



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 32

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

The House met at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, over the last few days the Leader of the Opposition has been making certain claims with respect to the Province's position in terms of the fishery and particularly in terms of what he says was a Federal proposal to downsize the fishery. Yesterday he asked, will the Premier table the document as submitted to this Government by the Federal Task Force, the Stein Task Force, entitled Building a Viable Fishery and I said, Mr. Speaker, I would probably table it in the House tomorrow and 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 officials sought the approval of the Federal Government whose document it was and which was sent to us on a confidential basis. We sought approval to table it. They have not agreed. They have refused to give the approval and I have no doubt that the hon. Members opposite have it of course, because they have been using it and quoting from it in recent days so I have no doubt they have been given copies of it by the Federal Government, so if they want to make it public, I don't object to it. In any event they appear to be able to quote from what's in it. Whatever they have been given information out of it by the Federal Government, so if they want to arrange with the Federal Government to make it

public I don't object.

An Hon. Member: We don't have a copy.

Premier Wells: Well, they have been given information out of it obviously by the Federal Government, they haven't been given it by this Government, but the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, has not given approval to table the document. Earlier this week, on May 8, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition raised questions in this House relative to the Province's position on a document entitled Building a Viable Fishery. In commenting on this document, the hon. Member indicated that the Province concurred with an approach to the fisheries crisis that would result in fishermen being forced out of the fishery. In early October, 1989, the Federal Task Force on Northern Cod presented a fisheries response framework document to the Province's Official Task Force on Fish Quota Reductions entitled A Structural/Adjustment Approach. The Province's Cabinet Committee on Fish Quota Reduction subsequently assessed the document and, on October 27, the Province's position on the Federal proposal was communicated to the Federal Government in a meeting of the respective Task Forces. In responding to the Federal proposal, the Province stated that it could accept aspects of A Structural/Adjustment Approach, in principle, but that the Province had major problems, particularly with arbitrary restriction on entry into the fishery and removal of fishermen from the fishery. The Province rejected this approach and advised the Federal Government that "Measures should be taken to provide alternatives for people with a marginal

attachment to the fishery and to permit the fishery income system to focus on "core" or "real" full-time fishermen on the condition that the need for such alternatives be explicitly recognized and accommodated in any economic development package." Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the position that the Province took on downsizing the fishery at that time, and which remains our position, is that the only grounds on which such a move could be acceptable is if there are measures taken to provide economic opportunities both within and outside the fishery. Once these opportunities are provided, individuals would then have the option to choose whether or not they would remain in the fishery.

As a result of concerns raised by the Province during discussions of the Federal structural/adjustment document on October 27, 1989, the framework document was subsequently modified to reflect the Province's concerns. The original Federal document became a Province's concerns. The original Federal document became a Federal/Provincial working document retitled Building A Viable Fishery. This revised document reflected the Province's view that any joint Federal/Provincial response program must consist of policy decisions to place the fishing industry on a stable competitive footing and include an integrated development package. This integrated development package would have three objectives: (1) easing the adjustment process for fishermen, plant workers and communities; (2) facilitating developments within and outside the fishing industry; and (3) facilitating broader-based developments in the Newfoundland

economy to accommodate any dislocations and to broaden the Province's economic base.

Mr. Speaker, it is clearly evident that, at the very beginning of our discussions with the Federal Government, the Province was not prepared to accept any approach that would see fishermen and plant workers removed or forced from the fishery without alternative employment opportunities and choices. The Province has consistently maintained that the objective of building a viable fishery must be accompanied by an economic diversification program since these objectives are inextricably linked. It is in this respect that the Federal Government's Atlantic Fisheries Adjustment Program is seriously flawed. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, in fact, that after they had a second look at it, instead of giving the Federal Government a big pat on the back, the Opposition has also acknowledged that the proposal is seriously flawed.

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador remains fully committed to the fishing industry and remains sensitive to the plight of those individuals who, through no fault of their own, now find themselves in difficult economic circumstances. Under the circumstances, Governments cannot expect individuals to share the blame for the present resource management crisis. We, as a Government, have demonstrated our sensitivity to the plight of those who have been affected by the resource crisis and we remain fully prepared to cooperate with the Federal Government on measures to generate meaningful opportunities, both within and outside the fishery, for our

people opportunities both within and outside the fishery for our people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could not table the Federal document because I did not have the consent of the Federal Government to do so, but what I can table is an excerpt from the Cabinet minutes that deals directly with this proposal. And here is the precise directive from Cabinet. "Directed that approval be given to the recommendations of the Provincial task force," and this was the response made by the Provincial task force to the original Federal proposal entitled Structural Adjustment, "with respect to fish quota reduction as follows: Measures to be taken to provide alternatives for people with a marginal attachment to the fishery, and to permit the fishery income support system to focus on "core" or "real" full-time fishermen, on the condition that the need for alternatives is explicitly recognized and accommodated in the economic development package."

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to table this information this morning.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Anybody who had been in the House this last week or so and had followed what had gone on in relation to the topic concerned and then listened to the Premier this morning, they would have no doubt at all in discovering that he was a lawyer, because he has taken the facts and he has used them to his own advantage. His selected phraseology tries to

cover up the real issue. What we asked, or what the Leader of the Opposition asked, was that the Premier table the presentation that the Provincial Government made to the Federal Government, which is entirely separate from the all inclusive document. And in his statement he says on October 27, the Province's position on the Federal proposal was communicated to the Federal Government in a meeting of respective task forces.

What we have asked is that that presentation be tabled because every indication is in that presentation that the Government was all in favor of downsizing. Now it is not only in that. In the evidence, if you want to go back and research Hansard, if you want to research public statements made by the Premier, by the Minister of Fisheries when talking about the industry, the one thing that stands out always is downsizing, rationalization of the fishing industry. Plants must close. We must have, in the words of the Minister of Fisheries, a professional fishery, people who are not fully involved in the fishery should have no part. These are the words of a man or of Government who does not really understand Newfoundland and how Newfoundlanders have survived and existed over the centuries, a professional fishery in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has skated around the request that was made, he has tried to confuse the issue by once again putting the blame upon the Feds, when all he was asked was to table the position, as stated to the Federal Government, of the Province, and hopefully, in the next few days we will see that being tabled.

It is, once again, just smoke and mirrors that we have seen. What we asked for was the presentation of the Provincial Government to the Federal Government as of October 27, the Province's position, which states clearly the Province's position on the fishery. And the evidence is there, quite clearly, that the Province's position is downsizing, downgrading, rationalizing and forcing people out of the fishery. You can do it in two ways. (1) By eliminating the part-timers so that you have a professional fishery, as the Minister of Fishery advocates, and the other way is to make sure plants close, because if plants close, fishermen do not have markets, they get confused -

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Hearn: - the workers do not have employment and consequently, the aim of this Government to move people out of the smaller centres into the larger areas, into the great industrial areas that they are going to build up with their dream plans, resettlement again, that is the aim of the Government, Mr. Speaker, but certainly, we are going to make sure that the people of Newfoundland know the facts and sooner or later, the true position of this Government will come out so that everybody will know.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

Mr. Kelland: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the past few weeks and months, Mr. Speaker, uninformed sources have raised the spectre that some of our provincial parks, one of the finest networks in the country,

may not open this year, and this unfounded speculation, Mr. Speaker, has caused some concern obviously with the camping public, with the personnel and staff in my Parks Division.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the hon. Members of the House of Assembly and the residents of our Province, that seventeen Provincial Parks will be opened for the Victoria Day weekend with a total of 1,322 campsites available. The following Parks will be opening on May 16: Butterpot, Gushue's Pond, Catamaran, Bellevue Beach, Beothic, La Manche, Notre Dame, Backside Pond, Square Pond. And on May 18, Jack's Pond, Blue Ponds, Barachois Pond, Cochrane Pond, Fitzgerald's Pond, Northern Bay Sands, Frenchmen's Cove, and J.T. Cheeseman will be opening. The park staff have been preparing for the openings, all maintenance and improvements are completed for the opening weekend.

I am pleased to announce that we will be providing employment for 300 seasonal staff this summer in our parks systems, including 100 students.

I would like to remind everyone that fees for 1990 will remain the same as last year. Daily and seasonal vehicle entry permits are \$2 and \$10 respectively. Six dollars will be charged for a one night stay in the park and \$35 is charged for a weekly stay. Seasonal permits cost \$250. Fully and partially serviced sites in Grand Codroy Park will cost \$9 and \$8 respectively. Senior citizens of our Province are still provided free access for themselves only into any provincial park.

Because there have been a number

of incidents involving liquor and liquor related offences in previous years, the following measures will be enforced during the Victoria Day weekend and throughout the year. Alcohol will only be permitted on designated camping or picnic sites. Additional staff will be put in place in parks on the opening long weekend. Park staff will maintain a close liaison with local police officials before and during the weekend. All campers must register, all visitors to the campground must register. There will be increased foot and vehicle patrols and no visitors will be permitted after 10:00 p.m., that is the same as last year.

I would request that everyone using our provincial parks on the first long weekend of the summer, cooperate with park officials in following our rules and regulations so that all visitors will have a safe and enjoyable weekend. I ask that this spirit of cooperation continue throughout the summer.

In closing, I wish to emphasize that all provincial parks in our system will be open, as in previous years, and an announcement will be made at a later date regarding the dates of the parks which have not yet opened.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

First of all, I want to thank the Minister for a copy of his release and certainly I feel the same as many other Newfoundlanders and

Labradorians, it is nice to see that summer is coming and the parks are on everyone's minds and when I pass along by Butterpot and Gushue's Park you can see there is a line-up there already, people are anticipating that the fine weather is coming and hopefully that is the way it will always remain.

As I went through the Minister's release there were a couple of things that sort of struck my mind when he mentions about alcohol will only be permitted on designated camping or picnic sites. I thought that there might be some designation there for areas of completely non-alcohol such as areas for children to play or whatever. I thought that might be a stipulation in his release.

I know for a number of years the handicapped accessibility, not alone for accessibility, but a number of designated areas for the handicapped was, I thought, perhaps introduced, I am not sure if it was or not really, but I just thought that it should be there that a certain number of sites be designated for the handicapped, at least.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on is: I have been told that on the call-back of the students who have certainly experience in the working of the parks, and certainly experience is the world's greatest teacher, I wonder how many of the call-backs actually have been called back? I am led to believe that in other years the park superintendent or park supervisor had to do with the hiring of students. And, Mr. Speaker, I just wondered why this year that the changes be made; that all applications for student employment, Mr. Speaker, has to go

directly to the Minister's office? And they can laugh all they like over there, Mr. Speaker. It shows their lack of interest in the students that we have in this Province who apply for work, and who should not be discriminated against under any conditions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Parsons: And I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is not discriminating in any way.

An Hon. Member: Masters of hypocrisy.

Mr. Parsons: Yes, masters of hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

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

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding to the next item of business or recognizing the President of Treasury Board, if I may on behalf of hon. Members welcome to the House of Assembly today twenty-one Grade V students accompanied by their teacher Mr. Bruce Critch from the Purchase Academy School in Botwood.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of hon. Members recent Government actions regarding the management of its vehicle fleet, specifically light trucks and cars. As part of this

Administrations review of Government's overall operations, the Department of Works, Services and Transportation was asked to examine the cost effectiveness of our light vehicle fleet management policies. This examination revealed considerable waste of tax payers money. Accordingly this Administration has initiated a number of changes to policies and further reviews, with the objective of maximizing the effectiveness of every dollar spent in this area. Mr. Speaker, I want to outline some of these changes to hon. Members this morning.

Mr. Speaker, the records reveal that Government Departments operated just over 1200 light vehicles. Of these almost 500 were driven less than 20,000 km per year. We are also aware that various Crown Agencies operate an additional over 800 vehicles with similar usage rates.

Based on this information, Mr. Speaker, we immediately placed a freeze on the purchase of new light vehicles. We exempted specialty vehicles such as police cars, ambulances, and so on, Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons. We will save almost \$2 million this year as a result of this change.

Mr. Speaker, this does not mean that public servants who require a Government vehicle to do their job effectively will be without one. We are simply trimming the fat.

We also examined, Mr. Speaker, use of Government cars by Ministers. We found that Ministerial cars were costing tax payers in excess of \$12,000 per year each. With twenty-five Ministerial cars in use by the former Government, the existing policy was costing over

\$300,000 per year, simply to provide Ministers with cars.

Before making any changes we also looked at what was done in other provinces. We found that similar policies existed there. In fact, in several provinces tax payers provide chauffeurs to Ministers as well as cars. Mr. Speaker, we found this to be totally unacceptable. We decided to get rid of Ministerial cars. All cars must be turned in by the end of May. In future Ministers will receive an annual car allowance of \$8,000 and a gas card. This allowance will be reported as taxable income. The amount is substantially less -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

The Opposition will be provided with ample time to respond to the Ministerial statement.

Mr. Baker: The amount, Mr. Speaker, is substantially less than the current cost, reflecting the fact that a portion of usage under the old system was for personal reasons. Tax payers, Mr. Speaker, cannot be expected to subsidize personal use of cars. This will reduce the overall cost of cars for Ministers from over \$300,000 per year under the former Administration, to less than \$150,000 which (inaudible). Mr. Speaker, we will continue to examine the use of vehicles in Government Departments and Crown Agencies with the objective of maximizing the productivity of tax payers dollars. As further changes are implemented, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to advise hon. Members.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Mount Pearl has hit the nail on the head. This is a sham. First of all, it is going to be very interesting to see the Premier walking down to Water Street from Confederation Building every day, and walking out to his District or walking out to meetings with no car. That's going to be really unusual to see.

I don't think this is really a smart move, no.1. No. 2, as part of this Administration's review, the Department involved, Works, Services and Transportation, was asked to examine the cost effectiveness of the Vehicle Fleet Management Policies. Well, Mr. Speaker, you wouldn't know that this was a brand new initiative of this Administration. I can tell this Administration that initiative was undertaken quite a while before that under the recommendations of the Senior Expenditure Review Committee, so its not an initiative. They would like to give the impression that it is a big initiative of theirs, but it is not. Secondly, it will be interesting of course to see the final results, that's what will be interesting because it is hard to understand how this is going to change an awful lot, cost wise, with an \$8,000 car allowance and a gas card which by the way covers maintenance costs, repairs -

Some Hon. Members: No, no!

Mr. Simms: Oh yes it does, oh yes it does, oh yes it does! You better check your gas cards, you better check your gas cards. The possibility is -

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

Mr. Simms: Anybody who has a gasoline credit card can tell you that, Mr. Speaker. Maintenance is covered on it, repairs are covered on it, tires are covered on it, anything is covered on a gasoline credit card. The bottom line is the end result will probably be that the cost of \$12,000, which they analysed as the cost, will probably be more than \$12,000 - \$13,000, \$14,000, \$15,000. As I said we will have to wait and see. It seems to me to be a lot of smoke and mirrors, and nothing more than a public relations exercise by the Government, but we'll see what happens at the end of the year. We will see what happens.

Oral Questions

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I want to ask the Premier a follow-up question to his statement this morning, if I might. He made quite a big to-do about the fact that he could not get the Federal Government's permission or agreement to table the document entitled Building a Viable Fishery. Then he went on to talk about the Province's assessment of that document, and the Province's position which was communicated to the Federal Government by the Provincial Task Force. Indeed, in the third paragraph of his statement he goes on to quote from it.

I wonder, since he is not able to table the Federal - Provincial

document without the Federal Government's approval, would the Premier table the Provincial Task Force document, which indicates what the Province's position was?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member has it all wrong.

If he will go back and read the statement, the original Federal document was a document in early October, entitled A Structural/Adjustment Approach. That was the Federal document which they initiated and they sent to us. The Newfoundland Task Force reviewed it, made their recommendations to the Cabinet Committee, and the Cabinet issued a directive, Mr. Speaker. I tabled a copy of the response of the Provincial Government. I would like to read it, but I have misplaced it here somewhere.

Here is what the Cabinet Directive said with respect to a proposal relating to this matter, that was contained in the Federal document: 'Measures to be taken to provide alternatives for people with a marginal attachment to the fishery, and to permit the Fishery Income Support System to focus on core or real full-time fishermen on the condition that the need for alternatives is explicitly recognized and accommodated in the economic development package.' Now that is the Provincial position, and that is tabled.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government produced another document called Building a Viable Fishery. That other document incorporated a response to the Provincial Government position. So both documents, A Structural/Adjustment Approach and

Building a Viable Fishery, were the Federal documents.

Now, here is precisely what I was asked to table by the Leader of the Opposition. This is Hansard from yesterday. Here is the question. Here is precisely -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: I have to answer the question in order to put out the truth.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) the answer.

Premier Wells: He has a right to ask a supplementary if he wishes, Mr. Speaker. Here is the answer.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) spend five minutes answering every question you are going to answer. That is an abuse.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: Here is precisely what I was asked.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: We know that. We know all about that. We heard it all (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I ask hon. gentlemen to please to observe the rules of the House. The Premier is answering the question in terms of what he was asked to table, and hon. Members ought to allow him that opportunity.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: When is he going to answer the question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to answer the question fully, not in a limited way that will allow the Opposition to contort it. They are going to have the whole truth. I know they do not like the whole truth, but they are going to have it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I ask the Premier to get on with the answer, please!

Premier Wells: Thank you. Here is the precise request. Will the Premier table the document as submitted.

An Hon. Member: That is not the question.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: Here is the precise request. Will the Premier table the document as submitted to this Government by the Federal Task Force, The Stein Task Force, entitled Building a Viable Fishery? Now, Mr. Speaker, having laid that foundation, here is the total answer to the question today. Neither of these documents is the Provincial response. They are both Federal documents, as I have explained. We sought the permission of the Federal Government to release them, and it was refused - it was refused. Now, here is the Provincial response which I have tabled. So, the Provincial response has been tabled, and the hon. Member should read the document.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, the more I hear this Premier and his smooth-talking, the more he tries to bamboozle the people. He doesn't have the ability to give a straightforward answer. That is his difficulty, he hasn't the ability. He was asked to give a copy of the Province's response to the Federal Government. He is now saying that response was simply to the Cabinet, nothing else. No other response was given to the Federal Government, is that what the Premier is saying?

Mr. R. Aylward: You are going to see a copy of it someday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. The Premier.

Premier Wells: The document which I tabled this morning says, Mr. Speaker, that the Task Forces met and the response of the Province was given orally, based on this Cabinet directive.

Mr. Simms: Orally?

Premier Wells: Yes! Yes!

Ms Verge: Oh, come on!

Premier Wells: Well, I will go and see if there is anything in writing.

Mr. Simms: Will you?

Premier Wells: Yes, I will. I will check to see if there is anything in writing, but I think this document says at meetings -

Mr. R. Aylward: (Inaudible). I doubt for very long.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Premier Wells: Page 2 of the Statement: 'As a result of concerns raised by the Province during discussions of the Federal Structural Adjustment Document, on October 27, the framework - I am sorry! At a point before that it says it was done at meetings between the two Task Forces, the Province's position was put to the Federal Government, and, as a result, the second document, Building a Viable Fishery, was generated by the Federal Government which reflected this comment of the Province, and this is the Province's position on it - it was tabled in this way.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. The Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: This is absolutely unbelievable! Is the Premier now saying that his response to such a large question, large problem was a verbal response? Is that what he is saying, it was simply a verbal response?

Mr. R. Aylward: What a way to do business.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is written. It is verbal but it is not oral, it is written.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Well, if he wants every response has to be a verbal response. We do not talk in sign language, we talk in words or we write in words.

An Hon. Member: Verbal not oral.

Premier Wells: Maybe the Member does not know the difference between verbal and oral, and I commend him to the dictionary.

Mr. Speaker, the Province's response was decided by Cabinet. It was written in a Cabinet Minute, which I have tabled. Now, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, that was conveyed directly to the Federal Task Force. In meetings with the Provincial Task Force, the Province's position was conveyed, and, as a result, a second document, Building A Viable Fishery, was, I believe, generated by the Federal Government. But I will go back and reaffirm as to whether that was generated by the Federal Government or was our version of the Federal Government's document, adjusted to reflect the concerns of the Province. I will go back and check that, but to the best of my knowledge, it was originated by the Federal Government, also.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier talks about - what was it he said? - our answer was verbal not oral, or oral not verbal. I am not quite sure what he said. I used the word 'written'. The Premier used the word 'oral'. It has nothing to do with verbal versus oral. Talk about smooth talk.

Can I direct him to his own Order in Council, then, the one he just tabled? This is a written Order in Council. The first line or so says '...directed that approval is given' - this is to send to the Federal Government - 'to the recommendations of the Provincial Task Force.' What we are asking - I will say it very clearly - is if he will table a copy of the recommendations of the Provincial Task Force. It cannot be any

clearer than that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Task Force is a Cabinet paper generated to Cabinet and put forward to Cabinet dealing with the whole thing, and discusses in -

An Hon. Member: Will you table it?

An Hon. Member: We know what a task force does.

An Hon. Member: Why don't you shut up and listen?

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

The Chair has very often in the past made the ruling that when a question is asked, hon. Members should give the Member answering the question a chance to answer the question without interjections. There is plenty of time for questions, and the Chair recognizes everybody who rises. So if hon. Members want to ask the Premier a further question, do it on a supplementary.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The recommendations of the Provincial Task Force - I will start again, Mr. Speaker - the recommendations of the Provincial Task Force was contained in a Cabinet paper and, as hon. Members know, Cabinet papers are confidential and are never released.

Ms. Verge: Oh! The Task Force (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Maybe the hon.

Members want me to table every Cabinet paper that was submitted by the former Government. Maybe I will consider doing that, and then we will have some explosion.

Mr. Baker: Then we will have some fun.

An Hon. Member: The answer is yes or no?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, the recommendations to the Provincial Task Force are contained in the overall paper generated for Cabinet to make recommendation and assess the details of the Federal Government proposal. Now those papers are never made public, as hon. Members opposite know. All of their papers are still available, but they are not made public either. We respect the normal courtesies of Governments when they change not to make those things public, and we would do not intend to, nor do we intend to make this document public. It is a Cabinet paper.

What we have done, Mr. Speaker, and made public, is the Cabinet decision that came out of it. The Provincial Task Force recommendation discussed in detail all the proposals contained in the Federal paper, and they have not agreed with that being made public either.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, we are getting nowhere with this. It is obvious the Government is going to stonewall on it. That is precisely what the Leader of the Opposition was at and after for the past week, and the Premier

today has cleverly tried to camouflage it by his statement. But the fact of the matter is he will not provide the information we are asking for, under the guise that it is protected by Cabinet confidentiality. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

I want to move to another area, Mr. Speaker, if I may. A few days ago, in response to the allegation by the Leader of the Opposition that this Government has given really no serious thought to any program to directly help the communities which are going to be affected by the fishery situation, the Premier threw out this tremendous idea - it was almost as if it was an afterthought. No, I should not say it. Well, yes, maybe I will - he threw out this idea to help the people of Trepassey, the 650 people who will be out of jobs and out of work if the plant closes, and I am referring to his naval base idea.

I would like to ask the Premier if he could briefly tell us what precisely he is talking about and, secondly, can he also tell us how many jobs this idea will have or will provide for the 650 people in Trepassey who will lose their jobs?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell him any of those details. Not because I will not, but because I do not have the details.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: I will start again, Mr. Speaker. No, I cannot tell the House any of those details, not because I do not want

to, but because I do not have them. They are under the control of the Federal Government. We have become aware that the Federal Government wants to establish a facility in St. John's to accommodate naval vessels. Now, we are pleased to hear that. We are very pleased, indeed, to hear that, and we will do anything we can to accommodate the Federal Government in this regard, including making space the Province has on the St. John's waterfront, adjoining the naval property there, available to accommodate it.

When we got word that they were asking for this additional space, it is not that we would not make the space available to them, we will if St. John's Harbour is the only place where it can be done, we said to the Federal Government what I conveyed last week to the Minister of Fisheries and what our officials have been conveying to other Federal officials, please do not automatically assume St. John's, look at Trepassey. It is only a drive of an hour or an hour and a half from away from St. John's, and it is an excellent harbour. Look at establishing the facility in Trepassey, and we will do everything we possibly can, and this will help make up for some of the job loss. Now, if it is 100 jobs, it will make up for 100; if it 1000, it will be a real boon; if it is 15, it is better than none, Mr. Speaker. Whatever it is, it is the right thing to do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Simms: Trepassey has an excellent harbour. That harbour has a sandbar across it, as I

recollect from the information I have. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, what an exposé! What an admission!

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

I ask the hon. Member to take his seat. Increasingly now, I find hon. Members are beginning to debate the answers. Hon. Members know that in a supplementary they are supposed to get to the supplementary. In any event, Question Period is a place for information, not for debating. I am sure all hon. Members want to be confined by the rules.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree with you, the rules should apply to both sides. Mr. Speaker, I am saying that -

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

I will ask the hon. Member to take his place. That statement is not one the Chair really appreciates, and I ask the hon. Member to refrain from making such statements. The hon. Member makes the suggestion that the rules should apply to both sides. The Speaker is applying them to both sides, and will not tolerate that kind of reflection.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, with due respect, I certainly did not indicate anything should reflect on you. I said the rules apply to both sides, and they do. So, you know, maybe people are too testy today. I do not know, but I was not implying anything to Your

Honour.

I will expose this idea of the Premier's for what it is worth. He has now admitted the reason he could not give us any information is because he does not have the information. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to get the information. I suggest to him, or I ask him, isn't the Premier aware that this grandiose project he talks about is really an idea the Federal Government has to build a building to house the employees who are already existing here in St. John's and in Pleasantville, who work in Pleasantville, to house 15 permanent employees and the reserve people who are associated with that program? That is what the Federal Government is now planning to do; that is what they are looking for the land down at the harbour for; and all you have to do is call the City Council staff down there and they will give you the information on the project. Is he not aware of all of that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of all that, because it is inaccurate, it inaccurately represents the situation. I am aware that the Federal Government wants to build such a building. I am aware of that. But I was talking about -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) railway crossing.

Premier Wells: I will start again, Mr. Speaker. I am aware that the Federal Government wants to build such a building, but what I was talking about is the request of the Federal Government that the Government of this Province make available to them harbour front

space, waterfront space. You do not need harbour-front space to build a building. They need the additional harbour-front space to accommodate ships. Now, that is what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. That is precisely why the first thing I did when my officials asked me if the Provincial Government would agree to make this waterfront space available for that purpose was say, go back to the Federal Government and ask them to consider putting it in Trepassey, where it can do some real economic good for the community. It is not that we will not make the space available. If that is the only space that can be available, we will most certainly consider making it available. Then the next thing I did was get a nautical chart of the harbour at Trepassey and looked at the capacity of Trepassey Harbour. This is a small photo copy, the big full chart is in my office and I will get it and show hon. Members. Trepassey has a tremendous harbour, with all kinds of water. Every harbour has some kind of a sandbar somewhere in some part of it, but Trepassey has a tremendous harbour that could accommodate the entire Royal Canadian Navy, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, again we see another comouflage. That is all this is. The Premier knows full well - actually he doesn't know, and that is the problem.

I would like to ask him this: Is he not aware that this idea he is talking about is, first of all, something that is a long, long way

down the road, a very long way down the road? That is not an immediate project or interest of the Federal Government. Secondly, the facility they are talking about is for deep-sea training. That is what it is. It is not a naval base, it is for deep-sea training. They are going to bring in a couple of boats, a few jobs, not very many. A very small facility is all they are talking about. How is that going to help the 650 people who are going to lose their jobs in Trepassey? Can he explain that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, would they rather put a scallop plant there that in two years from now may also be in trouble, with no diversity? It is a means of diversifying. If it creates fifteen jobs, terrific! If it creates 1,500 jobs so much the better.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal we were dealing with was a request -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: They have a real aversion to truth and to being shown up for what they are.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) we have not heard it from you in weeks.

Premier Wells: You do not want to hear it, or they do not want to hear it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair must again intervene and remind hon. Members that when a question is asked, hon. Members should do the courtesy of allowing the answer without any interjections. Every Member is

entitled to silence. I ask hon. Members to my right to please restrain themselves, and I ask all hon. Members to confine themselves to the rules of the House.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, just let me spell it out so that at least the media and other Members of the House will know precisely what the situation is if the Opposition doesn't want it known. The proposal came to the Government to make space available to accommodate naval ships in the St. John's Harbour; because there was not adequate space at the present naval wharf, would we make space, which is really under the management of the Marine Institute, available to the Navy to accommodate ships? - and they were going to put another building there as well. So, the first response I had was, well, sure, we'll accommodate the navy, but don't automatically think of St. John's, there are other places in this Province. We have to build and continue to build an economy in rural Newfoundland, or the reason for existence of St. John's will cease. St. John's will be the capital of nothing if we don't build the economy of rural Newfoundland. That is our objective, Mr. Speaker, so I did the same, I did exactly the same in this case, to promote Trepassey, as I did to promote western Newfoundland.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

I will ask the Premier please to try and clue up his answer. We are getting to an area of repetition, and I know the

questions were repetitious, so I will ask the hon. the Premier to try an clue up his answer quickly.

The hon. the Premier,

Premier Wells: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will do as you request. In response to the repetitious question let me say again, Mr. Speaker, that the first response of Government was look at Trepassey. If it can be done in Trepassey, then by all means do it. And it will be the right thing to do, because it will make some jobs available. It is not and never was intended to be - let me repeat - it is not and never was intended to be -

An Hon. Member: What an abuse! What an abuse!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I will tell hon. Members it is an absolute abuse as long as hon. Members keep interrupting. The Premier wants to give an answer without interruption. If hon. Members will co-operate without interruptions, I will decide when I should tell the Premier to take his seat. So if hon. gentlemen will co-operate, I will listen to the answer and tell the Premier when he is finished.

The hon. the Premier,

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is not and never was intended to be a total answer to Trepassey's problem for the 650 people, it was intended to make a contribution to the economy of Trepassey. And if it comes about, if the Federal Government has the will to do it, it will make -

An Hon. Member: You said you knew nothing about it. You knew

nothing about it, you said.

Premier Wells: Let me repeat again. It was intended to make a contribution to the problem, not to be the total answer. And if the Federal Government has the will to do it, it will make an economic contribution to Trepassey. But it won't necessarily be the total answer, we still have to find the total answer for Trepassey's problem.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Resource Legislative Review Committee recently considered an amendment to the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Act. The amendment formalizes Government's budgetary decision to charge a guarantee fee which, I understand, will cost Hydro in the order of \$9 million - that is \$9 million Hydro will have to find from somewhere. They were recently before the Utilities Board looking for 4.5 per cent a year for three years. Will this particular guarantee fee requirement require Hydro to go back again very soon? I would ask the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Energy.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, it won't require them to make any such application at all, it is all included in the application that has already been made. That particular requirement is reflective of Government's general policy to require the payment of a guarantee fee every time the Government gives a gurantee, no matter to whom it is given.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member

for Green Bay.

Mr. Hewlett: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance announced a payroll tax will affect both major public utilities in the Province. I would ask the Premier again, will that particular requirement require both of these particular utilities to go back to the Public Utilities Board soon?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

Mr. Hewlett: Mr. Speaker, given things like the PDD subsidy with a phaseout, guarantee fees, payroll tax, Federal GST, inflation, would the Premier admit to the House and the people of this Province that we are facing upwards of a 50 per cent power rate hike over the next several years?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, we have a Public Utilities Board that manages the -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: I will start again, Mr. Speaker. We have a Public Utilities Board charged with the -

Mr. R. Aylward: (Inaudible) rip-off.

Premier Wells: I will start again, Mr. Speaker. We have a Public Utilities Board -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I again ask hon. Members, a final time, to stop interrupting in Question Period. There are rules the Speaker would have to abide by in these events. If hon. Members will not abide by them, then the Chair is going to have to use the extent of the rules to ensure that Question Period is carried out smoothly and within the confinement of the rules.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: We have a Public Utilities Board charged with the responsibility of supervising the conduct of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and Newfoundland Light and Power Company, the two distributors of electrical power in the Province, and they supervise it. The inference in the hon. gentleman's question is totally without foundation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will try to get some information from the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is no doubt aware of the statements made yesterday by Mr. French, the President of the St. John's Board of Trade. He was speaking on behalf of businesspeople right across this Province when he says that the Province is very much into an economic recession, which he considers, from a business point of view, as a crisis situation. The question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, is he aware of the statements the President of the St. John's Board of Trade made?

The President pointed out that there were 105 bankruptcies in the

first part of this year in comparison to 44 in the same period last year; he pointed out that housing starts are down by 40 per cent in the same period this year; and he pointed out that there is a tremendous slowdown in retail sales. May I ask the Minister a very simple question? What is the Minister proposing to do to deal with this serious economic situation we are faced with in Newfoundland and Labrador today?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, some of the points made by the Member are not entirely accurate. He has exaggerated to some extent.

Mr. Windsor: What Mr. French said?

Dr. Kitchen: No, Mr. French did not say what the Member said he said. But let me say this, Mr. Speaker, the bankruptcies which are increasing throughout Canada, and which are of great concern to all Canadians, including all Finance Ministers, are a direct result of the interest rates policy of the Federal Government. That Federal Government is determined to keep interest rates high in order to keep inflation down, so they say, and it is creating tremendous problems from one part of Canada to the other. Yesterday, or the day before yesterday. I attended a meeting of Trade Ministers and there the question was raised again and again, that interest rates are killing Canadian industry and putting people into bankruptcy. That question should be directed to the Federal Government, not to this Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I point out to the Minister that I certainly did not exaggerate it, I quoted directly from the statement released by the President of the Board of Trade. The Minister's response last night was, Oh, well, the Board of Trade are always getting on with that foolishness, so we see the respect the Minister has for business in this Province.

Let me ask the Minister this, Mr. Speaker. The President of the Board of Trade also pointed out, of course, that interest rates were high, but he also pointed out that the Minister's payroll tax is having a very detrimental effect on business.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: He said there are two choices for business, either cut back in the amount of labour, or increase the price to consumers. Is the Minister now, in view of the economic situation and in view of Mr. French's statements as it relates to the payroll tax, prepared to eliminate that payroll tax which is a direct disincentive for business in this Province, and which puts them at a decided disadvantage to other provinces of Canada?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We will not be eliminating the payroll tax. The payroll tax is not a harsh tax on business. Under the circumstance, it is the most reasonable tax we could have

brought in this year. Some of the other provinces confronted with the Federal Government's proposal decided to increase personal taxes, and that is a very, very serious thing.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Kitchen: They increased personal taxes this year in light of the fact that the goods and services tax is coming in in January, which will transfer the burden from business to personal people, and that is the wrong approach. The proper approach is what we did. And will defend that payroll tax, because in this particular circumstance it is the best tax we could have devised.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member for Mount Pearl, a final supplementary.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to point out to the Minister that his payroll tax is a tax on people, very directly on taxpayers of this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: Let me ask the Minister this: How does the Minister justify the statement he just made in view of the fact that school boards in this Province have a payroll of about \$38 million a year, and that by applying the \$300,000 deduction times the number of school boards you can get a deduction of about \$9.3 million, which leaves about \$28 million on which school boards have to pay payroll tax? How does the Minister justify that, in view of the fact that School Tax Authorities raise about \$28 million and, therefore, this is very clearly a tax on tax, which

is on the people? How does the Minister explain that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. The Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member would come to the House of Assembly more frequently, instead of his one day a week -

An Hon. Member: Oh, come on!

Dr. Kitchen: - sojourn, he would realize -

Mr. Windsor: A point of privilege, Mr. speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Winsor: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to sit here in this House and take abuse from that Minister like that, a Minister who refuses to answer questions. I want to make it very clear that I have as good an attendance record in this House as he does, and I have made a hell of a lot bigger contribution than he has.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has ruled in the past and will rule again that it is not proper for anyone to refer to the attendance or otherwise of Members in the House. I would ask the hon. Minister to refrain from doing that.

Question Period has expired.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today, on behalf of hon. Members, twenty-five students from Frank Roberts Junior High School, Foxtrap, accompanied by

twenty-seven students from LaFlèche, Saskatchewan, with the Principal of their school, Mr. Howard Whitty.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

O O O

Notices of Motion

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Dicks: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Registration of Deeds Act."

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Highways Traffic Act, 1988."

Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Order 2, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order 2. It is moved that I do leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

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

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Before the Committee rose last night, the Opposition House Leader rose on a point of order. The Chair did not rule on that point of order. The point of order was that it requested the Minister of Social Services to table a document. The Chair has ruled that according to Beauchesne, 495, the Minister of Social Services has to table the document. The recipe book is a public document, and the Minister read directly from that document. So the Chair has ruled that the Minister has to table the recipe book.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Mr. Chairman, I intended to table a copy but for some reason the copy had disappeared out of my drawer. It was there last night when I left at ten o'clock. But I will have copies tabled for every Member in the House of Assembly. I think there are about 5,000 sitting down in the office that we can distribute to anybody.

Mr. Simms: Somebody has stolen something from your desk.

Mr. Efford: No, I am serious. No, no I said it was there last night when I left, but it is not there now.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I will have one to table and there will be copies provided for every Member of the House of Assembly. But it is not here now, I am quite serious.

Mr. Simms: His own colleagues stole it.

Mr. Efford: Well I am quite

serious, it is not here in my drawer.

An Hon. Member: That is one autographed by former Premier Peckford.

Mr. Efford: That is another copy.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Opposite House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Yes, I think the Minister has raised a very serious matter here. Laugh as we might. The Minister is quite certain that the document he was asked to table was in his desk when the House closed at 10:00 o'clock last night. He came back at 9:00 o'clock this morning and it is not in his desk. I mean there is only one possible answer and that is that somebody stole property from the hon. Member's desk. Now that is a serious situation, not to be laughed at.

The same thing could happen, somebody could come and take something from my desk. Doesn't the Premier think that that is a serious matter? or it could be potentially -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Of course he does.

And I suggest to the Chairman of Committees that he investigate the matter under this point of order and order an investigation by the Minister of Public Works or, in fact, the Sergeant-at-Arms should be asked to investigate the matter. Because if somebody is taking something from another

Member's desk then that is a serious situation. Laugh as you might, it is a serious situation.

An Hon. Member: He just found it.

Mr. Simms: You found it?

An Hon. Member: He just found it.

Mr. Simms: So could we get that document tabled then, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Efford: I just tabled the document.

Mr. Simms: No, you are to table the one you read from, that is the one there.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot get any answers from the Minister of Finance in Question Period. And he is so scared of me now he is going to run away. Let the record show that the Minister is like a jackrabbit this morning, he runs out of the Chamber the minute we look at him.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: I am allowed to say that the Minister just left the Chamber. I did not comment on the Minister's attendance. The Minister does not know the rules. It is time for him to learn. I am not talking about his attendance.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Windsor: I am simply saying he just left the Chamber, which is certainly in order. As the

President of Treasury Board is now leaving the Chamber. The heat is getting to them, Mr. Chairman. So they are starting to bail out of the kitchen. They are starting to bail out, all of them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can that Minister stand in the House of Assembly and say as he said today, that he has not increased any taxes on individuals in this Province? What a deceitful statement for the Minister of Finance to make. He knows he cannot substantiate that. To try to suggest to the people of this Province that the payroll tax, which is a tax on labour, Mr. Chairman, that is what it is, it is a tax on labour, and the Minister is trying to suggest that there are no additional taxes on people. It is one of the most dishonest statements that I have ever heard made in this House of Assembly. And if the Minister wants to sit back and yawn and make faces, this kind of foolishness - that is the kind of respect that he has for the people of this Province.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, the Minister should get one of his assistants, to get from Hansard the responses that he has given to questions in this House, if he wants to see something that lacks intelligence. It would be interesting to have a good look at the questions that have been asked to the Minister of Finance, good, legitimate, honest, intelligent questions, and have a look at some of the foolish responses that we got. The Minister, Mr. Chairman, across this Province, is the laughing stock of this Government.

I feel sorry for the other hon.

Members opposite because there are some very good Members opposite. The Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, is a disgrace in this Province. He is being laughed at right across this Province, not only for the way he conducts himself, but for the policies that he brought forward in this Budget. The Minister does not like to hear that, Mr. Chairman. He refuses to accept that. But it is true. It very clearly is true, Mr. Chairman.

And he is trying to hide the fact that he has increased dramatically taxes on people of this Province. Well the game is up, Mr. Speaker, as the people of the Province now realize.

An Hon. Member: Your own Members are not listening to you.

Mr. Winsor: My own Members, Mr. Speaker, know what I am talking about. They do not need to sit here. I am delighted to see there are a few hon. Members opposite. Because the hon. Members opposite on the back benches are a little ashamed of the Minister of Finance too, and his Budget.

Mr. Efford: Not likely.

Mr. Winsor: They do not mind listening to this because they know every word I am saying is true, and they are secretly telling me, give him more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no increase on taxes on people. How about the 1 per cent on personal income tax, Mr. Speaker, who is that on?

An Hon. Member: That was last year.

Mr. Winsor: Oh, it was announced last year, it takes effect this

year.

Only 1 per cent, Mr. Speaker, not very much.

Personal income tax: That only raised \$20 million additional this year. That is all, that is not a tax on people. Personal income tax increasing by \$20 million, that is not additional taxation the Minister wants us to believe. And retail sales tax, Mr. Speaker, who pays that? \$35 million additional retail sales tax this year. Who is going to pay that, Mr. Speaker? Is it not the people of this Province?

And how about the additional cost of electricity in this Province, as a result of the fact that the Minister has increased the cost to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, by reducing, by eliminating the subsidy on PDD. \$20 million this year he is taking out of the pockets of people through Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. And \$10 million is a guarantee fee. \$10 million he is stealing from Hydro. It costs him nothing to put his name on a document and say this Province guarantees it, it is not a tax. No, but it costs the people of this Province because that \$10 million will reflect in the power costs of the people in this Province. Very directly it does. What foolishness, Mr. Speaker. How simple is the Minister of Finance if he does not know that an additional \$30 million cost to Newfoundland Hydro transfers to Newfoundland Light and Power and gets passed on to the people.

Dr. Kitchen: Go back to school.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, he is hurting now, Mr. Speaker when he starts such low comments as that.

And he is obviously hurting. The truth bothers him now.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: It will be interesting to see what kind of response he makes to some of these. How about gasoline tax, Mr. Speaker. Gasoline tax this year is going to net the Province an additional \$4 million. Who is paying that? The Minister got an \$8000 allowance now, and a gas card, so the people can pay that for the Minister. The Minister does not care about the cost of gasoline.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Because he has got a Government Gas Card. And the Premier stands here today and pontificates and says-

An Hon. Member: Did you have one?

Mr. Winsor: I had one, yes. And I do not apologize for it. Because I used it. The Minister of Finance now has the nice little four wheel drive vehicle I had, and I say it has not been in four wheel drive since he had it. He has not been outside the overpass. Because he does not know what is going on around this Province, Mr. Speaker. If he did, he would not come in with such stupid policies, as he has in his Budget. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has now got an \$8000 car allowance. We will see some fancy cars out in front now, Mr. Speaker, there is no guidelines anymore now.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: I beg your pardon.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Some fancy cars now, Mr. Speaker, you will see them now. The power windows, sun roofs and everything else, for \$8000 a year, Mr. Speaker. For \$8000 a year you can get a pretty nice car, \$8000 a year allowance, that is what the Ministers are going to be given.

An Hon. Member: You cannot.

Mr. Winsor: You can. Well have a look at the one I am driving now. A personal vehicle, which is a top of the line four wheel drive, similar to the one the Minister of Finance drives, but it has everything in it, sun roof, power windows, power locks, you name it. A lovely machine, and I have a trailer hitch on it, if that is any of the Minister's business. It is a personal vehicle and it costs me about \$700 a month to lease that vehicle. So, the Ministers can get a pretty nice vehicle for \$8000 a year.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Yes. Seven hundred dollars a month it costs me for that vehicle.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Seven hundred dollars a month. And you can put a lot of gas in a car for \$4,000.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: You can put a lot of gas in a car with a credit card. And the Premier may have never looked at his Government Card but if the Premier would look at the handbook that is issued with the Government gasoline card he will see all of the things that the Ministers can now put into their own car.

Premier Wells: Have you ever heard of change?

Mr. Windsor: Oh. Well, if the Premier were to table it, if the Minister or the Premier will table new guidelines - you have them I assume. I will yield for the Premier to table them. You do not have them yet. You may change them now that it has been brought to your attention. A bit late now isn't it, now that the scam has been shown. You may change them now and bring in some new guidelines, now that you have been exposed.

But the Premier will have a look at the guidelines that are released with credit cards that are in that booklet, the handbook, as set for use of Government credit cards. And he will find that all normal maintenance and repairs that can be done in Ultramar Service Stations, because they have the contract at this point in time, but you can go in there and you can get those things done within certain limitations. But you can certainly get grease and oil change, and you can get tires and tires repaired, you can get car washes, an nice shiny wash and wax anytime you go through.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Ah, public accounts. Yes, sure.

So we will see now. They people of the Province, Mr. Speaker, are going to be paying an extra \$4 million this year in gasoline tax, but that is not going to hurt the Ministers because they have a credit card to use in your own car. Now the Premier will have to issue a new Cabinet directive on that, because it very clearly states that a credit card is

issued for a particular specific vehicle. And the licence plate number of that vehicle is on the credit card, so it cannot be used. It is not acceptable for any other vehicle except that car.

So I assume now the Ministers are going to go buy their own cars and then the Government will issue a credit card with their own personal vehicle licence number on it, so that all of these things can now be applied to their own personal vehicles. Let that be very clear, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: There is such a thing as honesty in this Government.

Mr. Windsor: There is such a thing as honesty. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have not seen a heck of a lot of it, I will tell you that. We have not seen a heck of a lot of it. There is certainly none of it in the Minister's budget - the most deceitful document that any Minister ever had the gall to table in this House of Assembly is the Minister's budget. And on top of the fact that he is totally incapable of defending it, and the reason he cannot defend it, Mr. Speaker, is he knows it is a fraudulent document.

Fines and licences, Mr. Speaker, he sneaked those in. It was interesting this morning to hear the Minister of Environment and Lands indicate that fees in parks have not increased. I am pleased to hear that. That just means that every other fine and fee and licence has gone up more. Anybody who wants now a birth certificate has to pay more. I daresay a student coming out for the summer wanting to work as a waiter or waitress, I daresay that cost has

gone up now quite dramatically, is it? To get a waiters licence.

Mr. Walsh: I don't think so.

Mr. Windsor: Oh, the Member for Mount Scio does not think so? I challenge him to check it out. He is interested in tourism. He is a great proponent of tourism and has made a great contribution to tourism and is concerned about it. I invite him to check it out, to see if waiters licences have gone up now. Have a look at that. I wonder if tourist home licences have gone up, and lounge licences, and bar licences, or all of these sorts of licences and fees, have they increased?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: The hon. gentleman knows full well they have because he is in the business. A little bit of a conflict here. He cannot say too much can he, or he is just going to have to pay it himself. He is just going to have to pay them, bite his tongue and say, 'Oh well, I will have to pay it I guess.' But he knows. He knows. It may not impact on a big business operation like he had, but it will on the little, smaller lounges and taverns and little, smaller restaurants and hospitality homes. I believe now, is there not a large increase in the fee that has to be paid by the Harbour charters now to have a bar licence on their vessel? Maybe the Member for Mount Scio would like to have a look at that and see if that is fair now. How much did he pay so he can provide a little toddy of screech when he sails people out through the harbour. I believe it is a couple of hundred dollars a year that he has to pay for that privilege. And he probably does not take in

that much in total in what he sells on his little vessel.

An Hon. Member: Are you against that?

Mr. Windsor: I am not against anybody who is trying to run a nice little tourist operation. It is a class tourist operation. I invite the Minister to go down. I am sure they would be delighted to take him out and give him a run and show the product that they are promoting and selling here in this Province.

An Hon. Member: I have my own boat.

Mr. Windsor: I know you have your own boat and we know where it was built, but it would be nice to have --

An Hon. Member: Nova Scotia.

Mr. Windsor: - nice to have the Minister go out and sail out on the harbour charters and take that tour. It is a very, very good tourist package, a good tourist package, and now his licence has gone up, I think you will find, by probably over \$100 this year. Maybe he doesn't have a high payroll, so he probably doesn't have to pay payroll tax. I will give him that. He will probably sneak underneath that one. It is just as well he is not a big operation; if he was a big operation he would certainly pay. Of course, not only is the fee gone up for his licence, but there is another \$2.5 million being sneaked out of people's pockets by the Minister of Finance. He tried to sneak that one through the House.

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

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will get back at him. He is not going to rest that easy.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it has been sixty-six hours since we gave the Budget Speech, and there have been some very good comments made, in my view, including some that were made on the opposite side of the House by one speaker. I won't identify that speaker yet, Mr. Chairman, I am just going to leave them hanging for a while. I really feel that all that has really come from across the House -- most of the good comments have come from this side actually. I remember the Member for Lewisporte and his elucidation of the effect of the payroll tax on businesses, and I remember comments made by the Members for Placentia and Eagle River, and other Members, quite appropriate comments to be made. But the Members opposite seem to have developed a style of personal invective, name calling without delivering the substance on which the names are to be called, and that is wrong in my view. If they think they are going to intimidate me by calling me names, they are going to have to get up in the morning. Because, you know, calling names is something we were all used to when we were growing up as children, yeah, yeah, and all this old stuff. And this is their type of intelligent discussion.

Now the hon. Member, my friend from Port de Grave, suggests that he would give them lessons in asking questions. Mr. Chairman, I really believe we are going to

have to conduct classes in analyzing the Budget and in analyzing the Estimates, so that they will go over the Estimates bit by bit and ask questions. It is quite appropriate and proper to ask questions. If a certain vote has gone up, why has it gone up? If a certain tax is being imposed, why has it been done? And make comments based on the Budget. But there is not much point in calling names. We have been called names always and we are not interested in that, it makes no difference.

An Hon. Member: You haven't even been able to defend yourselves.

Dr. Kitchen: That is what they have been doing, calling names. I won't repeat the names -

An Hon. Member: For sixty hours.

Dr. Kitchen: Well, not quite, because we have been talking part of the time. But I would say there has been fifty hours of name calling.

This is a good Budget. Now I am going to start my lessons to Members opposite; I am going to have a series of ten minute seminars to educate these people across the way. One of the Members there didn't know the difference between verbal and oral this morning. He was confused between verbal and oral. It is amazing! But I am not going to get into that, I am going to stick with the Budget. A Budget is a financial plan. You figure out how much money you have and what the important things are on which you must spend it. You have to figure out your priorities.

The Minister of Social Assistance has his workers helping people develop budgets so that people

with limited incomes can live within their budget, and he says they say certain things to people: You know you have to make sure you are well sheltered, that you have food, that you have things for your children and so on, and that you cut out the frills or cut down on them. But you can carry that to the extreme, because a poor person, I suppose, does need the odd bottle of beer once in a while. You don't want to say too much about that and things of that nature, you can become too harsh. But, basically, a budget is a strict plan by which you live with financial management. And that is what we have, because we in this Province, Mr. Chairman, have 48 per cent of our revenues coming from Ottawa. We are not a self-supporting Province from the point of view of the Budget, we are in exactly the same position as any person with a very limited income. Now, then, we are living within a limited Budget. We have to be very careful on what we spend our money, we have to be very careful how we raise money, we have to look at what we can raise, and we have to be very careful about going in the hole. Now, the Members opposite, the last seven years they were there, ran in the hole every year.

Mr. Efford: Every single year.

Dr. Kitchen: Every single year, they ran her in the hole and budgeted in the hole, and it came to the point where our credit rating, at one time, was lowered, and we now, Mr. Chairman, have the lowest credit rating in Canada. With the economic problems we are having with respect to the fishery as a result of quotas and the high interest rates from Ottawa, we have to be extremely careful lest

it go down. Because if it goes down any more, and I do not want to become an alarmist here, that means we will not be able to borrow money very easily. And when we do, the interest rates will be higher. And that is the problem. We must be very careful about how we finance our budget.

We just cannot borrow and charge it up to the future. Because when you do that, you put the burden from the present generation to the future generations, and load the burden on your youngsters. We cannot do that. We cannot just borrow and borrow money from Household Finance or wherever it is, and do it that way. What we have to do is be very prudent with respect to our borrowing, unlike what has been happening in this Province in the past seven years. Last year, we decided we would balance our budget if we could at all, and we did everything we could to balance the budget. And this year we are hoping we will be able to balance our budget; we are proposing a budget that will come out balanced. Hopefully, it will.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Dr. Kitchen: I am not sure, because interest rates already went up 2 per cent, very recently. We went to borrow money the other day at 12 7/8, whereas last year we could have gotten it for 10 - up 2 per cent. On \$100 million, that is \$2 million extra per year we would have to pay. We are going to borrow \$500 million this year we anticipate, both to pay back previous loans and to finance our capital expenditures. That will cost us an additional \$10 million if interest rates remain high. So we have to be extremely careful about our borrowing, unlike the previous

people.

Now, the other thing we have to do, we have to, rather than borrow - the last thing you want to do is raise taxes. The last thing any people want to do is raise taxes. We had no intentions of raising taxes this year. We hoped we could get by without raising any significant amount of taxes - a few adjustments perhaps. So what we decided to do was look at our expenditures. We started that last year by downsizing the Cabinet, and that saved us some money, and now we decided to have another look at it. And it is very hard, I do not mind telling Members of the House, it is a very difficult thing to downsize Government. We looked at various Government Departments to see if there were functions being performed that need not be performed, and we identified a few. We decided we would reduce the Public Service in some areas, and it has been very hard, even in areas which we feel were not high priority.

Now there has been a lot of talk about the hospital schools the past few days, the teachers in the hospitals. No doubt there was some usefulness to these, some, but not much. The very people who were there with crocodile tears and got up and pushed this as if we were demons and very bad people, were the people who decided the priority would be to close hospital beds. We had a choice: we opened hospital beds, and we closed areas we felt were not absolutely essential. You have to look at what you do. If you have a limited budget, you cannot spend it all on things which are not as essential as things you must have. So that is what we had to do.

In our Department of Finance we looked at the gas inspectors and we felt this was an activity which was not as useful as it was once, and we could eliminate these without serious consequence to our operation. But it has been a hard struggle to do that. You know, it is very difficult to downsize the Public Service. But where it is necessary, it has to be done so that expansion can take place in other areas, perhaps. When you have a limited budget you have to make difficult choices: Will I spend it this way, or will I spend it that way? You have this problem of deciding what is important and what is not important, what is more important than something else. It is a very difficult question.

We are attempting to downsize our expenditures. We have just started it, and we will continue that. Next year we hope there will be other areas where we can save money for the public, so that we can bring in a better program in something else that has to be done. The main point I want to make is that in this Province we have limited revenues; we have certain priorities which must be achieved. Our health care was in a mess when we took over; we wanted to improve the health care system. The education system was not doing very well. We have improved the education system, and hopefully we will do more on that. Then we have to get on with our development; we have laid the foundation for development.

Now you look at expenditures and, as I say, it is very difficult to downsize expenditures. We have tried, and we are making some substantial progress. We looked at the cars - it is an interesting way. There is really no reason

for spending unnecessary money on vehicles which are not used very much, so we do not spend it on that. And there are other areas we are going to have to attend to.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Trinity North.

I have recognized the hon. Member for Trinity North.

Mr. Hynes: Sorry! I did not hear you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to be able to stand in this House and take part in this debate. I do not wish to concentrate my efforts or my remarks solely on the Executive Council portion of the Budget, I will leave that to my more learned friends who are quite capable, I am sure, of picking out the nitty-gritty pieces of information which need to be divulged to the people of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak about the Budget in general, more particularly what benefits the District of Trinity North will accrue as a result of it. Last night, in this Legislature, the Member for Bellevue spoke about the White Hills Ski Resort in Clarendville, and he indicated he was sure that I supported it. I do support it very fully, Mr. Chairman. It has brought a great deal of economic benefits, not only to the Clarendville area, but to the other two outlying Districts, the District of Bellevue and the District of Terra Nova. But I support the expansion

of the White Hills Development as an expansion unto itself. But if it is this Government's plan to develop the White Hills at the expense of the fishery, then, Mr. Chairman, I do not support it, and I am sure you will not find very many individuals in the Province who would support something like that. But the White Hills Ski Resort has and will, I am sure, bring a lot of economic benefits to my District.

Mr. Chairman, there were a couple of things I looked for in this Budget. As a matter of fact, one in particular I was hoping would be announced in last year's Budget, but it was not. On April 19, 1989, the then Member for Trinity North, Mr. Brett, publicly announced that approval was given for three hospitals in central Newfoundland to acquire the services of a mobile CAT scanning unit. The mobile CAT scanning unit, Mr. Chairman, was to be used between the hospitals located at Clarenville, Gander, and Grand Falls. As I just indicated, the Member for Trinity North at that time announced that approval was given. However, when the new Government took over that was the end of the mobile CAT scanning unit for those three hospitals. Given that there are, and I can be corrected, only two such units in Newfoundland, a mobile unit to be used between the three hospitals would certainly have been of tremendous benefit to that portion of the Province.

I looked forward to an announcement in this Budget, but, again, it was not forthcoming. Probably the Minister of Health, at sometime in his remarks in this debate, can indicate what Government's plans are with regard to that unit.

The other announcement I was hoping for in this Budget was the announcement that first year university courses would be offered at the Eastern Community College at Clarenville. Renovations were completed, Mr. Chairman, with the intention of offering the courses this coming September. I have written the Minister of Education on several occasions, and I have spoken with him personally, but I still have not received a commitment one way or the other as to whether courses are going to be offered or whether they are not going to be offered. I have not been able to get a commitment from the Minister of Education. I hope he realizes that we now have students graduating from all around the Clarenville area, from Bonavista right to, I guess, portions of the Bellevue District and down in the upper portion of the Burin Peninsula. These students are going to be attending university, and they are anxiously awaiting the knowledge of whether or not the courses will be offered in Clarenville. Probably at some time during his speech in this House the Minister of Education can indicate, and indicate quickly, whether or not the courses will be offered this coming September.

The Minister of Education, again last night, made a very eloquent speech outlining all the increases to the various school boards around the Province. And I have great admiration for the Minister of Education. He was one of my professors at the University, back in the early 1960s, but I have a fear, Mr. Chairman, and the Bonavista-Trinity-Placentia Integrated School Board has a fear, that all the increases which are going to be coming their way

are going to be used to pay the electricity bills for the various schools it operates. The \$30 million subsidy that was removed by this Government to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro will come out of the pockets of the operators of the school board, as well as the payroll tax - they are going to have to pay the payroll tax. The increases look good on paper, but what are they going to amount to in actuality? I do not think very many benefits are going to accrue to schools.

Mr. Chairman, there were a couple of good points in the Budget, and I will give the Government praise where I see fit. I want to commend personally the Minister of Social Services for bringing in, or announcing at least, fifty new front-line positions within the Department of Social Services. He is to be commended, and so is the Government. I was Executive Assistant to the Minister of Social Services and I know something about what social workers have to go through in this Province. But I do have a concern in that regard, and it is simply that qualified individuals are not going to be found to fill those positions. And when I talk about qualified individuals, I mean individuals who have a bachelor of social work degree.

Mr. Efford: They are not to be found (inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: I have a concern that they will not be found. A lot of the people graduating with a bachelor of social work degree are not going into the Department of Social Services, and the Minister knows that. They are finding other Departments - the Department of Health, for example.

Mr. Efford: I suggest you quit while you are ahead.

Mr. Hynes: Oh! Why is that? Why is that?

An Hon. Member: Do not let him try you.

Mr. Hynes: There are not enough social workers graduating this year to fill those fifty positions. There are not enough social workers graduating with a bachelor of social work degree to fill those positions. However, I commend the Department in that regard. Mr. Chairman, I commend, I will not be like the Member for LaPoile. I refer to him as a mugwump, and a mugwump is an Australian bird which sits on a fence with its mug on one side and its wump on the other.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Hynes: Okay. I will return.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, my second seminar will be entitled, The Big Rock Candy Mountain. Hon. Members will remember that during the depression years people always felt the future would be better because it could not be any worse, so one of the songs that was going around was called The Big Rock Candy Mountain.

Mr. Efford: Sing it for them.

Dr. Kitchen: I can sing it, but I will just give you the refrain. 'Where the roast ducks springs/ And the coconut sings/ In the ice cold soda fountain...' What this means, Mr. Speaker, is a

commitment to the materialistic philosophy that things will always get better - things will get better. Everything is going to get better, so you can run her in the hole this year, because next year you will be alright, you see. This is the philosophy, the big rock candy mountain philosophy of Members of the Opposition.

Now, we are living in a world, Mr. Chairman, where the big rock candy mountain philosophy is obsolete. This is a finite world. We are living on a small planet, a lot of people, many, many people. We have abused our environment, we have taken our resources and wasted our resources, and we have to take appropriate steps to cope with the future on a global situation. Especially is that true in Newfoundland.

For 450 years, Mr. Chairman, people in this Province lived, as far as fishing is concerned, in harmony with their environment. We caught fish and the resource was there the next year, and the year after, and the year after. And we developed a very skillful society, a highly educated society from the point of view of coping with the environment. People could do all sorts of intricate, skillful things we learned about and were passed on, not through a formal education system, but through another education system which was very valid. Skills were passed on; skills which were very difficult to learn were taught from father to son, and neighbor to neighbor, and mother to daughter, and it was a very highly skilled society, one which was labour intensive. Look at the fishing industry. We value-added. We caught our fish, we split it, we salted it and dried it - value added.

Then a few years ago, Mr. Chairman, something changed. Our technology got out of control; we brought in the draggers. I am not against draggers, but they dragged it off the ocean and before you knew it, within thirty or forty years our draggers and the foreign draggers gutted the resource. They gutted the resource and now we have a problem. We have a problem in our fishery. What we did was concentrate on quantity - catch it, ship it off to the United States, catch it, ship it off to the United States. This is an industrial strategy, the same industrial strategy which caused the pollution across the world. It is a strategy which is totally inappropriate for the future of mankind and this planet. What we have to do is live within the capabilities of our resource. We have to recognize that our resource in the fishing industry is finite, and that concentration on quantity is not the solution. What we have to be doing is concentrating on value-added; we have to develop relationships with other countries, with Japan and with the far East, as well as with the United States and Canada. We have to live within the resource and we have to add value. Now, this message is starting to come through from a variety of factors, but we have to live within the capabilities of that resource. We had a sustainable society. We no longer have a sustainable society, and we have to restore, the best way we can, a new sustainable society, not like we had before, but we have to live within the balance of that resource.

So, the big rock candy mountain philosophy of ever-expanding, larger plants, larger everything, assembly line techniques in everything you do, is not an

appropriate philosophy.

Now, the other thing I want to say has to do with the forest industry. The same thing occurred, but not to the same extent. We lived with the forest industry for 400 or 500 years. I do not think we were successful there, because I remember you could see the hillsides being chopped down as people needed wood. But there was always wood further away. If there was no wood in Conception Bay, in behind Carbonear, you could always go over to Trinity Bay and get some. We still started chopping down the resource, but we lived in more-or-less harmony with our forest resource. We certainly did not gut out the forests, but we brought in the big paper companies. And they were good, I am not opposed to that, but we exceeded the resource, and we now have some problems there. We have to be careful with that resource. We have to make sure the resource is there forever, and the notion that all you have to do is chop, chop, chop and export it is not an appropriate manner of doing it.

What we have to do, in my thinking, Mr. Chairman, is think about a sustainable life in this Province, and in the world generally, and that means we have to live within our means, we have to identify our resources, we have to not concentrate on quantity but concentrate on adding value wherever we can, adding value to every species of fish, process it, do it up in small packages, ask the Japanese what kinds of products they want, and we will produce in the form they want it. I believe, if we can adopt that approach, things will be very good for us.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to have a comment on social institutions. In the past, our big problem in education, for example, was numbers. We had many, many students we had to throw education at in a very quick way, and we developed these large institutions, large buildings, huge schools, the larger the better. That was the philosophy that was permeating North America. Now we don't have 160,000 students, we are down to around 100,000 and dropping. So the same is true. What is true about the fishing resource is true about the human resource. We have fewer people. But we have the mechanism in place as if we had many more. The mechanism we have in place has to be addressed and altered. We have to cope with smaller numbers, value added. We have to add quality education to fewer people. And the methodology that has been used, the large institutions with the specialized people doing specialized things, just the same as it does not work in these large industrialized plants, is not going to work in this. We have to be careful of what we are doing. We have to value add, rather than concentrate on quantity. And the institutions we have established will have to be altered. Otherwise, we will have a half dozen very large institutions, and we will be bringing people from great distances to participate in them. It is not the large institutions that matters, what matters is the quality of education which occurs. And this can occur in a small place, in a small school, as well as it can occur in a larger school, but it has to happen in a different fashion.

And the technology of the past is not necessarily the technology of

the present and the future. We have to think about these things, not only in education, but in fisheries, and forestry and everything else. The big rock candy mountain philosophy is gone, it is finished, and we might as well recognize it. We are living in a world where there is a limited resource with many people, and we have to recognize that fact. And we, in Newfoundland, have to think in terms of our economic fiscal policies, so bear that in mind - bear that in mind. We have to add value wherever we can.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Trinity North.

Mr. Hynes: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to finish up some of the things I did not get a chance to say. I had mentioned a couple of points I found acceptable in the Budget. The other one point announced in the Budget I want to publicly announce my support for is the relocation of the headquarters of the Eastern Community College from Burin to Clarenville. The Minister of Education has known my position for sometime, the people of the District of Trinity North have known my position, and I want to relate my position to the House of Assembly.

When the post-secondary education system in our Province was revamped some time ago and they set up the college system, I think Burin, Clarenville, and Bonavista were put under one group. I believe at that time the obvious choice for the headquarters was Clarenville, it was the central portion of that group of colleges. The reason why the

college was put in Burin, as I understand it, was because of a lot of favourable - we call them petitions - from area residents down there. They did a lot of lobbying with the Government. I am sure Government receives each and every day a lot of lobbying from a lot of groups and individuals, but I believe it is the purpose of Government to look through the lobbies, the lobbying people, and make the right decision. I do not think the right decision was made at that time. I think the benefits which will accrue to the post-secondary education system will far outweigh the economic benefits or the economic losses that Burin will sustain or Clarenville will gain.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment very briefly on the municipal funding portion of the Budget as it relates to Trinity North. I am sure it was appreciated by the Town of Shoal Harbour and the residents of the Town of Shoal Harbour, as it was appreciated by myself, the Town of Shoal Harbour received \$250,000 towards the continuation of its water and sewer system. It is interesting to note that no other part of the District received any funding under the Capital Works Program. Particularly I want to speak about Clarenville, because with the Hibernia development, as the Minister of Mines and Energy leads us to believe, just around the corner, I think all hon. Members realize that Clarenville is going to be a central location for that development, especially for the workers who are going to come into that location.

I will give you some facts as presented to me by Council. From 1979 to 1989, the Town of Clarenville has received

\$2,097,000 towards water and sewer; it has received \$901,000 towards street improvements. Now that is a total of \$2,998,000 over a ten year period. But over the last five years, Mr. Chairman, the debt charges to NMFC from the Town of Clarendville towards its debt, towards water and sewer, it has repaid \$1,581,994. That is what they have repaid. Of capital funding for street improvements, they have repaid \$537,076. That shows that the Town of Clarendville is repaying its debt charges, it is contributing. It is probably one of the few communities around this Province which is doing something, running its own affairs in the blue.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: Oh, yes. I agree there are more municipalities.

But, Mr. Chairman, for the Town of Clarendville to receive zilch, nothing, I do not think was justice. In that regard, the fairness and balance from the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs seems to be wavering.

I understand the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs was out and met with council just two or three weeks ago, probably, and the Mayor took him around and showed him what improvements they needed and so on. So I hope the Minister will reconsider. Based on the information given him by the Mayor at that time, I hope he will reconsider and approve some capital funding for the town to carry on its roadwork this year.

Mr. Chairman, that is about all I have to say at this point in time. There may be other times later on. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am indeed sorry that Members opposite are not participating in the seminar. We are going to have take attendance, Mr. Chairman, and we are going to have to keep them in after school. We will have to let the constituents know that Members opposite neither know anything about the Budget nor care anything about the Budget.

An Hon. Member: May be you could (inaudible).

Dr. Kitchen: Perhaps that is what we will do. We will circulate Hansard. There you go!

Mr. Chairman, I really feel bad because I got so many notes across the House when I mentioned the fact that there was one hon. Member opposite who asked some nice questions. I got notes across - was it I? Was it I?

I do not want to go out back, because the notes are piling up out there. I really should not, but I will name the hon. Member. I will name him this morning, the hon. Member opposite who asked the intelligent questions.

Mr. Hogan: You will name him before noon, will you?

Dr. Kitchen: I will name him before noon, providing I get the floor. But I want to keep them in suspense, you see, something to look forward to.

Mr. Chairman, you may be interested in knowing that the title of this seminar is po po platters. Part of our problem in this Province is that we have

turned our backs on our own resources; we have, to a large extent, been brainwashed into thinking that Kentucky Fried garbage was better than Newfoundland food, and we spend all our time getting these. The other night, in the height of the sealing season, when Members were coming back at night and we had a very limited time to have supper, we decided we would go out and get some food, get some good old Newfoundland food right in the heart of the sealing season, but we ended up eating a dish called po po platters! I had never heard tell of it before. It tasted delicious, but it wasn't a bit like seal. And I asked around the table, how come we are not eating seal? I don't like seal, I can't eat seal, I haven't eaten it for years, and I think that's true of many people. I remember teaching in a settlement where every family had its quarter of beef in the fall, which lasted, perhaps, till after Christmas. Then people went and netted seals, and we lived on the fresh meat of the netted seal. We had it almost daily. Not every day, because we had dried fish and other fish as well, but seal meat was a staple form of our diet, and it was good. We had it cold, we had it roasted, we had it in many ways. And sometimes it was garnished with a bullbird or garnished with a turr or something like that, and some partridgeberries. We have, to a large extent, gotten away from that, and when I see the sealers despairing of selling meat, I am wondering what is wrong. I believe the technique of cooking and getting seal meat ready for consumption is disappearing from our society. In many cases, it is only the very old people who are interested. I don't know why we are not pushing this delicacy on

people, and why restaurants in St. John's can't have seal meat available and are pushing it as part of the tourist industry. Some do occasionally, but it is really as a treat rather than as a staple form of our diet.

How much is a carcass of seal, about ten pounds not counting the flipper, and that is not very much? How long would a small seal last a family of four?

An Hon. Member: One good feed, boy.

Dr. Kitchen: One good feed in a carcass, isn't it? One good feed, or perhaps two if they are not heavy eaters -one or two good feeds. Now if you had it once a week for a year, you would need about twenty-five or thirty carcasses. There are 100,000 families in Newfoundland, with thirty carcasses each, that is 3 million carcasses. Isn't that right, 3 million carcasses? Now, there is a market for seal meat in our own Province.

I raise that because not only do we have problems there, but we believe we have to export our berries. That is another source of good, solid food in this Province. We export blueberries, we export just about everything, and it is very difficult to come by locally. Some people don't know where to get it, but I believe the berry situation is not as bad as some of the other foods. We are being brainwashed by television into thinking that what we produce ourselves, our fish and the delicacies that you go in other places to get and pay very high prices for, are not the proper things for us to eat. We have on our doorstep a tremendous fishery resource for eating,

codfish and other types of fish that people eat and should eat, yet I believe what people are eating more and more of are types of food that were developed elsewhere and are being pushed at us. I really think the restaurant industry and the cooking industry, and whoever is involved in training and rearing up children, or in educational establishments - I do not want to load too much on school systems, but perhaps post-secondary institutions should concentrate a great deal on making good markets available for the food we have so that we do not have to spend all our funds on importing things which are really no better, or perhaps a good site worse. Not that we are against the other forms of food, but it seems wrong for us to ignore the bounty that is at our doorstep when we are looking for resources.

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

Mr. R. Aylward: The Minister of Finance started off his statement with this seminar that had something to do with the Kentucky Fried garbage, Mr. Chairman. Now what an insult to Newfoundland farmers in this Province, Mr. Chairman, because the chicken that is used in Kentucky Fried garbage is raised here in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, and is bought, Mr. Chairman, from Newfoundland farmers, Mr. Chairman, and it creates Newfoundland jobs, Mr. Chairman, and I believe the hon. Minister should apologize to the farmers of this Province, Mr. Chairman. It creates jobs at Newfoundland Farm Products, Mr. Chairman, this Kentucky Fried garbage that the Minister referred to. Mr. Chairman, he has insulted, Mr. Chairman, the producers of this Province which,

I would not mind if he had said yes we should use this Newfoundland product, chicken, and we should use seal meat more, I would agree with him wholeheartedly on that, it should be used more.

But, Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons why it is not used more, one of the reasons that families cannot partake of the utilization of seal meat and catching the seal meat as he said, and cleaning it and preparing it, Mr. Chairman, this Minister has the families of Newfoundland taxed so much, Mr. Chairman, that both husbands and wives have to work eight to ten hours a day, Mr. Chairman, to try to survive. They cannot afford, they do not have the time to go out and catch seals which we would all love to do, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes. So, Mr. Chairman, he also insulted one of his own Members, Mr. Chairman, which I completely forgot. The Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island is selling this Kentucky Fried garbage that the Minister referred to a few minutes ago, and I think that is absolutely shocking. No wonder the Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island beat it out of the House. He is out with an ad company now, Mr. Chairman, trying to salvage the damage that this Minister is after doing. Trying to create some more advertising for the product that he was involved in, I do not believe he is anymore, but he was involved in at one time.

An Hon. Member: He still is?

Mr. R. Aylward: He still is.

An Hon. Member: Oh, yes. Very

much so.

Mr. R. Aylward: But, he has to hire an ad company now, Mr. Chairman, to try to undo the damage that the Minister of Finance has done. Again, more damage, Mr. Chairman, he has taxed the Kentucky Fried Chicken operations with his payroll tax, Mr. Chairman. He is after bleeding them all he can with his payroll tax.

An Hon. Member: Buy a bucket of Kentucky Fried Chicken and you will get it in a garbage bucket.

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, they will change it to garbage buckets if the Minister of Finance has his way, Mr. Chairman, that is what we will have. But, I think he should probably give up on his seminars. But, Mr. Chairman, another reason, Mr. Chairman, why people in this Province cannot afford to go out and catch seals and have the time or the equipment, Mr. Chairman, is because the Minister of Finance and his budgets over this year and last year, Mr. Chairman, have robbed \$30 million from consumers of electricity, Mr. Chairman, by taking away the subsidy, a \$30 million subsidy on the power distribution, I forget the name of it now, but the rural power distribution system, Mr. Chairman. That is another \$30 million that the consumers of this Province - no wonder he is running away, Mr. Chairman. He is out now talking to the Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island to try to calm him down, I would say. Mr. Chairman, \$30 million he stole from the consumers, electrical consumers of this Province, Mr. Chairman, \$10 million a year over the next few years. That is why people cannot, they do not have the time, both parents in families

nowadays, and children, Mr. Chairman -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The Hon. Member for Lapoile on a point of order.

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Kilbride has imputed that the Minister of Finance has stolen something, and I think that is an incorrect inference for him to make and he should possibly be reprimanded by the Chair.

Mr. R. Aylward: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: I did not impute anything, Mr. Chairman. I said that the Minister of Finance is stealing the tax dollars from the people of this Province, Mr. Chairman, and that is as parliamentary as anything I have ever said in this House.

Mr. Chairman: No point of order, just a disagreement.

The Hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your protection from the onslaught from the Member from Port aux Basques, Mr. Chairman. But, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. the Minister of Finance would catch up with the times, he would realize that the taxes that he has imposed over the last two years, \$100 million worth of extra money, is coming out of the tax payers of the Province. About \$90 million, \$93 million extra taxes being clawed out of the pockets of tax payers in the Province. Every time this

Minister brings down a budget, and the Member for Burin - Placentia, I believe, his prediction will be true, because of the incompetence of the Minister of Finance this will definitely be the last budget that he will ever bring down in this House of Assembly. I agree with the Member for Burin - Placentia that this will be the last budget that the Minister of Finance will bring down in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on the Minister of Finance's representation of his constituents also. Just a small comment on that. I get calls daily from St. John's Center. They cannot get ahold of the Member for St. John's Center. I do not know why, I guess he is a busy man. I do not disagree with that. They can get his executive assistant who is a good person, Mr. Chairman.

But one thing that the Minister of Finance is reported - I got word back that the Minister of Finance, who represents a St. John's seat, Mr. Chairman, who should be trying to defend against the anti-St. John's Cabinet that we have now. The Minister of Finance is completely and utterly opposed to the construction of the outer ring road, Mr. Chairman. Now, I think that is absolutely shocking that a Minister in the Cabinet of this Province who represents a City of St. John's seat and the project that will be of benefit to all the residents of the City of St. John's, a lot of the residents living in his own District, Mr. Chairman. This project is going to be extremely important if we are ever fortunate enough that the Hibernia development does take off, and we get some good reports from the Minister of Mines that it is getting closer to reality, if

that Hibernia development does take off the activity that it will create throughout this Province and throughout Eastern Canada no doubt, but particularly in St. John's, Mr. Chairman, will be tremendous. The construction of the outer ring road will be more important in the next ten years, Mr. Chairman, than the construction of the downtown and crosstown arterial were some seven to ten years ago when they were built.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we do have some objection from a group who call themselves the Friends of Pippy Park on this outer ring road who have not given any viable alternative of what we should do with this outer ring road with the traffic problems that are going to be created. We have to get traffic from St. John's harbour into the airport industrial park somehow. We are not going to fly it in there, Mr. Chairman, we have to bring it in on trucks somehow. And that somehow, I think, will be an outer ring road, a road that has completed an environmental study, Mr. Chairman, and with the technology that exists today, if there are environmental problems certainly today's technology can look after what problems might exist.

I understand that some of the complaints are that it is going to interfere with the ski trails. Now if that is the reason to stop an \$80 million or \$90 million project because of some cross country ski trails, Mr. Chairman, certainly with today's technology that is not a good reason. I visited the western part of Canada, Mr. Chairman, where they have built large four lane highways right through the middle of farmland, and farmers with the

big equipment they have can get under these roads without crossing. You have technology and construction methods that will take care of farmers and farm equipment and cattle. And I am sure that we can accommodate the friends of Pippy Park, Mr. Chairman, if they are concerned that some of their recreational activities would be interfered with. I am sure that today's technology is available to accommodate them, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that the Pippy Park outer ring road -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. R. Aylward: By leave, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: No leave.

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

Mr. Efford: Mr. Chairman, I want to get the opportunity to speak. There is lots of time, but I had to rise and make some comments after listening to the former Minister of Forestry, the former Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, the great contribution that he has made to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: Now why is it a fact that they are continuously attacking the Minister of Finance and blaming everything that has happened in the Province, and the financial position of the Province on the present Minister of Finance. He has been there eleven or twelve months.

An Hon. Member: Two Budgets.

Mr. Efford: Twelve months, he has been there in that position.

An Hon. Member: Two Budgets.

Mr. Efford: Nevertheless he has been there for twelve months. Now what did he take over? Did he take over a Province, a Treasury that had all kinds of extra finances, had all kinds of money in the pot? Did we have any debt when he took over? Were the interest rates low? Were you able to go out to any of the markets and borrow without any problems? Let me tell the former Minister of a Cabinet that in 1971 the debt of this Province was less than \$1 billion. What was the tax rate -

An Hon. Member: One billion dollars?

Mr. Efford: - when you took over in 1971? 5 per cent? 6 per cent? Now it is in excess of - I will go close to \$6 billion. This Minister of Finance took over a debt that was close to \$6 billion.

An Hon. Member: Two Budgets. How much is that?

Mr. Efford: A tax rate of 12 per cent - 12 per cent tax rate. What was it when you took over? Let us be fair. Let us be honest. You would accuse the Minister of Finance of stealing. Let us be honest and tell what it was. You took over a debt of less than \$1 billion and when the people had the good sense to put you in your place, there was in excess of \$5 billion. Now you took over a tax rate, it was 5 per cent or 6 per cent in 1971, now it is 12 per cent. Now the Minister of Finance, although he is one, he is not one, he is the best

Minister of Finance since 1949, he is not a miracle worker. He cannot be a miracle worker and wave a magic wand and eliminate the \$5.5 billion that we are in debt. The interest payments alone is what? It takes about one-third of our revenue.

Dr. Kitchen: Well one-third of what we raise ourselves.

Mr. Efford: One-third of what we raise ourself just to pay the interest rates. And you stand up in your place and try to make some political points and you cannot do a good job at that. But you try to make some points and you try to accuse the present Minister of Finance for all those debts. I mean seventeen years of Toryism - it is like the old fellow said out in Port de Grave one time - 'I voted Tory once in my life, and I only hope that God will forgive me.' You know, and I can understand why they said it. Because there is a clear example that Tory times are hard times. And when this Minister of Finance took over with \$5.5 billion, now what do you do? You have to charge a tax. Now the only way that they can charge a tax that would not have too much impact on the people of the Province, is to charge it on a payroll, on businesses. But Tory Governments do not agree with charging corporation taxes because that is their buddies. The more money you make in business the more profit you make, the better it is for Tory friends. They would rather charge a tax on the poor people of the Province, but directly to the poor people. I mean that is Tory philosophy.

They do not agree with cutting down the profits of large corporations, so the Minister of

Finance in his wisdom brings in in a health and education tax, what do you do? You have to get taxes. You have to pay the debt, you have to pay the bills, and you have to give the essential services, the education and health and municipal transportation to the people of the Province, unless they have another magic way of giving the services without paying the bills. Now, of course, they did not pay many bills, if we rose from a debt of less than \$1 billion to a debt of in excess of \$5.5 billion, they did not pay many bills. So probably that is the wisdom in not imposing any taxes on people. The payroll tax is the only way that the Minister could find in collecting some of the monies that he needed. What did he need it for? How many hospital beds were closed over the last four or five years? How many times did we stand in Opposition and point out that the people were driving into St. John's via ambulance from areas like Clarendville and Trinity Bay and Conception Bay and having to come into St. John's, be put on a stretcher bed into a corridor of a hospital for eight or ten hours, only to find out that the doctor went through all kinds of hardships that day to try to get a bed to put them into, to try and get a nurse to give them some care, and there was nothing. What happened? They would have to be transported back to the community over and over again.

So the priorities are: do you let people die? Do you let people have those sicknesses and give them no treatment? That was the attitude of the former Government. This Minister of Finance saw the priority and opened some hospital beds. Try to get some of the money in your

Budget that you are not paying off the Tory debt and try to help some of the people, so in his wisdom, he saw the priority number one of opening some of the beds that the former Government had closed. How many beds did you open this year? Eighty-three beds was it?

An Hon. Member: An awful lot.

An Hon. Member: Seventy-three.

An Hon. Member: Eighty-eight.

Mr. Efford: Eighty-eight beds, so you cannot even tell the truth about that. Eighty-eight beds that were closed by the former Government. Now is that necessary. Should we have left the eighty-eight beds closed? Is that what you are saying? Is that what the Member for Mount Pearl was saying this morning when you should not impose any taxes, that you leave those beds closed and you let people die? If that is the attitude that you have, because that was the attitude, but now that you are on the Opposition and you are seeing that this Government can open beds you should be congratulating them, that they are not willing to let people die.

Now what about the education system. Are we going to take the same philosophy that you have, that people, children must go to school with no supplies, not a descent school building to go into, with no teachers out in rural Newfoundland. That is the attitude that you had. This is a Liberal Government. This is a Government that represents the needs of the people. Now we could have taken that same money, and we could have probably developed a pickle book, or probably a tomato book. We could have taken the

money from the taxes. Or we could have gone down to the printers and we could have paid them another \$20,000 to print another book like this, but - no. Twenty thousand dollars will keep a bed in hospital open for a year and probably during that year there might be eight or ten patients who would go through that bed and get cured and save money. That is the priority of this Government. That is the priority. Where are your concerns - pickles? Because the former Minister of Agriculture - let us tell him about the benefits that he had from the cucumber farm - how many farmers out in Kilbride during the cucumber farm fed their cattle on cucumbers? How many?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Oh, the former Minister said none. Now you had a choice. They had to dump them out in Robin Hood Bay, or give them to the cattle. I have no problems with the wisdom of giving them to the farmers rather than dump them, but this is what the great light over Mount Pearl was producing, Robin Hood Bay or - now I have no problems even with this book. I have never seen a bottle of pickles on the shelf yet. I have the book, but where are the pickles.

Listen to this statement, if my hubby called and said, company for dinner -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Why would you create recipes without a product? Why would you write recipes without a product? But I only want to read one sentence because I do not want to continue - if my hubby called and said, company for dinner, I would be proud to whip up this,

cucumber tomato sauce. My, oh, my, you should hold your head in shame. I think that beats Bev's dip.

The only thing that I can honestly say, and I say this in all sincerity, I had a lot of doubts about the people of the Province when they continuously voted Tory because they did not realize. But fortunately for the Opposition of the day we pointed out what this type of Government was all about. In their wisdom, enough is enough, they put them over there. But they did have some wisdom in allowing a few of the people to return to the House of Assembly, because you need an Opposition. God knows why, after reading Bev's dip why you would need that type of an Opposition, nevertheless, that is the type that came in.

I sat down in Question Period this morning, and it is difficult for me to sit down in my Chair during Question Period, because when I was over there for four years I very seldom sat down. But listening to the type of questions that comes out of Question Period and then my hon. critic over there, my hon. critic from Port au Port, shouted across the Floor and told me to be quiet, when I made some remark. How many days has the House of Assembly been open?

An Hon. Member: Now, now.

Mr. Efford: Oh, no. I have not been asked one question by the Opposition Member yet, my critic, not one question. Now there is a production for an Opposition. There is a performance for an Opposition. But seriously, if you are going to stand up and debate the Budget, which you should, everybody is entitled. Pick out the realities of what is in the

Budget, there are some things in the Budget that you have a right, but do not create false impressions, do not say -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Oh, tremble, tremble, tremble.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will have to sit down after that.

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

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Just a few words again. We have one Minister, the Minister of Finance, insulting the chicken farmers, and now we have another Minister insulting the farmers of this Province about the cucumbers and pickles.

Mr. Chairman, does he not realize that there are cucumbers being produced in this Province? Does he not understand that other farmers in this Province also grow cucumbers, Mr. Chairman - for anything you want to use them for? And maybe, if the Minister of Finance could come up with some type of recipe to make pickles and seal meat, maybe he would have both problems solved.

I have a little note here, Mr. Chairman. It is a question from a person and it appeared in one of our papers: 'Mr. Wells, with all these layoffs in the fish plants and the paper mill, will you still be bringing my sons home.'

Mr. Chairman, I wish this were worded some other way. I wish this was the mother of the Minister of Social Services, she would probably be saying, 'Mr. Wells, with all these layoffs in the fish plants and the shipbuilding industry, would you please send my son away.' That is probably what she would say.

Mr. Chairman, what has this Government and this Minister of Finance done -

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

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Social Services, on a point of order.

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, because it is absolutely necessary. The Member already knows from last evening that when I read from a document in this House, it had to be tabled. The Member opposite should table any information he has about another Member in the House of Assembly.

Mr. R. Aylward: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, I would just like to -

Mr. Speaker: The Chair is ready to make a ruling.

Mr. R. Aylward: Alright, carry on.

Mr. Speaker: I refer to Beauchesne, Paragraph 495 (6): "A private Member has neither the right nor the obligation to table an official, or any other document."

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am glad you made that ruling, Mr. Speaker. I hate embarrassing the Minister of Social Services. He has been in this House long enough now to know the rules. We used to have here a former Member for LaPoile who represented Bell Island one time, too. He had a way of interpreting rules to his satisfaction and we have another one of them here now, Mr. Speaker, who does the same thing with whatever rule happens to suit him for the day.

I do not think that he tabled - it does say in the rules, Mr. Speaker, that if a Minister reads from an article, the Minister should table that article or document. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister tabled that pickle book he had there last night, I am not sure he did, but I hope he did, anyway, just to keep in tune with the rules, Mr. Speaker. He was forced to do it, I would imagine, because he interpreted the rules his own way, again.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services, when he was speaking there a minute ago, suggested that the previous Administration closed hospital beds and inflicted damage on youth, or whatever he was saying. What has this Government, to date, done for youth in this Province, Mr. Speaker. I just want to go over a few things after going through this Estimates document, Mr. Speaker, of what the Provincial Government has done for youth in this Province. First of all, they have cut the travel subsidy for youth in Labrador; they have eliminated it completely, Mr. Speaker, one of them, but mostly, they have cut the one that was very important for sports and culture people in

Labrador coming back and forth to the Province of Newfoundland to participate with people in this part of Newfoundland and Labrador. They have cut that travel subsidy, Mr. Speaker, and they have set up a Cabinet Committee to look into it. All you have to do is, go to Labrador, have a meeting find out what the people in Labrador want. This would take one day. This Cabinet Committee could do this all in one day and they would get a message loud and clear that the youth of Labrador and the youth of this Province plus most of the adults do not agree with cutting this travel subsidy to Labrador.

This Cabinet Committee has been in existence since the Budget was brought down. I don't know if they have even met yet. But I would imagine they have not made a decision on this and I am hoping that they are going to reverse the decision of the Minister of Finance - Attila the Hun, Minister of Finance - who knows no other word, has no other economic background, except cut. I hope they will turn that around. Mr. Speaker, what else have they done for the youth of this Province, for our children in this Province with this Budget? They have cut the schools and the teachers in hospitals for sick children. Now how much more damage can you do to sick children than to take away the activity that they have during the day while they are in hospital. It is bad enough to be sick and be in hospital, but at least there was a professional person there, an experienced teacher, who could try to keep them active during the day, whether it be only twelve as the Minister of Education said last night, there were only twelve, as if twelve people, twelve children

in this Province were not significant.

I don't know what more damage the Minister of Finance or a Minister of Education can do to young people in this Province but take away the professional person who, while they were sick kept them occupied and helped take their mind off the illness that they do have, and I know the Member for Port aux Basques is tired but he probably should go outside and have a little nap. What else did this Minister of Finance do for the youth of the Province? Twice he has raised the tuition fees for our students at Memorial University. Last year's Budget he raised it directly and announced it in his Budget, this year he tried to sneak it in by having the university announce it. Mr. Speaker, that is another great progressive step forward that this Minister of Finance has done for the youth of the Province.

There was a freeze on Education funds, the Youth Diversion Programs in Grand Falls were cut - a program which helped people who needed help in the Grand Falls area. It was a very good program, very successful program. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Social Services got together and cut this program so that funding for the Youth Diversion Programs in Grand Falls was cut, eliminated, Mr. Speaker! A program that was very successful and should not have been cut. The same funding should have been given to the other Youth Diversion Programs in the Province so that they could do the same job as the people in Grand Falls did.

The Youth Services Division of the Department of Culture Recreation and Youth, another great step

forward for the youth of this Province, the capital funding, the capital Budget has been cut by \$85,000 this year. Great initiative for the youth of this Province and the Youth Employment Service under the Department of Labour is cut this year by \$185,000. All of these cuts affect the youth of this Province and I am surprised that we have two former presidents of the NTA in Cabinet, or one in Cabinet and one who is very close to the Premier, I am surprised that they would allow this devastation, these clawbacks from the youth of our Province. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Education have worked with youth all their life and I am surprised that they would allow these programs and this money to be cut for the youth of the Province, but, where are they going to spend some of this money that they have cut from the youth.

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

Mr. K. Aylward: Oh, that is too bad, Mr. Chairman. By leave?

Some Hon. Members: No leave, no leave!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for La Poile.

Mr. Ramsay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The thing I want to build-on has been focussed in by the Minister of Finance and concerns the sustainable view of economic development. The way things have been approached in the past, as he mentioned the big rock candy mountain, is one that will not sustain us into the future. Also, I might note, there is a certain element which relates to a lot of our initiative, which is

that we, as the public of the Province, in representing the public, will always have to pay. If the charge does not come initially, in referring to mutual funds as a front-end load, or in the financial services, it will come on the way out as you unload your mutual funds or whatever, you pay the fee then. So, eventually, no matter what, we will have to pay the fee. This relates to Municipal Affairs. I might note the efforts of our Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs in bringing through the amalgamation process, is a matter of setting up our municipal system in the Province so that people pay now, so that we all, as the collective public, do not have to pay later.

Now again, there will be no forced amalgamation as we have heard against the will of the people and the public of the Province. What is in the best interest of the public of the Province is what is tantamount in this regard. That is what the hon. Minister said, and that is what you are always asking, and the answers you get.

I also might note that amalgamation is an effort which is very politically dangerous. It has always been a politically dangerous thing to do. But the hon. Minister that we have in our Cabinet here has decided, notwithstanding the political problems associated with amalgamation as an effort, he is willing to take the chance with it. That chance is something that I might note, two other Ministers of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, or Municipal Affairs as the hon. John Crosbie, and also the hon. Brian Peckford, two former leaders, have failed to bring in. The amalgamation

process that was sitting in the Department of Municipal Affairs for years and years and years, and they decided that it was too politically hot to touch. No courage at all. We have an hon. Minister here, a man who is no stranger to municipal politics, to the workings of municipal government in the Province, who has decided that the time has come for certain services to be shared amongst municipalities, as opposed to unsustainable development happening in two -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: If the municipalities choose, exactly.

But anyway that brings us back to the fact that this Minister has taken the initiative and will certainly not force amalgamation, as the hon. Members' opposite Government did on Foxtrap and St. Philips, as I understand it. Seal Cove and Foxtrap it was. They forced amalgamation. I remember there was a burning of an effigy of the current Premier of the time. So that is how dangerous that an amalgamation effort, when forced against the people's will, as hon. Members opposite have done in the past, can be. So that is the consequences, and we are very cognizant of those consequences, and thereby, if it is in the best interest of the public of the Province, it will be done.

I would mention also that there are certain parameters of Government operation that this Government has undertaken to try to tighten up. I would like to bring about an analogy to describe how these parameters can possibly best work. I am a fan, I suppose, of automobiles and the automobile industry. I follow it quite

closely. There is a recent event that has transpired between the American Company, Ford, and the Japanese Company, Mazda. Now Mazda are partially owned by Ford, and they have decided to do a joint venture to produce the new vehicle called the Ford-Escort - a new version of the Escort, which is a model that they have been producing for quite some time now. So what they decided was that they would get together and do it the old way, or the new way. The Japanese engineers and the North American engineers got together and said, how should we build this? Should we build it the old way, the North American way, or should we build it the newer technological way, the Japanese way? So in doing this they said, well, the Japanese figured that they had the best way of doing it, and the North American engineers figured they had the best way. So the North American engineers said, well how do we decide. So they came to a compromise that they would take two vehicles, one being a Ford Tempo, which is a current model that is available, and another being a Mazda 626. Now what they decided that they would do to prove their point, the Japanese engineers said, we will take the two vehicles apart and we will reassemble them ten times. And in so doing, by the fourth time they could not get the North American one back together. And the reason being that the parameters of design of the Ford versus the Mazda were such that there was so much room to move, there was always a lot of room for these bolts to go in their respective fasteners, the tolerance of fastening the fender onto the car, were very much larger -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: - in the North American vehicle. And, therefore, by the time they had taken it apart and put it back together three or four times, the North American vehicle, it would not go back to together. Of course, everything had bent and twisted and the Japanese ones had zero tolerance. There was one specific place where the bolt would go into the nut and that was it. And how you can relate this to the way Governments function, I would submit that the tolerance level, as far as the focus of the former Government -

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: - is to a point where it is gone back and forth so much that it is hard to get back together. Now we are attempting to put this back together.

Mr. Simms: What is your position on Sunday hunting and year round to Argentina?

Mr. Ramsay: Well Sunday hunting is one I have not heard. Sunday hunting, just to appease the hon. Member opposite, who thinks he is still in control of the Government because when he asks questions he sometimes gets the answers that he wants.

Mr. Simms: You drove me nuts last night (inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: But anyway Sunday hunting: I feel that we could probably come to a compromise on this.

Mr. Simms: Yes, have it on Saturdays.

Mr. Ramsay: If we had Sunday hunting from 12:00 noon on Sunday onwards.

Mr. Simms: 12:00 noon on Sunday onwards?

Mr. Ramsay: Yes, none on Sunday mornings. Everyone goes to church on Sunday mornings.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: Anyway there is another thing that I would like to bring to the House's attention, Mr. Speaker, and that concerns the view of privatization versus an interventionist type of Government. Now when I say that I am in favour of an interventionist government policy some would suggest that that is a socialist view. But I submit that it is not, because a certain element of -

Mr. Simms: This is (inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: The way of analyzing this is that you have your American society, which is possibly more right wing as far as their Governments go anyway, and their policies being more private, their medical system etc., ours in Canada being more of a liberal society, I guess, a democratic society with social welfare, social assistance for individuals, universal social programs - what have you.

I came across an article in a Time magazine -

Mr. Simms: Morning or afternoon?

Mr. Ramsay: - which would support this theory. And the article is talking about the medical system in the U.S. And the medical system in the U.S.: it gives a comparison of annual health costs per capita adjusted in the same dollar figure, the U.S. annual health costs per capita are \$1,926; in Canada they are

\$1,370. Even though we have a system which is supported by Government, an interventionist type of system, it is still more cost effective, and it caused the American medical people to say, are we doing it right? Is the private system the correct one to use? Well I submit that a certain element of Government assistance in there has its place.

I might also note in the same Time magazine as I was browsing through it to focus on what the privatization view of Canada is doing to the country, lo and behold, near the front of the book, which according to the way Americans would suggest that they consider Canada to be a bit more important, the fact that we made Page 23 in the Time Magazine, the article is entitled 'Yes, But What's the Good News.' Now, for Brian Mulroney there does not seem to be any, it says, as voters are riled over interest rates, taxes, and his austerity policies. I say, austerity policies for the people, not necessarily austerity policies for the Government.

I will note in the article it mentions that Mulroney's government has imposed thirty-three tax increases since 1985. Thirty-three tax increases by the Federal Government since 1985. Noting that the Conservatives have raised Federal spending from \$85 billion in 1984 to nearly \$127.5 billion this year. So, if Mr. Crow, the famous interest rate man, the Governor of the Bank of Canada, wants to understand what is fueling inflation, I would suggest that it is Federal Government spending and not the public spending or the Provincial Government spending clear of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, the two economic

engines, that are fueling the interest rate problem that we now have.

The inflation is being fueled to a point where interest rates have to be kept high in order to tone down the economy. Also noted in here, Mr. Chairman, is something that is not really brought about and that is the figures for the Tory Government's popularity now, marked an all-time low in the history of any democracy, any Western-styled democracy. They now have the lowest ever approval rating of any Western-styled democracy since polling began. I might also note a comment attributed to the hon. Don Blenkarn, not hon. I guess, Conservative Member of Parliament for the Province of Ontario, and he says about Mr. Mulroney, 'he tells us we are going to do the unpopular things now and tomorrow we will be laying out some very popular things.' And they go out of there whistling and singing and clapping their hands, speaking about -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Ramsay: All right, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the first thing I have to do today, because of the Minister of Social Service's press release yesterday, give him a sort of a platitude, I suppose. A slight pat on the shoulder. And I think he will remember about a year ago, we approached him as a group as it pertains to the Coach House, and

the problems were certainly evident, and I am glad for the people in the area, and I am glad for the teenagers who were part and parcel of that establishment. The people there were, I think, nervous in some instances, because of some of the incidents which took place in the Coach House or around the Coach House. We will not go into detail, but I think it is a good thing this establishment is closed. But in saying that, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister gave his statement he said they were looking at programs to facilitate the people involved, because of the loss of the Coach House. The only thing I say to the Minister, because of this being a very serious situation as it concerns, I suppose - you have to use the right terminology - not wayward but problem -

Mr. Efford: Special behaviour.

Mr. Parsons: Special behaviour. That is suitable, I suppose. That is the terminology, extreme behavioural problems. But in saying that, I thought the Minister would already, because it is a year, have that program in place.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: Right, because that is what confused me with the press release.

Dr. Kitchen: An alternative for now.

Mr. Parsons: An alternative for now.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: Yes, but the Minister has had a year to put this in place. You have to take

into consideration, Mr. Chairman, the children or the young people who are involved in this type of institution. Now if the Member only has something temporary to give to those teenagers, then I would like the Minister to tell the hon. House sometime the long-range plans for those young teenagers who do have problems. Now, I mean, the questions are very simple. I have my own feeling. I am that type of individual. I think if they do have behavioural problems, that if you bring in one person who has a behavioural problem and then you bring in ten more with behavioural problems, you are only adding to the problem.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) experts in the department.

Mr. Parsons: Yes, I mean -

Mr. Simms: There is a new service, something to do with the experts in the department. It was not a brain wave of the Minister.

Mr. Parsons: It was only brought to the Minister's attention again when the group I represent, in my constituency, came to the Minister.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible) Members of the Opposition get Hansard and read it.

Mr. Parsons: I have read Hansard, and I know exactly what you did. You did a good job as critic of the Department of Social Services when you were on this side.

Again, going back to the Minister's press release, I really concur with, perhaps, his departmental staff and their ideas, and his as it pertains to those individuals. The thing that enthuses me is what program have

we? How do we split them up? Can we get private homes to take an individual?

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: But I thought that should have been in the Minister's presentation yesterday. What the Minister did yesterday was put out a sort of alarm saying, we are closing down the Coach House. But there are five individuals in the Coach House.

Mr. Efford: You are not even right about that.

Mr. Parsons: Well, how many are there?

Mr. Simms: There were five.

Mr. Parsons: There were five.

Mr. Simms: Don't be picky.

Mr. Parsons: No, don't be picky now. From five down to two. But even if it is only one, what you said yesterday was the establishment is going to be closed. There is a long-range plan, but we have something in mind for the present.

Mr. Efford: We do.

Mr. Parsons: I do not think that is really suitable.

Mr. Simms: He is asking you now.

Mr. Parsons: I am asking you now. After I sit down, the Minister can certainly get up.

Mr. Simms: He does not get any coverage on it now.

Mr. Winsor: No press.

Mr. Parsons: I wanted to say a

few words, as well, to my predecessor. When he was up speaking, the hon. the Member for LaPoile mentioned moose calls, and when asked his position as it pertains to Sunday hunting he said -

Mr. Winsor: The Member for Mount Scio over there, he is the expert on moose calls.

Mr. Parsons: Oh, yes. The Member for Mount Scio he is the moose caller, but, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for LaPoile said that on Sunday hunting, he believed there might be a compromise.

Mr. Simms: Yes, Sunday afternoon.

Mr. Parsons: Sunday morning no hunting, and at 12:00 we go hunting.

Mr. Simms: Set the alarm clocks Saturday Night and wake them all up.

Mr. Parsons: The thing is we have to orientate the moose now. I do not know how we are going to do it.

Mr. Simms: Put alarm clocks around their neck.

Mr. Parsons: Well, they are going to have to put some kind of a device on the moose to let them know which is morning and which is afternoon. I do not know if that is possible. At any rate, yes. I do not know but we had better bring back double daylight savings time.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a concern out there. I have mentioned to the Minister that these moose licences are soon going to be given out and there should be some provision there as it pertains to Sunday hunting. A

lot of people are pro and a lot of people are anti, and the Government has to make a decision.

On the other thing, the hon. the Member for LaPoile skated around. In fact, he could have won an award for skating this morning when he was asked by several Members on this side what his position is on the North Sydney to Port aux Basques ferry run. I know my hon. colleague from Placentia is quite clear on the issue. He says he has been fighting for the ferry to go to Argentia for years, and he believes this change would be beneficial for all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. And I have to go along with that hon. Member in saying that. I am not sure it is going to take anything away from Port aux Basques. I think, as far as the tourism aspect of it is concerned, some of the people who want to come to the east coast would be reluctant, perhaps, to drive right across the Province. I think for those people alone it would increase our potential as it pertains to tourism. And certainly if a person wanted to come in via Argentia and visit the east coast and then go back via the Trans-Canada, that would be entirely up to themselves. But they certainly would have an option, and I think it would be a plus if this ferry service was inaugurated.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Parsons: Oh, glory be to God!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister of Lands and Environment.

Mr. Kelland: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thought before we got into the weekend -

Mr. Simms: You might address Sunday hunting.

Mr. Kelland: Yes, if I can, in the couple of minutes I have, I will make a brief reference to Sunday hunting, because it was raised by the hon. Member who is now speaking from his seat.

Generally speaking, we could safely say the question of Sunday hunting has been in the public domain, it is a piece of public information that there is a concern about Sunday hunting and there are at least two views, and perhaps more, on the question. So it would mean that if a complaint or any concern is brought to Government, any responsible Government, Mr. Chairman, would deal with the issue as a complaint or a matter of concern in the public forum. Therefore, it is public knowledge that somewhere down the road the Government will have to make a decision with respect to Sunday hunting. As I have indicated publicly and in the House before this, there are three obvious options if Government will make a decision on the question of Sunday hunting. The options which are quite obvious -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) shipping them in.

Mr. Kelland: It is possible.

I do not want to be distracted, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask hon. Members to just give me the one or two minutes I have.

The options are to allow the ban on Sunday hunting in this Province to remain in place, which I suppose is an extreme position; on

the other extreme would be the option of Government deciding to lift the ban entirely. They are the two opposite ends, I guess, of the spectrum. The third option would be, as has been suggested by many people and has been considered by groups and organizations and individuals, to allow Sunday hunting in more remote wilderness areas, where the question of safety would not be as large a factor as it would in a more populated or more multiused area of the Province.

All we are saying here, and I will have a chance to address it a little further, but time restrictions are there now, those are the three options. It is public knowledge that Government will sometime in the future be required to make a decision on that, and they will consider those three options. If there are any other options, we will also consider those.

I will yield to the clock, Mr. Chairman, and will continue at another date, and another time.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved and seconded that the Committee now rise and report progress.

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

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

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

On motion, report received and

adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, on tomorrow.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If we could just stop the clock for one minute. I know it is just passed twelve noon.

On Monday, we intend to continue on with the Estimate procedure, Committee of Supply. I believe the Governor-General is going to be here on Monday, and that will take up part of the time on Monday.

On Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, there is an occasion involving the visit of the Governor-General, and on that occasion I wish to revert back to the time for opening, for that one day only, that is contained in our Standing Orders; it is three o'clock, and we will sit from three o'clock to six o'clock on Tuesday rather than from two o'clock to five o'clock, and I wonder if the Opposition House Leader would respond to that. I know it's according to our Standing Orders, and by agreement we have done it from two o'clock to five o'clock, but I would like to revert back on Tuesday.

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

Mr. Simms: I don't know why, Mr. Speaker, but every time the Government House Leader makes a proposal like that, I get the feeling I am being set up for something, I am not sure. Anyway, I am sure we would be quite prepared to agree to revert and sit from three o'clock to five o'clock.

An Hon. Member: Three to five?

Mr. Simms: Is that what you are asking, or three to six?

Some Hon. Members: Three to six.

Mr. Simms: Three to six. Well, if we sit from three o'clock to six o'clock, would the Government House Leader consider not sitting on Tuesday night, forget Tuesday night for a break for all of us.

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

Mr. Baker: I would be quite agreeable if we go to six, not coming back again. That is pushing it a bit, but that's agreeable.

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

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