under the Moore's Administration that these changes were made, and if that is the case it is not the former, nor the former, former, but the former, former, former Government, which goes back quite a ways.

If he was trying to imply it was the Conservative Administration then why did he not just say so. He implied it was an Administration of which the Leader of the Opposition was part of and

that is not correct, it is inaccurate. He is wrong again, as usual. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact I thought there had been a further amendment proposed, if not passed.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) the Forestry Department only started doing that this past winter.

Mr. Simms: Yes.

I understood and I thought that there was an amendment proposed or passed even later, that corrected the situation, because these kinds of complaints apparently have only been developing over the last year.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Simms: Complaints are only coming forward in the last year. Nevertheless, it does not help the people of Coachman's Cove to argue or to blame. The point is, they would like to see it corrected. It is in that light that I am speaking in support of the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition.

It is too bad that the Premier would not let the Minister of Forestry respond to the petition. It was directed to him. Perhaps he could have enlightened us all and told us what the situation is. I have no doubt that he knows just about everything that the Premier just said for the last five minutes. I dare say he has that down pat anyway and probably could have added more. But the point is, he is bringing in new legislation himself now, the Forestry Legislation, and perhaps before that legislation is finalized, because it is not yet finalized obviously it is going through the review process, perhaps there might be an

opportunity, if it is not in the new legislation, I do not know if the Minister knows if it is included or not, but if it is not, perhaps there might be an opportunity during the legislative review process to include some kind of an amendment to correct the situation. So that is the whole point of the matter, we can argue until the cows come home as to who is to blame, whether it was the Tories or the Liberals. I do not think that is important from the point of view of the people of Coachman's Cove.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well, you know, if in fact it was a Conservative Administration, so what. It was not one that I was part of, that I recollect. It was not one that he was part of. There may have been somebody here, I do not know, who might have been back there in those days. Even if we were, I mean, I would have no hesitation in accepting responsibility for it, if it was the wrong thing to do. So what. But the point is that now we are looking for it to be corrected. And I hope that is the point the Minister will look at it from, in that light, to try to correct it, if it is possible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: With the permission of the House, a recollection comes back, I guess as a function of age it takes a while for it to come back. My recollection as to what happened with the legislation is that the Government took back everything that was then in the Reids, but they could not take back what was then the Bowater land. So the

irony of it is, that people have access to the lands that are still held by Kruger for firewood and boat timber and stage purposes, but they do not have access to those of the lands that went back to the Crown. So the legislation could not take back the rights of the Paper Company. They still own the timber rights in that area, in the three mile limit, but it was subject to this right of fishermen. That still applies in the case of non-Crown land. It applies in the case of the Company land but not the Crown land.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Motion 8, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Motion 8. The hon. the Minister of Justice, to have leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Human Rights Code, 1988." (Bill No. 46). Carried.

On motion, Bill No. (46) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Mr. Baker: Motion 9.

Mr. Speaker: Motion 9.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Commissioner For Oaths Act." (Bill No. 47). Carried.

On motion, Bill No. (47) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Simms: Sure, no problem, I will speak for five minutes until the Premier comes back.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I believe, I am not sure what the clock says now in terms of the overall time for the Estimates in this area, I think originally when we started we had twenty-four and a half hours, and I believe there may be about nine hours gone, so that should leave us with about fifteen or so hours remaining to scrutinize the Estimates of the Executive Council, the Premier's Office and well, just about every Department in Government for that matter. I think it is generally now widely accepted, even by the Chair, that we can debate or discuss any matter at all. It is not specifically related directly to Executive Council Estimates. And the person that ensured that was the case was the President of Treasury Board. When I was doing my duty as his critic and raised some detailed technical questions, I happened to mention the word fish in one of my questions. A simple word fish, and before you know it, the next three hours, all hell broke loose. The place came apart. Even the Minister of Social Services got a chance to get up and speak, which we were delighted to see or hear for a change. So, Mr. Chairman, it is valid now that we can speak about anything.

Now, that was not my intent on that evening, as the Government House Leader knows. We were moving along quite nicely at our own pace for six hours or so

asking questions - getting no answers, asking questions - getting no answers, asking questions - getting no answers. So maybe it was a blessing in disguise, to use a recent favorite term of the Minister of Fisheries, maybe it was a blessing in disguise that the fisheries debate broke out. Because it gave the Government House Leader much more time to get his thoughts together and to get his answers together and to get the officials down in Executive Council to scamper around trying to get some answers for him to the questions that I asked. And I still have them listed here. And there are quite a few that I am expecting him to get back to me throughout the day on, I guess, and tonight.

We sit tonight do we not? Well, I am assuming that the President of The Council will be true to his word when he said we will be sitting all this week and all next week, Monday, Tuesday and Thursday nights. I assume that is what he has in mind, unless he has changed his mind and that may not happen, but if that is the case, then tonight would be a sitting night.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Friday, no I do not think that would be a good idea. But, maybe I can just toss out a few more topics, and see if it will spark anybody in the opposite side to getting up and having a few words in this debate. Because we have lots of time left in the debate. And we had a good discussion on the fishery, and I am sure we will have more as time goes on.

But I wonder if the Minister of Finance, who is now back in the House after being away from a day

or so, no doubt on Her Majesty's Service as Her Loyal Minister of Finance, I would like to see him participate in this Estimates debate, because it is a very good debate, ten minutes per person is a great opportunity for people to get on their feet. I would like to see some of the backbenchers over there get up, particularly the Member for Placentia and the Member for LaPoile. I would like to see them get on their feet and tell us about the year round service to Argentia. That is an interesting topic and I really like to hear both their points of view, because we know full well they are differing points of view.

But from the Minister of Finance's perspective, I understand that yesterday the Minister may be aware by now that the President of the St. John's Board of Trade, I think according to the news reports yesterday, I understand the President, speaking on behalf of the Board of Trade, the business community in the Province, made a pretty gloomy prediction about the future of the Province.

An Hon. Member: They are always at it.

Mr. Simms: Yes, I know they are always at it. Well I can't say I know they are always at it. I am sure they have -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well that is why I want the Minister to speak in the debate. As I understand it, and this is a serious matter now, this is a business community. And they did not blame it all on the Provincial Government or anything. I do not want them to get defensive right away and

testy. They did not talk about that, they talked about inflation and all those kinds of things. But they did say, I say to the Minister of Finance and to the President of Treasury Board, they did say that retail sales were either down or projected to be down this year. They also did say that construction was down, big construction was down. They had a concern over Hibernia. A lot of concern over whether Hibernia will be finalized. And they referenced the significant increase in the number of bankruptcies this year over last year. They are quite concerned about that. And indeed, as I understand it, they projected a recession for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and Canada.

So it is pretty gloomy stuff, and I was hoping that the Minister of Finance, who is the Province's and the Government's chief economic's spokesperson, would stand in the debate and try to allay our fears and try to maybe preach something a little more positive, because quite frankly I do not like to hear all negative news either, even though I can see how people in Opposition can easily get attuned to that approach. But I try not to get that way if I can do it, but it is very hard to do when you are in Opposition. But it does not do anything for the economy if, in particular, people such as the President of the Board of Trade are going around predicting recessions and talking about retail sales being drastically down and so on.

So hopefully the Minister of Finance might come to his feet and take ten minutes, he does not have to speak for an hour, and give us his views on the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador. I

would like to hear from, as I say the Member for Placentia, and the Member for LaPoile, and the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation on this whole question of the year round service to Argentia. Because I hear debate on it for the last several weeks, and I hear, as usual - as there are with most issues in Newfoundland.- two sides.

Mr. Hogan: Do you want to hear it now?

Mr. Simms: Yes, I would like to hear it now, as soon as I am finished my few remarks I would love to hear the Member - okay I will sit down, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Placentia would like to speak.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Placentia.

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to have this opportunity to address the concerns of the hon. the Member for Grand Falls. And I hope he does not mind if I refer to my notes because this is a very important subject - I want notes, because I will be here all day if you want me to on Argentia.

I would like to comment probably, Mr. Chairman, on the various options and on the report that was submitted regarding the year round service into Argentia. As the House and Members know, Mr. Speaker, there were three options: Option No. 1 was an extended seasonal service from June 1 to October 3, aimed primarily at peak passenger periods, and with some limited freight capabilities. Option No. 2, Mr. Speaker, was a year round freight service with passenger capability provided during the summer season. Option No. 3 was a year round freight and

passenger service with additional capacity provided during the summer season.

Mr. Simms: There were three options.

Mr. Hogan: Should I take the full ten minutes?

Mr. Simms: Yes.

Mr. Hogan: All right. Option No. 1. is an extended service from June 1 to October 3, and that is aimed primarily at the peak passenger period or tourist period.

An Hon. Member: Was that taking on a seasonal extension?

Mr. Hogan: That is a seasonal extension, yes, and with the capability of taking freight during that period also. Okay, limited, designated amount of freight. Option 2. is the year-round freight service with passenger capability provided during the summer season. Now I might also add here, Mr. Speaker, that this particular option was an interjection by I guess the Department of Transport. It was not one that was ever explored locally and certainly not expounded by anybody west of Gander, probably not as far as Gander, and this was put in, as I said, by the Department officials. Option. 3. which was the one expounded upon and advocated by those who lived, worked and do business on the east coast, and in particular in the Argentia area. That was a year-round freight and passenger service with additional capacity provided during the summer season.

An Hon. Member: Additional what?

Mr. Hogan: Additional capacity

provided during the summer season for passengers. Very basically, that particular option grew from our suggestion that the new boat would target their marketing at tourists during the tourist season and freight during the off-season, so what you would do is, you would have passengers and freight to a limited degree in the tourist season and in the non tourist season it would be targeted at freight with some passenger service.

Mr. Simms: Is that Option 3?

Mr. Hogan: That's basically what Option 3 is, yes.

Mr. Simms: Is that the one the Argentia group - are advocating?

Mr. Hogan: That is being advocated, yes. I do not believe option 2 is being addressed by anybody. I think, Mr. Speaker, I might also add and will interject here that I feel somewhat qualified because we have been dealing with this subject for many, many years, probably as far back as 1974. I might also add at this particular time too, that, some people might want to argue that this is a constitutional or a legal thing or a whatever, but I think it always has been and is at the stage where it is strictly a political decision, and that is something that we advocated all along and the latest report by ADI Consultants bears that out.

Year-round services received the support of almost every municipality in eastern Newfoundland and indeed of many from outside of that particular region. All these municipalities including the cities of St. John's and Mount Pearl are on record with the Federal Department of

Transport in Ottawa as favouring year-round service. As well, both labour and the business sector, several of the major shippers, importers, trucking companies have communicated to Ottawa their written support. Included in this vast group is the St. John's Board of Trade, by the way, and I would also interject here, Mr. Speaker, that at more recent meetings, and I believe possibly the one which was held in Port aux Basques yesterday, where the unions and workers themselves advocate the service into Argentia.

I would suggest that everybody got a position on this one, Mr. Speaker, including my friend from Placentia - Burin. Anyway if he would stay quiet for a few minutes, I will finish my little dissertation while I am on a good track. Consequently, it will be no surprise to anyone that the people in the Argentia area are supporting the year-round service option 3, which I have done and which was considered by the ADI report. We have been very strong in advocating this position, Mr. Speaker, and we have met with the Minister in Ottawa and we have met with various groups in the north Sydney area and we met, as I said, with the Minister of Transport in Ottawa on on April 23.

We were sort of disappointed in the report in our area, Mr. Chairman, because it did not make any firm recommendations, nor does it adequately reflect the tremendous, I guess, positive reaction of all the parties that I mentioned earlier. However, an analysis of the report cannot but conclude that the case for the year round service is strongly made. And for this reason I am pleased with the reports finding. If the Minister's decision, which

I think is a political one in Ottawa, if that Minister's decision is based on what is good for this particular Province, I have every reason to believe and to be optimistic that the overall benefits to the Province are many. And I would like to emphasize that the people in the Argentic area with the support of everybody on the eastern part of the Province are promoting the interest of the Province and not just the Argentic area; an analysis of the report clearly indicates that the benefits of a year round service apply to all sectors of the Province including Port aux Basques and the whole west coast.

And to begin with there would be a more positive impact on tourism, expanding the ferry service at Argentic would increase by about 7,000 passengers; and the total number of travellers that would visit the Province, and probably increase the entire system probably 16,500 as indicated in the report. And this, Mr. Chairman, would encourage what we call the loop trip, where travellers enter via one port and exit via the other. And the impact of the new service and the loop travel pattern would be quite positive and would extend the travel season in the spring and late fall. Already, Mr. Chairman, I have heard from, as a matter of fact, from sources that are closer to the City of St. John's than mind and other sources, and confirmed by Marine Atlantic in a phone call yesterday, that they are having many calls because of rumours afloat that the year round service might happen, is that they are getting many calls now to put on tour buses, late this fall right up until early December, as a matter of fact.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, this route also has, of all travel patterns, the highest number of destinations, the loop pattern, to be visited, and should therefore be promoted as the most favourable tour route to the west coast.

In addition to the increase in pleasure travellers the new service would increase the number of coach tour operations that I just mentioned by at least thirty visits or more annually. Already, Mr. Chairman, they had over twenty requests and the service is not even being started to go on until December. The increased tourism effect will create a minimum of forty-eight to fifty jobs, most of which would be in the west coast region. This is a fact-finding report now for the Department of Transport, not my figures. Needless to say the increase in tourism would have a significant positive economic effect.

Shipping and trucking firms are most interested in year round rather than seasonal operations at Argentic, for obvious reasons. Savings due to lower round trip costs, availability of berths for truckers, elimination of hazardous winter driving on the Trans Canada Highway, and the ability to take the mandatory eight hours time off on board, allowing them a full allotment of thirteen hours of driving. The service would result in a significant improvement to truck traffic freight flow across the Province and produce overall road cruiser benefits of over \$6 million to be passed on to the consumer.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!
The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: There is lots more time later on. He will do Chapter

2 later on. He can get up any time for ten minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!
The Hon. The Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was appreciative of the well-meaning words of the Member for Placentia, but I was specifically interested in his position on the issue as it relates to the report commissioned by the Federal Government. He did give me the information I was looking for early on in his comments when he described Options 1, 2, 3, for me and said his choice is Option 3 and that is what the people in his area support.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, and the rest of the explanation he gave me were all the other groups that support their position, and the reasons for it, and a very good explanation for that reason.

Now, I raise the issue because I heard one day on CBC Radio Noon, the topic being discussed when the Member for Placentia was the guest, and, lo and behold, who calls up in the middle of the program to monopolize the Member for Placentia's time, but his old colleague and rival, his near seat mate, the Member for LaPoile, who, at the time he called in, started giving another side to the story. And I thought it was extremely important that he did, because it was a side of the story and I thought he was very articulate in explaining that side of the story. And it was not the side of the story, I say to him, by the

way, that most people have heard. They have heard the side of the story advocated by the Placentia group and the Member for Placentia, who is in the press just about every second day on behalf of that group, talking about his reasons for supporting it. But the position that the Member for LaPoile expressed that day in that program, I do not think, quite frankly, has gotten out, and I found it kind of interesting.

So since we have a forum here to debate issues of this nature, which are of importance to the Province - tourism generally, transportation services generally, are important to all sectors of the economy, are important to people, are important to businesses. And, since we have had an explanation by the Member for Placentia of his choice, I was hoping and I do hope that the Member for LaPoile will take advantage of the opportunity for ten minutes or seven minutes -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Okay, that is fine, too. But I do hope he will stand and explain the other side of the story. I would like to know clearly what is the difference in the two positions and what is the specific argument? You know, see if you can bring it down to that, so people can understand rather than argue with each other. They will understand the contentious issue.

Following the Member for LaPoile, I would hope that the Minister of Justice, a Cabinet Minister, a Minister of the Crown, who represents a part of the City of Corner Brook, whose Mayor has strongly opposed option three, as

advocated by the Member for Placentia, I believe, supports the position of the Member for LaPoile - I am not absolutely certain what the Member for LaPoile's position is, but we will hear it today, for sure - but certainly opposes the position advocated by the Member for Placentia.

So, I understand the Minister of Justice went to the mainland, somewhere -

Mr. Tobin: Ottawa.

Mr. Simms: - Ottawa, or wherever -

Mr. Tobin: Friday.

Mr. Simms: - Friday of last week.

Mr. Tobin: Took a stand against Argentina.

Mr. Simms: And I gather that he told the - was it the Federal Minister, or just officials?

Mr. Tobin: The Federal Minister, I think.

Mr. Simms: Well, whoever he met with, the Federal people, that he supported strongly the position of the people of the west coast, led by the people from Port aux Basques, I guess, the Municipal Council of Port aux Basques and the Member for LaPoile, I presume, who supports his Council - I am not quite sure if he does or not, maybe he does not. But I understand that the Minister of Justice, who now sits in the middle, between the Member for Placentia, who has this position and the Member for LaPoile who has that position - I think the Member for LaPoile's position might be over here in the middle, somewhere, I am not quite sure yet if he has come out strongly

opposing the lobby of the Placentia group. I am not certain. He can tell us today.

The Minister of Justice - it would be interesting to hear what his position is, because he is a Minister of the Crown and, obviously, he is speaking as a Minister of the Crown, although I understand the Minister of Transportation yesterday, at the meeting in Port aux Basques, told the group, 'Our position is that we do not have a position at the moment,' which is not unusual for this Government. I think he said, 'We will have a position by the end of May or thereabouts.' Perhaps he has taken his advice from the Minister of Finance.

The end of May will come and the Minister of Finance will advise him, now tell them it will be another couple of weeks. The same kind of advice, I suspect, he has given to the Minister of Education, take another couple of weeks, then when the House closes we will announce all this stuff. The Recreation Capital Grants will be announced after the House closes, the location of the Central Newfoundland University will be announced after the House closes. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I will leave it at that and see if the Member for LaPoile is going to have a few words now, or is he going to wait? He is still going to wait. Well let me throw out a few other topics then. We will know what to expect on that topic. That is a good one for discussion. I would like to hear from the Minister of Education, by the way, to see if he will confirm the announcement by the Minister of Forestry, who yesterday, according to the news headlines on VOXM at 7.45 am, announced that the Government - I am sorry, where

is it - that was the one where he announced that Government supports the water treatment plants, so the Minister of Municipal Affairs can tell me about that. Here it is. It was on the VOCM radio news at 1 o'clock, Graham Flight says the decision on the location for Memorial Central Campus will be known in a couple of weeks. Now let me go back to the University decision. It was delayed not once, not twice, to use the words of a famous former, former, former Premier, and it was delayed not three times - three times was it?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well, this is the third delay is what I am saying. It was delayed twice before and this is an indefinite delay. The Minister of Education makes the announcement that we should not have said what we said. We should not have done it. We should not have built up the people's hopes. He said this time we are going to do it right so the decision will be indefinite. It will be an indefinite time before we make the decision. That is what he said. He said we will not set a date or a time on the decision. Did he not say that? However, his colleague the Minister of Forestry, yesterday, goes out and says the decision will be made in a couple of weeks which would bring us into -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well, that is what the news headlines say, so I want to ask the Minister of Education if he will confirm, stand in this debate sometime, and speak without taking the advice of his colleague, the Minister of Finance, who would be the last person in the world you would take

advice from, and tell us if he will confirm the announcement of the Minister of Forestry that the decision on the location for the university will be made by May 24 which is two weeks, or will it still be delayed further, and will it in fact be delayed until after the House closes, and accept the advice of the Minister of Finance? That is something for the Minister of Education to mull over, and I hope he will stand in his place and say a few words. These are just a few topics of interest and we would like to hear some discussion. Now, if the VOCM 1 o'clock news yesterday quoted the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations properly, did she say that she is pleased Ottawa is proposing some changes in its planned legislation on unemployment insurance? Did she say, Pat Cowan is pleased Ottawa is proposing changes in its planned legislation on unemployment insurance?

Mr. Tobin: She cannot remember. She is like the Premier, she forgets.

Mr. Simms: Obviously, the Minister of Employment has been counselled and advised, do not respond to these little taunts, little questions. I know, I can tell. I hope, since she is a public figure and a Minister of the Crown, certainly able to speak on her feet, I would hope that she will participate in this Estimates Debate, and I would like to hear an elaboration of what she means, because everything I ever heard her say certainly led me to believe that you were violently opposed to the legislation. Now, she nods. That was her position. So, what did she say yesterday to VOCM news to give them reason to report that Pat Cowan is pleased

Ottawa is proposing changes in its planned legislation on unemployment insurance? I am sure she will take the opportunity to explain her position, and if not we will have to ask VOIC news to produce the tape, but why did they quote her that way if she did not say it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: Is it, Mr. Speaker? I have a few more topics to throw out. Unless somebody is ready to jump up, I can throw a few more out, just food for thought.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Stephenville.

Mr. K. Aylward: I was not going to stand. I was intently listening to the positions the Opposition House Leader was outlining, and the very articulate and concrete and substantial debate that was going on, and how he stimulated the debate. I must say, I always enjoy it, Mr. Speaker.

I want to get up in this debate for just a couple of minutes to go over a couple of issues that I think are very important.

I was reading this morning the number of editorials concerning the Premier's appearance at the Meech Lake hearings. I must say, the list of editorials from across Canada that are supportive of the Premier's approach and the position taken by this Government, are many in number and the way they are put is very reasonable. The approach we have taken seems to now be - I think maybe we are convinced it is the right approach to take. I just want to say in

this debate, that is very wide-ranging, that the Premier's approach and this Government's approach is now being well received across Canada, not only by the national media, but to other provincial Premiers, who are now starting to come around, and are proposing some possible solutions to the national debate that is underway at this present time.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to see this Government taking such a leading role in trying to find a solution to the stalemate that has come about. A number of the editorials outline the position of this Government that there is a flexibility there and that other provinces should take the same. So from watching the news last night and the last few days, I would hope that the Prime Minister will convene a conference to discuss these matters in a reasonable fashion that would see this national debate and this problem come to a reasonable solution. I think reasonableness must prevail if that is to happen.

I wanted to make note of that because I watched the Prime Minister last night on the news. Again, there seems to be more of trying to create an atmosphere that we have no choice but we must go through with this, instead of 'Why don't we sit down and see if we can negotiate and try to come up with a compromise.' Noting the Western Premier's proposals, again, they are trying to strike out and bring some kind of compromise to it, so I would hope the Prime Minister and the Federal Government will see light there and try to get some reasonableness to pervade in this discussion. I think it is very important that

this be done and that that occur.

I must say, I am very supportive of the approach, and the commendations that have been given from the variety of leading national editors across Canada are very welcome. I think it put this Province on a very high plateau when it comes to constitutional discussions and when it comes to debate on most issues across Canada.

I believe also that in relation to this, the fishery problems we are experiencing right now should be taken very seriously by the Prime Minister and the Federal Government. It doesn't appear that they are. You would think the representations that have been made, not only from this Province but from other provinces, that they would very seriously be taking representations from us, but they seem to be just wanting to go on their own path. That is most unfortunate, as seen by the package that has been announced in the last couple of days. It is very unfortunate, and many people now see what the attempt has been to do with the fishery in this Province, most unfortunately, very little. But the focus of it has not been substantiated and has not been supported with proper funding in which way to go.

So the Federal Government is having a major drastic impact on Atlantic Canada by not taking upon itself the responsibility it has to carry out and implement a proper program to rehabilitate and get the fishery moving again. It is most unfortunate. It is a desperate situation that they should be dealing with but are refusing to do so.

I think this Government has put

forward and is continuing to put forward some strong proposals based on sound logic, reasonableness and a passion for this Province, and I would hope that the Federal Minister, Mr. Valcourt, will give these proposals more than lip service, give it some serious consideration. These are major proposals that we have put forward for the long-term for the Province and they have been given very little consideration. I think the Federal Government, through its representatives in this Province, Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Reid, should certainly review what they have been doing and this recent announcement. I think that message has gone loud and clear from everybody in the Province over the last few days. Hopefully, we will see something coming out of it.

Our Minister of Fisheries is going to be meeting with Mr. Valcourt in the next few days to try to deal with this matter, and hopefully, we will see more coming from Ottawa in the sense of not only funding but in the sense of programs and also in a sense of effort, in a sense of showing that they care about what happens to this Province and its economic activity. That again is the major message that has to go to Ottawa and that has to go from this Province and from all people in the Province, because it has not sunk in and it has not gotten through, Mr. Speaker.

I think that is all I am going to have to say, Mr. Speaker, I will let the debate continue.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for St. John's East.

Ms Duff: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is interesting that the Member for Stephenville would once again raise Meech Lake because I am sure that if all the words that have been said in this House on Meech Lake, and printed in the Newfoundland media, were laid end to end they would stretch from here to Victoria and would make a wonderful path for the Premier to ride his favorite diversionary hobbyhorse.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Duff: An almost equal amount of words have been spent on the fishery. I would have to agree that there could be no other topic more worthy of discussion in this House than the fishery, because here we have a genuine crisis and an industry that is the most single important employer in this Province. The difference between the two is that in the fishery we have a crisis that is not of the making of the people of Newfoundland. In Meech Lake, we have a crisis that is wholly and solely the making of the Premier of this Province.

In contrast to that, if you were to take the number of words that have been spoken in this House on the subject of culture and historic resources and laid them end to end I think they would probably stretch from the Speaker's Chair to the door, or barely. So for that reason, I am going to spend my ten minutes today on the subject of historic resources and culture, because they are probably the most neglected, languishing areas in the whole Budget and in the whole priority of this Government. Just to put it in perspective, if you look at what is spent on culture,

as a percentage of the total Newfoundland Budget, it comes out to .003 per cent. If you look at what is spent on historic resources, it comes out to .001 per cent. And if it gets any less, we can round it off to three zeros and drop it from the Budget altogether. Because the people in this Province who value their culture and value their heritage, the artists in this Province, the heritage groups in this Province, are so disappointed with the difference between the promises, the fine words of the Minister and what has actually happened, after more than one year in office, that I think you are very shortly going to start hearing from them.

Because this Minister is very capable of listening, he listens and he makes all the nice noises and people go out of his office and think, good we have the Minister's ear, he understands what we are saying and he is going to do something. He goes to a lot of functions, and he makes the right noises. But after a year the same noises, when there is no action following those noises, become just what they were in the first place and that is pious platitudes. I think that is absolutely disgraceful in a Province which prides itself on being the most historic Province in Canada. In a Province that probably has more indigenous artists, visual artists and performing artists, more native raw talent, most of whom are starving to death because of lack of opportunity to make a living from their craft, and leaving to seek their fame and fortune elsewhere. It is very, very difficult to understand from a Government who pretends to be so proud of this Province.

I am actually angry about it. There is a good question I think that needs to be asked, and I only wish the Minister responsible were here. Unfortunately, I gather he is down at a meeting in the Minister of Public Works board room. I am sure he will hear about it anyway. Almost a year ago, he made a promise to the Heritage Coalition of Newfoundland and Labrador that he would establish a task force to take a comprehensive review at the whole area of Historic Resources Protection and Development in this Province. It is an area, I quite frankly admit, that was neglected, but not as badly neglected before he came into office. But he was going to do the world and all about it. He told them at the time that he thought it was a very good idea, he was very responsive, but he couldn't do it while the task force on the Arts was in progress. Now, I find it a little difficult to understand, because it is two totally different groups of people, and it didn't cost a whole lot of money, why they couldn't be done on a parallel track. But as my friend, Andy Wells, often says at council when there is somebody who cannot handle two things at the same time, they can't walk and chew gum. So maybe that was the problem. In any case, the groups are very reasonable. Our Heritage groups are probably too reasonable; they walked away from that meeting thinking the Minister would make good on his promise and as soon as the task force on Culture had reported, he would establish a similar task force on Historic Resources. Nothing has happened and, as far as I can find out, nothing is going to happen; there has been no discussion about it, there have been no terms of reference established about it,

and we will probably be here this time next year debating whether or not there will be a task force on Historical Resources set up, and that will be a profound disappointment to those who believed in this Government and this Minister.

But I am not totally surprised, because this Minister has not yet dealt with the review on the Internal Reorganization of the Historic Resources Division; he has not yet appointed people to fill about thirteen vacancies which exist in those two areas in his Department. I know that's a wonderful money-saving device, but it doesn't do much for the morale of the staff; it certainly doesn't do much for protecting our culture and our heritage; and it certainly doesn't do much for trying to get something done to allow these two areas to reach their potential, not only in helping Newfoundlanders be proud of the Province in which they live and of their own identity, but in the development of tourism, which I have heard this Government say time and time again has the greatest potential as a generator of new income of any industry in this Province.

Now that we are really in trouble with the fishery, we really should have something in place in the area of tourism and what's there? Nothing! And if the time it has taken so far to do it is any judge, I hate to think of how long it will take. I think it is very important to keep in mind, particularly with heritage and historic resources, that they are nonrenewable. You may be able to come up with another generation of artists with great difficulty, at tremendous loss of the potential of our current offices, but if you

lose your environment and your heritage, it is nonrenewable, it is less renewable than the fishery, it is gone, and then, I think, we should stop even attempting to call ourselves an Historic Province. Every single year we lose something else, and the catalogue of the losses is already profoundly depressing.

I do not know how much time I have left, but there is one other area I would like to just touch on. No, I am not finished with that area yet, because even though the Minister is not here, I would like to address this to the Government House Leader. I know that Minister is overburdened. He knows he is overburdened. It was absolutely obvious from the day that catch-bag of a Department was put together that no one person, no matter how good, could possibly handle all those diverse responsibilities, particularly since we came up with amalgamation which, in itself, would be enough to keep a Minister busy, and the Fire Department resolution, which is another very large issue, the whole problem of recreation services in this Province, and the youth and all these other things.

The area of culture and heritage has been very low. I would say it is number zero priority on this Government's priority list. So I would like to ask the Government House Leader if he would ask this Minister, who is a new Minister, and probably proud, and probably feels that if he goes to the Premier and says, Mr. Premier, look, I cannot do this. These are important areas which are being totally neglected, and I think it is time you split my Department into two Departments. If you would tell him as a sort of a father figure, as a senior

Government Minister, someone I am sure he looks up to and relies on, not to be so -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms Duff: I speak in terms of wisdom, not age.

Some Hon. Members: Ah!

Ms Duff: If you could tell him that he does not have to be proud, in fact he would be respected if he would publicly do that and say he thinks these areas are so important that they deserve the attention of a Minister dedicated to those areas, I think he would gain a tremendous amount of respect and no loss of face. So perhaps the Government House Leader would have a chat with his colleague. And, in the interests of the Province and of our culture and of our heritage, that, I think, would be a very wise and very forward-thinking move. I can tell the hon. the Member for Port de Grave totally agrees with me, and I can understand why, because he comes from a district that is probably the most historic part of this entire Province.

An Hon. Member: The great District of Port de Grave.

Ms Duff: It is the great District of Port de Grave, one of the earliest areas settled in the Province.

Now the other area that is giving me a great deal of concern is Pippy Park, so-called Pippy Park, and that, of course, falls under the area of the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. It is a park nobody really has defined; nobody knows what it is for, nobody knows what is going to happen to it. The Commission that

has been appointed to look after the park are afraid to move, are afraid to make a decision without the permission of the Deputy Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, so it is farce to call it an Independent Commission. It has a budget, where the budget for administration exceeds by a considerable amount of money the total budget for development in the park. And this year, unfortunately, that measly budget, which was so small that the animals in the Animal Farm starved to death, was cut by another \$218,000.

An Hon. Member: That is not true.

Ms Duff: That is true.

Mr. Efford: That is not nice.

Ms Duff: It is not nice. The hon. Member for Port de Grave is very right, it is not nice. And I do not know where they are going to take that \$218,000 from, unless there are going to be no flowers in the flower beds around Confederation Building this year.

Mr. Simms: No flowers by request.

Ms Duff: Yes, no flowers by request of the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. That Minister, I hope, will not have the face and the hypocrisy to suggest that his sitting on the funding for the Outer Ring Road until it hatches has anything to do with his concern for that park.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Ms Duff: I was just getting started. That is all right, I will go again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Before I recognize the hon. Member for Placentia, I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly, on behalf of hon. Members, the Deputy Mayor of Steady Brook, Allan Best, accompanied by Councillor Claude Wilton.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Placentia.

Mr. Hogan: Now, if I could carry on, Mr. Chairman, and probably reiterate that the shipping and trucking firms are more interested in a year-round rather than seasonal operation at Argentia for obvious reasons: savings due to lower round trip costs, availability of berths of truckers, elimination of hazardous winter driving on the TCA, and the ability to take that mandatory eight hours time off while on board, allowing them a full allotment of thirteen hours driving. The service would result in a significant improvement in truck traffic freight flow across the Province, and produce overall road user benefits of nearly \$6 million, which would be passed onto the consumers. As these savings are spent by the shippers and consumers, additional employment would likely result. Back haul traffic, such as fish and fish products, paper, and other products to be picked up across the Province, would guarantee the continued viability of truck serving centres, such as Deer Lake.

I might also add, Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Member for Grand Falls alluded to the Cross Talk Program last week, that there was

a trucker who called in who enunciated and, I guess, gave expertise on the factor of use of the Trans-Canada, particularly during the winter months. And he described off-loading of the boats in Port aux Basques, or off-loading anywhere. He said he arrives in Port aux Basques, and when the boat pulls into the dock and they drop the doors, the stevedores almost say, 'Start your motors, gentlemen,' and then there is a mad tear for Corner Brook and other nearby centres, and the traffic is absolute madness. He went into great detail, a truck driver who has been hauling back and forth across the Province, and to the Province from the mainland, I think he said, for seven years, or something like that.

As far as negative community and employment impacts are concerned, the report, in its final analysis, does not consider them to be significant. Increased tourism would more than compensate for any anticipated loss of casual jobs in Port aux Basques and in the truck or auto serving centres. As well, twenty-five new jobs would be created at Argenticia. Given even the worst case scenario, the report concluded that in the short-term only would Port aux Basques be negatively affected, since most of the traffic entering Argenticia would exit via Port aux Basques. Since it would mean another shift in full-time service, Mr. Chairman, there would be an extra shift go on the existing service in Port aux Basques, employing crew members from the Port aux Basques area. And, since Port aux Basques would continue to be the main port of entry to the Province, they concluded what is good for Argenticia would be good for Port aux Basques. Thus, the report

confirms what we have always felt to be true in the Argenticia area about the impact on Port aux Basques.

The report further suggests many other benefits of year-round service, including the reduction of maintenance on the highway, increased safety on the highways, which was enunciated by that same truck driver who called in to the Cross Talk Program, reduction of the Federal Government subsidy. Now, the Federal Government is talking about austerity and savings and cutbacks and everything. The implementation of the year-round service to Argenticia would not be an extra cost to Marine Atlantic, but would, in fact, save a minimum of \$5 million, and the additional purchase by Marine Atlantic of local goods and services in the Argenticia and North Sydney areas.

A very significant section of that report, to which I referred, deals with the effect the year-round service would have on the private water carriers ACE and ASL, although the report seems to spend a great deal of time analyzing the potential negative impacts on the two carriers. They were not concerned too much about the positive effect. Although they could not ignore the facts and figures on the positive impact it would have on the Province, on the Argenticia area, or the positive or negative impacts on Port aux Basques, they did spend a great deal of time analyzing the potential negative impacts on the two carriers. I guess they have good lobbyists, and they got to the group.

In the final analysis, the ADI report confirms that the potential loss of traffic by ACE and ASL to

road transport is purely speculative and unlikely to occur - I reiterate, Mr. Chairman, unlikely to occur. It should be emphasized that ACE and ASL are in the container business and are essentially not tractor trailer or drop trailer freight carriers. The report states that these carriers are concerned that Marine Atlantic would undercut their rates if the level of business drops. However, safeguards are built into the system, since the rates for Marine Atlantic are set by the Federal Government and cannot be changed by Marine Atlantic. Consequently, ACE and ASL would maintain their competitive position. It is also clear from the ADI report that the implementation of option three would result, not only in substantial benefits for the Argentia and Avalon region, but in significant net benefits for the Province as a whole, including Port aux Basques. Expanded tourist traffic and its resulting spinoff benefits, a lengthened tourist season, increased exploitation of the Loop, Argentia/Port aux Basques tours, savings in highway costs, gains in highway safety and net employment growth, would ensure that the benefits were distributed through the whole Province and to the provincial economy. What is good for Argentia will be good, not only for Port aux Basques, but for all of the Province.

Marine Atlantic's economic health is also of direct concern to residents in all communities where the company operates. As the ADI report shows, a year-round service will enhance the company's economic viability through greater and more efficient use of its present facilities, and by further solidifying the company's position

in the Province. Further, the ADI report estimates that Marine Atlantic could attract up to \$5 million in new revenues each year, thereby reducing the annual federal subsidy to the service by an equal amount, in times when more and more services are being cut by the Federal Government. Because of their lack of financial viability, any movement in the direction of self-sufficiency must strengthen the future of the Company.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, for some fifteen or sixteen years we have been advocating the year-round service. There are two things to be considered: The loop, which I illustrated and talked about in my prepared text, and the traffic corridor of North Sydney - Argentia and North Sydney - Port aux Basques. Mr. Chairman, that will only lend to the economy of the Province, and lend to the betterment of the Province; it will result in more jobs overall, and enhance the position of rural Newfoundland. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Fortune - Hermitage.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to participate in the debate. I would, in a sense, disagree somewhat with the Member for St. John's East when she talked about the need for culture. No doubt we do need culture in this Province - this heritage which we have. But I would like to go back and address for a few moments the needs of the people in the Fortune - Hermitage District, particularly those in the inshore fishery.

I do not think people realize the

impact the failure of the inshore fishery has had in that particular part of the Province. In fact, the number of inshore fishermen in that District numbers the equivalent of three Grand Bank fish plants or five Gaultois fish plants. To realize, Mr. Chairman, that in the package just announced by the Provincial Government there was no compensation for these people, is very difficult to accept, especially when the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Valcourt, went to Hermitage on his initial visit to the community, met with the fishermen and, in a sense, assured them that he would, indeed, look at the plight of these people.

A case in point, Mr. Chairman, recently an inshore fisherman's son was brought to St. John's after being diagnosed as having leukemia. After fishing for the full winter, he did not have enough money for transportation to bring his son to the hospital, the mother did not have enough money to take a hotel, and she had to sleep for two nights in the room with her son. That, to me, is really not good enough. We were told recently that some of the students in the area, in high school, have no money or very little money to buy lunches during the day at school because of the insufficient income these people have had during the winter. In fact, the Department of Social Services, over the last couple of days, paid the light bill for one of the fishermen, whose light bill was \$581 when, for the last week, he made \$18. It is impossible for these people to survive.

The point to be made here, Mr. Chairman, is simply this, that this inshore fishermen are worse off than the people in Grand Bank,

they are worse off than the people in Gaultois, and worse off than the people in Trepassey, because these people are presently employed; they are earning money, and because they are earning money, it also entitles them to UI benefits, which will indeed tide them over into 1991. These inshore fishermen have no income or very little income. In fact, today is a beautiful day. This morning I had a call from Hermitage, and the long-liners are not fishing today. They see no point in going out, because you cannot get enough fillet for lunch. So why would you go out and fish under these conditions?

And the point was made, Mr. Chairman, when the people from the area, the town councils and the fishermen's delegation, met with the Premier and with the Minister of Fisheries earlier, and we sent off a document to the Minister of Fisheries outlining for him the failure in the catch over the last number of years. And the people in Ottawa realize that these fishermen are in the plight they are through no fault of their own; it is primarily because of French overfishing. The French people, the French trawlers and their factory freezers, have taken the fish these people normally have on the inshore fishing grounds, and the fish is not there for them to catch anymore. So to leave these people in that particular part of the Province, to use an expression, high and dry, is just not fair.

I look at the situation in this perspective: if I were to have an accident and I was fully covered, with collision on my car, yet the other fellow who ran into me was at fault, I do not think I should have to take my money and my \$250

deductible, if that would be the case, to fix my car when the other person was at fault. And I see the same scenario, the same outfit being applied to the fisheries. The Federal Government is at fault here. They have allowed the overfishing to occur, and they know quite well the stocks are depleted. They have caused the situation, yet they are not willing to do anything about it. And that is a point of contention with these people, and they are in desperate straits.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

If the hon. Member would not mind me interrupting, I have to announce the questions for the Late Show.

The first question: 'I give notice that I am not satisfied with answers from the Premier to my question on extended notice to plants.' That is from the hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

The second question: 'I wish to give notice that I am dissatisfied with the answers to my question to the Minister of Education re: the elimination of hospital full-time teachers, and I wish to debate same in the Late Show.' That is from the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

The third question: 'I am not satisfied with the answers given to me by the Minister of Fisheries in response to questions asked today about his involvement in the opening of the plants.' That is from the hon. the Member for Fogo.

The hon. the Member for Fortune - Hermitage.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Chairman, the

plight of the inshore fishery there, being devastated as it is, doesn't leave much chance for the people in the area to do much other than to look to Government for help at this time. But these people have been proud, they have been industrious, they have been independent, and they are not looking to be long-time recipients of Government help.

Now, the area itself does have tourist potential, down there in that particular part of the Province. It has not been touched, and primarily the reason why it has not been, Mr. Chairman, is because of the gravel roads. These roads are in deplorable condition. They are under construction there now, in the Belleoram/English Harbour area. Hopefully the road to Hermitage and Seal Cove will be done under the agreement in the next little while and will, indeed, open up that particular area of the Province to tourists. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the area of the Connaigre Peninsula is just twenty-three miles from the Island of Miquelon and would, indeed, I think, be an area of great interest to people who would come into the area to do work.

One time, last fall, I suggested to the President of Treasury Board that probably one of the areas we could use to create some meaningful employment was the beautification of the area on the Bay d'Espoir highway. In fact, that highway, which stretches about 210 kilometers down there, has brush and trees quite close to the shoulder of the road, and if we were to cut the timber and brush on the road back probably fifty or sixty feet from the road line, a lot of the cost incurred in giving the people some

meaningful work could be recovered in the form of saw logs and timber that could be sold to the companies concerned.

I am sure that would be a welcome addition to the inshore fishermen down in that area who now find it practically impossible to make it on the fishery at all. As I said earlier, there is no fish and they have in a sense become disillusioned and find themselves giving up. Also, Mr. Chairman, the area itself has drawbacks because of the physical layout of the particular District. An area of concern for some time has been in the form of education, where up until now the grants given to the schools are as a per-pupil grant, and what we have found in that particular area, because of the small number of students that attended the schools, the schools have not been able to keep abreast with it because of the lack of educational financing with some of the larger area.

It is also good to realize that the Government has plans to change that particular situation so that the per-grant can be changed from per capita on the condition of the schools, and what have you, so that these people can be treated fairly with the larger centres. The school board has also been somewhat pleased with the fact that there has been debt retention and it has been written off by the Department, and that indeed has been a welcome addition for these people. Mr. Chairman, because of the failure in the fishery in that area, as I said, all sectors of the area are finding it difficult, especially business. What we find, of course, is that some of the smaller businesses have allowed the people credit and probably have overextended

themselves to the point where they have difficulty in maintaining business.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Langdon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to rise today in consideration of the year-round Argentinia question. It is one that I am quite aware of because of the possible impact on my area of year-round Argentinia. The Port aux Basques delegation travelled to Ottawa recently to meet with the Federal Minister of Transport, the Hon. Doug Lewis, and we were very surprised to find that the Hon. Federal Minister of Transport did not even know where exactly Port aux Basques was located. The first thing they had to do was take out a map and show him where Port aux Basques was.

The second thing that happened was, the Hon. Federal Minister went so far as to say that Port aux Basques should not really be worried because there would be new jobs created on the Joseph and Clara Smallwood. He was quite surprised to hear that the vessel was already in service, and had already been staffed, and there were no new jobs, there were transfers of other jobs, so the Federal Minister of Transport obviously has his head around the situation quite well, I might add. I might note that there are certain individuals in our area who are members of unions that are in support of year-round Argentinia. These people,

understandably with representations made to them right from the President of Marine Atlantic, in making sure that they understood the company's position on the same thing, which I think it is the Communication and Transportation Workers' Union.

An Hon. Member: How many workers are involved?

An Hon. Member: Leave him alone, boy! Leave him alone!

Mr. Ramsay: They are the ones on the vessels. But anyway they are in support of year-round Argentia and understandably it is there position that their jobs would be in jeopardy given a lowering of service by Marine Atlantic. Now this accounts for possibly 200 in total, of which there could possibly be, if year-round Argentia did not go ahead, lowering by forty or fifty jobs. So likewise it is forty or fifty if year-round Argentia did not go ahead that they are concerned about versus the forty or fifty jobs that we would lose in the Port aux Basques area as a result of the year-round Argentia going ahead. So if you want talk about numbers, that is the situation. You know, it is a total lack of difference there.

We have to look at the whole situation which has got us the Joseph and Clara Smallwood. Why do we have another large capacity vessel that is the equivalent of the Marine Atlantic ferry the Caribou. The reason being that Marine Atlantic as a Crown Corporation is interested in building up their operation to a level that eventually could become a private operation. That is the Federal Government's agenda when it comes to transportation in the

country and that is the reason why the Joseph and Clara Smallwood was built. But there is also another part to the equation and that part is that the Joseph and Clara Smallwood was built because Quebec shipyard, Davie, M.I.L. Davie Incorporated in laws on Quebec, needed the work, so if you wanted to bring Meech Lake into it, the whole idea of the concentration of voting power in Ontario and Quebec is the reason why the Federal Government changed its mind from its original decision not to build a second passenger ferry and decided that Quebec needed this humongous ferry as a joint make work project, you could call it.

The Federal Government paid for the Joseph and Clara Smallwood which in effect is over-capacity on the Nova Scotia/Newfoundland ferry service. It creates an over-capacity where they have to get rid of another vessel, if they are going to keep the two of them operating as the things currently operate or to justify the creation of this monstrosity of two vessels that are in over-capacity. They then have to come up with a situation where the Joseph and Clara has to be increasing its amount of service.

The Crown Corporation, therefore, as we might see it, is trying to in effect dictate Government policy on transportation to the Province, by virtue of saying, we are in over-capacity right now and because, by virtue of, that over-capacity we, therefore, must increase the amount of service to the Province to justify this operation.

Now Marine Atlantic wants another vessel like this. They want to build a third one to go to Labrador of a similar size to the

Joseph and Clara. Now what will happen then with three vessels like this in the wintertime? This is their request, as I understand they are hoping to have three of these large vessels in the summertime to use another one like that to go to Labrador, and then have the other one to come down, so you have two, one to Argentia, one to Port aux Basques and one to Labrador.

Now this is a very difficult situation because then you have three vessels, again more over-capacity for the summertime ferry service. Now the hon. Member from Placentia did mention that there would be an extra ship on full time service for Port aux Basques. Now this is somewhat incorrect because year-round Argentia would be twice a week, with three times a week being for the Port aux Basques/North Sydney run. That is the way it is planned now, all right.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: Hold on a second now! You are badgering the witness, as they say.

Anyway I am just explaining a few of the things that the hon. Member has mentioned.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: He also takes great pains in saying that this will not have an effect -

Mr. Walsh: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: A point of privilege?

Mr. Walsh: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: You cannot bring a point of -

Mr. Walsh: I cannot hear what the gentleman is saying because of confusion in this thing. It is a point of order. It is a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: No point of privilege.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: You cannot bring a point of privilege in Committee.

The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

Mr. Ramsay: The hon. gentleman makes certain points in trying to say that his position and Argentia's position on year round Argentia ferry service will have little or no effect on the west coast of the Province. Now I mention this because who would better be able to decide as to whether or not this would have an effect on the west coast and Port aux Basques, than Port aux Basques on the west coast. Who would be able to better decide that, not someone who has another or an area that has a different vested interest in that particular aspect of it. The decision has to be one as to whether it is in the best interest of the people of a given area by the people of a given area.

Also, I might note that freight through Atlantic Container Express and Atlantic Steamship Lines or Atlantic Sea Route Limited is - the rates can be changed - Marine Atlantic's rates are covered by the Federal Government in coming to Newfoundland. The fact of the matter is that the rates on ACE and ASL are coming to Newfoundland with an indirect subsidy. There is an indirect subsidy on all of

this CN formerly Terra Transport Traffic that comes into the port of St. John's and also goes into the port of Corner Brook. What happens is, CN, on the day the railway agreement was signed, CN decided they were going to reroute their freight traffic, the deal which they cooked up with ACE and ASL - basically they decided then they were going to reroute it through Montreal and Halifax so that North Sydney never had a chance to get this anyway, so the majority of freight coming to the Province that is in the indirect subsidy comes about by guaranteeing a certain purchase of a given amount of freight on these vessels as it comes into the Province, so this is the way they have done it. Now, to say that automatically year-round Argentia is going to capture all of this freight is somewhat of a misrepresentation because, unless CN, which is another Crown Corporation, which at one time they were all the same, one and the same, CN Steamships and CN Rail but now they are two different entities competing for privatization dollar I would say, how are you going to get them to decide: Okay, well, we've got you on to Argentia now, so let us divert some traffic through North Sydney. I doubt very much that will happen and the only way is through an aggressive marketing program that would ever get the freight back on Marine Atlantic vessels.

Now the problem with that is, that normally the Port aux Basques to North Sydney route has been the route that is covered under the terms of union. Now the Port aux Basques/North Sydney route is the one that the majority of the rates to the Province are based on. The freight rates which are supposed

to be the same as rail. The idea, if you travel ninety-nine miles by rail, the freight rates should be exactly the same coming from North Sydney to Port aux Basques. Now if the freight is then going to go to Argentia, the equivalent is that it should have to be charged the same as if it travelled by road from Port aux Basques on up around as far as the destination that it then reaches by boat. That is the way that the Federal Government policies work as far as it goes. It is a very difficult and complicated process as you might have heard the hon. Minister of Justice mention. The idea of non-compensatory -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: If it was that simple I would stand up and just say it, but it is not a simple problem -

An Hon. Member: Placentia had no problem.

Mr. Ramsay: Oh he has no problem of course! It is something that he does not have and he is wishing he had, but it is now something that we have but we have been eroded and eroded to a point where we do not have a lot right now and we stand to lose -

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, please! The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Ramsay: All right. I have more, you wait, you will understand.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I did not have plans to participate in this debate at this point in time but there is no way I was going to

give the floor to the Minister of Social Services. But I listened with a great deal of interest to the -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I like a bit of noise, I am spoiled now. The Member for La Poile is talking out of both sides of his mouth the one time. The Member for Placentia got on the floor and he categorically stated that I support a year-round service for Argentia! That's what his people want him to do, Mr. Speaker, and that is what he should do. The Member for La Poile hasn't got the courage of his convictions, do you support the year-round service to Argentia or do you not, where are you coming from?

You sound like the Premier on the fish aid package. I am for it one day, I am against it the next day. Whatever day it may be that is his position. Well, I can tell you Sir that by following that example of the Premier will not guarantee a seat in the Cabinet, because the Member for Placentia is by far in the lead when it comes to getting into Cabinet over you. As a matter of fact, anyone who observed the House yesterday could see that every time the Premier moved the Member for Placentia was behind him. So, there is a clear indication that the Member for Placentia -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, and you should look at your seat. The Member for Exploits should look at his seat, Mr. Speaker, because he occupied that for a long while yesterday as well.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I understand the Member for Placentia told you the conversation we had yesterday.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Now, Mr. Speaker, we can sit back and listen to what is -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: The pig is out again.

We can sit back, Mr. Speaker, and take heed to what has been said in this legislature, to what is taking place. And I know where the Member for Placentia is coming from, Mr. Speaker, because I know what is happening in Placentia Bay these days. I am very much aware of what is taking place. Argentia is one of the places together with Marystown and Come by Chance that have been always referred to as the Golden Triangle and had great promises. And I supported that, Mr. Speaker, from day one as did the Member for Placentia, now and before we got in and out of politics. But what has happened, Mr. Speaker -

An Hon. Member: Have a cup of coffee.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, the Minister for Social Services should be careful or we might tell him about destruction. The only Cabinet Minister who has been part of a destruction so far has been the Minister of Social Services when he sat by the wayside for over there for a month.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to my point and that is about Placentia Bay. If you want to talk about destruction I will tell you about destruction. I will tell you about the destruction of

Placentia Bay, Mr. Speaker, and the promise that was held for it. I can tell you about the negative effect of taking the Hibernia GBS system from Come by Chance and moving it over in Trinity Bay will have in Placentia Bay. Don't tell me that it will not have any bearing on Argentina, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Don't forget resettlement, Churchill Falls (inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Listen now. Mr. Speaker, the Minister for Social Services talks about building things. The only thing he knows how to do is build boats for his brother. Now he better keep quiet.

The bottom line is that the Minister of Social Services and this Government have done everything they can do since they got elected to destroy the aspirations, the wishes and the work force in Placentia Bay. Number one, Mr. Speaker, they have gutted the GBS system from Placentia Bay, and I have no difficulty if Trinity Bay is where it is going to go. Let it go there, Mr. Speaker, so long as the jobs are in Newfoundland. But don't tell me by moving it from Come by Chance it will not have a negative effect on the Argentina area because it will.

And the people from the Argentina area, Mr. Speaker, for years have been trying to get some sort of development taken place. The former Member was at it for years. The present Member is still at it. When he was the Mayor of Dunville he was at it, and everybody knows of his involvement, Mr. Speaker, and he should be given full credit. And he should be given full credit in his efforts to try and bring a

year round service to Argentina. And that, Mr. Speaker, begs the question as to why will the Premier and the Government of Newfoundland not take the position? Because what is happening in this Province today - we have just seen it. What is happening in this Province today is the Member for Port au Basques and the Member for Placentia were in this House today literally going at each others throats, over this very important issue.

The Government has let this develop into what is becoming a bitter argument not just between two Members but between two parts of the Province. That is what is taking place. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no one who makes a fool of himself when the Minister is around because he is a fool for all of us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, sitting down in this House today we have all witnessed both Members going at each others throats over who was going to get the ferry service. And it is time for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to take a position whether it be for Port au Basques or whether it be for Argentina, but let the people know where they stand. Do not let the bitterness that can take place and is taking place - don't kid yourself - I heard the Member for Placentia on the CBC program when the Mayor of Corner Brook called in. Don't think that is not taking place in this Province. There was a meeting yesterday in Port au Basques to try and deny, for whatever reasons, a year round service to Argentina. We had the Minister of Justice last Friday up in Ottawa taking a position against Argentina. Probably that is the right thing. I am not saying he took the wrong decision

or anything else, but what I am saying is that it is time for this Government to take one united direction. Let there be no doubt where I stand. I have said it before in this House. And the Member for Placentia knows where I stand and the people of Placentia Bay, and I said it again today on the radio, but it is time for this Government to take a position and stop trying to divide the Province, stop trying to play one town and one community, one part, the western part against the eastern part. It is not right.

The only way that can be prevented is with a direction from this Government. Whatever that direction may be, I may disagree with it, Mr. Speaker, but at least the people of this Province will know where they are coming from. That is not happening. I would ask the Premier and his Ministers today to do what is right. Nobody enjoys it. I am sure the Member for LaPoile, Mr. Speaker, nor the Member for Placentia enjoy coming in this House today and having to take one another on over this issue. Nobody, Mr. Speaker -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)
Corner Brook, Deer Lake, Stephenville.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, but there are a lot of people on the east coast together too. Nobody, Mr. Speaker -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, and it is because of lack of direction by this Government.

This Government refused to take a position on the fish aid package. They refused to take a position. They have still refused, Mr.

Speaker, to show the color of their money. They waited until the fish aid package was found so that they could criticize the Federal Government and blame them. That is the lack of direction that this Government has and the same thing is true for the east coast ferry service. This Government will not take a position, and when the decision is made whatever it may be, the Government will then criticize the Federal Government for the decision that they take. They must realize that they are the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to serve the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. In this Chamber in the last week you would almost believe that you were sitting in a Legislature in New Brunswick or somewhere.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Well, you know last night I watched that thing, what it on television? Mrs. Purchase, or whatever it is on CBC television, where buddy calls the cat here Meech, Meech. Mr. Speaker, anyone who watched that knew what they were talking about. I do not want to get distracted on this, I am talking about an issue that is important to the unity of this Province.

Let there be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this will develop into a very bitter battle between both sides of the Provinces, between the west coast - there was a meeting there yesterday and the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation attended it. That is what is happening.

Premier Wells: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Well, Mr. Premier, why do you not take a position, Sir.

The Member for St. Mary's - The Capes asked you a question yesterday and you refused to answer him, on whether or not you supported the year-round ferry service for Argentia. Take a position, show direction. You have been elected, Sir, you have been elected to lead this Government and to represent the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and you have not been doing that. That position has been left to somebody else.

Now there are other issues that I would like to get into today and probably my time does not permit, but I want to talk a little bit about the Ombudsman. I want to talk a little bit about the \$250,000 that has been spent so far for the Meech Lake debate. The \$250,000 that you took on the Ombudsman to give them the right to representation in this Province so that you could hire people from outside the Province to look after the Meech Lake debate. I want to get into issues as it pertains to my District, the lack of support for the Marystown Shipyard. The mess the fishery is in. I want to get into these and I will have the opportunity over the next few days.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Tobin: Well, I shall get back to it after.

Mr. Chairman: It is moved and seconded that I leave the Chair and report progress.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Bellevue.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them

referred, and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

Debate on the Adjournment [Late Show]

Mr. Speaker: It being Thursday and 4:30 into the Motion of Adjournment, known most commonly as the Late Show, I will call on the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes to state his dissatisfaction.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hearn: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

But I presume you meant for me to state my dissatisfaction with the answer to one question, because if I stated my dissatisfaction with the Government I would be here for a long time. The Late Show would not be much good to us. I asked a question of the Premier on Tuesday regarding whether or not he would help the people of Trepassey, and other areas affected by plant closures, to find ways to keep their plants open?

The Premier in answering actually gave me a five minute sermon, so I am really not losing anything by having the opportunity to give him five minutes this evening. He basically said, no, he did not want to hold out any hope. Maybe the Premier misunderstood what I was trying to ask, so I will explain it briefly for him. We were talking about extended notice given by the Premier when notice was given that the plants would close. Now the extended notice,

for all intents and purposes up to now, means absolutely nothing, and will mean nothing unless the plants are kept open next year.

When the companies decided to close the plants, FPI particularly, they told their workers that they would keep the plant open for twenty weeks this year. The Premier suggested to them later that they pay for sixteen weeks, that the Government would pay for four. Now whether or not the Government pays for four this year really was immaterial because the workers had twenty weeks committed anyway. And in turn next year the Government will pick up sixteen weeks and the companies will pay for four which will really give the workers an extra year's work provided there is product enough to make it viable to keep the plants open, if not the Government is really off the hook with no commitment.

Now provided that there is fish enough to keep the plants open next year, and they can be extended for twenty weeks next season, then certainly it is extremely beneficial, and we appreciate the effort by the Premier and his Government, because it does give us time to put a plan in place to keep the areas alive. And as the Premier has said himself it gives other agencies a chance to put diversification plans in place.

But in most areas of the Province, particularly the Trepassey area, and I am sure the same is true certainly of Gaultois and Grand Bank to a large extent, once you step outside the fishery the chances of finding employment for the numbers of people involved are slim, if any. We cannot despair,

and we have to try and we have to look at new things, and we have to diversify. I am not against, never have been against diversification, as long as it is above and beyond what we already have.

I do not believe in throwing away what we have, if there is an opportunity to increase it, because the stocks, with proper management and control, can stabilize and rebuild to the point where a few years down the road, very few years down the road, if properly handled, we should be in a position that we were a few short years ago, which means that the plants can operate. Maybe if not at 100 per cent potential then at a potential that will be viable for the people in the area and also for the companies who operate these plants. But if we let the plants die, if we say to the areas no we are not going to help you, the companies are going to close you down and even though things might turn around five years down the road, we are not going to help you in the interim.

Five years down the road from now we will not have a workforce because all our young people are now leaving the Province, and we do not need the new computers that have been brought by the Recovery Commission, because the writing is on the wall that the workforce is not going to be there when things turn around. So if we can find ways, and there are ways if we use the money that has been allocated, as little as it is, we can develop plans within the fishery as well as diversification outside, to keep those plants open in the interim by using underutilized species, developmental fisheries, co-ordinate the landings of the inshore catches to make sure that

the fish that is thrown away and wasted is funnelled into those plants with a lot of more co-operation locally by perhaps some of the foreign resource that is being processed in other areas, there is potential in that area, and we can go on, and on.

There are things that can at least be looked at, and maybe bottom line, the answer will be there is nothing that can be done. Everyone accepts that, but while there is life there is hope, and while there are some funds around, then some avenues can be explored to make sure that these plants can be opened. My question to the Premier is, will you co-operate in trying to find ways to keep these plants open, realizing that these plants could be the only way of assuring the long-term viability of these areas, and the long-term livelihood for the people in these areas? In the end, if we find it is impossible, we will find other ways, or try to find other ways to diversify, but hopefully we can find ways that are above and beyond, and will be an add-on to the base of work that is already there.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The question, as I heard it yesterday, was would I assure the people of Trepassey that we would do everything possible to keep the fish plant open, and the answer was, I could not give, and I would not deceive the people of

Trepassey by giving them a hollow assurance and say, oh, yes, we will do everything possible to keep the fish plant open. Now that gets me off the hook, and I say, yes, we will do it, and then there is nothing we can do, and we tell the people of Trepassey there was nothing we could do. I would be honest with the people of Trepassey, as I have been all along. It is not a mechanical problem, a problem of finances, or anything like that, it is a question of the total allowable catch having been reduced by 25 per cent in the last two years with a prospect of it being reduced still more next year. Now, in those circumstances something has to happen. You cannot possibly keep all the plants open, every single plant open, and have a viable fishery. It is obvious you cannot have an all-plants-open policy and make the thing work on a viable basis, cope with US countervailing duties, and build a viable fishery. It cannot be done, so I will not deceive the people of Trepassey or any other place in this Province, by giving them a false hope.

The Government took the position that we did when the Federal Government failed to meet its obligations and we stepped in to provide for an extended period of notice that at least gives some period of time. As the hon. Member mentioned, the people of Trepassey were very grateful to the Government for the action we took in that regard, but I will not build up the false hope for Trepassey, or any other community, by saying to them, do not worry, we are in there pitching for you to try and keep every plant in the Province open, when it is an unrealistic prospect in the face

of the lack of an adequate supply of fish to keep the plants open. I will be honest with them, we are going to try and work with the Federal Government to find other economic alternatives. If keeping the fish plant open becomes a possibility due to the ability to use underutilized species, or by any other means, then we would be happy to do whatever we could to do that, but I do not want to give false hope to the people of Trepassey. I have told the people of Trepassey, and all of the other communities, the truth as it is and we will maintain that.

In the meantime we will work to do everything we possibly can to ensure the future viability of the community of Trepassey and ensure that the people who work in the fish plant, either have an opportunity to continue to work there, or have some other alternative available to them. I cannot guarantee success and I would not falsely do so.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The second Member with dissatisfaction to an answer is the hon. Opposition House Leader and the Member for Grand Falls.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In days gone by my colleague the Member for Humber East, just yesterday, or whenever it was, a day or so ago, I asked questions of the Minister of Education related to the Government's decision to cancel the Hospital Teacher's Program, or in-house program, and I want to refer him to the facts as I put forth yesterday. I have heard parents publicly stating that this particular decision is a

disastrous decision.

I have heard young people on radio who were former patients in the hospital who went through the program, who publicly spoke out against this particular decision. I suspect people are pretty upset with this decision, particularly in the central Newfoundland area. I know they are on the west coast, western Newfoundland. I dare say they are on the Northern Peninsula up in St. Anthony. And it begs the question, of course, does the Minister of Health himself not agree with the professional people in the hospitals, the nurses, the physicians, who have publicly spoken against this decision?

We also have in recent days, I am told, the President of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association who has publicly spoken out against this decision. And, Mr. Speaker, in a letter that I tabled in the House a day or so ago, as the Minister would know, I presume he got a copy of it, well the letter was sent to him anyway, along to another group of his colleagues, central Newfoundland Members, I know, received it. A letter from seventeen pediatric nurses on the nursing staff on the Pediatric Floor at the Central Newfoundland Health Care Foundation. I would just like to quote a couple of comments, a few comments from their letter to the Minister, because I think they have put it all in pretty good order.

They said: 'As the nursing staff on a Pediatric Floor, we have all acknowledged the importance of a regular school program and the development of optimum health, both mentally and physically, in the shortest period of time possible. Indeed, in the

development of our health care plans for all school-age children the encouragement to attend our school program is viewed as a very integral part of their health care. A primary concern of parents of young school age children, about the hospitalization of their child, is that they will develop separation anxiety because they are away from family, peer group and normal activities. They find immediate reassurance in the fact that we have a full-time school program that will ensure activity to keep the child occupied.'

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I would expect nothing less from a man with the mind of the Minister of Social Services. This is a quote from seventeen pediatric nurses in a letter written to the Minister of Education. And they go on to say, in as normal and everyday life as is possible, thereby decreasing the stress and trauma of hospitalization. They point out that their hospital has had recent expansion out there in which a brand new classroom was built and a considerable number of supplies, equipment and so on were donated, much of which was donated by the general public, because they recognized the importance of continuing the school education program. And they point out as well, the Central Newfoundland Hospital, is a referral hospital, many of the children are away from contact with their families for long periods of time, and the extras that a child needs should be provided, and are in this case provided by our school teacher. A permanent school teacher who, through her dedication, provides not only as a teacher but as a confidant, therapist in play with

young people, occupational therapist and friend. They also point out, what is written in the United Nations Declarations of the Rights of the Child, which point out that, they are entitled to special treatment with respect to education.

They have asked the Minister to reconsider his decision. I do not think it was a nasty letter, I thought it was a well written letter and they put their thoughts in fine form. They ended their letter by saying, as our country moves toward the year 2000 we pride ourselves on improving, advancing and increasing our ability to provide better opportunities and care. Would the termination of a proven beneficial program be such an advancement?

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that the Minister also received a letter from an academic, from the principal of an elementary school out in the central Newfoundland area. He said and I quote, I believe the school - referring to the school at the hospital - provided a valuable academic service to the children. More importantly, the service provided a positive emotional boost to the children during their period of illness and separation from family, friends and familiar routines. I am confident, this is an educator, a school principal, that the home tutor service being proposed will not be a satisfactory replacement. In fact, he went on to say that it appears that the Government is attempting to solve the economic ills of the Province on the backs of young people. That is what he said in his letter.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: As an elementary school principal, I am particularly saddened that a Government comprised of so many former educators, including two past presidents of the NTA, and others who have worked with children, can be so insensitive to their particular plight.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. Gentleman's time is up.

Mr. Simms: So, I ask the Minister to respond to the requests of these groups and individuals and reconsider this particular decision, there is no need to rush it right now. Reconsider it.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. The Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Member for his question and I am taking the issue very seriously as I do all of these issues. I read all the letters, and we have had a number of very thorough letters and very sincere letters about this issue. I have stressed from day one, Mr. Speaker, that there are very small numbers of students involved in the three hospitals that were noted. I have Grand Falls, the daily average in 1989-1990 was six students in the school, and the average length of stay was four and a half days and the range was from two to sixteen days. In St. Anthony, if I might use the second one, they had one teacher, by the way, in the Grand Falls school, Mr. Speaker.

In St. Anthony, one teacher, the daily average to date for 1989-1990, three students on the average, and the average length of stay, three and a half days with a range from two to twenty, so most of the stays must be relatively

short periods of time. Now, these are small numbers, and I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that every student counts, with this Government, we believe in equality for all students irrespective of where they live in the Province and in respect of their needs. We believe that. The first E in our Triple Educational Agenda for the 90's is equality. So, there are small numbers, but we are still concerned about these small numbers and the short period of time. I guess the question that the Government has to decide to answer is is this the best use of \$200 or \$250,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, I have travelled this Province more in the last eight months to visit schools and to see the needs of this Province than Ministers have, I have been told, in years in office. I visited fifty schools and communities in the past eight months and I have seen the needs of this Province from the smallest communities to the biggest, and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are tremendous needs out there in rural Newfoundland.

Ms Verge: You must (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Dr. Warren: There are tremendous needs in this Province and the question we had to ask: is this the best use of \$200,000 or \$250,000 a year? and the Government decided no. But, Mr. Speaker, the Government didn't abandon these students. We would like to have a teacher in these hospitals; we would like to have a teacher in Gander, in Clarenville, in Carbonear, in Port aux Basques, in Burin. We would like to have teachers there. We would like, Mr. Speaker, to have teachers

working at home with students. There are hundred of students who spend three days or four days at home ill, they are home and we would like to have teachers there, but we can't do it, Mr. Speaker. We can't do it! We have to make the best use of the dollars we have available, so we have looked at an option. We are looking at an option, Mr. Speaker; we are going to provide alternate services for students who need them. We understand there are students who do need this kind of education, who may recover after a couple of days in hospital and are ready for an educational program. We will look at the options we have indicated - perhaps volunteers. All the parents who are writing, perhaps we can reach out to use the homebound service and volunteers, and I have already indicated we are going to ask school boards to look at this in the fall. So we want to assure the students and the parents of students who are in hospital for extended periods, that we will, in September, have an alternate program involved so that students who are in hospitals for extended periods of time will receive the educational programs they rightly deserve. We assure students and parents of that, Mr. Speaker.

Ms Verge: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East, on a point of order.

Ms Verge: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Education referred to statistics for two of the three hospitals whose schools are closing, and I would like to ask him to table the statistics.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Order, please!

The Speaker hasn't heard what has been said.

Ms Verge: I think the Minister should table the statistics for all three hospitals.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Fogo states his dissatisfaction with an answer given by the Minister of Fisheries.

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I asked the Minister of Fisheries to give us the arrangements of the lease agreement with the new operators in Twillingate, formerly the Oceana plant, and the Minister failed to do so. I might add, yesterday we asked the Minister if there was a meeting, as well, with regard to concessions for the workers, and the Minister said no. When I turned on the radio this morning, the first thing I heard was there was a meeting in Twillingate last night, whereby the workers did grant concessions, another indication that the Minister is not very aware of what is going on.

We are concerned about the lease arrangements in Twillingate, and I would like to know what went on in Twillingate. It is our understanding that the Province, through Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, held the mortgage on the plant. What type of lease arrangements are in place? Are there any Government guaranteed loans in place for Twillingate? We are also waiting to see the announcement of

guaranteed loans. I think I asked the Minister some time ago about the one for Fogo, the Fogo Island Co-op, and we still not have heard about that.

And what is strange about this entire affair is that Twillingate plant went into receivership in mid-March, and by early April an operator was found. The Minister of Fisheries said he and his people have been meeting on a daily basis, trying to sift through the problems and come up with solutions. Nothing concrete has been decided, but he said the wheels are moving as fast as possible. We are delighted that the wheels moved as fast as possible, and that Twillingate is going to have a viable fishery this year. We only wish the Minister had taken the same interest in Piccadilly, in Fermeuse, which he calls the jewel of the Crown, and see if he can find an operator for plants there, in light of the fact that the Fermeuse plant does not suffer from a resource problem, and the Twillingate plant does. I think in the past two years the Twillingate plant had losses of in excess of \$1 million each year, and the Minister says a Government guaranteed loan for \$1.9 million will be written off.

So what we are interested in is why the Minister has not taken the same diligence in trying to find operators in exactly the same situation? Both plants were in receivership, and one plant is now open and the other one is not. The Minister also said yesterday, given the fact that this Government is taking a very businesslike approach to running the Province, we are not going to be bailing out fish plants which have no future, and if the workers

in Twillingate plant will prove this year that they, in fact, do have a future, they will continue to have our support. What we are wondering is why the same criteria cannot be used and applied to other fish plants in this Province which are in similar situations? It seems that Twillingate got an extra push. Because, perhaps, the Minister of Fisheries, in his message to the people of Twillingate said, have faith in him as the MHA for the area, and as a Fisheries Minister, because he would do whatever could be done. Now, the question is, why would the Minister not do the same thing for all the other fish plants in this Province? He could open Twillingate in ten days, which is commendable, so why would he not do it for the rest of this Province, where fish plants are in trouble and they don't have a resource problem?

Mr. Simms: Have a public meeting in Fermeuse, have a public meeting in Piccadilly. Why don't you go out there and have public meetings?

Mr. Efford: Did they request them?

An Hon. Member: Yes, and he promised to do it. Several times.

Mr. Efford: He said yes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Winsor: Perhaps when the Premier, or the Minister responsible for Treasury Board speak, they will tell us the lease arrangements. And if there are any Government guaranteed loans in place for Twillingate, when are they going to be announced?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier,

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, there

is a substantial difference between the situation in Fermeuse and the situation in Twillingate. The situation in Fermeuse, as everybody knows, was brought about because of the involvement of the Canadian Salfish Corporation in the Universal operation. The Salfish Corporation took steps to place Universal Fisheries into receivership, and the several plants operated by Universal were then put up for sale, or offered for sale by the receiver, or management was offered by the receiver, and one plant, I believe, at Ferryland, somebody was interested in it and arrangements have been made to sell that plant, I believe. I do not know the final details, but at least it is in progress.

There was no such interest, apparently, in the Fermeuse plant. In the case of Twillingate, it was a different situation. It was a plant operated by Oceana and it was placed into receivership when the company failed to meet its obligations to NLDC. As a result, a receiver was appointed and that receiver has taken steps to take possession of the plant and find an operator. There was an immediate interest in the plant at Twillingate, as there was in Ferryland, exactly the same thing. There was virtually immediate interest in Ferryland, so they found somebody there to operate it. The same thing happened in Twillingate; they found somebody with whom they are discussing some basis for operating the plant. I do not know what the final details are yet, they are still being worked out. I cannot tell the House what the lease arrangement is at the moment, because the arrangement is still in the process of being

worked out. What I can tell the House is that there are no Government guaranteed loans involved.

Now, I know that is not what the hon. Member wanted to hear, because he wanted to be able to say the Government guaranteed loans for Twillingate, in the District of the Fisheries Minister, but would not guarantee it for Fermeuse. That is not the case. The Government did not give any guaranteed loans in the case of Twillingate. I am sorry that does not meet with his expectations, but that is the reality of it.

Like Ferryland, there was an immediate interest in the Twillingate Plant by another operator. There was a fairly immediate interest in the Ferryland Plant. It does not matter whether it was in a different District, it did not matter, the Government treats everybody the same. We call it fairness and balance. They are not used to it, Mr. Speaker, and that is regrettable.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, before their days in Opposition come to an end, they will know all about fairness and balance; they will have a couple of decades, I expect, to observe fairness and balance in action.

Premier Wells: And before their period of time in the wilderness expires, they too will be well-versed in fairness and balance. And when they get another turn at Government, Mr. Speaker, they will know how to implement fairness and balance, as well, because we will have shown

the way. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: You did not answer the question.

Premier Wells: I answered the question, but the hon. Member was talking to somebody else and did not hear.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? All those in favour 'aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: Those against 'nay'.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker will return to the Chair at 7:00 p.m.



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 31(A)

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

The House resumed at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Baker: Order 2, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is moved that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

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

Mr. Chairman: Order!

The Hon. the Member for LaPoile.

Mr. Ramsay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the Opposition's intent to try to drive a wedge right into the heart of the Member for Carbonear here, to separate the two of us, that will not happen.

Certain things the question of the Argentia ferry bring to mind are not necessarily visible, as was mentioned by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the certain parts of the strong lobby put forth by the hon. the Member for Placentia and interested municipal groups and any other interest groups that have a stake in this question, the fact of the matter being that regardless of the Province's position, the Federal Government, through Transport Canada, certainly does has a large part in the decision. Possibly notwithstanding our decision in support of the Provincial Government's position, the Federal Government may very well come forth with a position that does not allow us any opportunity to bend on it one way or the other, unless it is through intervention

by the National Transportation Agency.

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible) Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Ramsay: This is the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, but the ferry service is, of course, controlled by Transport Canada and funded by the Federal Government, therefore, if they do not get their way, I am sure they can make the funding situation difficult to Marine Atlantic and, also, in general, as they have done with ferry services throughout the Province, they have cut back on the funding they have provided.

Now there are a couple of things here that were mentioned. The hon. the Member for Placentia did say that Marine Atlantic should become economically viable. Now I debate as to whether you can take a ferry service that is supposed to be a service to the people of the Province in providing the same as driving services; the idea of the link is supposed to be an extension of the Trans Canada Highway.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The Chair has difficulty in hearing what the hon. Member is saying. Could we have some order, please!

Mr. Ramsay: Now based on this as being an extension, therefore, how are you ever going to make the ferry service, either between North Sydney and Port Aux Basques or Argentia and North Sydney, viable economically as a business entity, which is the whole idea?

The hiring of a gentleman as the new president of Marine Atlantic,

Mr. Terry Ivany, and he has come from the private sector, formerly being with Day and Ross, this should send a signal as to what the Federal Government has in mind for Marine Atlantic.

The idea as I see it, and again this is just an observation, would certainly allow one to think that it will become a non-subsidized affair eventually. Now, by not being subsidized, it will be ripe for privatization which, in effect, will damage the transportation service to the Province much more than it has already been damaged.

If we look at the case of our national airline, Air Canada, in being brought about to compete through deregulation with other airlines, and also in having the fare structures rise to a point, it is so high now the price for a person to travel between, say, Newfoundland and Toronto is even in excess of the amount it would cost, at times, to travel to London, England. So if you can travel to Europe cheaper than you can travel to the center of your own country, it certainly shows how deregulation has affected the regions of the country.

Now, as to Marine Atlantic becoming economically viable, I do not think that is the case. I think Marine Atlantic should have a dependency on a certain amount of Government subsidy. Certainly it has to operate in a manner that is efficient and economically viable, but it must also be qualified with the factor that it is a service to be provided to the people of the Province and not just a service that should eventually become private.

The hon. Member also mentioned

road user benefits in the order of savings of \$6 million. Those savings, in effect, they say, will be passed on to the end users of the products. But the part left out of this equation is the loss of fuel tax on the trucks that are travelling from Port aux Basques to other points. So the fuel taxes on the trucks which are travelling in are not going to be collected. Because the vessels are going to be circumventing the island's road system, landing in Argentia and then, with a short stint to St. John's, returning back to Argentia and leaving the province via Argentia, the amount of fuel tax collected will be a lot less. So this, in effect, will be a net loss to the provincial Treasury.

Mr. Hogan: Nothing about safety (inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: The idea of safety. If the roads deal with the railway initiative had been negotiated properly, maybe we would be able to put the money into a proper highway system that would allow for a good order of safety. But because we actually got, in effect, using cost-adjusted monies, the idea of how much money we actually got in tomorrow's dollars, there is no benefit or excess of money over and above what we had in the past for highway construction.

Mr. Hogan: How about fatalities in the Province.

Mr. Ramsay: Fatalities on the highway are subject to miles travelled.

There is another thing, also. There was a suggestion that most traffic entering by Argentia would exit by Port aux Basques. I will

state that I think this is based on a false assumption; it is based on an entry and exit survey that was done, given the current level of service to Argentinia and Port aux Basques. But given a change in the level of service to Argentinia, I doubt very much that it will automatically allow the majority of tourist traffic to come into the Province via Argentinia and leave via Port aux Basques. There are statistics in there which are not really qualified, because what would happen in some cases, vessels would come in via Argentinia and, because of the breakdown of the ferry, they would leave via Port aux Basques. This is also part of those statistics. So the statistics that are used in that respect certainly support the intent of the ADI report, which was to qualify it, because they had this vessel there and the Federal Government had to support it.

Another factor is that additional purchases by Marine Atlantic in the Argentinia area will be very limited. I note this because Port aux Basques, having been a port for Marine Atlantic over the years, and the amount of purchases by Marine Atlantic in Port aux Basques certainly is far, far less than those purchased in North Sydney. Now one might say because of freight costs and other reasons, but Marine Atlantic, in effect, because of the gulf operation being headquartered in North Sydney, the majority of their purchases of goods happens in North Sydney and, regardless of the Argentinia ferry, will continue to happen in North Sydney. It will take an awful lot of work and promotion to get them to purchase in the Argentinia area.

Also I might note that the hon. Member did mention that we were guaranteed rail and ferry connections under the Terms of Union, which is true, but to suggest that improvements to the Argentinia ferry run will, in effect, reaffirm the constitutional obligations of the Federal Government, I think it quite incorrect. Knowing the amount of traffic that travels through Port aux Basques alone in the wintertime, there is no way one can justify a winter service to Argentinia considering the volume of freight and the volume of car and passenger traffic through the Port aux Basques port. To have two vessels operating during that period of time will not allow a level of service that will be financially viable for Marine Atlantic.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Ramsay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, maybe we could have more applause from the Minister. Thank you very, very much, Mr. Chairman.

I am glad the Minister of Health applauded, because I am going to read a letter that was written to the Minister of Health, and I am sure the Minister will enjoy the contents of this letter; it ties into the Budget and it ties into the Estimates.

It is a letter which came from one of my constituents.

An Hon. Member: Come clean.

Mr. Warren: Yes, indeed I will come clean. This letter is signed by Gary Mitchell, a former mayor of the town of Makkovik.

An Hon. Member:
The former mayor of what?

Mr. Warren: The town of Makkovik.

An Hon. Member: The former mayor?

Mr. Warren: That is right, the former mayor of the town of Makkovik. It is addressed to the Minister of Health, and it ties into the Budget and Estimates and everything else.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) considerations and concerns for Labrador.

Mr. Warren: You will see, Mr. Chairman, when I read this letter, it does have indirect consequences

Mr. Tobin: Direct.

Mr. Warren: Direct and indirect consequences to the Budget. Now, it is addressed to the Minister of Health: 'I wish to inform you of a concern I had for some time and I thought I should make you aware of it.'

An Hon. Member: Are you going to table that?

Mr. Warren: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In fact, not only am I tabling it, but all the media has it and there is a copy to the Premier.

Mr. Hodder: I wish you spoke as often as you interject and (inaudible). Now, Mr. Chairman, he has moved all the way over there so he is even worse; he is farther away and he will never stop speaking.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Warren: The second paragraph. 'Sometime in March of this year, March 1990, there was some controversy between you and Mr. Garfield Warren on appointments made to the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board of Directors. Mr. Warren was upset' - that is true - 'because no one was appointed, or not enough representation was present on the Board from the District of Torngat Mountains. This, in my view, was a legitimate concern by Mr. Warren.' It was a concern, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister announced appointments to the Board, and he would not announce anybody from my District. I think that was a good concern. Now, CBC news reported -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) said he could not find anybody (inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Who said that?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but that is fine and dandy.

'CBC news reported that three names were submitted to serve on the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board, and the same newscast reported that you, Mr. Decker, did not approve of any of these three names that were submitted.'

An Hon. Member: What did he say?

Mr. Warren: The Minister did not approve of the three names that were submitted to go on the Regional Health Services Board. That is right, Mr. Chairman, 'This remark you made upset me

very much and I have not forgotten about it, because it touched me deeply as I was one of these people'. His name was one of the three given to the Minister to be considered to go on the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board, so naturally he was upset that the Minister said that those-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Just listen.

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, the next paragraph. 'Mr. Decker, behind those three names were people, human beings with feelings, people who were willing to serve on the Health Board, people willing to put their time, energy and resources into improving health care programs here on the coast of Labrador. I thought you would -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: I will continue, Mr. Chairman, 'I thought you would be more professional and not make remarks like that on the air. How do you think my family and friends feel to hear on the news (radio) that I was not good enough to serve on the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board?' Now Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mitchell's expression to the Minister is that the Minister has condemned them, as far as he was concerned.

Now, Mr. Chairman, next paragraph: 'I have been Mayor of Makkovik, I have been President of the Combined Councils of Labrador, Board Member of the Labrador Inuit Association, Board Member of the Labrador Legal Services, Board Member of the Advisory Committee for the Community College of Labrador, and I am presently on the Citizen's Advisory Committee

for Crime Prevention in Makkovik and a member of the Volunteer Fire Brigade'.

Now, Mr. Chairman, 'I have deep concerns about the health delivery system in Labrador and I was hoping to bring them to the Board's attention. I was interviewed by a group from Halifax that was looking into the health delivery system. Where has all of this gone? That question was asked. Money was paid out for this group to do a survey and make recommendations. What has happened? Is this survey gathering dust on a shelf?' Those are some good questions that Mr. Mitchell is asking.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the next paragraph, I wonder.

An Hon. Member: Yes, what is the next paragraph?

An Hon. Member: Everybody listen to the next paragraph.

Mr. Warren: The next paragraph: Mr. Mitchell is saying, 'I should add here that I was approached by Premier Clyde Wells last winter (1989) to run as a Liberal candidate in the Torngat Mountains District'.

An Hon. Member: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Hodder: But he is not good enough to be on the Hospital Board.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, 'He thought I was good enough to work with the Liberal Party' -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) no politics involved.

Mr. Warren: - 'but you do not think I am good enough to sit on a Health Board'.

An Hon. Member: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Warren: 'I do not understand what is going on with your decision, or why you decided not to accept the names that were submitted to you.'

An Hon. Member: Now isn't that something?

Mr. Warren: Next paragraph, Mr. Chairman: 'Mr. Decker, You have to realize' -

Mr. Hodder: You should hang your heads in shame.

Mr. Warren: 'Mr. Decker, you have to realize that people have feelings and it was not fair of you to turn down the names when we were willing to volunteer ourselves to be of assistance for the good of our people here on the coast. We have always enjoyed' - and this is very important, Mr. Chairman - 'a democratic system of being selected to Boards in the past, and I think this practice should continue so we can make our own decisions for our own people. I was not acceptable. For what reasons and by whose standards?'

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) read that last paragraph again?

Mr. Warren: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will read it time and time again for you.

Mr. Tobin: You go out and talk to CBC every morning (inaudible) yourself.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Warren: 'We always have

enjoyed a democratic system of being selected to Boards in the past, and I think this practice should be continued so that we can make our own decisions for our own people. I was not acceptable. For what reasons and by whose standards?' And that is signed by Gary W. Mitchell.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this letter once again shows what this Government was up to. And do you know what I had to do in order to get two Members from my District on the Board?

An Hon. Member: Tell us.

Mr. Warren: Yes, I will tell you. I will tell you what I have done. I called every town council in by District and I said to them, now, you send me out as many names as possible that you would think would be good Members to go on the Board, and, Mr. Chairman, I delivered to the Minister, two hundred and fifty-one names.

Mr. Decker: Two hundred and fifty-two.

Mr. Warren: Two hundred and fifty-two names, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Parsons: He was pretending he was not listening.

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, now the Minister went right down through those names -

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Warren: - then he went and got the phone book, then he went and called his buddies up in my District and said, can you find a name that Mr. Warren did not give us? He said, could you find some other name?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Warren: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: He had them all.

Mr. Warren: And, Mr. Chairman -

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

An Hon. Member: Explain it.
Explain it.

Mr. Warren: When it ended up, Mr. Chairman, he went down through the names two or three times and, finally, he came up with Mrs. Campbell, in Rigolet, and Mr. Anderson, in Nain. And, I will be darned, on my list, those two names were there. He could not get anybody else because, Mr. Chairman, we had everybody selected that the Minister could pick.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman will get a chance to speak after I am finished, but I will get back at him again.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me say I am pleased that at least the Minister finally was convinced that there were qualified people in the District, and he selected two out of the two hundred and fifty-two. However, he had three good names given to him first. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the Board will eventually work for the betterment of the people on the coast of Labrador and on the Great Northern Peninsula.

An Hon. Member: That is right!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

The Hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Warren: By leave, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin-Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I am a bit disappointed, obviously, that there is no one on the Government side who wants to get involved in the Budget debate.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, that being the case, we are certainly ready, willing and able to participate in this Budget debate. Mr. Chairman, I have no difficulty in believing the apprehension on the part of my colleagues opposite in trying to defend this most deceitful document that has ever been presented to the House of Assembly. And, Mr. Chairman, the public of Newfoundland and Labrador are finally getting a taste of the deceit which has been implemented in this Budget.

If one were to watch the news this evening, on either channel, Mr. Chairman, either of the Newfoundland channels this evening, one would quite clearly see the message being carried loud and clear. You have a Minister, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance -

Dr. Kitchen: It is a pleasure to meet you.

Mr. Tobin: who brought in this document and delivered into the House of Assembly and was all glowing, Mr. Chairman. The media could not, Mr. Chairman, get clear of the Minister of Finance. But, as they said this evening, once

the Opposition started asking some penetrating questions, and started embarrassing -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: The Minister of Education should laugh, Mr. Chairman, after that story that was carried this evening, what you have done to the sick children in this Province, you should laugh, there is no doubt about it. Your attack sir, on the sick children of this Province warrants you to laugh, no doubt about that. You should hang your head in shame. Any man, Mr. Chairman, any man who portrays to be an educator in this Province and who, no doubt, had a fair amount of respect and no doubt earned that respect.

An Hon. Member: No he did not.

Mr. Tobin: Yes.

An Hon. Member: And he agrees with everybody.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, he agrees with everybody, but I think he earned that respect, but for him to attack in such a savage way the sick children of this province in that budget. It was brought out this evening, anyone see the news this evening? It was brought out quite clearly.

An Hon. Member: I do not have time.

Mr. Warren: What time, 6:30.

Mr. Tobin: You do not have time?
Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Warren: I know what you are doing.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, there must be some part-time Members in

this House, Mr. Chairman, if they do not have time to watch the news. But, what we have got here is a Budget that was brought into this Legislature, noted as the most deceitful document that has ever been presented.

You have got the President of the Board of Trade today telling the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that one of the main problems with the economy of this City with the economic conditions of this City is the deceitful tax that the Minister of Finance implemented when he put a burden of 1.5 per cent on the businesses.

An Hon. Member: And then he would not refuse an interview on it.

Mr. Tobin: That is old news, is it.

An Hon. Member: Not that long.

Mr. Tobin: Oh, Mr. Chairman, it was not too old when they tried to hide it. When they tried to cover it up. I can tell the Member for Exploits, Mr. Chairman, that there is an easy avenue to Cabinet. Get the Cabinet on your own merit, my son, your capabilities, not by trying to pick it up, the embarrassment for the Minister of Finance.

What has happened is that there has been in this Legislature in the last month a desire and a wish by all of the Members opposite to try to push the Minister of Finance out of the limelight, to try to get him, he has been such an embarrassment, Mr. Chairman, they have been trying to push him out the door and let the President of Treasury Board or the Premier answer the questions. We have seen it time and time again, when we tried to ask the Minister of

Education questions in this House, Mr. Chairman, time and time again when we asked the Minister of Finance questions about the Minister of Education, the man who attacked the sick children of this Province, we have seen him trying to stand up and defend the Budget.

Mr. R. Aylward: He should be ashamed of himself.

An Hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Tobin: That is true, Mr. Chairman, if anyone was to watch the news tonight on television, you would clearly see, Mr. Chairman, a teacher from a hospital -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I would advise the Minister of Finance to be very careful what he is saying because you, sir -

Mr. R. Aylward: Because you put your foot in your mouth again.

Mr. Tobin: have made one mess of your mouth already in this Legislature. You have caused the Premier to come in to this Legislature, and to say that you were basically incompetent and you did not know what you were saying. I think his word was foolish and stupid. I think is what he said.

An Hon. Member: He could not fire you.

Mr. Tobin: I think is what he said regarding the Minister of Finance. But, I will say today, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance has introduced in this Legislature, his last Budget. He will never again, as Minister of Finance, bring in a Budget in this

Legislature, and we might as well all accept that. You have got the Minister of Health, Mr. Chairman, he has closed hospital beds in Grand Bank, not only did he close down beds, he closed hospitals.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member from Placentia, Mr. Chairman, decided to go to his aid today, there were people in Placentia were very concerned that there was nobody saying anything about the east coast ferry operation, and they were aware that the Minister of Justice, Mr. Chairman, had been up in Ottawa and that the -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: What is that?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Well, Mr. Chairman, yes he was. The Member for Placentia is right. The record of the House should show that the Member for Placentia has quite clearly stated that the Minister of Justice went to Ottawa and undermined him and the Member for Placentia is right and I give him full marks, Mr. Chairman for having the courage, Mr. Chairman, to stand up to his constituents.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: That is much different, Mr. Chairman, than what the Member for LaPoile did when he missed the Meeting yesterday and sent word that he could not attend the Meeting because he had obligations and commitments to the House of Assembly. Now, take an example from the Member for Placentia who stood here. What did he say, the Minister of

Justice has tried to undermine my actions in having an east coast ferry.

That is the type of a man, Mr. Chairman, that I admire in this House.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: That is the type of man I admire in this House, and tomorrow, Mr. Chairman, I can tell the Member for Placentia that I again will do a press release commending him, Mr. Chairman, for acknowledging and having the courage to bring out in this House, the actions of the Minister of Justice.

An Hon. Member: I will be looking forward to it.

An Hon. Member: Take a break now.

Mr. Tobin: No, Mr. Chairman, I will not take a break. The only break I see the Member for Exploits taking was a few years ago on the steps of the building, he knows what I am talking about too.

An Hon. Member: Tell us about it.

Mr. Tobin: We can get on to a lot here, Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader, Mr. Chairman -

An Hon. Member: I do not know anything that.

An Hon. Member: What are you talking about?

Mr. Tobin: No, I am not talking about it. The Government House Leader, more important issues. I want to talk about the manner in which the Government House Leader, as the President of the Executive Council, who stood in this

Legislature and condemned the NIS, Newfoundland Information Services, condemned it, Mr. Chairman. What did he do when he got in Government? He took it from Public Works where it was, brought it up and put it under himself and doubled the budget, that is what he did, and then he cut the budget of the Ombudsman.

An Hon. Member: Shocking.

Mr. Tobin: Kicked out the Ombudsman, and said the MHAs can do the work of the Ombudsman. I will challenge the Government House Leader to give the MHAs the same Act and the same Legislation to work under that the Ombudsman had, and then let the Ombudsman do it. The Act that covers the Ombudsman, if the Minister is prepared to give the same Act to the MHAs, then sir, I will consider supporting it. But do not say that the MHAs can do it unless you are prepared to give them the same powers to do it as the Ombudsman had. And I would suspect you have not. I would suspect you will not.

And we also see that the Auditor General's Act is coming up very shortly, the Auditor General's Act is coming up very shortly, Mr. Chairman, another attempt -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, maybe, but it is another attempt, Mr. Chairman, to get at individuals.

An Hon. Member: You are hot tonight.

Mr. Tobin: It is another attempt, Mr. Chairman, President of Treasury Board, and I shall not, Mr. Chairman, be quiet because of threats. I have been threatened

by the Government House Leader, Mr. Chairman. He will not intimidate me with his threats, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, he is only a young fellow, leave him alone you are right.

Mr. Chairman, I want the record to know that that was an attempt -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I will get back to it.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gullage: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gullage: After the comments earlier today from the Member for Burin-Placentia West, I felt I had to make some comments tonight. I think he questioned me today why some of the hearings had to be delayed, which I found quite amusing. Some of the hearings did have, in fact, to be delayed because of the great interest in amalgamation throughout the Province.

Mr. Hewlett: Great outrage.

Mr. Gullage: And as we know, most of the hearings, I would say out of the forty-two we have done, there is one left to be done, the vast majority were well attended, to say the least. And why the Member would fault councils for

wanting to arrange larger meeting halls, school gymnasiums or whatever we use, as the case may be, is beyond me, surely heavens you would want to accommodate the numbers of people that had an interest.

I think what is really happening, Mr. Chairman, is there is a great fear on the part of the Opposition that the amalgamation procedure is going to succeed.

An Hon. Member: That is right!

Mr. Gullage: I think they are starting to become paranoid now because they are finding out that it is very positive.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gullage: In spite of press comments from time to time, particularly comments in the beginning, early on, negative comments on the part of the press, misinterpreting, I believe, the mood of the people and really, comments that were more attributable to individual councillors and mayors, but certainly not the mood of the people throughout the Province. Because I do not think if the Opposition was to think about it, and I am sure they have, that they would disagree that communities coming together is a very positive thing, and certainly that is what I am getting from the people that I am talking to and these various groupings throughout the Province, and I am getting from mayors and councillors as well.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gullage: Not all areas, no. That is quite correct, not all areas. We do not, at least I do not as a Minister, think for a

moment that we are going to proceed with amalgamation in all forty-three groupings. I think that would be strange, I think, if we were able to accomplish that because we realized from the beginning that the feasibility process would show that, in fact, not every area, not every grouping, is it feasible to bring the communities together. We have already found, although except for one grouping that I have a report on, we have already found, in the little bit of knowledge that I have been able to get by listening to the news mostly because certainly I am not a party to that, I have not attended any of the hearings, and I have not been a party -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gullage: to any of the reports. No believe it or not, my official told me nothing, absolutely nothing.

Mr. Tobin: We have got no difficulty believing you.

Mr. Gullage: And I have asked them, instructed them not to tell me anything. I do not want to be influenced in any way until I see the final report, and that is the right way to do it.

But anyway, what I have been able to find out, there are some groupings, there are going to be several of the groupings, I am quite confident, that will be recommended not to be amalgamated. That does not mean though, that we will not proceed to put in place a regional service board, so that we can have sharing of services on a formalized basis, and we will certainly encourage that. We can see some areas now, not just with the forty-three

groupings incidentally, we can see some areas with many communities that are grouped closely together that we can, in fact, put in place the Regional Services Legislation that we have on the Order Paper, and that Legislation will enable them, in a formalized way not just in a loose committee way as we have seen it in the past, but in a formalized, legal manner, they would have a board that they can participate in with elected representation from the councils, strictly elected representation, and share in services with a mechanism that will allow them to cost share on a per capita basis on whatever the service happens to be, and I feel confident that we will put many of these boards in place throughout the Province.

You know, in discussions with Ministers in other Provinces, and I have had many, concerning the amalgamation procedure and what they are doing in other Provinces, I have discovered that what we are doing is far in advance of what they have done in Provinces that have carried out an amalgamation procedure. Quebec for example, wished they were handling it the way we are. If they had their time back, they would do it the way we are doing it.

Mr. Simms: They don't know the whole story.

Mr. Gullage: As far as the Regional Services Boards are concerned, they think we are on to something that can be patterned in the rest of Canada, and we decided to go that route rather than another level of Government which, n Provinces such as Ontario, they are trying to eliminate regional governments, they are trying to take away that extra tier of government in a

Province that needs more government like a hole in the head. They have layers and layers of elected people trying to get a simple permit through, it is a nightmare. So, we did not want to go that route, we wanted to put in place a way for councils to share services, to per capita share services and have it community driven rather than another level of elected people on top of the elected councils.

I met with the Federation of Municipalities, as a matter of fact, this Saturday past, which I am doing quite frequently, and they are very, very receptive to the legislation we have on the Order Paper now. They are very familiar with it, of course, because I have consulted with them, and they think it is going to be very, very helpful to them.

You know, in a speech a couple of days ago, I alluded to Dr. Harris and his comments recently. He and I were on the same program, and he was talking about, his topic was the sea and our heritage related to the sea, and he was talking about the communities on the coast of Newfoundland and how they were formed in the first place.

It was an interesting talk because he went back to the beginnings, of course, of settlement in Newfoundland and he talked about how people pursuing the fishing industry, of course, that was the reason Newfoundland was settled in the first place, they wanted to be as close as possible to the fishing grounds, and they literally knew the ocean like a prairie farmer would know his fields. Even today, that is true, to a large degree that the fishermen know where they are going before they leave in their

boats, they know where the fish are located, they know their fishing area that they are used to going to where it is more productive than other areas.

And he talked about how communities, if you go around the coast of Newfoundland, they are not logically located. They are not located where there is lots of good farmland, where there is forests where they can, in those days, in the first early settlements, where they could build their houses, for example. They located their settlements in the most difficult places of all. Where there were no forests around. It was on rock.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Gullage: There was no place to farm. It is almost as if they wanted to create the most difficult circumstances for themselves as possible. So today, of course, we still have that. Those same communities have been there for three or four hundred years and they are still there.

So, we have got a unique circumstance in Newfoundland. I mean, this is not like other Provinces where the communities are logically planned, logically located, they can be more viable because of their location, they are probably surrounded by good farmland and forests that they can access, and so on. But, you know, we have hundreds, literally hundreds, of communities in this Province that the only thing they have going for them is the fishing industry, that is their living. There is nothing else, absolutely nothing else.

An Hon. Member: That was logical.

Mr. Gullage: That was logical. That is correct. The point I am making is that in many, many of these communities, there is nothing we can do as far as amalgamation is concerned, and if we look at the six hundred, I think there is something over six hundred really, settlements in Newfoundland, there are probably more like eight hundred if you want to include all the small pockets of houses that are away from incorporated communities -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Burin-Placentia.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments as it relates to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the statements that were put forward by the Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding amalgamation, and to -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Tobin: Thank you. Spike is talking. Mr. Chairman, there are a few comments I want to make regarding the statements from the Minister of Municipal Affairs on amalgamation, and for the Minister to stand up in this House and say how positive amalgamation is in this Province is somewhat beyond me because from the hearings I attended, and I know of other hearings that took place in this Province, particularly on the Burin Peninsula, I know they had

to cancel, as a matter of fact, they had to cancel the hearings in Grand Bank and Fortune because there were so many people showed up to protest against amalgamation, that the building was not even big enough to accommodate the numbers that were there. I say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the amalgamation issue that he is proposing is not going to work in this Province because of the way that the Minister has chosen to try and push it down the throats of the people of this Province. But basically, the Minister has threatened amalgamation on the people whether they like it or not. There are a lot of other issues that has to take place.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: What?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: There are a lot of other issues that have to take place in this Province before amalgamation will be accepted by the people, and the Minister says that it is positive. I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs that, for the communities and towns in this Province who have quite adamantly, opposed amalgamation with another centre, can they be assured that they will not have to amalgamate, that the Minister will not force amalgamation on them, that the Government will not force amalgamation on them. That is the question I would like to have answered when the Minister participates in this debate again because I -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: What is that?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: He never answered it to my satisfaction.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: He never answered it to my satisfaction, Mr. Chairman, and I asked the Minister that in all sincerity if he would tell me whether or not the Government will be forcing amalgamation on the people of this Province, because that is a very important issue. I know in my own District, we have communities that oppose amalgamation. They were very strongly in their objections, and I think the Minister is wrong, at this point in the game, to say that amalgamation is the most positive thing to ever take place in this Province.

I believe that the Minister made reference to a regional services board. Well, there is such a thing in this Province as the sharing of various services, and I have no problem with that provided it is done right and it is done in co-operation with the councils rather than tell the councils that this is the way that it has got to be. I do not think that will work, but I think if the Minister is efficient and sits down with the various councils -

Mr. Parsons: John be quiet.

Mr. Tobin: What the Minister of Social Services is trying to prove, Mr. Chairman, you certainly do not have to prove your ignorance. You do not have to prove to anyone your ignorance. You do not have to prove that to anyone, that is well taken for granted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I could

continue to speak to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In terms of the Rates and Service Boards, I would suspect that the Member for Placentia could probably give some direction in this, is that there is a lot of areas in this Province that shares various services, and I would suspect the Argentinia-Placentia area is one of the areas where there is amount of sharing in terms of the stadium, and things such as that, and I think it can work, but it has to be done right, it has to be done with the support of the councils rather than the councils to be told that they must do it.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that there have been -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I do not know what, Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time for the Chair to ask the Minister of Social Services to keep quiet because it is a bit irritable to, you know, to have a mouth like that, Mr. Chairman. A mouth without a brain let loose in this House is not the best thing you can have.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Now, let me say, yes I will stay on the high road, but I tell you I am not going to be intimidated by that across there.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs has, in my opinion, taken a very negative approach, and I do not know who advised him, Mr. Chairman, but the Minister of Municipal Affairs is taking a very negative approach to try and get communities amalgamated in this Province. I had the opportunity to attend two amalgamations in my own District, and I saw the

people, if I may use it, from Spanish Room.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: The community of Spanish Room.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: What is that?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Hearings.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: In Marystown and in Burin.

Mr. Gullage: I attended every hearing.

Mr. Tobin: Is the Minister not aware that these hearings took place.

Mr. Gullage: Oh, yes. I attended every hearing.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I had the opportunity to attend two amalgamation hearings. Amalgamation that was being forced sure by you on the people of Spanish Room, a small community outside of Marystown. That is the hearing that I attended. When the people, and every single one of them, every single person in the community signed the petition opposing amalgamation, and yet you proceeded with your official as your agent to hear this and expect an impartial view and to put it in place.

The Minister is saying here tonight that he has never spoken to his officials regarding

amalgamation, Mr. Chairman. Who does the Minister of Municipal Affairs think he is kidding, to never have his officials speak to him about any of these hearings. Mr. Chairman, some of us have been Ministers before, and to tell us that the Minister, that your Deputy Minister or your Assistant Deputy Minister and you have never discussed a hearing, and expect, how gullible, Mr. Chairman, how gullible do you think we are to listen to that. That you have never spoken to your officials regarding the amalgamation hearings. It is time for the respect for the truth to be brought back into this Legislature. It is time for the Government to show respect for the truth, Mr. Speaker, because we have seen a lot of that. We have seen a lot of that being forgotten over the past number of weeks and months in this Legislature.

I would say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I say it with all sincerity that he is responsible for creating much concern, for having people very concerned about their future, and no other place, Mr. Chairman, is it more evident than in the District of St. John's East Extern, the people of Wedgewood Park.

Can the Minister stand in this House and tell the people of Wedgewood Park that they will not be amalgamated? Will the Minister of Municipal Affairs do that, Mr. Chairman? He knows their stand, everybody in this House and everybody in this city knows exactly where the people of Wedgewood Park stand on amalgamation, and will the Minister of Municipal Affairs tell this House that no, the people of Wedgewood Park will not be forced

to be amalgamated. And it is not good enough for the Minister to weasel around and say, Mr. Chairman, that the Government will not decide, the House will decide.

Who is the House? Who is the House of Assembly? Who carries the vote? Who carries the vote to force out the Ombudsman in this Province? Who carries the vote on everything else in this House? It is the Government. It is the Government that is going to do it, Mr. Chairman. It will be the Cabinet Ministers, Mr. Chairman, who will participate in this discussion.

An Hon. Member: Thank God for democracy.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, thank God for democracy. I thank God for democracy is right.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but I do not understand what the hon. gentleman said, maybe if he was speaking, I could hear him.

But I would say, and I ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs to be very concerned, to show some concern, Mr. Chairman, for the people in this Province in small communities and towns in rural Newfoundland that has opposed the amalgamation issue, that do not want their towns to be amalgamated with some other council. I would ask the Minister to be very concerned and sensitive to (inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Tobin: Thank you very much,

Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: Mr. Chairman, where did he go?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of points I want to make, and it is in reference to what the Member for Burin-Placentia West was just talking about, amalgamation. I have never seen a group of people in my life so determined to create negative feelings in the Province, so determined to get up there, and no way can they understand the reality of what is taking place. The critic, the supposed critic for the Department would love the fact that the Minister would stand up in his seat and say yes, nobody has got a say in the amalgamation process, we are not going to listen to anybody in the Province, everybody is going to go out there, and amalgamation is going to be forced. That is what he is asking the Minister, and his prayers would be answered tomorrow morning if he could hear someone making a statement on that.

He does not understand the process taking place, and yet he attended several hearings, he said, in his own District, and he is still saying that the Minister is forcing amalgamation on the people. Now, I know, and I have known him for the past seven or eight years, I have known how thick and you know, hard he is to understand anything, but when you sit in an audience, even if you do

not participate, if you sit in an audience, you should at least learn the process.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: or have some knowledge of what is going on. But, time after time after time he will stand up in the House of Assembly and he will go on the Minister of, how do you say it? Municipal, no, no, I am just trying to figure out, Municipal, yes that is it, and he would love, and he points the finger, you are forcing amalgamation down the throats. Well, I can understand now. The more you listen, the more you stay there in your chair and the more you listen to Members opposite, the former Members of Government, I cannot speak for the hon. Member over there alone in his seat. But the former Members of Government, I can understand now why everyone in the Province was totally disillusioned with them because - can you imagine, a former Minister, now a Member for his District, sitting in on several areas in his District, and not have any understanding whatsoever, what was going on, and what process was taking place. And that is what was Minister in a Cabinet, running the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Make no wonder -

I have to open up the booklet, the cookbook, now when I read it I can understand. I thought first, when I read this, there might have been some logic or some joke. But now I can understand more and more and more. They were serious about this, they were quite serious. This was the future of Newfoundland. First of all, let me read you this message, this recipe, and this was printed by the former Cabinet. On page seven-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Listen, you have to listen to this, you have to understand what I am going to say.

\$25 million pickles, really good, good, good. Now, start off. In large pan slice thinly four quarts, now, listen to this one, of Newfoundland cucumbers, two quarts of onions, now I do not know where they are going to get the onions, three green peppers, three red peppers, sprinkle with a half cup of pickling salt. Now, we can get the pickling salt because every fisherman got that around the Province. Cover with ice cubes, now what are you going to do in that hot green house with ice cubes. Let stand eight hours overnight and drain thoroughly.

Now that is the process that was going on, the future of the industries of Newfoundland and Labrador. The diversification programs that that Government had, to try to create some employment in the city, and especially the appetites -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: I am telling you, the hon Minister of Agriculture is going to have difficulty if I keep on showing this book around because it is going to be pickle factories all over the Province.

I will not tell you yum yum pickles, really yummy. If you think I am fabricating, if you think I am not telling the truth, you should purchase a copy.

This is the type of people that you have standing up, making speeches, hour after hour after hour, in the House of Assembly trying to rationalize, like,

today, the Leader of the Opposition, trying to rationalize diversification programs and trying to tell the hon. Premier what we should be doing in the town of Gaultois. A pickle factory in Gaultois. A cucumber factory in Grand Bank. Is that the sort of an attitude that, is that seventeen years of Government and that was the most productive thing that came out of seventeen years. A pickle cookbook.

Now, the hilarious part about it is that they printed the cookbook before they got the cucumbers. That was the other part about it.

An Hon. Member: Did that cost anything?

Mr. Efford: Cost? \$20,000 for that.

My critic, the Member for Port au Port - of course, the Member for Kilbride should know all about the pickles. The cattle farm is out in Kilbride, and got a good taste of the pickles.

I think my critic from Port au Port, I want to get back on the fishery, because that was - I do not know if any other hon. Member in the House of Assembly caught what the Member from Port au Port said this afternoon, when he asked the hon. the Premier a question about keeping the plant open in Piccadilly. He said there, that he was disgusted with the attitude of the Federal Government towards the inshore fishery in the response program. His Leader, yesterday, in the House of Assembly, totally supported the Federal Program. Now, there is the Leader of the Opposition - it is in Hansard, it is in Hansard for anybody to read - he said it this afternoon. He was totally

shocked that there was nothing in there for the inshore fisherman of Newfoundland and Labrador.

An Hon. Member: We believe you.

Mr. Efford: Now, if you do not understand, if you do not take my word, tomorrow take Hansard and read his response today, his question, and take Hansard and read. Well, there it is.

An Hon. Member: It is not misleading.

Mr. Efford: It is not misleading, here it is, it is facts.

An Hon. Member: What does it say?

Mr. Efford: Now, let's talk about the inshore fishery. I have never, and I have been sitting down listening to all the debating going on on the inshore fishery. But we have all missed something. If you remember back a few years ago when there was an Opposition over there, we pointed out to the House of Assembly what the future for the inshore fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador was. And what the mandate was to the Federal Government. There was one mandate in mind. To totally eliminate, annihilate, destroy the inshore fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador.

They started that some ten years ago, and that is unanswered, that is on the record, when the real Opposition, when there was an Opposition in the House of Assembly stated very clearly, time after time after time. Now, here is living proof of what the Federal attitude is towards the inshore fishery. What do they want to do? They allowed the overfishing to take place. They knew it was going to have a

serious impact on the Province, the overfishing. Sometime, it had to come to a point when quotas had to be cut. So, they allowed it to happen, to erode over the last ten years. I mean, they caused it because the foreign overfishing had been taking place, they knew about it, they did not stop it, so they allowed it to happen.

What happens when the inshore fishery gets to the point when there are no fish in the traps? Well now, the fishermen start to get in trouble. What happens when people start to get in trouble? The get discouraged, and they ask for help. Now the Federal Government's plan was when they ask for it, what will we do? We completely turn our backs on them, we will ignore them and they will disappear.

An Hon. Member: No they did not.

Mr. Efford: That is exactly -

An Hon. Member: No, they gave away some more to Japan first, then they gave some more away to Russia.

Mr. Efford: Well yes, but that was the process that took place up until the fishery, they gave the quotas and they gave the licences to all the foreign fleets. There is not a Member on that side who can argue and say what I am saying is not correct.

Now the situation is there has been no support for the inshore fishery in this Province whatsoever.

Now what is going to happen this year to the fishermen across Newfoundland and Labrador? The people are going to move out of the fishery. They have already

started. They took five hundred caplin licences. They have just taken them away. So that is five hundred licences gone now. Now, if there is no cod, you cannot catch caplin, the squid have not been in since 1979, they have taken the sealing licences, you are not allowed to kill seals, what is left? I got my licence, but the situation is -

An Hon. Member: Driver's licence.

Mr. Efford: The situation is that, it is the cute way, the roundabout way of destroying, wiping out the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador. And it is a reality now. It is a reality because thirdly, what they have had to do is no more people who now hold a part-time licence allowed to get a full-time licence.

An Hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Efford: So as the generations, and the AIDS population and people drop off, there are no more people with the part-time licences allowed to come in, and more importantly, any fishermen in Newfoundland and Labrador who is living in the community, who has got a son or any member of his family cannot get any licence. You cannot get a part-time licence and you cannot get a full-time licence. So you cannot get in, there are no new entries into the fishery. Now how long- think about it- how long will the fishery last in Newfoundland and Labrador? And that is what that Leader of the Opposition or the so-called weak Opposition Party of Newfoundland and Labrador absolutely agreed with the response by the Federal Tory Government.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Efford: Already?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

I have identified the hon. Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to take part in this debate. Sometimes I wonder if perhaps the Minister of Social Services might not know a little more about the fishery than the Minister of Fisheries. At least it is the first time that we have got any information from a Minister on that side with respect to the fisheries was his final minute or so, he spent most of his time talking about pickles. I will not say what Minister should perhaps be pickled and put in the Archives, but there might be one or two over there.

But I want to address a few remarks to the budget tonight, and I was a bit late coming in because I could not get torn from my seat. I had to watch, did not see the news, well I will have to tell you what happened tonight.

An Hon. Member: What was on the news?

An Hon. Member: He will tell you now.

Mr. Winsor: Ten minutes to seven, waited and there was very little in a report from the House, a couple of little blurps, and all of a sudden, Rick Seward comes on

with an analysis of this year's budget. No mention of Ralph and Spike, that was not part of it. Seven minutes and he started to go through and agreed with what the Opposition has been saying all along, that this is the most fraudulent, deceitful budget that has been ever introduced.

An Hon. Member: Is that what he said now?

Mr. Winsor: That is what Rick Seward said, CBC reporter, and then he went on to tell us why.

An Hon. Member: He did.

Mr. Winsor: He went on to tell us why, and he said that the budget this year has got a 1 per cent income tax that was introduced last year that there was no reference to in the Budget yet it takes \$25 or \$30 million out of the taxpayers of the Province, covered up very cleverly. No increases in liquor announced in the Budget, but the Liquor Commission was told to raise an additional \$2.5 million. How did they do it? They go out and they raise taxes. That was not announced.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Yes, but no liquor increases. The Minister thumped his desk, he was not going to do that, no, he was not going to do that.

A \$10 million callback in Hydro, announced last year, and another \$10 million next year, that the Minister will not have to announce, but going to come out of the taxpayers of the Province.

Ten per cent tuition hike last year by the Government, this year

they got the University to announce it. Fifteen per cent over the last two years.

A phase-out of the hospital teachers in the Province. Devastating. Western Memorial, the one institution, the one hospital that the Minister failed to address today. No mention of the number of pupils that were in the Western Memorial Hospital receiving instruction, and had the nerve, the audacity, a former professor at the University, to suggest that six pupils were not important. One hospital had six -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: All right, the Minister said was not enough to warrant a teacher. Shame on him, shame on him.

Mr. Tobin: That was a separate story.

Mr. Winsor: Yes, and then the Minister of Education, his great thing that he likes to talk about in the Budget, this Budget was going to address three things: the economy, health, and education, coming to the payroll tax. Going to address the three things.

He said we gave four per cent increase per pupil. Initially that looked good, until you get at the statistics, and you discover that Newfoundland has got a declining enrollment. Four per cent increase means virtually no increase throughout, yet inflation is eating into school board bucks, and so the dollars are going to buy less. There is not more bang for your bucks, or more dollar for your scholar, or whatever he likes to shout.

And then the Minister has got this

little hobbyhorse that he talks about. That he saved \$3 million last year in his education budget, and before March 31, he rushed out to every computer center in this Province and elsewhere in the country. He has got warehouses in St. John's full of computers, for those lighthouse schools that he talks about. Lighthouse schools. Let me tell the Minister what he did. The Minister sent out a hurried command to his Curriculum Committee on Computer Studies to get a program for the schools in a day and a half. That is what they had to devise a program, because the Minister had \$3 million in his budget that he had to spend. No preparation. The committee has been working all year to put a program together, and the Minister says, get it done in a day and a half.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: No, that was not on the news tonight, that is a little bit of information that came along. But I will give you the rest of the news tonight; nothing for Exploits in it, nothing about University.

Then of course, added to that, for Education, we have got our 1.5 per cent payroll tax. The Minister stood in his place, day after day after day -

An Hon. Member: That was on the news.

Mr. Winsor: That was on the news. Day after day after day, and said: Don't worry about it, we are going to make a statement next week. Next week, and the days and the days and the days went on, and the Minister never made a statement. When the house broke for Easter, you know what the

Minister was forced to admit? The Minister was forced to admit that yes, the payroll tax was going to apply to all institutions and all health care, and we are going to try to sneak it back to them at the end of the year, if we can.

An Hon. Member: Was that on the news tonight?

Mr. Winsor: That was on the news tonight, yes.

And then, of course, there was another one that has not made the news yet, but it has gone to the Legislative Review Committees where Newfoundland Hydro, on top of the 4.5 per cent increase it just went for, is now going to need \$9 million because of some kind of a guarantee fee, Hydro rates have to go up by another 1 per cent.

An Hon. Member: Another 1 per cent?

Mr. Winsor: Another 1 per cent. So another \$9 million is going to be taken out.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Yes, well let me tell you what happened next. And Rick Seward said, 'And when called upon to defend this Budget, the Minister of Finance would not give an interview.'

An Hon. Member: Refused.

Mr. Winsor: Refused to give an interview.

An Hon. Member: Yes I was there, I remember it well.

Mr. Winsor: He refused to give an interview.

An Hon. Member: He said no way, not tonight, I am not doing that.

Mr. Winsor: He refused to defend it in the House, he refused to defend it. The Member for Carbonear should sit in his own seat if he wants to talk, otherwise he should keep quiet.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Chairman, the yakker from Mount scio - Bell Island is at it again, could you have him be quiet.

Mr. Chairman, and you know why the Minister of Finance would not make a comment? Because he has been told by the Premier, to never ever again speak in public after the fiasco he created in this House on his Meech Lake debate, he has been told: Don't you ever get up in public and speak again. In fact, you know what? I was out in the lobby outside today and the Minister of Finance even told me.

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Winsor: He said he was up to Ottawa having a meeting with Mr. Crosbie trying to straighten him up, and I said well why did you not tell us about it. He said I do not want to put my foot in my mouth anymore.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Winsor: The Minister of Finance was there, and we have witnesses to that effect.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: That is what the Minister of Finance said.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Then before I sit down, I have to address a few words to the Minister responsible for Provincial and Municipal Affairs and everything else but the kitchen sink, about his Recreation Grants that he cut out. He tried to sneak it through the Budget, tried to make people believe that there was a program.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible), you might not get any water and sewage next year.

An Hon. Member: Oh, another threat.

Mr. Winsor: Another threat. The Minister of Social Services has been saying all day that he does not give Tories anything, now the Member for Carbonear. Looks like the fairness and balance has suddenly disappeared.

An Hon. Member: He is starting to falter.

Mr. Winsor: But, you know, the Premier is not in his seat. See when the Premier is in his seat, you find none of this kind of thing going on.

An Hon. Member: They do not open their mouths when the Premier is here.

Mr. Winsor: And so the Minister took \$2.7 million from capital grants for recreation in this Province, no announcements at all that there was going to be a new Program,, did not tell the Recreation Commissions in the Province, he did not say to them, do not bother to fill out any applications this year, all the recreation commissions and municipalities trying to fill in grants, the Minister got \$300,000 left from last year that he was

going to announce last week, going to announce the week before, and we still have not heard the announcements. I do not suppose it is something like the list from last year.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Winsor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Minister of Education.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: I am tempted, Mr. Chairman, to do tonight what I thought I would never do in this House and that is go back over the last seventeen years. When I arrived here, and when I arrived in the post, when I was appointed Minister of Education, one thing I said to my colleagues in Cabinet and I said to this House, that I am the Minister of Education and I take responsibility for the problems with education. I do not want to blame everything on the last seventeen years. I am tempted, however, to tell the truth about the last seventeen years. But I will not do it.

An Hon. Member: Why not?

An Hon. Member: Yes, go ahead.

Dr. Warren: I will not do it. I will not indicate the problems that exist in education in this Province.

An Hon. Member: Do not embarrass him.

Dr. Warren: I can tell you what the problems are and I have travelled this Province from

school to school and community to community, as much as any person in this Province, and I can tell the House about the problems that exist in education in this Province, Mr. Chairman. But I will talk about what we have done in the last year. Let me just say what we have done in the last year.

By the way, I have a few notes here on their budget. Let me go back to just one budget that they had, the 1988 Budget. Here is the glorious Education Budget, 1988.

An Hon. Member: Their budget?

Dr. Warren: Yes.

They increased School Tax Equalization from \$2 million to \$4.5 million, \$2.5 million dollars.

Do you know what they did in Capital, Mr. Chairman? They did not increase Capital. They kept the Capital Construction Grant at \$20 million for about the third or fourth year. And in Teacher Positions they kept fifty teacher positions, which we have done for the past two years. This is the glorious Education Budget that the former Administration announced in 1988.

Now, let me just list a few things, and perhaps I need three or four shots at this. How much time do I have? Five minutes? Ten minutes?

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Dr. Warren: Well, maybe I need three or four to list what we have done in elementary and secondary education first.

Let us take the Capital Grants: What we did last year, the first year, two months after we came to

power, we increased Capital Grants from \$20 million to \$27 million.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: A 35 per cent increase, and we guaranteed that for the next two years.

We increased the School Tax Equalization Grant from \$4.5 million to \$10 million.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: You know, there was a letter in the paper -

An Hon. Member: Oh, but they saved the money!

Dr. Warren: I am sure my hon. friend understands.

There was a letter in the paper yesterday about school tax equalization. You know, in 1986 - 1987 that school board, I think it was the Green Bay Integrated School Board, got \$85,000 in school tax equalization; in 1987 - 1988 they got \$106,000; and in 1988 - 1989 they got \$175,000, that same school board that wrote the letter to the paper. Do you know what they got last year, the first year we were in power? They went up from \$175,000 to \$420,000.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: We made that available last year, and the same amount this year, \$420,000 in School Tax Equalization.

Let me take School Board Operation Costs: Four per cent this year to \$40 million.

Let me take Scholarships: What did they do? No! I was not going to do that. I will not do that.

I will not say what they did in seventeen years in the area of scholarships. No. I am tempted, but I will not.

An Hon. Member: The public deserves to know.

Dr. Warren: The public deserves to know. Let me tell the public that the last year they were in power they spent \$82,000 on scholarships. This year we are spending \$282,000 on electoral scholarships.

Distance Education: We are increasing the new sites in distance education. We are adding new courses in distance education, advanced math and physics.

The lighthouse schools: I taught on Fogo Island and I know how desperate the situation was when I was there. I think they are as pleased as any part of this Province to hear this announcement on lighthouse schools. We are spending \$1.7 million this year on computers, and that is the beginning, \$1.7 million. I can assure you -

Mr. Grimes: You are making fun at it, are you?

Dr. Warren: It does not matter what he says, but I know how the teachers feel about this in the Province. This Government brought in a computer policy, and in the first year, \$1.7 million to purchase computers and computer software.

Centers of Excellence; Economic and Entrepreneur Education; Small schools: We hired a consultant for small schools to start developing programs to meet the needs of small schools. Do you know what they did? They had a

study done. Fourteen studies done in education in the last five years under their Administration. Small Schools: We have a consultant to develop programs in small schools in this Province.

Co-operative Education; Guidance Services: Let me just mention guidance services. You know of vital importance to this Province. This year, with the help of the Federal Government I must admit, but this Government took the initiative, our Department took the initiative, \$1.5 million for Choices, a new program for guidance in the schools in this Province. Fantastic!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: Resource Materials for School Libraries: If there is one thing I found, as a Professor at Memorial, as a member of the Task Force, and as a Chairperson of the Royal Commission on Education and Youth, is that the materials were not out there. Eight dollars a student, I have to find out how many years they gave a grant of eight dollars per student for instructional materials in the schools. This year, Mr. Chairman, we are adding an extra \$500,000 for instruction materials in the schools.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: I have a list of books here, Newfoundland books we are putting in the schools this year. I will table a copy. The hundreds of books we are putting in the schools. Local writers, local authors, Newfoundland materials from all parts of the Province, \$500,000.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: New courses in computers, new courses in science, new courses in entrepreneurship and technology. Early childhood, we are expanding early childhood. We have a student retention committee going, travelling the Province, trying to keep people in school. On and on and on, Mr. Chairman, in the area of elementary and secondary education. Unbelievable, in one year, can you imagine what we are going to do in fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five years?

I must admit, Mr. Chairman, two or three things. I must admit that we did not get all the money we needed this year. Last year we really increased the budget substantially and we kept the school tax equalization as the capital this year. We got some, we did not get enough, and you know the reason why, the Federal Government did not help us.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Dr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be back up.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

It is a difficult act to follow. One Warren following another Warren. However, the hon. Minister did not mention about any books that were censored this past year. He never mentioned anything about that.

And the hon. Minister did not tell us of the correspondence that the

hon. Minister had with former Ministers of Education requesting that studies be done, and in fact, he was hired by the former Government to do some studies. Could the hon. Minister tell us - and Mr. Chairman, exactly I say, the hon. Minister is a good person to do studies, because the Provincial Government for the last seventeen years kept him employed doing studies. The hon. gentleman was doing studies for the the last number of year.

The hon. gentleman also mentioned about Newfoundland books in the schools. I think the hon. Minister should realize that the first native book put in the schools was done by the former Government. And I must say, it was a real good book, and it is in the schools throughout Newfoundland and Labrador.

The former Premier was up in Nain, and in fact, presented the lady that produced this book with a plaque of recognition from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador for her involvement in bringing this book into the schools.

The hon. Minister did not say one word about cutting out the program in the hospitals, the health/education program in the hospitals. That was on the radio tonight, on TV tonight, and the hon. Minister did not speak about it.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to say those few remarks in response to the hon. Minister. I have something very serious that I have to say. Last week I had concerns expressed to me from people in Labrador about low level flying. Tonight there were two more air crashes in Labrador. Two planes

crashed in Labrador. I have to say to this Government, I think there has to be a halt.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: To my colleagues answer, one pilot was taken to hospital with injuries and they have not located the second pilot, as of now. Unless there is something since the House opened. But Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. House Leader should ask the military to halt any further low level flying in Labrador until there is an inquiry into those three accidents.

An Hon. Member: But they were not low level flights.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, they were practicing Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: They were up to seventeen thousand feet.

Mr. Chairman, when you go up, you have got to come down.

An Hon. Member: The same with any plane.

Mr. Warren: So let me say to the hon. gentleman that those two aircraft were in the flight zone for low level flying and don't the hon. gentleman tell me, in fact, Mr. Chairman, they were twenty-four miles northwest of Grand Lake, Mr. Chairman. Right within the area where the native people have been doing their traditional hunting.

An Hon. Member: Do you feel the same way now if a 747 was coming in and would not be allowed to land in an emergency.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I am

not saying anything about commercial airlines, nothing about commercial airlines. I am talking about the military activities in Labrador.

An Hon. Member: You separate the value of life, do you?

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

I have recognized the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains.

If the Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island wants to be recognized, I will recognize him.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I am talking about military activities over Labrador and what I am saying is that this Government has to be sensitive enough to the concerns that the people are expressing, and the concerns are, Mr. Chairman: there have been three crashes, three different airplanes that have crashed in Labrador in the last three weeks. So answers have to be found, and I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that if this Government -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I say to my hon. colleague, I am not concerned about car accidents up over the Labrador territory north of Goose Bay because there are no roads, and my constituents make a living by going in the country and looking for traditional meat for their families.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, no, I want to continue but I want the military to stop flying over their traditional grounds until an inquiry can determine that at least everything was taken care of.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say one other thing and I say this to my hon. colleague from Mount Scio-Bell Island because he is one of the guys that interjected. Mr. Chairman, let's compare our Province, and let's look at this Government as the landlord. The people in Hopedale are using property belonging to the landlord, okay? And now, the landlord has allowed a third party to use that same property, okay?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Government of this Province is the landlord, they own the crown lands in this Province. Okay, Mr. Chairman? Now Mr. Chairman, the people in Hopedale, for years and years for their traditional way of life have used this land, the Government's land, as a way of making their living. Now Mr. Chairman, the last couple of years, and this Government is supporting it, now they are allowing a third party, the military, to come in and obstruct them from making their way of living. Mr. Chairman, I am saying to my hon. colleague, I have said it publicly and I will say it again, now, I support military activity if health, environment and wildlife is protected. But it is not protected now.

An Hon. Member: So you do not support NATO.

Mr. Warren: It is not protected now, Mr. Chairman, and I said to this House that I am having my concerns about the activity of the military now in Labrador, in particular this year. Now whether it is personalities, I do not know, but Mr. Chairman, I think what has happened is that the military, for some reason, and I

have got to blame it on the landlord, the Premier and his Government, and this is the unfortunate part about it, Mr. Chairman.

I say to my hon. colleague from Mount Scio-Bell Island, that the Premier is also Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and the Premier should ask one of the other Ministers to be in charge of Intergovernmental Affairs. At least, then somebody will keep an eye on the military activity. That is what is wrong. There is not enough attention paid to what the third party is doing to the landlords property, that is what the problem is.

Now, my hon. colleague from Bonavista South, a sophisticated lawyer, will now understand what I was saying. I would recommend that the Member for Eagle River be given that task at Intergovernmental Affairs. I think Mr. Chairman, and I am sure, knowing the deep concern and devotion he has for the Labrador people, one of the first things that he would do would be making sure that the base commander in Goose Bay does not -

An Hon. Member: Your time is up.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I have another half hour yet.

I would think that the hon. Member would make sure that the military follows the rules and regulations that have been set down by both the Federal and Provincial Governments. And those rules and regulations, in my opinion, have not been followed.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island.

Mr. Walsh: I was willing to relinquish to the Minister, but I may not be allowed to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I have got to stand to participate and respond, I suppose, or to question some of the statements made by the previous speaker from Torngat Mountains. It makes me question whether or not the Opposition have changed their position.

Some Hon. Members: That is a good point.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
Order, please!

I recognized the hon. Member from Mount Scio-Bell Island.

Mr. Walsh: It makes me wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether or not the Opposition have now changed their position as far as not only low level flying goes, but I suppose, as far as NATO is concerned. I suppose the question that has to be asked by the people of this Province is, have the Opposition now changed their mind totally with regards to NATO? I guess the big question is, Mr. Chairman, now that spike is out of the House, are they all changing their minds on him too.

I think it is shameful if someone stands in this House, knowing full well that a plane was in jeopardy some weeks ago, that a plane was at 17,000 feet and having engine trouble, that a plane was trying to find somewhere to land, and that someone would actually stand in this House and say they would be just as happy if the plane had gone somewhere else in trying to get to an airport, and making no

difference between a commercial airliner or a military plane, especially when they are in trouble. Mr. Chairman, I find that hard to accept.

An Hon. Member: Nobody said that.

Mr. Walsh: That is what was said.

Mr. Warren: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member for Torngat Mountains on a point of order.

Mr. Warren: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that answer will be revealed when we see a copy of it, that the hon. gentleman is misleading the House.

An Hon. Member: That is just an interruption.

Mr. Chairman: No point of order it is just a disagreement.

The hon. the Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island.

Mr. Walsh: I look forward to seeing Hansard tomorrow, but maybe my eyes will see a little clearer than my ears heard, but that is what I heard. And when I interjected across the floor, I was told again, that is what it was.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us talk about some of the other positive things that came out in this Budget. Some very positive things. I have heard comments about the tourism development that is taking place in the Province, and this is probably the first year in a long time, except for last year, that tourist development has seen quite an increase in its dollars.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walsh: The Member for St. John's East made some reference to the fact that tourism development seems to be taking place on the west coast of the island more so than here. Mr. Chairman, I will have you know that there has been a fair amount of money spent in the Avalon region on promoting tourism as well as it has in other parts. The City of Legends, for example, is supported also by the Department of Tourism, and advertising efforts in that particular area have been taken care of as well. Now Mr. Chairman, I want to also point out some things about developments that have taken place in my own District, and I suppose most of us as Members are familiar more than anything else with their own District, and while I have the opportunity, I want to also congratulate the Dr. Walter Templeman Hospital for celebrating their twenty-fifth anniversary.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walsh: Mr. Chairman, some twenty-five years ago the hospital became a reality, but what a lot of people do not realize is that for probably some ten years prior to that the people of Bell Island were striving to have a hospital created there and that was spearheaded by people like Isaac Sheppard, who was a miner there, who never lived to see the actual hospital built, but the miners themselves contributed greatly to that hospital by taking out what may not seem like very much today, but had fifty cents a week taken out of their pay cheques, and back in the 1950s, Mr. Chairman, that was a lot of money coming out of a miner, and they worked very hard towards that hospital.

I had an opportunity to attend their opening celebrations the other night, and I felt somewhat embarrassed by the fact that speaker after speaker stood up and thanked, not only this Government, but the Minister of Health -

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walsh: - for contributing the first hundred and fifty thousand dollars, or in that fact, the first dollar they had seen in over ten years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walsh: Humble as I am, I stood up to give them all the credit that they deserved for their contribution, and in putting together a plan that would be hard for any Government to ignore, and then again Mr. Chairman, the following two speakers after me said no, that plan had existed for three or four years and the previous Government not only ignored it, but disagreed, would not even look at it.

An Hon. Member: You know why?

Mr. Walsh: Why is that?

Mr. Efford: They spent their time making pickles.

Mr. Walsh: Too much time making pickles, that is probably correct. The hundred and fifty thousand dollars is going to go a long way to meeting the needs of the hospital on Bell Island and the people on Bell Island, and I suppose if we had to have the other \$22,850,000, we would probably go a long way with other hospitals in Newfoundland.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walsh: Now Mr. Chairman, when I look at the amount -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Walsh: - The rescue van, Mr. Chairman, that some of the Members on the opposite side are referring to, is the same rescue van that they raised their share of the money for seven years ago and they are still waiting for the help, but I assure you, Mr. Chairman, they will not wait seven years from this Member as they did from the previous Members.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walsh: They have been ignored for seven years on that, they have been ignored.

Mr. Tobin: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Burin-Placentia West on a point of order.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if the Member realizes what he is doing, but is it fair to attack the former Member for Bell Island in the way he did, Mr Barry, Mr. Justice Barry, and I think he should apologize to the House and Mr. Barry for his attack.

Mr. Chairman: No point of order.

The Hon. Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island.

Mr. Walsh: I make no apologies for the fact that the Member tried with all earnestness and every bit of vim and vigor he had, but it had been ignored by the Opposition, a group of people, Mr. Chairman, who never knew what the words fairness and balance meant, never touched their lips.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walsh: The words fairness and balance never touched their lips until their derrieres touched the Opposition benches.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walsh: So, Mr. Chairman, I make no apologies for the fact that, not only did they ignore the people on the hospital, they ignored the people on the ferry service, they ignored the people on the roads, they ignored the people for water and sewer. I have gone through my District, and there is sewage coming up through the ground while these fellows over there, lambasted, and had parties, and drove limousines and stayed in thousand dollar a night hotel rooms.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walsh: I make no apologies, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Walsh: I may not have been on Bell Island very much prior to the election, but I can assure you that time will show that I will be the best thing that landed on Bell Island compared to what Members in the Opposition did for the Island.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walsh: Now Mr. Chairman, when you look at other developments that are coming along very well. The carrot that managed to pull off a number of elections for the Opposition today, Government then, was Hibernia. Too many of my friends went bankrupt, Mr. Chairman, hanging on to the dreams that were being dangled out in front of them by Members who now

sit on the Opposition, telling my friends in the business world to jump on the band wagon now, invest your money, spend it now, if not, you are going to be left behind. They are left behind all right, Mr. Chairman, they are left behind by the banks and so many others. At least, finally, Mr. Chairman, the people of Newfoundland are hearing the facts as they are. No more innuendoes, no more maybes, a Government that is currently working diligently towards achieving an agreement, not only with Ottawa, which is getting tougher to deal with, but also with the consortium of companies that are involved in it.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, hopefully this summer, that will be achieved.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Walsh: Mr. Chairman, by leave, there was some reference to the moose on Bell Island, and I want to say that Bell -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed and I do not see any consensus on leave.

Mr. Walsh: - that Bell, Mr. Chairman, as like any other of God's creatures, has the right to be successful as well.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I just want to participate for a few moments in the debate.

When I spoke earlier in the day, you may recall Mr. Chairman, that

I offered some suggestions of topics for discussion. I am very pleased to see that some of the topics I threw out for discussion included the issue of the year round ferry service to Argentia, and we had good considerable debate, good considerable discussion on that issue.

An. hon. Member: How do you stand on it?

Mr. Simms: I support the town of Grand Falls, and they support Port aux Basques, I might say to them, that is my position.

I am like the like the Member for Placentia. I have no difficulty indicating where my support lies. I support my constituents and the leaders of my community, the town of Grand Falls, who support the efforts of the town of Port aux Basques. That is my position. The Member for Placentia supports community groups in his area, and his community councils, community leaders and so on. That is fine. I respect that. Of course, I do.

I asked the Member for LaPoile, invited him and encouraged him to speak today on that particular issue, and he did. I asked him to explain the issue, and he spoke up on a second occasion, as a matter of a fact, and took advantage of the opportunity to speak twice. However, I never did hear him state explicitly what his position is. And hopefully, he just indicated to me in a private conversation, that he was going to get up and speak later on about some other thoughts that he has. Perhaps at that time he will put forth his position on the issue, whether he supports the town of Port aux Basques, or whether he supports the Member for Placentia and his group, that will be

interesting.

An Hon. Member: What about the Member for Exploits, next to Grand Falls, who does he support?

Mr. Simms: I am not sure, he can speak for himself, when the time comes. I really do not know what his position is on that issue. I know what his position is on the issue of the university, for example, for central Newfoundland, the location of the university.

But the Minister of Justice is another individual I would like to hear on this issue of year round Argenticia ferry service. I have a feeling he privately and secretly supports the Mayor of Corner Brook and the City of Corner Brook, who support the community of Port aux Basques. That is the feeling I have, because when the Member for Placentia was speaking today about the year round service to Argenticia, I looked at him, and he looked over at me, and he went like that. So, I presume he was opposed to your position. Anyway on that issue there was a nice bit of discussion and Private Members in the House, backbenchers in the House got up and participated in the debate, and I think that is healthy and great, and we need more of it.

The other topic I raised, threw out for discussion, was the issue of education.. I just heard the Minister speak eloquently a few moments ago about some of the things his Department has done in the last year, which is good information, we like to hear that kind of information.

That, of course, does not prevent Members on this side from offering opposing views, or suggesting that he has not done enough, or that he

is twisting things a little bit, or whatever. And I am sure, Members on this side will do it. I do not particularly intend to do it at this point in time. But, I do ask him, because I know he is chomping at the bit to get up again, and he is going to get up again.

I asked him a question earlier this afternoon about the decision on the location for the Central Newfoundland University. I pointed out to him, and I gathered from his reaction that he was not aware of the comments made by his colleague, the Minister of Forestry, the Member for Windsor - Buchans, who said in the press yesterday, in fact I think he said it at the Chamber of Commerce in Windsor, I am not quite sure, the other night when he spoke there; that he expected that the decision on the location of the university would be made in about two weeks. Two to three weeks, I think, were his words, which would bring it to May 24 or thereabouts. So we look forward to hearing a decision finally, after two other delays. I hope we will not have another delay on May 24th.

I hope he will address that for me. Now when he does address it, if I could get the Minister's attention, I do not want him to get up and tell me about how difficult it has been, how many communities are involved, and he had to do all the assessment. I would just like him to answer the question, when does he expect to have the decision, and does he agree with the Minister of Forestry that the decision will be ready in about two weeks time, May 24th. I would like him to address that.

My friend from Gander, the

President of Treasury Board, somehow or another he and I spent a fair bit of time in this process at the beginning. These are his estimates, the President of the Council and the President of Treasury Board, his estimates that we are debating.

I am his critic. We were doing very well for about six hours on questions, I did not get all those many answers. He tells me he has more answers for me and I look forward to that, and I hope that he will do it sooner than later. It would not be fair to wait until the last minute and give a whole pile of answers. I might have more questions flowing from those answers, so I would expect him to give me the answers at his earliest opportunity.

My friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, stood up briefly. I am sorry, I did not hear everything he had to say, because I had to take a phone call, and I had to see somebody out in the corridor. He is anxious to get up again, but I gather the topic he raised, that was raised, or that he responded to was amalgamation. Am I correct?

An Hon. Member: What else?

Mr. Simms: Well, there are other things. For example, the fact that there was no Capital Recreation Grant Funding Program this year, in this fiscal year. I think that is an important issue to address, I mentioned it in my comments a few days ago.

That was a very important, very good program, particularly for smaller communities in rural Newfoundland who could build a small ball field, or fix up their soccer field for \$5,000 or

\$10,000, it was a very, very good program, very popular program. I know that for a fact.

I know from the fact that his officials will tell him, and will confirm for him, that he has in requests over there, thousands and thousands of dollars worth of requests for many small Recreation Capital Grants Programs. So I would like to ask him, why did they eliminate the program? Essentially, that is what has happened, they have eliminated it. They have no funding provided for it in their estimates other than the carry over from what was left over from the last fiscal year. And why is that taking so long to table? Why is it taking so long to table that information, it is only a paltry amount of money, \$300,000, I believe, was it not?

I think he indicated last week, in response to a question from my colleague, the Member for Fogo, that he would get that information for him. So a week has gone by. I know the officials in his Department, in the Recreation Division, and they are very competent people. I am sure, if the Minister asked them for that, to put it on a sheet of paper, they would have it for him in a matter of minutes, well days anyway. Hopefully, he will respond to that and address that question.

I also want to address the question of the, if I might be permitted, the water treatment plant, which is an issue obviously that I am interested in from my own perspective and my own community, I have asked him about it before, it deals with the question of the funding for water treatment being deferred or held

up until the question of amalgamation between the two towns of Grand Falls and Windsor - until that question is resolved, that decision is made. And if he is going to talk about amalgamation, I would love for him to give me the critical path for the next couple of months or few months, exactly what the steps are from here on to bring about that decision, you know, what is happening next month, next week, and I am sure he knows it or at least, and I realize as well that what he will tell me, hopefully is really what he anticipates and what he expects. It is probably not firm or cast in stone, or maybe it is. And if it is, I would love to hear that too. And I think the people of the area would like to know. They want to get on with their lives. The decision is going to be made one way or another sometime soon. So I would like him to address that, and then tell me at the same time why he decided to wait until after the amalgamation question was resolved between Grand Falls and Windsor before they addressed the question of funding for the water treatment plant.

I understand now his colleague, his seat mate, the Minister of Forestry, and Member for Windsor-Buchans, again, when he was in Windsor a couple of nights ago, said and announced and it is covered in the news again, that the Government supports funding for the water treatment plant. So, I presume he made that announcement on behalf of the Minister, it does not really say, but I presume he made that announcement on behalf of the Minister.

An Hon. Member: Table it.

Mr. Simms: Table it? Certainly, absolutely. I can even tell him when it was. It was the VOXM news at 7:45 on Wednesday, yesterday morning, item number seventeen in the VOXM morning newscast. I dare say the Minister is aware of it, I imagine that Mr. Flight, or the Member has advised him of that. I would assume he has advised him, that he went out and made that announcement, I would hope. But anyway, the Minister might be able to respond to that question for me.

And the other person I would like to have make a comment in the Budget debate, if I might when the time comes, is the Minister of Environment, on the whole question of Sunday hunting. It has become a topic of great interest, not only has it become, I guess it has always been a topic of great interest, but I think he is in possession, as I understand it, of a petition of some sort with, I do not know, in excess of twenty or so thousand names, as I am told, I am not sure, but whatever it is, it is a very substantial number of people who want him to bring in the changes in the law that are required, or the regulations or whatever it is that are required, that would permit, legally, Sunday hunting.

I understand that the Minister has indicated, at a public meeting in Gander, I am only going by press reports I read in the Gander Beacon, that in fact, he was going to recommend that to his Cabinet colleagues. Now he may not have put it that way but that is certainly the way I read it, and I think, dozens of other people that read it, read it in the same way.

Pardon?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: I said I was asking the Minister of Environment if he would participate in the debate sometime soon because I would like him to address this whole question of Sunday hunting. It is a big issue, it always has been but it is coming to a head. And the Minister, when he spoke to the Federation, the Wildlife Federation meeting in Gander a couple of weeks ago, indicated publicly that he was -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: If the Members will relax, pardon?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: No, I will tell him. If you will give me a minute. I was trying to answer his colleagues question, the Minister will still get ten minutes when his turn comes, by the way, he will not lose that.

I was trying to say that the Minister of Environment spoke to the Federation of Wildlife in Gander and he indicated in that speech that he was going to recommend, at least that is the way it is perceived, now whether that is right, because I could not believe it when I read it quite frankly, he was going to be recommending to his Cabinet colleagues that they bring in the necessary changes required to allow Sunday hunting. I kind of thought that was outside of -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: I will tell the hon.

Member, if he will just give me a minutes to finish my sentence and stop interrupting me

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Will you just gave me leave, do you want to know my position?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: Do I have leave?

Mr. Chairman: Does he have leave of the House to continue?

Mr. Simms: Okay, I have leave?

An Hon. Member: Yes or no.

Mr. Simms: I want to finish my sentence.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: But, listen Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Simms: Do you want me to speak or not?

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Simms: Well just relax, and I will tell you my position on it. It is no big secret.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: I have said it publicly.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: Well I will get up the next time and I will tell you.

Mr. Chairman: He does not have leave now.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: The Member over there said leave. The Government House Leader said leave.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The Hon. Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, when I stood up in the House to answer my first question, I was quite nervous as I said once before in the House, and the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains called out across the House, come clean, tell the truth. Well I want to tell the truth about this study I did for the Government. He raised it a few minutes ago about my doing a study for the Government.

In 1988, they announced in the Throne Speech or the Budget Speech - the former Administration - that they were going to have a study conducted of school finance, another study. And shortly after that I received a call from the officials of the Government, I will not name them, asking me if I could nominate people to conduct such a study. I was rather delighted to get this call because they were consulting me about who should do the study. But anyhow, I gave a few names, now I do not know what happened between that date and in June or July. The

rumor is that they searched the whole of Canada and they could not get anybody who could do the study. So they came back to me the second time, Mr. Chairman, and they said will you do the study. The understanding, I believe, the rumor is they could not find anybody to do the kind of study that needed to be done, it is such a complicated study, so as a modest person, I must admit, I was proud to be invited to do that study for the former Administration. I thank them for their choice.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Dr. Warren: Well, that is the rumor, that they could not find anybody competent to do the study and they came back and asked me to do it, and I did it, and they even paid me for it.

An Hon. Member: Oh yes!

Dr. Warren: So I thank them for that as well.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of these studies -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Dr. Warren: No well, hardly. As a result of that study, I think I know something about school finance in Canada and school finance in this Province. And one of the major issues, one of the major weaknesses, and they were there for a long time, one of the major weaknesses of the school finance program in this Province is that it finances education on the basis of per student. And you cannot finance education on a per student basis because the cost of education varies from various parts of the Province, needs vary, you have got to finance education

on the basis of need and on the basis of cost.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: Let me tell this House that we are going to change that grant system to provide greater equality of educational opportunity in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: Now let me say a couple of other things about elementary and secondary education. Let me just tell you about it. I am proud of a couple of other things. Mr. Chairman, excuse me, Mr. Chairperson, I am proud of another thing that this Government has done.

We have announced the establishment of a Multicultural Education Committee, a Multicultural Education Committee in this Province to develop a policy for multiculturalism. We are the only Province in this country that does not have a multicultural education policy, and I am proud to have announced that in the past few months.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: And I have received support from thousands of Newfoundlanders about this initiative and the many persons who come to this Province from various countries throughout the world. We are going to do a fair amount more in this area of multiculturalism, I can assure the House of that.

We have a couple of other special studies going. Mr. Chairman, we are going to study AIDS education. This is a vital issue. We know that a lot of

school boards are providing for student's programs in AIDS education. We are going to study that and find out how universal the program is.

I have asked my people to look at gender equity in education. Equality, greater equality for males and females in the school administration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: And in the textbooks of this Province: I have asked my officials, I want to tell the hon. Member for Torngat, I have asked my officials to tell me what has been done in the area of Native education because I am concerned about it. And they are going to provide me with a report, and if there are gaps, Mr. Chairman, I am going to see that something is done. Mr. Chairman, I am going to see that something is done to make sure that there is greater equality for natives in this Province, I am proud to announce.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: And there are a lot of other things. Let me tell you there are a number of other things we have ongoing, but I want to get to a couple of other issues in post-secondary. Perhaps one other issue in elementary and secondary. I want to be fair. I want to be straight on this issue because I have been quoted and misquoted in the past few weeks.

I have said to the press, and I say to the House and to the people, that there is a feeling abroad in the Province that we have got to get better value for the money that we are spending. I do not know if it is right or if it is wrong. There is a

perception, that we have inefficiencies in the school system. We have limited dollars and therefore, I want to assure my colleagues, in Government, in the Cabinet and in the House, that we are getting the best possible value for the dollars that we have. And we are going to look at school busing and we are going to look at the denominational system.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: We believe, as a Government, that there must be greater sharing between communities, between denominations, and in due course, we will announce -

By the way, I was in a community a few weeks ago, and let me read a little survey done in that community. The two school boards in a community on the south coast, and I was there on Monday, asked the people of a community what they felt about sharing. This was encouraging. Out of the 576 people who responded, and that is nearly half the people in the community, 567 said yes to co-operation among school boards, Integrated and Roman Catholic School Boards. That is encouraging, and this Government is going to promote interdenominational sharing in co-operation with the churches. It is a major issue, and we are going to address that issue in the next two year.

One or two things about post-secondary, since the whole post-secondary issue has come up. I did consult my friend, the Minister of Forestry, and I got a feeling he did not say two weeks, I think he said a few weeks. Now, I will consult him again, I have not had a chance to talk with him,

but we are moving along on the decision with respect to a campus in Central Newfoundland. We have called for tenders with respect to extension of Fisher, we are planning the extension of Grenfell.

I was proud, Mr. Chairman, to be in Labrador City a few weeks ago, to officiate at the opening, and the hon. Member for Torngat was there, and for Menihek.

Some Hon. Members: Tell the story.

Dr. Warren: No, I won't tell, I don't have time, I won't tell the story. But I can assure you that the Member for Menihek got up and he praised the Government. I was proud that he paid tribute to this Government for what it had done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: And let me return the compliment. I pay tribute to him, for his work on behalf of education in this District. I was proud, the people of Labrador City are delighted with what we did there with that first year. And the people of Burin are delighted with the first year program. And let me assure you, we are going to continue to expand post-secondary education to have greater equality at all levels of education in this Province.

One or two points about student aid, because my time is running out. Student aid is a very important consideration for this Government. We, this year, added \$1.7 million dollars, the first increase in years, to the student grants, the Provincial grants for students.

An Hon. Member: How many years?

Dr. Warren: I do not know how

many years, I will check the number of years.

An Hon. Member: Seventeen years.

Dr. Warren: It could be.

We added \$1.7 million. We are going to increase the grants to single students, we are going to increase the grants to single parents and married students very substantially this year. To give more women, in particular, a chance to go on to post-secondary education.

We are going to provide semester system financing to the non university sector. We are going to increase allowances, we have already, I might say, put in place a Student Appeals Committee, which was recommended some years ago. We have a new telephone system installed. We have a public information officer for student aid. We have computers throughout the province for student aid.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Minister for the job he is doing, I have no hesitation in doing that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: I am not as small-minded and partisan-minded as the Minister of Social Services.

An Hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: The Minister of

Education is quite a reputable individual.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: That is why, in fact, we asked him to do the study that he talked about in the beginning, because he is reputable.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: And I recall, at the same time, being told that he indicated he would be able to fulfill the responsibilities even if there was an election called, and he would not be running in politics for the Liberals. Now that is the word I heard back then, I do not know if it is true. Now I do not know if there is any truth to that, I am just saying what I heard.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: But he is a very reputable individual. I have no problem at all congratulating him on the fine job he is doing, that is no problem.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: But, I do want to get back, touch on a couple of points that he made. I believe the Member for Menihek praised the Government in his speech in Menihek when the Minister went up to open the first-year university, I think he praised the Government for finally coming to its senses after having promised the people of Menihek that they would deliver the university program in September, and then announcing in their Budget they were renegeing on that, and they were not going to do it until the following September, and after a lot of opposition by the Member for

Menihek and the groups up in the area, we finally got the Government to, at least, compromise and come back and start it in January. So I think that is why he was congratulating the Government, for coming to its senses.

On the other issue of the location of the university, I just want to come back to it because I want to see, the Minister was vague in his answer again, he never really gave me an answer as to when he was going to give the announcement of the decision. I would like him, if he gets up again, to indicate if he will be announcing the decision on the location before the House closes, perhaps I could put it to him that way. That would, at least, be giving him fairly, you know, a lot of latitude.

Can I ask the Minister another question? In his Budget under Hospital School Services, and I might say tonight, on CBC news, by the way, they really did a job on the Minister and his Government's decision with respect to the issue that I have raised and the Member for Humber East has raised. He might want to watch the tape of it or get a tape of it, because I think they did a much better job than we did. But in your Budget under Hospital School Services in your Department or in the Minister's Department, last year there was \$739,000 spent in salaries, this year there is an increase nearly a half a million, or whatever it is, close to a half a million dollar increase in salaries. Now I mean, is that for this other program he is talking about? If there is a significant increase of nearly 70 per cent or whatever it works out to be in salaries, why on earth would you

make the decision to eliminate the three or four teachers in Grand Falls. So I would like him to explain that for me, perhaps there is something in there that I am not reading or am not aware of.

And also when he does get up to explain that, could he explain also why today, in answer to the question in the late show, he neglected to give the details on the western hospitals activities with respect to that program too, because the way it was shown tonight on CBC news was certainly, certainly quite different from the image or the impression or the illusion, I suppose, that the Minister tried to create today in the late show in response. So, perhaps, those few educational questions he could deal with.

Now, let me get back to the Sunday hunting.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: Now if Members will relax, I have got six minutes, I will tell you. But I want to finish my point to the Government House Leader.

The Government House Leader was asking me what I was saying when I was asking about the Minister of Environment's intention, and he said in the newspaper, I understand he said in the newspaper, I read the newspaper, the way I perceived what he said, was that he was going to take the matter to Cabinet, and he was going to recommend to Cabinet that the changes be made to allow Sunday hunting. The Minister said publicly -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: I am going to tell you

but I am trying to tell the story to the President of Treasury Board.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: First, I am making the other point. I am trying to explain to the President of Treasury Board, the President of the Executive Council. The Minister said publicly he was going to recommend to Cabinet that he was going to change Sunday hunting rules. Now the reason I am asking the President of the Council to pay attention or to listen to that and respond to it, I hope, is that to me it sounded almost like it was a breach of a Cabinet Minister's oath. You do not indicate publicly what you are going to recommend to the Cabinet before it even goes to the Cabinet.

Mr. Efford: Table it! Table it!

Mr. Simms: Well, it is in the Gander Beacon. He can read it for himself.

The reason I have raised it is because I want the Minister of Environment (Mr. Kelland) to respond and to explain why he would make such public statements or, if indeed he did not, he will have an opportunity to explain it. That is the reason I raised it, you see.

Now, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford) immediately thought I was trying to get him in trouble or something. I want him to explain publicly if he said it and, if he did say it, then I think he has made a mistake. If he did not say it, he should put it on the public record.

Now, with respect to Sunday hunting, my position is and has always been in support of Sunday

hunting.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: It is no big deal. I have said it publicly in the past.

Mr. Decker: Well, why did you not change it when you were sitting over here?

Mr. Simms: Well, we discussed the matter quite frequently.

An Hon. Member: There was Sunday hunting when we were there.

Mr. Decker: You mean (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Now look, immediately the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker), who is not even in his seat by the way, totally unparliamentary, shouting across the House, says, 'You mean, we cannot even discuss it?' Who says you cannot discuss it?

Mr. Decker: You do.

Mr. Simms: I never said that.

Mr. Decker: (Inaudible) the Minister should not discuss it.

Mr. Simms: No he did not. He said he was recommending the changes. That is different.

So I want to know what the Government's position is going to be. Now, having asked me what my position was, and all of you bellyaching over there and indicating what my position was, I fully expect all of you who have the political courage that you pretend to have, to stand and tell me what each of your positions is on the issue of Sunday hunting. Now can I expect that? What is the Minister of Social Services position on Sunday hunting?

Mr. Efford: You will never know.

Mr. Simms: That is what I thought.

What is the Member for Placentia's (Mr. Hogan) position?

Mr. Hogan: Against.

Mr. Simms: The Member for Placentia is against Sunday hunting. How about the Member for Labrador?

Mr. Dumaresque: Against it.

Mr. Simms: He is against it.

How about the Member for St. George's (Mr. Short)?

Mr. Short: In favour.

Mr. Simms: In favour. The Member for St. George's is in favour.

How about the Member for Stephenville?

Mr. K. Aylward: Not sure.

Mr. Simms: He is not sure. He is hoping to be in Cabinet, so he is on defence.

How about the Minister of Finance (Mr. Kitchen)?

Dr. Kitchen: What are you, an orchestra leader or something?

Mr. Simms: Well I can tell the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance could sure use an orchestra leader. Anyway, as usual, you will only get silliness from the Minister of Finance.

Let me go on to the Minister of Health. What is the Minister of Health's position on it? He just shouted across at me twenty times,

and he is now trying to pretend that he cannot hear me by engaging in conversation with the President of the Council. He is pretending he does not hear me. I wonder what his position is? What is the Minister of Health's position on Sunday hunting? If he does not answer it now, we will ask him in Question Period tomorrow.

An Hon. Member: The President of Treasury Board was shouting out too.

Mr. Simms: The President of Treasury Board is in favour of Sunday hunting. I feel pretty confident of that.

How about the Minister of Recreation (Mr. Gullage)?

Mr. Gullage: In favour.

Mr. Simms: Totally in favour. The Member for Bellevue (Mr. Barrett) is in favour?

Mr. Barrett: I will tell you when I speak.

Mr. Simms: Okay.

The Member for Lewisporte (Mr. Penney)?

Mr. Penney: In favour.

Mr. Simms: He is in favour. I thought he might be, coming from a good hunting area like Lewisporte.

Anyway, the Member for Carbonear (Mr. Reid) wants me to ask him. You are against it?

Mr. Reid: Yes.

Mr. Simms: Good.

An Hon. Member: How about the Member for Exploits, the Premier's

clone.

Mr. Simms: The Member for Exploits: I do not know about the Member for Exploits. He will probably say that he will tell me when he gets a chance to stand.

Mr. Warren: Or when the Premier tells him.

Mr. Simms: I am going to let him off easy. He is a good friend of mine. I do not want to get him into any trouble. He will tell us what his position is.

Anyway, the point is you can see -

Dr. Kitchen: The point is there is no point.

Mr. Simms: The point is the Minister of Finance is a point head. Perhaps he could go out again.

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible) twenty-four hours is enough.

Mr. Simms: Boy, I tell you, you are getting worse. You are an absolute dunce. You are an absolute fool.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: Get out of the House.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Simms: If you cannot -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member has made an unparliamentary utterance.

Mr. Simms: What is that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: 'Fool'.

Mr. Simms: It is?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Simms: Your Honor, could you tell me where that is referenced. I will withdraw it anyway.

Mr. Chairman: In the opinion of the Chair, it is unparliamentary.

Mr. Simms: Okay, I will withdraw it.

An Hon. Member: Even if it is true.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Anyway, as I was saying, the issue here we were debating was a serious issue, an issue that the Minister of Environment has a petition containing twenty thousand names on, that will indicate to the Minister of Finance how serious the matter is, he thinks it is a foolish thing.

An Hon. Member: Thirty thousand.

Mr. Simms: He thinks it is silly, thirty thousand. Have you heard the Minister of Finance, it is a silly issue, we should not even be talking about it. But that is typical of the Minister of Finance.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Anyway, so I hope I have satisfied my friends over in the corner. I have told them how I stand and I know how some of them stand, and even in the Caucus over there, you can see the difference of opinion on such a contentious issue, and how much difficulty it is going to be for the Government to deal with it. Yet, the Minister has said that he

is going to recommend in favor.

An Hon. Member: It is a dollar issue.

Mr. Simms: When does the President of Treasury Board expect that decision to be made.

Mr. Baker: In due course.

Mr. Simms: In due course, yes. What is the Minister of Health's position?

Mr. Decker: In due course.

Mr. Simms: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: Okay, Mr. Chairman, we will get back at it, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Member for Bellevue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Indeed it gives me great pleasure to rise in this hon. House to represent the constituents of the District of Bellevue, and the hon. Opposition House Leader in his recent poll wanted to know where I stood in regards to Sunday hunting. I have done a survey in my District, and I guess, I take an example from the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains, at the time when the issue of the flag was being discussed in Newfoundland, he said that 50 per cent of the people in his District supported the flag and 50 per cent were against. Well 50 per cent of the people in Bellevue District are for Sunday hunting and 50 per cent are against Sunday hunting, so I will

stand with my constitutents.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: So when that issue is being discussed I will speak for and against the issue.

In the District of Bellevue, we have thirty-six communities spread over a fair area of the Province and within these thirty-six communities we have six town councils, and we have twelve local Service Districts in form of a local government. And in the District of Bellevue today, at this present time, we have roughly eight hundred families within the Bellevue District that have to bring water in buckets.

An Hon. Member: Still?

Mr. Barrett: Still, after forty-odd years of Confederation, there are eighty families who have to bring water in buckets. Somewhere in the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains home town of Chance Cove, and when I sit in this House and I hear discussions taking place about whether we should eliminate the position of Ombudsman or whether we should have clean drinking water in the District of Bellevue, I say give us clean drinking water in the District of Bellevue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: One of the objectives of my getting involved in politics was to bring Government services and programs to the District of Bellevue.

In previous years, in the local water grants within the Province, there was roughly \$800,000 allocated over the years for water grants in small towns, small

communities which have local Service Districts, a very, very small amount of money. I support this Budget on one reason only, that we have increased the amount of money in the local Service Districts, double, we raised it to \$1.7 million.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: And I tell you one thing, that as long as I am in this Caucus that next year it will be doubled again.

An Hon. Member: Do not look at the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Barrett: I will look at the President of Treasury Board, and I know that the President of Treasury Board and the hon. Minister of Finance is well aware of the problem in rural Newfoundland, and I stand for rural Newfoundland.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: As long as you do not get out of (inaudible).

An Hon. Member: Where do you live?

Mr. Barrett: It does not matter where you live.

An Hon. Member: Where do you live?

Mr. Barrett: I am a young fellow that grew up in Placentia Bay, and was educated in Placentia Bay; was educated on an island in Placentia Bay that was resettled. And when I sit in this hon. House and hear people talk about amalgamation and resettlement, you did not let your legs dangle over the wharf in Swift Current so many hours as I did, waiting for a boat, you would not talk about the resettlement program.

You talk to the people in Red Harbour, you talk to the people in Placentia Bay that resettled. It was difficult on the old people, but the younger people, it was the best thing that ever happened. And I was like many of the other people in Placentia Bay, I had to leave the islands to get a job. And I have always worked for a living, whether it is in Mount Pearl, or whether it is in Bellevue, or whether it is in Come by Chance.

Mr. Tobin: So now everybody has got to leave Placentia Bay because you did.

Mr. Barrett: No, no. You listen now and you will hear something. Myself and the hon. Member for Placentia, lobbied strong and hard to get the road to Petit Forte -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: - because I did not want the people to have to dangle their legs over the wharf and wait for boats. Myself and the hon. Member for Placentia.

It is the same way I support the hon. Member for Placentia and his ferry for Argentinia. The same way I support the White Hills Resort in Clarenville, because it is going to bring economic prosperity to my District.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman has recognized the hon. Member for Bellevue.

Mr. Barrett: I would like to go on record as supporting the White Hills Resort in Clarenville. That particular resort, we hear a lot of criticism, and I hear it, I sat in this House and heard criticism of the White Hills Resort in Clarenville, about the kind of

economic opportunity.

I will speak for my constituents in Bellevue. I was elected to this House to represent the constituents of Bellevue, and I will not be harassed by the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

An Hon. Member: Bully, that is all he ever was.

Mr. Barrett: The White Hills Resort in Clarendville, during the construction period, provided one hundred jobs. The hon. Member for Trinity North supports me. This year in the White Hills resort there was sixty jobs provided in that facility. And this year, 26,000 people travelled to that area to use that facility.

The economic spin-off that was created in that area was unbelievable. You had to make reservations two months in advance to get a hotel room in Clarendville area, and surrounding area. The manager of White Hills resort told me in a telephone conversation last night that the best snow makers they had in that facility was the inshore fishermen from my District.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: One of the objectives - and I am sure that the hon. Member for Bonavista South and the hon. Member for Trinity North - one of our objectives will see that that resort becomes an all year round resort.

An Hon. Member: And it should be, I support you on that.

Mr. Barrett: In my District, in the community of Goobies, 110 jobs are provided in the service

industry. Irving Oil just went through a major expansion of the service station which is open on a 24 hour basis. The Esso people have just recently constructed a service station in that area.

The business people in that area tell me, that because of the White Hills resort, and the things that have happened in that area; in the winter they used to have to lay off their workers, but now they are working all year around. And I tell you, I stand in this hon. House and I support developments like White Hills, I support developments like Marble Mountain. We need to diversify our economy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: The people in Bellevue District are pleased with the budget of this Provincial Government. In this fiscal year, \$1.2 million in Provincial funds is going in road construction.

You talk about fairness and balance, and you talk about good representation. There are four communities in my District getting asphalt this year. Three communities did not vote for me, one did. When I got elected last year, they said; we will never see the asphalt in our communities. I said, you have elected an honorable person to represent you. I do not care which way you vote.. I will look after the needs of the people of Bellevue District, yes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: There was \$1.8 million last year in Municipal Capital Works, and \$1.8 million in Municipal Capital Works this year, to provide water and sewer

services.

I believe the other reason I got involved in politics was to make some sense of the post-secondary educational system in this Province. The previous government created a post-secondary system that had first-class and second-class citizens. At the campus in Burin a month ago, when I talked to the students there, they said to the hon. Minister, 'We want fairness and balance. We want the same programs in Burin as they have in St. John's and Corner Brook.'

One young woman said, 'Mr. Minister, why can't I do a two-year secretarial science course in Burin rather than having to travel to St. John's to do a two-year secretarial course?' The hon. Minister said, 'That is why we are reorganizing the post-secondary educational system, so that people everywhere in Newfoundland will have an equal opportunity to be provided with post-secondary education.'

I support first-year university for Burin; I support first-year university for Labrador City; I support first-year university for Clarenville; I support first-year university for Carbonear; and I support the headquarters going wherever it is needed and where it is most feasible to go.

Mr. Simms: What about the students in Clarenville?

Mr. Barrett: I did an interview for The Packet in Clarenville and I said I supported Clarenville, because that is where it should have gone in the first place.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Barrett: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also say, as the hon. Member for Bellevue who just took his seat, that I support the White Hills Resort too. I think it is one of the better resort areas in this Province and, in fact, in Eastern Canada. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that all members of this House need to support projects such as the White Hills or Marble Mountain or the ski slopes in Labrador.

However, Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of issues concerning Labrador that I want to speak about in my eight or nine minutes. What I want to say, Mr. Chairman, has some connection with Labrador, with St. John's and with Lewisporte.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering where the St. John's Members stand with respect to the Member for Lewisporte. The Federal Government, Marine Atlantic, has completed a task force on freight services to Labrador, and they are recommending that Lewisporte would be the only port of call and St. John's would be eliminated from the port of call for freight going to Labrador. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this will be a step in the wrong direction for the people on the Coast of Labrador.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, after I get finished I believe my hon. colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque) will probably explain it to you as well or probably better than I can.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say, St. John's is where 75 per cent to 80 per cent of all the freight that goes to Labrador originates from. Mr. Chairman, it will cost more to get that freight by ground transportation to Lewisporte and then by ship transportation to the Coast of Labrador. That is where the extra cost is going to be. I believe my hon. colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) will realize that it is naturally going to be passed along to the consumer.

Now, I agree with Lewisporte being a port of call, but not the only port of call.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) a port of call.

Mr. Warren: Exactly, Mr. Chairman. I say to my hon. colleague, the same thing applies to St. Anthony. It should be St. John's, Lewisporte, and St. Anthony. And by doing that, Mr. Chairman, the people on the Labrador coast will not be socked to by business people on the island portion of the Province, because then they would be able to get their freight much, much cheaper. So, I just wanted to say it.

An Hon. Member: What about Carbonear?

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, no I do not believe Carbonear should be a port of call.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: I do not believe Carbonear should be a port of call, Mr. Chairman, but meanwhile, I have to say this to my hon. colleague from Carbonear and my hon. colleague from Lewisporte that 67 per cent of the provisions that are sold in the Government Store come from the suppliers in Lewisporte and Carbonear. M.A. Powell Limited and Lewisporte Wholesalers, they are the major suppliers of goods and provisions to the Government Store in my District and St. Anthony.

An Hon. Member: Cartwright?

Mr. Warren: Well Cartwright is a port of call now anyhow for Goose Bay. But, Mr. Chairman, let me say another thing to my hon. colleague, and this is important, my colleague from Eagle River.

Mr. Chairman, would you kindly tell the hon. Minister of Social Services to not act like a pig.

Mr. Efford: What?

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

I warn the hon. Member that this kind of comment cannot be tolerated.

Mr. Warren: I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, but why don't you tell him not to act like a pig? That is what I asked you. Tell him not to act like a pig?

Mr. Chairman: I asked the hon. Member if he will withdraw that remark. It is considered unparliamentary to refer to any hon. Member as a pig.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the remark, but I wish he would not act like one, that is all.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: Right on!

Mr. Warren: Let me continue, Mr. Chairman. What I was saying is that I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Cartwright would be a port of call, instead of all the freight from St. John's and Lewisporte going into Goose Bay and then unloaded and then trans-shipped. I think it should go to Cartwright and then trans-shipped from Cartwright to the North. And by doing that, Mr. Chairman, you would save one day on transportation of very important fruits and vegetables, so I think Cartwright could be that section for the transportation or the re-transportation from St. John's to connect with a larger boat in Cartwright and go further North. And I think this is what Marine Atlantic is planning to do.

Now Mr. Chairman, before I finish, I want to, in my two or three minutes, voice the concerns re: the Native Policy Section of the Executive Council, and I want to talk about my constituents. The people that have sent a strong message to this House on four occasions.

An Hon. Member: The IGA.

Mr. Warren: In fact, Mr. Chairman, the IGA, but under the Executive Council.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Native people in my District which comprises roughly about 70 to 72 per cent of the population, are Inu and Inuit, and about 72 per cent of them, that is what they are, Mr. Chairman, and there are different cards issued by the Labrador Inuit Association such as

Card A and Card B, and I think there is even a Card C. However Mr. Chairman, there are other people in my District that naturally, is not a member of the Labrador Inuit Association, so we have to make sure that, and I think with land claims being negotiated, I think the Labrador Inuit Association are looking at all people that are living within the land claims boundary.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: I beg your pardon.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister a question and the Minister is not there, maybe some other Minister can answer and maybe the hon. Member for Naskaupi, the salary has increased from \$150,000 last year to \$257,000 this year in Native Policy, and I would think we need a policy. And I would think this would have to tie in with the intense negotiations of land claims that is on-going now, and I understand there was a new person hired recently involved with the land claims negotiations, so I would hope that this Government will continue the progress, the rapid pace that the former Government was doing with land claims negotiations.

And now, between the two Governments and LIA, they have arrived at a framework agreement. And I would think, within the next five and a half or six years, hopefully before that, but knowing how long land claim negotiations have taken in the past number of years and the claims that have been settled, you may as well allow yourself five or six years for settlement to take place. And

I would hope that this Government will co-operate in every way possible with the LIA in reaching a settlement.

Now Mr. Chairman, let me also say, and I think probably if the Minister had a chance, there were a couple of questions I wanted to ask the Minister for Wildlife, and if he got a chance maybe he can answer. I am just wondering if the Minister has made a decision yet on whether there will be a polar bear hunt this year or not.

An Hon. Member: It was on the news today.

Mr. Warren: I didn't listen to all the news today, so is the decision yes or no, I do not know.

An Hon. Member: No, (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Okay, that is good. And I would also ask the Minister, now this year is too late, if the Minister completed the survey on the Mealy Mountain caribou herd, because I understand there was announcements made that there would be some survey carried out. So I would think, that at least for next year, there should be some kind of decision made whether there will be hunting in the Mealy Mountains.

I want to ask the Minister also, if he had any discussions with the base commander in the last week or so, concerning the flying in and around the Harp Lake area of Hopedale. There are concerns expressed from the council in Hopedale concerning the activity of low level flying in that particular area, where not only the people from Hopedale go there hunting, but a majority of the hon. Member's constituents every year go in that area also by

charter plane.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Warren: So these are some questions that the Minister probably would think about answering.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Stephenville.

Mr. K. Aylward: This Budget debate is a very worthy exercise because it gives you a chance to speak about the things in your District, or it gives you a chance to speak about what the Government is doing or not doing.

It gives you a chance to go back and research what previous Governments have done. Especially when you are getting criticized for not doing a number of things. When you go to criticize, you should always examine your own position and where you were, and what you have done in the past, if you had the opportunity.

There are a few things I think that should be pointed out, to the public and to the hon. Opposition. Many of them were in power for many years, therefore, when one criticizes one should always remember what one did when one was there. I think there is a memory lapse with certain Member's opposite, not that many, a few, for the most part, some of them just forget, and have very short memories as to when they used to be the Government. It was not that long ago.

We can take the criticism because we are trying to improve on things. We are working on it and so on and it is going to take some

time. One year in the House. We have just got our second Budget in, twelve months or so, thirteen months.

They would not go to the people with a budget for the election. They called the election. They would not go and have a budget, they would not do it, because they were scared to death.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) no hurry.

Mr. K. Aylward: No hurry, no, no. But they did not want to do that. So criticize like they want, but let us be credible with the criticism. I think that that has got to be the lesson.

I went back and did some research on some budget speeches that were presented by the former Government, and 1985, the front cover got Marystown, Mortier Bay - it is a very good picture. It has got oil rigs all over the place, and all kinds of things here about offshore development and so on. It was an exciting time, that it was built up to be at the time, there was a lot of action on the move, in 1985, prosperity was bulging.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. K. Aylward: That was before the pickles.

An Hon. Member: Who was Chairman of the Treasury Board then?

Mr. K. Aylward: This was presented by Dr. John Collins, who was then the Minister of Finance, this budget of '85. This was after the mandate, they just got a new mandate as a matter of a fact.

I want to read one line of the

opening statement. Opening is, Kick Start the Economy, and that is what it was, too. 'Mr. Speaker, this Budget is brought down at a time when a new political era commences for our country. The election of the Mulroney Government in Ottawa last September set the stage for a refreshing change in attitudes all across the land'.

An Hon. Member: You can say that again.

Mr. K. Aylward: 'Co-operation has replaced confrontation'.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. K. Aylward: 'And compromise has replaced intransigence. Nowhere are the fruits of this new spirit more evident than in own Province'. Now, you know, I remember getting elected in 1985, I mean I remember, a young whipper-snapper in 1985 getting elected. John Efford got elected in 1985, a number of us, just barely, I do not know how we did it, I mean they were trying to wipe us out, of course, but I mean we just barely did it. We had nobody running against us.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. K. Aylward: Now, now I would not want to comment on that. I give credit to the former Member for Stephenville before me, he did try to do his best, I mean, now, now, let's be good.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. K. Aylward: But that is the only way, and again I always say that anybody who runs for politics is very credible, and you know, you go on. So anyway, the election of the Mulroney

Government in Ottawa set the stage for refreshing change in attitudes all across the land. This crowd opposite helped him get elected. They inflicted Brian Mulroney and the Federal Government on Canada, and you know, they should be held accountable for that.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. K. Aylward: They are not enough. We are too soft you see, we are a little too soft over here because we just sit back sometimes and let them harass us and let them criticize us and everything else, but the record they have got, and getting up and criticizing us, I mean, they should go back and look at what they did before. And the infliction of the Mulroney Government on Canada is probably going to go down in history as one of the worst things that ever happened to Canada, and it is time to make them accountable for what they did.

An Hon. Member: We should forgive them for making that mistake.

Mr. K. Aylward: Now we have to go on to the next one. This is worth looking at, this is.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. K. Aylward: This is worth looking at, this is, 1988, this is three years later, of course, and economic development and the kick started economy, prosperity is reigning all over the place. Oh, come back from Upper Canada and you have got jobs all over the place. It was hard to get people to join the Liberal Party at that time, I mean, it was very difficult.

Estimates from 1988 presented by

the hon. Len Simms, who was the President of Council and President of Treasury Board.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. K. Aylward: And the front page, of course, has a very illuminated picture of the Sprung Greenhouse.

Mr. Simms: Is my picture inside?

Mr. K. Aylward: Your picture is inside, and it was a good one. It is a nice picture, too. It is a very nice picture.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. K. Aylward: No, there was no picture this year. I do not know why. Now the inside of the cover, the photo shows the Newfoundland Enviroponics greenhouse constructed near Mount Pearl. 'This high-tech facility produces fresh produce for local and mainland markets' That was before it ever did and it never did. 'The high intensity lighting system used in the growing processes produces a spectacular effect in the evening sky'.

Some Hon. Members: Well, well.

Mr. K. Aylward: I remember a five minute speech I made when we were in Opposition on Sprung, and here is the deal in a lump sum. I am going to recount it again in the ten seconds. \$14.5 million was given, right, to Newfoundland Enviroponics to go ahead and construct a facility.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. K. Aylward: Now, do not distract me, I will get back to

that in a minute. Now, \$14.5 million, they become a 50 per cent owner of Newfoundland Enviroponics, the Government of Newfoundland. Now, the Sprung Group of Companies were the other 50 per cent. But who is Newfoundland Enviroponics? The Sprung Group of Companies, so, we gave them a \$14.5 million contract, we gave them \$950,000 worth of land out there, I believe, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing land, just handed it right over to them, go ahead and do it, no sweat.

It was a total of \$20 million, anyway, and nobody could understand, and the only question we had, basically, was there was never a deal like this in recent years that ever ever came about at all, all we did was ask questions. And they used to get up and defend it. No problem whatsoever, never had a problem with it, whatsoever, and they let it keep going.

An Hon. Member: And they went one step further.

Mr. K. Aylward: And they went one step further. Anyway, the Minister of Social Services described that one too, a little earlier, but it was just most unfortunate that they let that spectacle get on the front page of a Budget of Newfoundland and Labrador as far as I am concerned. As it shows where the Government was headed in the last years. Of course the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are very glad that it was the last years, because they could not go on any further, yes they were in their twilight there is not doubt about that. They were in their twilight there is no doubt about that.

Mr. Hodder: (Inaudible).

Mr. K. Aylward: Now the Member for Port au Port should be quiet, now really, you know I am just trying to give a speech here. If he wants to get up after, he can do the same thing and I look forward to hearing his remarks and so on, but the Member for Port au Port use to be a Liberal and now he is a Progressive Conservative and that is fine, that is up to him. You never know. But when you look at it these people opposite got the Mulroneu Government elected twice. Helped get him elected twice. Of course in Newfoundland they were not very successful. You know two seats last time bearly. But they helped him get elected and they contributed to this nation building, of Brian Mulroneu, and Mr. Lucien Bouchard, who thinks if we have to choose between Newfoundland and Quebec, you know what they are going to do.

That right no problem at all. Those nation building statements that have really helped contribute to the debate in Canada today, I mean it is just absolutely amazing and the crowd opposite, you know they have to be held up and accountable for what their contribution has been to this province. I must say I am very impressed with our Minister of Education. He got up tonight and he gave not just an excellent speech, he gave details of what we have done, and they were over there sitting down and embarrassed to tears, embarrassed to tears, because this Government in one year made more significant changes in educational funding than they did in about ten or fifteen. That is the problem that they got. Because we are just too good that is all.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. K. Aylward: I mean, you know we have to get real. I heard the Member for St. John's East, the Deputy Mayor, whatever, she is the Member for St. John's East, she was talking about the other day, last week, she was saying there is too much tourism money being spent on the west coast. Too much tourism money being spent on the west coast. So, I am not so sure what that means.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. The hon. Members time has elapsed.

Mr. K. Aylward: Ah, really Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member for Burin-Placentia West on a point of order.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, earlier tonight when you were speaking in the debate and I referred to you as not fit to sit in the Chair, I was not brought to task for it, but I realize the authority of the Chair and the comment was unwarranted and I would like to withdraw it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: No point of order. The hon. Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, just listening to the hon. Member for Stephenville, I don't know where he went now, he is gone, I must say that I am a firm believer that the hon. Member for Stephenville should be in Cabinet, I always believed since I got elected that there should be an Aylward in Cabinet. Preferably the one for Kilbride, but if not,

certainly the one from Stephenville will be a second best choice Mr. Chairman. But he was talking about some past budgets and about the Newfoundland Envirophonics Center, Mr. Chairman, and what a disaster it was and he made some comments from some past budgets. I have a picture here which was taken out of one of the papers and I have not got a date on it but it is the cartoon of a -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: - no it is a cartoon with a little caption on it which says, 'Mr. Wells with all these layoffs in the fish plants and paper mills will you still be bringing my sons home'? Mr. Chairman, that in a few months says more than all the Sprung greenhouses, Mr. Chairman, that says a lot more than all the Sprung greenhouses, in just a couple of weeks, Mr. Chairman. Its a nice picture of someone puzzling, a nice cartoon.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the hon. Member it is unparliamentary to display it in the house.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will lay it on my desk there, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: That little statement there, that little cartoon there would say more, in the year and a little bit that the Liberal Government -

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member from Mount Scio - Bell Island on a point of order.

Mr. Walsh: The point of order is he should not be holding up that paper, it is insulting the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: No point of order the hon. Member for Kilbride.

Mr. Walsh: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. Aylward: Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Minister of Education there today expound the great reforms he has brought into this House of Assembly with this year's Budget, the Budget of the Minister of Finance.

Certainly, some of the things that he said were correct, to a point, but he never did seem to go right through his Budget to see what things have been left out of this year's Budget, in his department, some fairly significant provisions in this Budget that were left out.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed one part of his Budget, for provision and distribution of school supplies. Now he did make a big deal of all these Newfoundland books that he is going to buy for Newfoundland schools this year. But for the provision and distribution of school supplies this year, he has taken away \$1 million. \$1.1 million from last year's expenditures. And that is quite a sizeable reduction in -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: He is saying I am wrong. Maybe I am wrong, I do not doubt that I might be wrong, because the fiasco that the Minister of Finance has gone through with this Budget, I do not doubt that it might be wrong.

But it is listed in the estimates in the 1990 Budget and it says

here that there is a reduction of \$1 million in school supplies. That is a very significant reduction in supplies for the young - and this is primary, elementary and secondary, it has nothing to do with any supplies for secondary, university or trade schools. And that is one very sizeable reduction in expenditure.

One other thing that the Opposition House Leader did raise, and it puzzles me, because I believe it might be another mistake in the Budget. Mr. Chairman, I could be wrong again, but I still believe the incompetent Minister of Finance has brought in a very poor Budget. Now we have learned through the Opposition, the public of this province has learned that there will be an elimination of the school teachers for sick children in the hospitals.

This great Minister of Education, this great reformer, has taken away the educational opportunities for children who will be going to our hospitals. Yet the mistake that the Minister of Finance must have made; it says here, hospital school services, and under hospital school services, we have increased the budget of that department by \$400,000 over last year. Now if you are going to eliminate a program, - it is not quite \$500,000, between \$400,000 - \$500,000 - but if you are going to eliminate a program, why are you going to raise the salaries? I do notice it in the salary details, and I would ask the Minister to explain that when he gets up, because it is confusing, that the reason for an increase in salary of \$375,000 is the hiring of ten special education teachers. I do not know if they are going to go into the hospitals, if those

special education teachers are going in to only the one hospital that keeps the - the Janeway Hospital in St. John's, I believe, is the only one that is keeping school teachers. Maybe you are adding ten teachers to that because you are taking a service away from rural parts of Newfoundland such as St. Anthony.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: Okay, the hon. Minister says it is new programs. He can explain that when he gets up. It is very confusing and it leads me to believe that the Minister of Finance has incompetently again brought in, made another mistake in his Budget. He did not know about the 1.5 per cent payroll tax, he knew nothing about that when he brought it in. And I think that we are finding some other mistakes in this department.

Mr. Chairman, another section in the current account part of this Department of Education's Budget, special education. When you go to special education, under those headings, there is a reduction of \$200,000 under special education, which is certainly a very important part of education in this Province.

Other positions that are very important to the pupils of this Province would be the teacher's aides, I used to call them; student assistants, I believe they have been renamed. We look under the Budget under education and we have \$1 million less to be spent on student assistants. Mr. Chairman, that is a serious step backwards for the Department of Education to take, when they budgeted \$3.4 million for that last year and they are only going

to spend \$2.5 or budgeted \$2.5 for that this year.

Under skilled training initiatives from the offshore fund, I realize it is Federal money but if there was not enough money to do these skilled training initiatives, the grants and subsidies have been cut by \$500,000. That does not seem to be any great reformer that I thought the Minister of Education was, when he is cutting such important programs as are being mentioned here Mr. Chairman. Center for Earth Resources, Mr. Chairman, a very important initiative of this Government when we were here and certainly a very important research and development

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is all finished is right because they are going to cut \$4 million from their Budget, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: It is capital.

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, it is capital, I realize it is capital, but it is \$4 million less in that education -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: Mr. Chairman, the Centre for Remote Medicine and Telemedicine, I do not know if that is all finished, but Mr. Chairman, that is cut by \$100,000 also, Mr. Chairman.

Other capital money which was spent last year on the institutes and community colleges, Mr. Chairman, under furniture and equipment, which I would expect that all trade schools must be pretty well up to scratch because

under furniture and equipment there is \$1.1 million again cut from that, under the institutions and community colleges. Last year there was spent \$3.6 million, Mr. Chairman, and that has been cut to \$2.5 million.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. R. Aylward: That is too bad.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: I remind hon. Members that the Chair can tell time.

Mr. R. Aylward: Mr. Chairman, do I have leave to continue for another five minutes.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Minister of Social Services.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Thank you.

Was I recognized?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I have to make a couple of comments, and I have not got much time to do it. A couple of things that we have got to talk about concerning the future of Newfoundland and Labrador. The future of Newfoundland and Labrador goes back for the last number of years, and I mean, it depends wholly and solely on the fishery.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

I recognized the hon. Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: We have heard a lot of comments by the Opposition over

the last two or three days about their position on the fishery and the future of Newfoundland and Labrador, and their support of the Federal programs towards Newfoundland. And I could not understand, I talked about the purpose and the reality of what the Federal Government was going to accomplish in the future and what they set out some ten years ago, and what they now have accomplished on the inshore fishery, but I could not understand why.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Efford: I could not understand why the Provincial -

An Hon. Member: Order please, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I said order please!

Over this noise, I cannot hear the speaker.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: The first time you spoke all year. He has not asked a question. That is what you would call a critic.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Mr. Chairman, why was the Opposition so strong in supporting the Federal Government against the inshore fishery, no support for the inshore fishery, they totally supported it. And I could never, in my wildest imagination, I never thought I would find the answer in the pickle book.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: In the pickle book?

Mr. Efford: I actually would not believe, because I was looking at it and I know somebody over there, a little bit silly, over on the other side had to dream this up, about reading the recipes, but I could not, really, until I happened to read the preface put there by the hon. Brian Peckford, Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador, at the time. Well, listen to this, in his opening remarks in the booklet: 'The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has printed and distributed recipes for fish products for some time now. If consumers have access to a variety of appealing and nutritious recipes for fish, they are likely to eat more of it, benefitting themselves and our fishing industry. But now it is time to go one step further into the future, with Newfoundland Enviroponics facility now supplying fresh vine-ripened cucumbers to the Newfoundland market, the same holds true.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I think the rules will clearly tell Members of the House that if you read from a document, in debate, then you must table the document. So we want to ensure -

Mr. Tobin: That is right, John. You have to table it.

Mr. Simms: Now Mr. Chairman, I am waiting for some order so I can -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Simms: Now Mr. Chairman, Beauchesne will clearly say that if a Member quotes from a document in debate, he must then table that document. I would like to know if

your Hon. is prepared to rule on that point of order at this point in time. A Minister quoting from a document as well, must table the document, and I would like to know if your Hon. will rule on that point of order because it is important, as the Member is not giving freely of his own opinions, which is what Members in the House are elected to do; give freely and express their own opinions. He is simply reading from another document, whatever that document is, some old silly piece of information.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the standing rules also say that, and I am talking about number eight in our own House Standing Orders, Number 8 rule says; unless the Closure Rule is in operation, which it is not, the proceedings of business under consideration, shall be interrupted, and Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the house without the question put.

Mr. Chairman, it is not now past 10 o'clock, the Speaker is not even in the House, so we are in some kind of a dilemma, because the House is automatically adjourned. If the Member wants to continue to talk, that is fine, but those are the rules.

Mr. Chairman: Stop the clock?

Mr. Simms: No, no agreement to stop the clock.

Mr. Chairman: I will take the point of order under advisement.

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Bellevue.

Mr. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, The Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to them referred, have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, 9:00 a.m.