



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 33

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

Monday

[Preliminary Transcript]

14 May 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege, I guess is the best way to put it. It has come to my attention that the transcripts, the verbatim report, Hansards for our night sittings during this past week, have not been transcribed by the Hansard staff. If I am incorrect then, fine, I would like somebody to tell me. But I happen to know that we asked for a copy of a transcript from one of the nights last week, Thursday night or something, and we were told that the night sittings, Monday, Tuesday and Thursday, were not transcribed by Hansard.

Now I recollect a couple of weeks prior to that, when we had the debate on the Meech Lake Accord, when we had a considerable number of night sittings, in fact, staff were brought back and extra staff were taken on and worked overtime to make sure the transcripts were done.

Obviously, in order for Members of the House to be able to properly carry out their duties, they have to, from time to time, refer to something that was said, in Hansard. I wonder if Your Honour is aware of that, number one and, number two, would he be prepared to do something about it? I think it is important that we have those transcripts, not that we expect a lot of night sittings in the future, but certainly those in the past which, it come to my attention, have not been transcribed.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, we will take that under advisement and check it out. I know there was some problem with an overload, but my understanding was that up to this point in time, at least, we would be able to do it. We will attempt to make the provision we had previously. The Chair will check it out, and report back to the House as quickly as possible.

Mr. Simms: Thank you.

#### Oral Questions

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, on a regular and on a consistent basis, continues to utter in this House irrational, insulting and, in many cases, intemperate remarks, sometimes directed at other Governments, sometimes directed at other groups within the Province. Of course the most recent of such remarks by the Minister were last Friday, I believe directed against the business community and the agriculture industry, with his silly Kentucky Fried garbage comment which was made in this House on Friday morning.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier, how much more of this kind of activity and those kinds of comments is the Premier going to tolerate from this Minister, and how much damage is he prepared to allow this Minister to continue to inflict, not only on the Government, but on the pride and generosity of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, intemperate language from any side of the House is not the appropriate language for the Chamber. And it does not matter whether it comes from a Minister or it comes from the Leader of the Opposition, when he refers to the Minister of Finance as being a jellyfish without backbone or a yellow something else, as I have heard him do on occasion. Those kinds of comments are provocative and, like all such comments, when they are made they usually evoke a corresponding response. Now, that does not justify the corresponding response, and I do not give any particular credit to any Minister for making such a response. I think they are not the appropriate remarks to be made in the House, and it behooves all of us to show some restraint.

Some of us are perhaps more prone to it than others, but all of us succumb to the pressure on occasion. I agree that such remarks are intemperate and really should not be made. I find it a bit difficult to accept the pious criticism from the Leader of the Opposition, when he frequently stands and asks of the Minister of Finance a question that is preceded by, 'when will the Minister of Finance, without any backbone or spine, stand up and say something?' That usually provokes or evokes an improper response.

Mr. Speaker: Before recognizing the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the Chair has a duty to ascertain whether or not there is any news media doing anything other than what ought to be done

with the Question Period. The understanding to all the news media is that the broadcasting only starts when His Excellency arrives. We have allowed them to set up their cameras, but there is supposed to be no televising or anything of the Question Period, or any proceeding, until we get to His Excellency, the Governor General.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer the Premier to Friday's Hansard, L35 and L36. The Premier will see clearly that there was no interruption of the Minister, there was no provocation, there was not even recorded a shout across the floor to the hon. the Minister. So, Mr. Speaker, the Premier should do better than try to justify that language that way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier, today, all during the morning at least, the agriculture industry and the business community were fuming at those kinds of comments made by this Minister, a senior Minister in the Government. Will the Premier, as a minimum, order the Minister to withdraw those remarks and apologize to those people who were so offended by the remarks?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, the Minister or the Premier will answer when I am finished. At least apologize and respond. I think that is the minimum that could be done under those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to order the Minister of Finance to do anything. I will ask the Minister of Finance to review those statements, and if he has done anything that offends any group within this Province or any person within this Province, I have no doubt the Minister of Finance will review it and will make whatever apology is appropriate, if any is appropriate. I will ask him to do that, but I will not order the Minister of Finance.

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, the last time the Premier publicly reprimanded the Minister for making similar remarks about another Government in this country the Premier said the Minister of Finance would not be his constitutional advisor. Now, can the Premier assure this House today, and particularly the agriculture industry in this Province, that the Minister of Finance will not have any input into agricultural policy in this Province, particularly when the Agrifoods Report comes in?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: (Inaudible) response, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I have a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Referring to the Kentucky Fried garbage statement made by the Minister of Finance last week in this House, does the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture agree with these statements, and does he think the statements will jeopardize chicken production and consumption in this Province?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member would know, of course, that I was not present in the House at the time. However, what I will tell the hon. Member is this, that the Minister of Finance has my total support as Minister of Finance. Let me say something else. Of all the Ministers in Cabinet, I find him most supportive when it comes to my going in looking to enhance the agriculture industry. He is aware of the contribution the broiler industry is making to the economy of this Province, and he is aware of the importance of users, like the company referred to in his statement. Mr. Speaker, other than as the Premier indicated, we all, once in awhile, make an intemperate remark. The agriculture industry and the service sector of this Province have the total commitment and support of the Minister of Finance.

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

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture have any concerns about the chicken produced in this Province by the Province's farmers, and manufactured by the workers at Newfoundland Farm Products?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: No, Mr. Speaker. I understand Newfoundland Farm Products is having good success with the chicken they produce and distribute to the various users in Newfoundland. I might also tell the Member, as Minister of Agriculture, I have been available all morning and Friday evening, and I have had no representation from any of the Groups to which the Leader of the Opposition refers. So I don't at this point in time, nor do I see any reason to have any concern about the industry's reaction to any comment that was made in the heat of debate in this House.

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

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture was not here during the time these comments were made; they were made at a seminar that was being given by the Minister of Finance, for the hon. Minister's information, and there was no heated debate at the time when he clearly insulted the farmers, the fast food industry in this Province, and the workers who produce chickens for this industry. Does the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture think the statement made by the Minister of Finance will jeopardize the recommendations of the Agrifoods Task Force, in that they will now be aware that one Minister in this Government has suggested that the chicken produced in this Province is not up to standard?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think so. And I have to say to the hon. Member, with his knowledge of the industry, he does not think so either.

An Hon. Member: Oh, is that so?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am surprised that the Minister of Agriculture is not standing here defending the producers of this Province. I find it insulting! Does the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture agree with me, that the Minister of Finance should apologize to the agriculture industry in this Province, to the manufacturers of chicken in this Province, and the retail outlets who sell Newfoundland produce in this Province?.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: Mr. Speaker, thank you. In answer to that question, I defer to the Premier's comment. I have enough confidence in the Minister of Finance to know that he will do anything he feels is necessary with regard to any situation in which he finds himself. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. The Minister is undoubtedly aware by now that the unemployment figures have been released which show an increase of 1.7 percentage points in the unemployment rate

over the same time period last year. And, incidentally, the unemployment rate has been up for every single month with the exception of one month over the last twelve month period, and, Mr. Speaker, that's at a time when the unemployment rate traditionally decreases because of construction and other activities which get underway in spring. Now that the Minister is aware of that, will she please tell the House once and for all what she is going to do to deal with the crisis in unemployment in the Province, and what she is going to do to reverse that trend?

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

Ms Cowan: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again, I will answer this question. It has not been asked to me for sometime, but I do recall it from, I think, a previous Session of the House. My Portfolio works with all of Government in order to improve the employment opportunities for people in this Province: Development has a role to play, the Fisheries, Mining and Energy, a whole variety, Agriculture and so on. We are all working together. Also, we have our Commission, and all of us together are trying to address problems that will make this Province more economically viable over the long term. You will be well aware, Sir, from having a look at the Budget, of the specific programs which are set up in my Department to address some specific segments of the population which are having employment problems.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Minister that her main mandate is the creation of employment in the Province, not unemployment.

Now the Minister told us last week, Mr. Speaker, that the money for job creation, \$2.9 million, has been all but used up - I believe she said it was all used up and no more money is going to be approved this year.

In view of this alarming news of a 1.7 percentage point increase in unemployment in the Province, I would ask the Minister can we now expect to see additional funding approved for job creation in Newfoundland?

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

Ms Cowan: My Department and the Government is always monitoring the employment figures. If we come to a stage where we see a need for some sort of employment creation program, then we will act upon that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly the Minister is keeping a very, very close watch on out-migration to other parts of Canada. Obviously, out-migration must be up if the unemployment rate is up, which it is over the last twelve month period for every month. Would the Minister please tell us what the current rate of out-migration is for the first three or four months of this year as compared to last year, and what her plans are to stem that out-migration?

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

Ms Cowan: I think it is rather amusing to be questioned here as if I were a high school student as to giving answers on what is the out-migration rate and so on. Certainly, we keep our eye -

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible). You are the Minister.

Ms Cowan: I beg your pardon. I would like quiet to speak.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: You are behaving like a high school teacher.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Ms Cowan: I took lessons. I have had lessons in it for a long time.

We are continually monitoring statistics and, as well, from time to time recommend to Cabinet certain programs we think will address them and then Cabinet will make the decision as to whether or not those programs are appropriate.

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

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Environment and Lands. Has the Minister of Environment and Lands made representation to his Federal counterpart expressing his concerns over the environmental damage done by the draggers on our spawning grounds?

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

Mr. Kelland: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, not specifically on that point, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware that Judge Dubé said, This question will be answered by trial, but it is surely a serious issue economically, socially and legally as well? It is not a frivolous question. In light of this serious statement, I ask the Minister would he also express his concerns in the strongest possible way to the Federal Minister?

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

Mr. Kelland: Of course, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Speaker, because this is a concern for so many people in Newfoundland and Labrador, so many communities, I ask the Minister again, surely goodness! at this late date is he telling this hon. House that he has made no representation whatsoever to the Minister with the concerns of the people? And why have you not made it? Why have you not asked the Federal people what is going on as it pertains to the environmental damage that could be caused by this dragging on our spawning grounds?

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

Mr. Kelland: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the environment naturally, as is this

Administration. But matters pertaining to the fishery are left in the hands of the Minister of Fisheries, and matters of the environment directly, and over which we have some jurisdiction, will be with my Department.

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

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, I heard some comments over the weekend and this morning, and looking at the papers I would like to ask a question to the Minister of Social Services. I am aware that there are problems at Coach House, but my question to the Minister is do you presently have alternate accommodations for the boys who are leaving? Where are they? What type of accommodations are they?

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, there had been a lot of problems at the Coach House, long before I became Minister of Social Services. In fact, problems we are quite scared might turn into something very, very serious. So we decided to take some action before something serious happens. There are two boys presently at the Coach House. Preparations were made by social workers of the Department of Social Services to do a full assessment. That assessment was completed this morning. They will be set up in a semi-independent living program. We already have a program which was developed by the Child Welfare Director, Mr. Stapleton, into something for the future, and that will be discussed by officials of my Department. When that decision is made, Mr. Speaker, I will be making a public

announcement to the House of Assembly on those matters.

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

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, that answer does not jibe with information I was given by his director this morning, nor does it jibe with information given me by the Director of the Home this morning. First of all, the Director of the Home told me there were four people there at the present time; that was this morning, just before I came into the House. Secondly, his Director told me that no programs had been developed, and they did not expect any programs to be developed for six weeks, that they had started two weeks ago and they did not know where they would be going.

Now, in light of that, I would like to ask the Minister if the problems of the young people involved can be dealt with in a foster home situation? If programs can be designed for each individual young person, does the Minister not think that six weeks is a very short time to design those programs? Why did the Minister put a closing date on that facility before programs and needs of the young people were fully assessed? And why did the Minister not have an alternate facility or alternate programs ready before he announced the closure of that institution?

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would have thought, from my former days in the Opposition, that he hon. Member would have had the ability to research the question and find



out the answer before he asked it. I can assure the hon. Member that whoever gave him the answers, or whichever way he interpreted them, they are absolutely wrong. First of all, there are a number of employees at the facility now, and we have set a closing date of June 30. We did not want to close that facility after something serious had happened, it would just be a reactionary. We would much rather close the facility before something happens.

Secondly, for the number of boys there now there will be an interim program in place. They will be placed in special care with the proper support services.

An Hon. Member: Where? Where?

Mr. Efford: In foster homes with special care - not the regular foster home situation - until the proper programs are put in place.

In answer to his third question, did we close the Coach House without some sort of alternate program in place for the future? No, Mr. Speaker. We have a pilot project proposal in place, therapeutic foster home care, where we will be involving special foster homes, professional people, with the proper counselling services on an individual basis, because we believe it is very serious to keep five boys in one institution with severe behavioural problems; it has not worked in the number years the Coach House has been developed. But the program being put in place now by the Director of Child Welfare is a program that is adequate to serve the needs of those boys, Mr. Speaker, and it will be put in place. It is not something we are dreaming up. We did not react to something for the

short term; a long-term program is being put in place, we have it on paper, and when it is ready to be presented to the House of Assembly, I will be making a public announcement.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) your staff?

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

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the Director of Child Welfare, whom the Minister refers to, and he told me he could not tell me where the students were going to go, because it would be six more weeks before the program. They did not know they were going to design the program around the individual student, and that is the basis on which I asked the question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Hon. Members are increasingly debating the answers.

Mr. Hodder: It is hard not to.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. Members know, that is not within the rules of the House. On a supplementary, hon. Members should proceed to the question as quickly as possible.

The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, the Minister closed the Remand Centre and did nothing to improve the situation, and now he has closed this particular - my question to the Minister: is this another of his pigheaded decisions carried through blindly? If the building

was inadequate, why did he not find another facility? And why did he not make sure that programs were designed around those children and the foster homes? At the present time, it is seventeen to four down there. It is not two at the present time, or else somebody is lying. It is seventeen to four, and they are highly - why didn't the Minister have these programs ready before he moved those children? Is this a cost-saving measure?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, in all cases any Minister responsible for his Department would take financial costs into concern when he is dealing with any program. But I can assure this hon. House that at no time was the financial aspect of this particular program given any consideration when the decision was made to close the Coach House. We decided, not I decided, we decided on the advice of the Director of Child Welfare and officials in the Department, that it was better to close the Coach House before something serious happened.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: And the hon. the Member -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Efford: The hon. Member keeps referring to the fact that there is no program in place. I have said very clearly that there is an interim program being put in place to deal with the boys until a final program for the future, not something to react to in short

term - we need to do something positive for those boys, unlike the former Administration who left them down there. The Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, the neighbors, the staff at the Coach House and everybody concerned advised the then Minister of the major problems they were having. And it has not stopped. We have now made a decision in the best interest of the boys. And if the Opposition critic or anybody in the public thinks they are going to change our minds and we are going to be pressured into making a wrong decision, they are absolutely wrong. The one concern we do have is the interest of the youth. There will be a better program, which we already have in the development stage, and we have an interim program for the short term. And when the six weeks are up, on the 30th of June, those boys will be well taken care of, and nobody will get lost in the cracks.

Some Hon. Members: Where? Where? Where?

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. From time to time, the Premier as Leader of the Government and the Minister of Municipal Affairs have been accused of forcing amalgamation down the throats of various communities. I have heard the Premier, of course, deny that. In fact, I think he has said the Government is not forcing amalgamation, that there are no fait accomplis, shall we say, with respect to the amalgamation process. Can he confirm that this is still, in fact, the Government's position on the issue?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I will restate again the Government's policy with respect to amalgamation. We will do everything possible to induce communities to amalgamate where it is appropriate that they should amalgamate. If particular communities do not want to amalgamate, the Government will not pressure or force amalgamation by order of the Cabinet, as it can do under the existing legislation. Now, I have also said that it may be that next year, this year, five years from now, a circumstance could occur where everybody is absolutely certain that any one particular community should be amalgamated, that it is totally irrational and wrong to preserve a situation with a separate municipality in a given situation. In that circumstance, if the Government felt it was the appropriate thing to do, we would bring legislation before this House to do it. I do not foresee at this moment any circumstance where that would be the appropriate thing to do, but I do not preclude the possibility of it.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Premier's statement, where he now confirms that nothing will be forced, and in view of the fact that there is a process in place for public hearings, ongoing meetings, and a board of commissioners who are expected to make recommendations, I want to ask my supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the Minister aware of the statement of his colleague, the Minister of Forestry, made last Wednesday, in Windsor, where he said and I quote, at least from

an newspaper article which quoted him, 'the Minister of Forestry told Windsor residents and Chamber of Commerce that by fall the communities of Grand Falls and Windsor will be amalgamated.' If he is aware of statement, and I am sure he is, doesn't he think that such a statement from a Cabinet Minister makes a mockery and a sham of the whole public hearings process, the ongoing meetings that are being held, and most importantly, the yet-to-be-released recommendations of the commissioners who might very well recommend against amalgamation? Can I ask the Minister if he is aware of those statements?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, the Member asked the question of me first as to what the Government policy is? I do not know whether the Minister said those precise words or if he did not, but I will ask him. I know it was reported in the newspaper, but hon. Members know that newspapers are not always absolutely correct, although in this instance they may be. And it may be that the hon. Member took it out of context, I do not know. But the Government's policy is exactly as I have -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: I will start again, Mr. Speaker. The Government's policy is exactly as I have enunciated it here, and Windsor and Grand Falls will know that the Government is not going to force amalgamation on Windsor and Grand Falls. But equally, Mr. Speaker, the Government is not going to allow to persist forever the totally unfair situation that exists at this moment in Grand

Falls, and if the two communities choose not to amalgamate, the Government will take other action to resolve the problem, and that may well be by fall.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, this must be the flip-flop of the decade. The Premier, during the same Question Period, in a series of answers, says on the one hand no, we will not force, and then says he will. I want to ask my final supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is speaking, I understand, tonight in Central Newfoundland, as he told me on Friday, to the Grand Falls Chamber of Commerce out there. By the way, I will table the newspaper article to show that I did not take it out of context. I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if he will take the opportunity tonight, when he speaks to the Chamber of Commerce in Grand Falls, to publicly indicate to the people of both communities that in fact the Government's policy is not to force amalgamation, that in fact Government's policy is to let the process follow the normal way it would, that you are waiting for the recommendations of the commissioners, and that, indeed, the comments of the Minister of Forestry, if indeed they are accurate and true, are totally wrong and improper, and that the Minister of Forestry should not have made such statements?

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

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, in fact I understand the Minister's comments in Grand Falls are very

similar to the comments you just made. In fact, he did take time to say that we were at a stage in the procedures right now where we were awaiting the commissioner's report, which is being written right now by the two commissioners, a report to me as the Minister, and following that report, of course, I will know how the commissioners feel about the proposed amalgamation. That is one part of the feasibility process; it is about 20 per cent of the process, and the rest of the feasibility process has to be carried out. But, ultimately, they will write a report for me and following that, of course, I will have a dialogue with the towns involved.

Yes, tonight I will go to great pains to explain the procedure, as I have done on many, many occasions when I have spoken about amalgamation, explain the procedure involved, in that we will carry out the balance of the feasibility process, await the commissioner's report, and then proceed to make a decision as Minister, first of all, and finally a recommendation to Government as to whether or not we should proceed with a recommendation to Government, in the first instance, and then ultimately whether or not amalgamation is recommended.

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

Mr. Winsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Fisheries. Is the Minister of Fisheries aware that under this year's salmon management plan there are proposals along several salmon fishing rivers, or mouths of the rivers, to move the caution boards

a considerable distance from where they were last year, and that if this plan is implemented, several fishermen will no longer have a place to fish?

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

Mr. Carter: I apologize. I was reading something here. Would he mind repeating the question?

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

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Fisheries: Is he aware that under this year's salmon management plan there are proposals to move the caution boards some considerable distance, miles as a matter of fact, from where they were placed last year, and if this is indeed the case, several fishermen will have no place to fish?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that. There are talks going on between the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans and other interests with respect to salmon management. We have made certain views known to Ottawa in that respect, and I'll be happy to table at the appropriate time, copies of my correspondence in that regard.

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

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, this is more than talks. DFO officials met fishermen in my district yesterday, six of them, telling them that the caution boards were indeed going to be moved and they would not have a place to fish.

The Minister has said on many occasions in this House that he stands solidly behind the commercial salmon fishermen of this Province. Will he, or as he made representation to DFO to articulate the Province's position as it relates to the commercial salmon fishery?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I say again what I have said publicly, that we are behind the commercial salmon fishery. We all realize that certain changes have probably had to be made, but certainly we are going to stand behind the commercial salmon fishery. We realize that certain adjustments will be necessary to protect the salmon stocks, and we have made those views known to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Oral Question Period has expired.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

#### Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

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

Dr. Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to table the report of the Commission of Inquiry on Pensions which the Government has recently received and after we review it, we will be making a further statement.

#### Notices of Motion

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

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution:

WHEREAS the inshore fixed gear fishery on the south/south west and west coast of the Province have experienced dismal catch failures over the last several years; and

WHEREAS inshore fixed gear fishermen and plant workers in the areas in question find themselves in very difficult circumstances; and

WHEREAS these fishermen and plant workers have called on the Federal Government to provide financial assistance to meet their immediate circumstances; and

WHEREAS the recently announced Federal Fisheries Response Program made no reference to the plight of these fishermen and plant workers; and

WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has made repeated requests to the Federal Government to address this serious problem; and

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House expresses its dissatisfaction over the failure of the Federal Government to respond to the needs of inshore fixed gear fishermen and affected plant workers in said referenced areas; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this hon. House calls upon the Federal Government to immediately implement a financial assistance package which adequately addresses

the immediate economic difficulties of fixed gear fishermen and plant workers along the south/south west and west coast of this Province.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

### Petitions

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

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 179 residents of the communities of Lourdes, L'Anse-aux-Canard, Winterhouses, Mainland, Three Rock Cove and West Bay. Mr. Speaker, the petition has been addressed to this House and the Federal House but the prayer of the petition reads: We the undersigned fishermen of Black Duck Brook petition the Provincial and Federal Governments to ensure the fourteen week requirement for unemployment insurance be reduced to ten weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I would read perhaps the letter that accompanied the petition and refer the petition to perhaps the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations who could then refer the petition to her counterpart in Ottawa, perhaps. It was the clear intention of the petitioners that their prayer should be heard, and I believe it should be heard. But the letter involved said 'the fishermen of this area are disappointed over the fact that with all of the hard times we have experienced over the years, this year will be the worst.' It goes on to talk about ice conditions that have already affected the lobster fishermen of Port au Port. I think hon. gentlemen might know or they might

be interested in knowing that Port au Port supplies 20 per cent of the lobsters of the whole Province. And they feel with the closure of their fish plant, with the severe ice conditions, and with the normal stormy conditions that this year will be a very hard year on them indeed, with having to have fourteen weeks to quality instead of ten. And they are asking that we do something about it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will table this petition and ask that it be referred to the Department of Employment and Labour Relations and perhaps that the Minister would forward it on to her counterpart in Ottawa.

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

Ms Cowan: Yes, I thank the Member for bringing that to the attention of the House and to my attention, in particular. He will be aware, of course, that this is a concern that we all have in the whole House and I have been continually talking to the hon. Barbara McDougall about that matter, and, in fact, just recently had written to her about some people who fish in Labrador. So certainly I will be glad to send supporting letters along with this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Order 2, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order 2 - The Motion is that I do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee on Supply.

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

#### Committee of the Whole on Supply

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In continuing debate on the Estimates of Executive Council it has become evident over the past number of days and nights - I am sorry to keep the Minister of Education awake there - it has become evident that Members on both sides of the House have taken advantage of the opportunities to talk about interests they have, particular interests on specific Government policies and so on. And I must say that the first six or seven hours we dealt with specifics in the Estimates and detailed questions on the Premier's Office and the President of Treasury Board's Office and so on. A whole bunch of questions which are still held in abeyance, and I expect the President of Treasury Board now to sometime give me some answers back, hopefully today or tonight.

An Hon. Member: Tonight.

Mr. Simms: Tonight maybe, okay. Good because there are other questions I want to get onto, but I do not want to pile up too many questions; and he has a whole slew of them there that I would expect to get some answers to.

Now in addition to that six or

seven hours, we have also touched on a lot of other interesting topics. Topics that come under the whole ambit of the Premier's Office, as Leader of the Government, and we have agreed on both sides that you can talk about just about any issue. Members will recall, we have talked about education, we have talked about wildlife issues, Sunday hunting, we have talked about fisheries, certainly, we spent one whole evening on the fisheries issue, we have talked about some of the initiatives of the Minister of Finance, or lack of initiatives, we have talked about health issues, we have talked about municipal, or issues that come under the purview of the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, and on and on it goes.

I have some other topics I would like to introduce now, in the hope Members opposite will take the opportunity to stand and give us their position, Government's position, or whatever the case might be, their own personal view, in many cases.

For example, on the topic of Sunday hunting, you will recall that we received a wide range of viewpoints from Members on both sides. I remember the Member for Bellevue pointing out that his position was squarely with his constituents. We asked what was that, and he said he had done a poll and he had received a 50/50 response, fifty per cent in favour and 50 per cent against. So, he stood squarely with his constituents, which was a bit humorous, obviously, but it does not show much leadership and, presumably, the Member will one of these days be able to make a decision as to where he stands.

The Member for St. George's indicated total support for Sunday hunting. The Member for Lewisporte indicated total support for Sunday hunting. I indicated total support for the issue of Sunday hunting. On the other side of the coin, you have some Members over there, particularly Ministers, which I can understand, I guess, who indicated that they were still thinking about it or they were not prepared to say what they publicly felt. We have the Minister of Environment, who is quoted publicly, saying he will be recommending to Cabinet to allow Sunday hunting. We asked him to take the opportunity to tell us if he was quoted accurately or not and what, indeed, his position was, and I have not had a chance to review Hansard yet, but I will be looking forward to reading it. It seems to me he skated all around the issue and did not exactly say directly.

But the most illuminating suggestion, Mr. Chairman, you will recall, the most illuminating suggestion on that topic, in addition to all these different viewpoints we had, was the compromise position, the infamous compromise position put forward by none other than the Member who introduced the motion for Wednesday's debate, the Member for LaPoile District. He had a great solution to the whole question, the whole issue of Sunday hunting, and I am hoping the Minister responsible for wildlife will stand up today in the debate and tell us how he feels about the compromise position suggested by his colleague, the Member for LaPoile, who said -

An Hon. Member: Do you support that?



Mr. Simms: What? His compromise? No, no! No, the Member for Gander is not quite sure how he is going to deal with Sunday hunting. But, here was the compromise of the Member for LaPoile. I said, 'What is your position on Sunday hunting?', because he had been harassing me the night before to give mine, and I did. When he finally got on his feet, he said, 'Well, I think there is a compromise to this whole Sunday hunting issue. There is a compromise.' 'Oh, yes? What is that?' He said, 'Well, I think the compromise is that we allow Sunday hunting after 12:00 noon on Sunday, but in the morning there would be no hunting.'

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: If I could just finish. He said, 'Allow Sunday hunting after 12:00 noon, with no hunting before 12:00 noon.'

An Hon. Member: Oh, my, oh, my!

Mr. Simms: And somebody said, 'Well, the idea is, we would have to tie alarm clocks around the necks of the moose I suppose, and set them for 12:00 noon, so they would know when hunting was underway.'

An Hon. Member: That is the Economic Recovery Team.

Mr. Simms: It sounded like it might be a recommendation from the Economic Recovery Commission, to tell you the truth. And I am hopeful that the Minister of Environment and Lands will tell us how he feels about the infamous compromise position put forward by his colleague, the Member for LaPoile. That is quite accurate.

An Hon. Member: He did not even

make The Sunday Express.

Mr. Simms: You did not make The Sunday Express this week.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some other issues I would like to discuss in the Estimates Debate and I hope Members will respond to them.

I was hoping the Minister of Mines and Energy would be back. Does anybody know when he is due back, by the way?

An Hon. Member: He is back.

Mr. Simms: Oh, he is here. Do you think he might be listening? I have a whole list of questions as he missed most of the debate last week. Can I count on the Whip? I will count on the Whip, the man who should be in Cabinet, the only veteran that was returned in the last election who did not get a Cabinet post and should be in Cabinet.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: But the Whip could pass on these topics to the Minister of Mines, if he would do so I would appreciate it. We would like a report on the oil show in Houston that he just returned from, I understand, where Hibernia was a topic of interest no doubt. We would like to have an update on the whole Hibernia project, when you consider the fact that the original deadline on the Hibernia negotiations, I believe, was somewhere in June, June 18, I think, was the date that sticks in my mind. And if June 18, or whatever it is, was the date, maybe he can tell us, since that is only three or four weeks away, is everything finalized? Because you would not

think there would be much left to do if they are going to meet those deadlines?

Another update on the negotiations with the Province of Quebec. I would like to know how close they are with the Province of Quebec with respect to the Hydro negotiations with the Province of Quebec. Could he tell us a bit about the gold find in King's Point down in Green Bay area. The gold find in King's Point. Now I know the Minister of Finance is quite capable of answering that question. But I think it is more properly asked the Minister of Mines, he is the one responsible. But I would like to know what the possibilities are with respect to that gold find in King's Point.

We have asked them to give us an overall update on the mineral situation, mining potential in central Newfoundland, which is one of the areas of the Province I think that has the greatest potential for mining. And there are other topics that, of course, the Minister will respond to and address when his time comes.

I also want to give notice, by the way, I want to remind those in the public sector with respect to being unions. The unions in the public sector in particular who may or may not be aware of the notice in the newspaper of the review of the labour legislation, overhaul of Bill 59, as it is commonly referred to. And unless union leaders and union organizations are aware of it they might not be aware that they must give notice of an interest to participate in hearings by the Legislative Review Committee, chaired by the Member for St. John's South. They must give notice of their intent by this

Friday. And unless that is better publicized and more widely publicized than simply putting an add in the newspaper, I am afraid there is a possibility that some of those unions might not be aware of it. Unless, of course, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, who has a fantastic repertoire with the Members -

An Hon. Member: Report.

Mr. Simms: Report, I am sorry, and a repertoire. She has a fantastic repertoire. But she has a good report with union leaders in this Province. She said she does. Now they do not say she does, but she says she does. I would assume that she has taken an interest and advised all of them by phone of the importance of them giving notice to the Chairman of the Committee by this Friday, otherwise they may not be able to appear before the public hearings. So we want to give it as much notice as we possibly can.

Ms Cowan: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Precisely. And that was the next point I was about to make. Those who are involved with the Employers Labour Relations Council, I think is the group, and anybody else who might have an interest in labour legislation in this Province, because this is a significant piece of legislation. I am sure there will be a considerable amount of time spent on it by the Committee. I suspect they will have some hearings around the Province which would be the right thing to do. So I am just saying, I hope the Minister will notify all of these groups by phone, because if they do not give notice by Friday, they may not have seen the ad in the paper, and I think that is the only bit of

advertising or promotion shall we say that the Committee itself would have undertaken.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much time I have left in this volley, but do I have a few more minutes?

Mr. Chairman: One minute.

Mr. Simms: One minute.

Well I would like to raise the question of cars, the Ministers' cars, the elimination of Ministers' cars that the President of Treasury Board referred to on Friday in a Ministerial Statement here in the House. Perhaps the Minister of Finance, in the Treasury Board Presidents absence, would give us an opportunity to respond. I think the Minister said in his statement that when they did the analysis, the cost annually of operating a car was somewhere in the area of \$12,000. I believe those were the figures that he used, in fact, in his statement. I do not have the statement right in front of me. And I presume that was the cost of the vehicles spread over a period of time and also the cost of gasoline and everything else, the \$12,000 figure. I would like for him to confirm that for me.

And I would also like to ask him this: When he made the statement he made reference to the previous Tory Administration's last year in office and what it cost? He used the figure of \$300,000. But what I would like to know is what was the cost for the last fiscal year, the first Liberal fiscal year of operating these vehicles? Because my guesstimates would be, using the same number of \$12,000 approximately for fourteen cars or whatever it was, it would be about

\$168,000 last year. Therefore the question has to be asked, why are you eliminating the vehicles this year if it is still going to cost you \$150,000? It does not seem to me to be a lot of savings for that kind of a move? So perhaps the Minister of Finance could answer that as I am not sure if the President of Treasury Board got the gist of the question.

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

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: Okay, I will just leave it for now, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you,

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

Mr. Kelland: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to continue with what I was saying the other evening as I just had a couple of minutes at that time, and it certainly does deal with the questions on Sunday hunting. I, also as mentioned by the Opposition House Leader, I would like to see the transcripts of the evening sessions, which we haven't seen yet, to see some of the questions which were raised by Members that I could probably address. I know some of them right from the top of my head, but I would have to review how many questions were asked in order to address them all.

In that minute and a half or two minutes which I had when we last sat, Mr. Chairman, I just made reference to Sunday hunting in response to what the hon. Member raised as an issue, and I think I clearly indicated at that time it

is public knowledge that the issue of Sunday hunting, whether or not the ban should remain in place or be lifted, it is a matter of public knowledge, everybody knows and everybody also knows that the present Administration is a very responsible body that takes all complaints and concerns seriously, and therefore would take some action whether review, assessment, reassessment, re-evaluation of any question, and if a decision is required then of course the Cabinet will make that decision. My personal view with respect to Sunday hunting, Mr. Chairman, is not significant in this case. Within the confines of the Cabinet room, I would present my arguments for whichever position I take on the subject as an individual Cabinet Minister. I guess it is also public knowledge that any paper with respect to Sunday hunting would be presented by my Department, therefore by me in Cabinet - when that will be, whether or not there will be a paper remains to be seen, but when the time comes, and as I said the public is fully aware that a decision sometime down the road will have to be made, there will be three very obvious options in that context I would ask Government to consider and those options are: Whether or not to keep the current ban in place and therefore allow no Sunday hunting anywhere in the Province. The second option would be to lift the ban entirely which would allow Sunday hunting everywhere in the Province by whoever wish to hunt on Sunday, a properly licenced hunter, and the third option would be some modified form of lifting of the ban so that perhaps Sunday hunting may be permitted in more remote areas - wilderness areas where only hunters would generally and normally be found. Those are

the three options. I don't think I have changed my position anyway with respect to that, and I think it is quite obvious and it is a matter of public knowledge. When that will take place, I can't, unfortunately, give a time frame, but hon. Members across the way would be aware of the workings of Cabinet and how these things come about. So for the time being, I suppose, we would let it rest there as far as I am concerned, until such time as all possible input and all sides of the question have been received, and I have received considerable input on both sides of the question. It seems to me though, to be fair and totally honest about it, the preponderance of opinion that I have recovered appears to be on the side of lifting the ban, if not totally then in some modified form. To give evidence to that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention that we do indeed have from Mr. Gordon Rice, a petition bearing something like 30,000 names, and Mr. Rice's involvement with this goes back a few years now, when there were some court cases involving his situation. Additionally, I have received correspondence from both sides of the question, and I have also appeared on a number of electronic media outlets, and probably I could mention the sort of input that I received on those occasions. On a radio show, we had fourteen callers if my memory serves me correctly who called in to express an opinion.

Ten of these callers agreed with the principle of Sunday hunting. They thought the ban, the current ban, should be lifted. Four of the callers, the other four, were against Sunday hunting. But in each case I posed a question, for my information, back to those four

callers and I asked them how they would feel if Government sometime down the road made a decision to have a partial ban. In other words the more remote areas allow Sunday hunting, and the more congested and heavily populated areas where other activities were under way to maintain the ban. And three of those four people thought that that may not be a bad idea, they agreed with that.

So my indication there for that show at that time, ten of the fourteen were in favor of lifting the ban, three of the fourteen were willing to see the ban lifted in a modified form, and the remaining person was dead set against Sunday hunting. And I believe the figures are very, very close to a similar program on a television show. Fourteen or fifteen callers, ten or eleven in favor of Sunday hunting, one or two fairly firm against Sunday hunting, and the balance three or four were saying some modified form. In areas where people, other than hunters, are not there then we probably could consider it. This is what the feeling was.

I know the hon. the Member for Grand Falls, who gets the most time in the House by the way, Mr. Chairman, properly on his feet, and by the very nature of his position puts him on his feet more than the average Member of the House, and then fifty percent of his time in his seat he is speaking. So he gets a lot of time in the House, and if he will be patient he will have another ten minutes shortly and I will try to respond to any sensible questions he raises to the best of my ability.

And with respect, he throws little comments out to try to throw other

Members off stride, Mr. Chairman, and he wonders what about the position or the suggestion by the Member for LaPoile, and what about the suggestion from Port au Port and Bellevue and Lewisporte and all of these different things.

I would like to say there are always a variety of opinions expressed in the House, and that every Member of the House of Assembly, as an MHA, has the opportunity to express his or her views, his or her suggestions, and all suggestions, if a Government is a good Government, all suggestions, no matter how ludicrous they may appear to other Members of the House, will be given some consideration, because every Member of the House of Assembly is put here by the choice of the people he or she represents. So, I do not think it is becoming of any particular Member to ridicule and down-play and poke fun at the suggestion of another Member of the House of Assembly, because in effect when someone does that and tries to make a joke of, or down-play or ridicule another Member - what that individual is doing at that time is tossing a very serious and substantial insult, not just to the individual Member but to the people who put him or her in the House of Assembly to start off with. So be very careful, I suggest to the Members of the House of Assembly, that fun is fun. A few jokes and the odd remark are not so bad, but when you pointedly try to ridicule another Member of the House simply because he or she made some sort of a suggestion, which may be a very valid suggestion, how can we as good responsible Members of the House of Assembly down-play the importance or the significance of any suggestion no matter how big

or small.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Kelland: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simms: I know I have already been up once.

An Hon. Member: That's okay.

Mr. Simms: I thank my colleagues for their warm reception.

Before the Minister runs away - I notice he runs out of the House very quickly - he spent ten minutes not answering my question. Again, my question was -

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

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands, on a point of order.

Mr. Kelland: Did we not make a ruling in the House just within the last day or so that references to Members in and out of the House and their attendance is improper and unparliamentary?

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: You are not allowed to make references to a Member's absence, not going back and forth, that is acceptable.

Anyway, now that the Minister has come back, he skated around my question quite nicely. I wanted to know: Is it a fact, as reported by the press, that he spoke to the Newfoundland Wildlife Federation, I believe it was, out in the constituency of my good friend and colleague, the Member for Gander? And did he say to the Newfoundland Federation of Wildlife that he was going to recommend to Cabinet that Cabinet support the concept and idea of Sunday hunting? That is what the Minister of Environment is reported to have said, that he will recommend to his Cabinet colleagues to support Sunday hunting.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well, that is what he is reported to have said.

Now, I raised it three times, in the hope that the Minister might get up and say, no, that is not accurate, because if it was accurate, then I would suggest that is a breach of the oath of office a Minister would take. You do not go out around saying what you are going to recommend to your Cabinet colleagues, that is strictly internal, confidential Cabinet deliberations. So, again, the Minister did not answer. Then I asked him what his own position was on Sunday hunting, and he talked about all the options that were talked about and how some people think this is okay and some people think the other thing is okay, and so on, but he never did say what his position is. Then, of course, I asked him to comment on the infamous Ramsay Accord, which would put forth a compromise position on Sunday hunting, where you would wake the moose up at 12:00 on Sunday and tell him, 'Okay, get out, you are going to

be hunted.' But before 12:00, they could all stay home or rest, that sort of thing. I thought it an interesting compromise. But the Minister of Environment obviously does not think much of the Ramsay Accord, because he would not even comment on it. He passed it off by saying, 'Oh, well, people have all kinds of weird and interesting -' I do know if he used the word 'weird', maybe I am being presumptuous, I should not have put that word in there, but people have all kinds of unusual suggestions, and that is one of them, to say the least.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious we are not going to get the Minister of Environment to tell us if he did say publicly he was going to recommend to Cabinet that Sunday hunting be approved. I had hoped he might.

My friend, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations has just strolled back into the House. I am hoping she will take advantage of the Estimates Debates to stand in her place today and answer the question that was asked of her several days ago. On Wednesday, I believe, my colleague, the Member for Grand Bank, wanted to know how much of the so-called \$14 million, which is allocated in her Department, as I understand it, is for the three fish plants to keep them open for another year? The Minister, as I recollect - I do not have a Hansard in front of me - said she would be giving a statement in a day or two. Now, that was Wednesday; a day would have been Thursday, two days would have been Friday. It is now five days, and I wonder, perhaps if the Minister would like, she could stand in her place during the Debate on the Estimates and give us the precise

answer. You hardly need a statement. You need ask only your Deputy Minister to get the information for you. How much has been expended from the \$14 million that our Government has been bragging we put up? How much have we spent, how much have we given? For example, to a company like FPI, who just recently announced a profit in their first quarter? How much of the \$14,000,000 have you given to FPI. So, I hope the Minister will take advantage of that to tell me.

The Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs is not here, but the President of Treasury Board would be very aware of this and very familiar. We just had some new appointments to the Board of the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador. It would have gone through Cabinet, so the Minister, my colleague and friend, the President of Treasury Board, who is very alert in Cabinet, around the Cabinet table, would be well aware of the appointments to the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador.

And the question I would like answered - it is in today's paper, as a matter of fact. There is one position there. The position is a Judy Foote, Mount Pearl, and my question is a simple one and an obvious one, I guess: Is this the same person who works in the Premier's Office? Surely, it cannot be, but I am just asking, is it? It may have gone unnoticed, because surely that would be a direct conflict of interest, to have somebody in the Premier's office appointed to the Heritage Foundation. The Board of the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador. The Chairman, I think, is Mr. Shane

O'Dea and a Mr. Chalker from St. John's is the Executive Secretary, and so on, on that particular board. There is a person there, Judy Foote, who may have been on the Board in the past, because what they did, I think, is they left so many on for continuity and then added some new ones, but surely if that is the same Judy Foote in the Premier's Office then there is a potential conflict there, I would think. The Premier's Parliamentary Assistant who takes the Premier everywhere, and looks after him everywhere, every which way but loose, might be able to get that information and pass it on to the House, because I think it would be interesting to know if it is accurate.

Mr. Chairman, I think, the Minister of Finance is anxiously jumping in his seat over there.

An Hon. Member: He is going to give a good speech.

Mr. Simms: He is going to give a good speech, is he? Well, I am afraid he is not going to have much time because we will soon have His Honour coming here.

An Hon. Member: You do not give him a chance.

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Finance has had more chances than any Member of this House to speak. We have egged him on and asked him questions left, right and centre. How many times have you seen him glued to his seat? Now, all of a sudden he wants to get up. Well, he can wait. As a matter of fact the Minister I am most interested in hearing from -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: No, I am not going to attack the Minister of Finance any more, nor any less. The Minister of Mines and Energy is the Minister we have been waiting to hear from. Where has he been? He will not be up next. The Minister of Finance insists he is going to be up next, so you had better fight it out between yourselves. Where has the Minister of Mines and Energy been? I have not seen his smiling face, his smiling Tory face for days, and days.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Tory face. He is a Tory, The Minister of Mines and Energy.

An Hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Simms: Next to your Premier he is one of the biggest Tories over there because he is the most Conservative of all, that I have ever seen. The Minister of Mines and Energy has been gone for a week, down to Houston, having a good time, no doubt, but also working very hard. I hope that the party whip, the Member for Stephenville who should be Minister of Mines and Energy, by the way, not the present Minister, but the Member for Stephenville should be the Minister, has given him a list of the questions that I would like him to address when he does get to his feet. He has given them all to him because I have asked some pretty interesting questions.

Mr. Chairman, my old friend the Minister of Forestry who is having an ongoing battle competing with the Minister of Finance to see who can get the most press for putting ones foot in ones mouth more frequently than the other. It is back and forth. We should



reinstitute that aware we used to give on free for all Friday mornings, for the one that gets the best coverage on major faux pas. My friend the Minister of Forestry has done it now on two occasions.

By the way the Minister of Education is very, very upset with him, and now the Minister of Municipal Affairs is upset with him, but I want him to ask when he stands to his feet to speak in the debate, he has announced cutbacks at Wooddale and he has given some pretty misleading excuses for the number of cutbacks and what will happen to those who require unemployment insurance, and so on. I am sure he has heard my rebuttal to his statements publicly, but he has said, most importantly, there will be less work at Wooddale for employees, and specifically twenty less jobs, in his statement. In his Budget 2.8.04 under Forestry Nurseries, under the salaries component of Forestry Nurseries, last year his Department spent \$1.227 million for salaries and this year he has budgeted \$1.496 million in salaries, which is an increase of nearly \$300,000, \$275,000 to \$300,000 in salaries, so I would like him to explain where he has in a salary vote, Forestry and Nurseries, an increase of \$300,000 more, how come there is a cutback of twenty positions at the Wooddale Nursery in Exploits, physically it is in Exploits. Sometime when he speaks I am sure he will address that for me. I asked the Minister of Education, but I did not catch his answer the other day. Perhaps the Minister of Finance -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: They are standing like anything over there now.

Mr. Simms: It is not hard to get him up at all now.

Dr. Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The last time I spoke, on Friday, I was conducting a seminar for the Members, largely of the Opposition who had trouble understanding how to properly criticize the Budget. And we got into a lesson on economics, on local economics, and they were not paying any attention, Mr. Chairman. They were not paying attention.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Dr. Kitchen: So I did what you normally do, and I learned this in Western Canada when I was out there, there was a guy who could not get his horse to go, and so he started hitting the horse over the head with a stick. And the clergyman came along and says, 'Why are you hitting that poor animal?' 'Well, he says, why don't you just make him go?' 'First, he said, Parson, you have to get his attention.' And now, Mr. Chairman, I got their attention. They are paying attention. Even the Leader of the Opposition, who was not in the House at the time, feels competent to comment on my remarks last week.

Mr. Simms: We all paid attention.

Dr. Kitchen: Now listen to this.

Let me say this, listen to this.  
I want to say now without -

AN. HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

Dr. Kitchen: I am! I am ! And always have been a great lover of chicken. In fact, I used to be a chicken farmer.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Dr. Kitchen: I used to be a chicken farmer. In fact, I believe we had the first incubator in central Newfoundland, where we used to hatch out the little chicken in an incubator, and unlike the hon. turkeys opposite, we were involved in chicken.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Kitchen: Well I did say hon. Should I withdraw the 'hon.', Mr. Chairman?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Kitchen: No.

Mr. Chairman: I suggest that the hon. Minister withdraw both comments, the 'hon.' and 'turkey'.

Dr. Kitchen: I will. Mr. Chairman, they are neither honourable nor turkey.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Kitchen: I certainly have no comments to make against any particular brand of chicken, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, I am beseiged by the other makers of chicken in the Province to see if I will mention their name in the House of Assembly as well.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Kitchen: As an old chicken farmer, Mr. Chairman, I am all for it. But what has happened, Mr. Chairman, is that they missed the whole point of the seminar. The seminar had to do with using local products and package them in such an attractive form that people will want to eat them. I remember mentioning seal, and how just a slight increase in the seal consumption by Newfoundlanders would absorb the number of seals that were caught annually in the Province. And when I was making reference to Members that I knew, who no longer liked seal, or they did not know how to prepare it, and I was lamenting that our educational systems and our people had lost some of these important skills that were contributing to the economic problems that we have in the Province. And what we have to do, I was saying with respect to the many wonderful local products we have seal, partridge berries and bakeapples and all the other things that we have in this Province - cod tongues, lobsters, and so on, would be to spend a lot of time marketing them so that we can sell them to markets.

And that is what we had to do.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) turrs.

Dr. Kitchen: I think there are a few turrs over there too: hon. turrs.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Dr. Kitchen: Oh, I see.

But, Mr. Chairman, having cleared up that point, and I am sure I would not want the people in Kentucky Fried Chicken to think that I was opposed to Kentucky Fried Chicken because I believe I had it that very night. I usually

eat it.

But I do say this, that I want to now come up with my next seminar, to begin my next seminar, which has to do with the appropriate way to handle loan guarantees. Now we have had loan guarantees in this Province for many years, Mr. Chairman. I would like to read out, and I have tabled this in the House before, the mess the former Government did with loan guarantees and all the payouts. They used to give loan guarantees without paying any attention to who was getting them very often, and very often the people whose loans they guaranteed went up the spout.

I remember tabling, last June, where the Government had to pay out \$2.5 million in about six or eight small loan guarantees they gave out. In addition, Mr. Chairman, quite recently I tabled another batch of loan guarantees, totalling over \$38 million, which were given out in a very haphazard way, and at that time I did not get an opportunity to discuss them at any great length. For instance, we paid out on behalf of Newfoundland Enviroponics, \$10.1 million, a loan guarantee to a company which could not pay up, so the Government had to pay up. Then, a little bit later, we had to pay out \$2.7 million on behalf of the Universal Group of Companies who could not hack it, could not meet it, and we, the Government, had to pay up; loans were guaranteed and then the Company went broke and we had to pay out.

Notre Dame Bay Fisheries, \$2.9 million we paid out, and so the story goes. On Bay Verte Mines we paid out \$20 million in a loan guarantee. You see, the total

last year was \$39 million because of the irresponsible manner in which the previous Government slashed out loan guarantees. Now, what this present Government has done, and I believe it is a very, very good thing - we, too, make guarantees, but we are much more careful. When a company comes to us who feel they need some Government support because the banks will not lend them the money, and they feel that if they had a Government guarantee they could get some working capital, we very carefully look at the proposition, very carefully look at it. If it is in fisheries, the Minister of Fisheries' Department looks at it, the Department of Finance looks at it, and the Department of Development looks at it. If it is in mining, the Department of Mines and Energy looks at it, along with the Department of Finance. We have put in place a set of strong criteria so that hopefully we will not have to pay out millions and millions of Government funds, taxpayers' dollars, to cover loan guarantees, guaranteed loans which are made on the spur of the moment, often in the past for silly schemes and untried ventures, ventures which are not carefully researched.

For example, Mr. Chairman, we do not give loan guarantees for term financing, it has to be for working capital. If somebody wants to buy equipment and things of that nature, well, that is not under the Loan Guarantee Program. Similarly, our loans are for resource based industries, for manufacturing industries, not for other things. The business must be an established business rather than a new one. There must be a need for the loan guarantee. In order words, if a company has

plenty of funds or can raise the money -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) a new company?

Dr. Kitchen: No, not unless it is an established business, taking over an established business, or something of that nature.

So there has to be need. In other words, if a group of people come to the Government and they really do not need money, then they are not going to get any. We are not going to take risk when a company can take it, or where they really do not need money. Similarly, the enterprise has to be viable - it has to be demonstrated to be viable. There is no use throwing money away just for the sake of keeping a business operating that has no chance of continuing profitably. So viability is a criterion, and so is management. You look at the management. Have they a good management team in place, or, have they not?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, is this the appropriate time to move that we -

Mr. Chairman: No. No.

Dr. Kitchen: All right, we will go a little longer then.

The other thing we do is insist that there be appropriate security, either in the form of assets the company has, or in the personal guarantees of the principals involved.

We insist that no dividends be paid, that no directors fees or payments to related companies be made unless there is Government

approval before these loan guarantees are in place. We set up a monitoring committee to watch carefully the progress of the company while the loan guarantee is in place. And Cabinet is kept informed at all times as to how things are going.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is this, that we have put in place a system of handling loan guarantees that will be prudent, that will be useful to the industries which require them. We are not going to throw away Government money on silly projects, as in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I move that we rise and report progress.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved and seconded that the Committee 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 (Lush): The hon. the Member for Bellevue.

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

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again presently, by leave.

Mr. Speaker: At this time, on behalf of hon. Members, I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly twenty-one students from Lake Academy, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Derrick Reid, from Fortune.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Sergeant-at-Arms: Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General has arrived.

Mr. Speaker: Admit His Excellency The Governor General of Canada.

Sergeant-at-Arms: All rise! Ladies and Gentlemen, it is the wish of His Excellency that all be seated.

Mr. Speaker: It is today my distinct, unusual and unique pleasure and privilege, on behalf of all hon. Members, to extend a most sincere, warm and cordial welcome to their Excellencies the Governor General of Canada and Mrs. Ramon John Hnatyshyn on this their official visit to our Legislature and to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

May I also recognize and welcome Mrs. Eleanor Wells and the Governor General's entourage. To our knowledge, this is the first time in which our Legislature in Session has been so privileged and honoured with a visit by a Governor General of Canada. As proud and loyal Canadians, we congratulate His Excellency on his recent appointment to the most respected and prestigious office of Governor General of Canada. It is the wish and hope of all hon. Members that the visit of their Excellencies to our Province and to our Legislature will be enjoyable and meaningful. I now recognize the Premier.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of all of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador I extend to Your Excellencies a most cordial and sincere welcome to the Province.

Excellences, au nom des citoyens de Terre-Neuve et du Labrador, je

vous souhaite la bienvenue dans notre Province.

While your visit on this occasion will be brief our people are both grateful and honoured because you have chosen to visit our Province so very early in your tenure as Governor General.

In expressing that welcome I am not unmindful that we have the unique distinction of welcoming you to the Province that is, in terms of European settlement at least, both the oldest and the youngest part of Canada at one and the same time. Recognizing, of course, that the history of the parts of Canada, prior to 1867, is also the history of Canada, then this Province, and this city, in terms of European settlement is the oldest part of Canada. We were also the last of the colonies and territories in North America to become a part of Canada and that makes us the youngest province.

It is also my pleasure to extend a most warm and cordial welcome on behalf of all Members of the Legislature and I am confident that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition will endorse that welcome. Even our Legislature is unique in Canada in that it is the only Legislature in the country, indeed, I believe it is the only Legislature in the Commonwealth, where the Government sits on the Speaker's left instead of on the Speaker's right.

Notwithstanding those things that make us unique in the country you will find our citizens to be the most devoted and loyal of Canadians. While taking great pride in this Province where we were born, or have chosen to live, and its tremendous heritage, we

nevertheless proclaim our greater loyalty to Canada, our nation that is the envy of so much of the rest of the world.

Speaking for all of our citizens I want to assure Your Excellency of our continuing loyalty and dedicated effort, in joining with our fellow citizens, to build a nation where all our people will have the benefit of personal well-being, good public services and equal economic opportunity.

It is the pursuit of these objectives together with our traditions of democratic freedoms and respect for the rule of law that give Canada the envied place that it has amongst the nations of the world.

In assuring you of our loyalty and dedication I want also, on behalf of all the citizens of this Province, to extend to Your Excellency our heartiest congratulations on your appointment and our sincere best wishes for a most successful and enjoyable tenure as Governor General. You are most sincerely welcome indeed, both of Your Excellencies. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. Rideout: I am very pleased on behalf of the Official Opposition to join with Mr. Speaker and the hon. the Premier in welcoming Your Excellencies to our Province today, and particularly to our House of Assembly on the occasion of your first official visit to Newfoundland and Labrador.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Your Excellency on your appointment. You bring to this position a long and

successful career in the public life of Canada and in the practice of your profession.

Your own background, Sir, and particularly your family roots also illustrate the unique nature of Canadian society. We are a country which values and, indeed, encourages diversity, both in the individual and in the collective sense. This is why we actively promote within our Constitution the multicultural nature of Canada which Your Excellency's background so richly illustrates. This is one of the factors which makes Canada a very attractive country for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who enjoy a very unique culture, developed from our own ancestry and from our relationship with the sea.

In Newfoundland and Labrador we particularly value our continued relationship with the Commonwealth and with The Queen. It is for this reason that Your Excellency as representative of The Queen as Head of State of Canada, and provincially in the office of the Lieutenant-Governor, has helped to bridge the transition between our constitutional history and our decision to become a province of Canada.

We are also mindful of the important constitutional role which the Governor General plays in our system of Government. As Canada's leading constitutional scholar Peter Hogg says, 'A system of responsible Government cannot work without a formal Head of State which has preserved certain reserved powers.' So your role and that of our Lieutenant-Governor is much greater than its ceremonial and symbolic aspects.

As Your Excellency is no doubt aware we have had situations in our constitutional history where these reserved powers have proved to be of considerable importance. We believe that in these very difficult times facing Canada, that the Governor General's role is a positive symbol of national unity and is of vital importance. We are confident that your background and your personal qualities will assist in this most important of your roles so that we continue to be a strong and united country in the months and years ahead. We are confident that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will extend to you our usual welcome and hospitality, and we trust that you will enjoy your stay in our Province.

Bonjour et bien neuf!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

His Excellency: Mr. Speaker, the Premier, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, and Members of the House of Assembly, ladies and gentlemen.

I thank you for your warm welcome on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Premier. Making this my first Provincial visit, I am reminded it is a little more than forty-one years since the people of this Province committed themselves to becoming part of Canada. In doing so they enriched us all and gave a new meaning and majesty to our country's motto, A Mari Usque Ad Mare, From Sea To Sea. And how proud Newfoundland has made us, how tenaciously determined we are to keep the Canada you helped us become.

Not only is Newfoundland part of Canada, it is part of all

Canadians, not everyone may have tasted bakeapples or fish and brewis, but the figure of the Rowdyman is part of our national treasure. Gordon Pinsent belongs as much to the people of Kamloops as he does to the people of Grand Falls. That is why his work is seen on television sets across the country.

The fame of Memorial University is not confined to this Province or indeed to this country. I understand, for example, that the work being done on giant squid has attracted world attention. And only a few weeks ago it was my pleasure to induct Doctors Chandra and House into the Order of Canada, in recognition of their work at Memorial in the field of Medicine.

Historiquement et géographiquement, Terre-Neuve a toujours servi de trait d'union entre l'Europe et le Canada. A ce titre, votre province constitue un lien important entre le passé de notre pays et son avenir.

Comme certaines régions de Terre-Neuve sont plus près de l'Irlande que du Manitoba, cela témoigne aussi du rôle de premier plan qu'a joué votre province dans le développement des télécommunications modernes.

In reflecting on the scope of Newfoundland's history, we remember that Henry VII of England gave John Cabot ten pounds for finding the "new island" nearly 40 years before any other explorer first saw the rest of Canada.

This is, indeed, an ancient and proud land. But Newfoundland is more than the sum of the great moments of its history. It is above anything else the people of

this Province who are its riches. Speaking personally I can tell you that it is more than twenty years since I first learned the story of NONIA, but I have never forgotten it. How in a depression the Women of Newfoundland's outports knitted clothing they could sell in order to finance visits from nurses their communities so desperately needed. Today the Crafts Movement begun by the Newfoundland Outport Nurses and Industrial Association is an important industry. The goods made in this Province are cherished throughout the world for their beauty and for the skill and integrity with which they are made.

But those of us who know its origins are moved by the generosity in the sense of mutual concern that was the beginning of NONIA and that is a foundation of so much of life in Newfoundland. I can assure you that Gert and I are looking forward to our time here, and to returning to bask in your famed hospitality as often as we can. In the years ahead, we hope to visit as many communities and meet as many Newfoundlanders as possible. Thank you for all the warmth of your reception, to the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier and to Mr. Speaker. The kindness you have already shown to us is very much appreciated. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I believe the motion now is, that I do leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee on Supply.

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!

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words again and make a few comments on exactly what the Minister of Finance did say in the debate of Friday, May 11, 1990. There was some indication today that comments were made in the heat of debate and I didn't understand that. When I was here, it didn't seem to be any heated debate, the Minister of Finance was conducting another seminar, and in his usual silly way, Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell you exactly what he did say. Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Finance says, you may be interested in knowing that the title of this seminar is: po-po platters. Silly! What a comment for a Minister of this Crown, Mr. Chairman.

He also said 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. Mr. Chairman, I don't know where he gets his information but Mr. Chairman, Kentucky Fried Chicken - the operation, and I am sure we good get a good seminar in the operations of Kentucky Fried Chicken from one Member of this House. The Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island, could give us a good seminar on the jobs that Kentucky Fried Chicken industry creates in this Province. I



understand that in the St. John's area alone, and my figures might not be correct, so I would appreciate if the Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island would get up in this discussion -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I just need to interrupt the hon. Member for a few minutes. I think, because of the way the sound travels, there is a request from the Protocol Office that hon. Members not hit the desk during the next half an hour while the Governor General is downstairs. We probably could clap instead.

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I won't excite anyone so much that they might have to hit the desk. I am not that type, but, I just want to inform hon. Members in this House and if I am not correct, the Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island will certainly correct it, but, I understand that the Kentucky Fried Chicken business in the St. John's area alone employs some 150 people, in just the St. John's area alone. Many more throughout the Province but I do not have those figures.

This business, Mr. Speaker, Kentucky Fried Chicken business, is going to be one of the businesses that the Minister of Finance is going to depend on to pay that 1.5 percent business tax I call it, payroll tax, in the future, and he is insulting him and trying to put him out of business. Mr. Chairman, if he had gotten up in the debate a few minutes ago and done what I think was the proper thing to do, I probably would not have stood in my place to speak right now. I think that the Minister of Finance

should have, the first time he got to his feet, the very first statements that he should have made was to have apologized to a good business in this Province, the Kentucky Fried Chicken business. He should also have apologized to the chicken producers in this Province who produce top quality chicken meat for the industries, not only Kentucky Fried Chicken, but many other industries.

He should also have apologized, I think, to over two hundred workers involved in Newfoundland Farm Products, the feed companies that operate because there is a chicken industry in this Province. And had he apologized, done what I think was the right thing for him to do, I would be here congratulating him now, because I would have let his comments go, maybe they were in the heat of debate, if he wants to claim that, I know that they were not, but I would have overlooked that. And had he made the apologies that I think are necessary, not only should they be done Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary that a Minister of the Crown in this province, who does make a mistake, none of us are infallible, I do not say that we all should be infallible, when we are a Minister in a Government we should be very careful of what we say, I think we all realize that. The Minister of Finance has shown himself to not give consideration to what he says. He insulted the Premier when he made his statements on Meech Lake, insulted him so much that the Premier had to apologize to Quebec, and apologize to the people of Newfoundland for the rash statement that the Minister of Finance made. Mr. Chairman, he also made this statement here, on the Kentucky Fried Chicken

garbage, which are very strong statements, and not something that a Minister of the Crown, or any Member of this House should say lightly.

But he also, and most people overlook it, he also was suggesting that this po po platter, which he was giving us a seminar on, was some kind of foreign food also. Mr. Chairman, I had some of this food at a local restaurant several times, and I noticed that there are pork products in this platter that are produced here in Newfoundland. There are fish products, shrimp certainly, but there are fish products sometimes on this platter which are produced here in Newfoundland. So the Minister has not only insulted the agricultural industry, he is insulting any food production industry that produces any food in Newfoundland, because he has the same ideas in his mind, the old time, old fashioned ideas, that if it is produced in Newfoundland it is not as good as if it were produced somewhere else, Mr. Chairman.

That is a problem that has always been fought by local producers in this Province. Local producers for quite some time now, have always fought the attitude that if it is produced here in Newfoundland, it is probably not as good as somewhere else, which is a total fallacy, because food products that are produced in Newfoundland, especially fresh foods, such as chicken and dairy products, are a better quality to Newfoundlanders because they are supplied to the marketplace in a fresh state. They are not trucked from other parts of Canada or other parts of the United States, so the quality is usually much better for locally produced

products. We all know that fish products in Newfoundland always taste better than they do elsewhere, but we do not always realize that agricultural products that are produced here, including cucumbers that used to be produced here, were a much better quality, Mr. Chairman, than what we are having trucked in.

When products are trucked from areas such as California, which supplies a lot of our food here, they are picked before they are ripe, Mr. Chairman, so you cannot get the right taste of the food in the product. Tomatoes, when they are sent here, they are picked before they are ripe, they are brought to the stores and they are gassed, Mr. Chairman, to turn them red so they will look presentable. But the exact taste of fresh food and probably the quality of this imported food is not up to standards, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the pickles that were produced here in Newfoundland were in very high demand, actually, in the Ontario and Quebec market. And the reason that they were in such high demand, and they were getting extra bonus prices for these products, was because they were produced herbicide free and insecticide free, which was a very good marketing ploy. It produced an extra special product, which I understand before the Newfoundland Clover Products in there now, ceased operation in there a few months ago, there was up to five tractor trailer loads of fresh product going out of this Province. The first time in our history that we were producing a quantity of vegetables to export to another market to bring in new finances and money into this Province, Mr. Chairman. And that

product, if the Government was not so blinded by the past publicity, if that facility was set up in some of the other fourteen areas of the Province that were looking for it - and the Minister of Agriculture is the last one in this House who should be making comments on this, because it is his job to produce food in this Province, Mr. Chairman. Yet he stands in his place today and supports the Minister of Finance insulting the farmers of this Province which he should hang his head in shame for doing such a thing, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment to the Minister of Finance in his - I leave that part for now, Mr. Chairman. I expect that the Minister of Finance will do the right thing eventually and get up. First of all he will apologize to the people who he has insulted, and the next correct thing that he should do, Mr. Chairman, is resign from the Cabinet because -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: - because this is his second or third attempt now at embarrassing the Government and certainly embarrassing the Premier. And if he had any gumption in him at all he would resign from Cabinet rather than have the Premier fire him next fall, Mr. Chairman, which I expect will happen by probably the last of October next year, when we will see some Cabinet changes and some new blood brought into the Cabinet.

This Cabinet is a year old now, Mr. Chairman. One year in office into their second year and they are stale already. They have created no jobs, they have not been pro-active on one single

issue that I know of, Mr. Chairman. Any announcements they have made have come from planning that was put in place by the former Administration. Most of the cuts that they put in place were recommendations that - many of them were refused by the former information, but they wanted to take these cuts. And early into their mandate they will take things away. It is the same ploy that Governments use, I suppose, world wide democratic Governments. Early into their mandate they take things away from people and take things away and increase taxes, and then the last year of their mandate or their election year they will give back some of the things they take away and hope that people will be foolish enough to believe that this is something new they are getting.

Mr. Chairman, I want to inform the Premier -

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 Mines and Energy.

Dr. Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the Member for Grand Falls for the questions today, and I will give him a report on a number of items.

The Member is probably most interested in the latter part of his questions when he asked about Mineral potential in Central

Newfoundland and the gold find at King's Point, so I am going to talk about that first.

In terms of mineral potential in this Province, Central Newfoundland including, for example, the Baie Verte Peninsula, along Notre Dame Bay and down through the Buchans Belt is probably, in terms of base metals and gold, the best part of this Province in terms of mineral potential. And there are a number of very interesting prospects.

The King's Point prospect that he referred to, owned by Noranda and Major General is a very interesting gold prospect. At this stage they have not proved enough for a mine. I believe the tonnage at this time that has been drilled off is about 250,000 tons. The grade of gold at 250,000 tons is about .35 ounces per ton, which is about three times the grade that is presently being mined at Hope Brook. So, at King's Point what we need is more tonnage of that grade, and we certainly could have a possible mine in the future. There is going to be more drilling this year.

In Central Newfoundland closer to Grand Falls at Duck Pond, Noranda is still working, still doing more drilling, and that project is still also going through the environmental impact process. We do not have a decision yet on whether they will be mining that ore. They have about five million tons proven, but there are prospects for more, and this year may be the year when we get a decision. I know a few months ago I was saying that I hoped for a decision and an end to the environmental impact process by mid-1990, by June or July or so.

I am not sure at this time when the Company will be in a position to make a decision.

A point which has some relevance to this is another new prospect in central Newfoundland, which the Member may have heard of recently, because it was only announced about a month ago by BP Canada, and this is approximately 20 kilometers from Buchans, just south and west of Millertown and Duck Pond. The new Daniel's Pond discovery is similar to Duck Pond, with grades of zinc that go up to almost 19 per cent in some of the drill hole intersections. We have great optimism for this prospect as well, and it may well be the one that will help put Duck Pond over the top in terms of tonnage to supply a mill. In 1990, we are expecting about 10 thousand meters of drilling this year.

There are other things in central Newfoundland as well of great interest in the mineral sector. Just east of Grand Falls, towards Birchy Bay, there is a very interesting antimony prospect being drilled by Noranda. They are continuing the drilling on that. Again no mine, but very good grades and some tonnage being proven. Another one I want to mention specifically is on the Bay Verte Peninsula, where Corona and Varna are continuing to drill a gold prospect near Ming's Bight - some very interesting grades, and I would hope that in the next few weeks they will announce some tonnages from that. None of these are immediate mines, but they are good prospects which may become mines in the future, all in central Newfoundland.

I will go now to the oil show in Houston. I know the Member for Grand Falls and some other Members

would like to get a report on that. Last week, the Minister of Development and I represented the Province at the oil show. The latest number I heard for attendance was about 27,000 delegates from seventy-five different countries in the world. If you mention a country which has any interest in oil at all, that country was represented at that oil show. We were there with a delegation of about two dozen or so Newfoundland business representatives, businessmen and women, and I believe they had a good show in terms of the contacts they made. We certainly had a good show in terms of the contacts we made and the meetings we had.

A couple of the specific things which happened last week that I really appreciated: number one was a tour of a fabrication facility operated by Brown and Root, which is one of the companies involved in one of the bids on offshore in Newfoundland. We got a feel from that tour, we got a feel for the type of facility we need to put in place on the Burin Peninsula, at Marystown and Cow Head, in terms of the scale of the operation and the types of things they need to put at Cow Head to be able to do the work we would like to see done there related to Hibernia. That was a very, very interesting tour that the Minister of Development and I went on on Tuesday morning of last week, in Houston.

Another tour we did on Wednesday morning was of the Stewart and Stevenson Yard in Houston. We were very, very pleased with that tour to see some of the things that company is making in a modular way, which are like the things which will have to be made to go on to the Hibernia platform.

So we had an excellent week, we made some excellent contacts. And the businesspeople who were there also, I believe, had an excellent week in Houston. I really appreciated it, but I also appreciated getting back home yesterday.

There were a couple of other points the Member for Grand Falls wanted to get some updates on. He mentioned Hydro Quebec, and he mentioned Hibernia. On Hydro Quebec I would like to say that last week our negotiating team had their most recent meeting, on May 7, and at that meeting they scheduled three more meetings for this Spring. So the process is still moving forward on hydro, in our negotiations with Quebec on Labrador power. And as that process continues, I would hope that by this fall we will be in a position to say whether or not we are going to be able to develop the remaining resources of the Labrador Churchill River.

On Hibernia: There is nothing really new to report on Hibernia right now, but the process is continuing to move forward. I believe we are still on a June 30 schedule. I have no reason to believe otherwise. But we are not there yet, we are still negotiating on the benefits and other issues. I would hope that within the next few weeks we will have more to report on that progress, and that by June 30 we can sign something.

On June 4, 5, and 6, when we have The Offshore Show in Newfoundland, there will be a lot of people visiting the Province from all over the world who are involved in offshore oil, and most of the companies, probably all of the companies which have any interest

in development will be here, and maybe we will have a little bit more to say by that time. But, at this time, I do not know for sure.

An Hon. Member: Do we get an invitation to that?

Dr. Gibbons: Anyone can go to that show. It is at the stadium and, I think, the Raddison. It is open to the public and there will be, I am sure, a number of opportunities for hon. Members to attend.

Ms Cowan: Even the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Gibbons: I have nothing further to say at this time, Mr. Chairman. I will answer any other questions as they come up.

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

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments based on what the Minister had to say about energy in this Province, particularly as it relates to my District, and to Marystown and the Cow Head project. I am delighted the Minister and the Government have finally decided to act on the Cow Head project because, as the Minister knows, both he and the Federal Minister of Energy agreed many, many months ago to delay anything to do with the Cow Head project until after there was a study completed. Some months ago now the Minister -

An Hon. Member: On what?

Mr. Tobin: On the Cow Head project. When your Government was elected, the Federal Minister requested a delay with which the Provincial Government concurred.

I do have the letter in my possession, as the Minister of Energy is very much aware. But I am delighted now that the Minister has indeed agreed with the Federal Government, or they have both agreed I should say, to continue with the Cow Head project and have the engineering study take place. I think that is a very positive step in the right direction.

As we are all aware, there have been many millions of dollars spent on the Cow Head facility already. It is there, and it does need significant expansion in terms of the role it will play in the development of Hibernia. I think, as the Minister of Energy will probably confirm, that the major work that is being looked at for the Cow Head project is the mechanical outfitting, and I would still suspect that is the -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I have recognized the hon. Member for Burin - Placentia West, and there is a lot of talk going back and forth across the House.

Mr. Tobin: I would still suspect that is the project the Minister of Energy is pursuing for Cow Head. If he would confirm it when he has the opportunity, it is the mechanical outfitting, or the shafts assembly, as some people refer to it.

It is also important, let me say to the Minister of Energy, it is extremely important, if we are to become involved - and the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations should listen to this as well - in a meaningful way in mechanical outfitting in the Marystown Shipyard, it is going to be

important that we not only get the contract to do it, but also the contract to assemble it on site. One thing is getting a contract to prefab it, but once it is prefabricated, then it has to be brought to the site and be assembled. I would suspect that Mobil Oil would have great problems with giving a contract to someone to do half the job and then letting someone else do the remaining part. So I would say to the Minister of Energy and the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, be very cognizant of that fact, that in order for the shipyard to get the contract for the mechanical outfit it is going to be important that they have the right to assemble it on site. I am sure she knows what I am referring to, and I do not want to get into it.

Mr. Chairman, it is also very important that the Placentia Bay area play a significant role in the development of the Hibernia project. It is very important that Placentia Bay play the role it was supposed to play from the outset. Argentia should have a major role to play in the development of the concrete platform, as well. I want to offer my full assistance to the Member for Placentia who, I know, is working very hard to try to obtain that for his District. I think it is very important that Argentia be permitted to play a major role in the development of the Hibernia field. As I understand it, if there are many facilities in place -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Any area of Placentia Bay, whether it be Argentia or Marystown that is playing a role in that, there will be a

significant impact on the other part. Whether the east side or the west side is leading, there will be a significant impact for the other part of Placentia Bay. And I believe that must be allowed to happen, because what we have seen lately is not what has taken place. I really say that to the Ministers in all sincerity, that they keep that in their minds.

Now I see the Member for Windsor - Buchans waving the Grand Falls Advertiser. Since the two Ministers from Central Newfoundland are sitting together, Mr. Chairman, probably they are discussing what kind of car the taxpayers of this Province are going to give them as a gift. Probably that is what they are discussing, what kind of car the taxpayers of this Province are going to give them, Mr. Chairman, what kind of car they will be driving. You know, are they going to go for the Lincoln's? With the taxpayers paying the shot, are they going to go for the Lincoln's?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: The decision is made by the Government. The decision is made by the Cabinet. It is not made by anybody on this side, it is not made by any private Members over there, the decision for the taxpayers of this Province to buy you a luxury car is made by the Cabinet. And not only that, not only are they going to have a car, not only are the taxpayers -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Sure they should have a car. Sure they should, there is no problem. The Ministers should have a car, but the car should belong to the Government. On the day they cease to be a Minister,

that car should belong to the taxpayers of this Province not the Minister. I believe it is a sham, Mr. Chairman. I believe it is a big scam the President of Treasury Board cooked up to buy himself a nice car. When does he get the \$8,000? That is the question I would like answered. When does he get the \$8,000, and how long will he have to wait for another \$8,000? Do you have the \$8,000 yet?

An Hon. Member: Another \$8,000 the 2nd of January (inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: No wonder there is a payroll tax in this Province. No wonder they are slapping a tax on the payrolls of this Province. How else are they going to afford to buy cars for themselves? And not only that, they can pull up to a gas station in their own car - in their own car - and pull out a Government credit card. What else can you do with the Government credit card? That is another question I would like answered. What else can be done with that Government credit card? Can you get maintenance done?

Mr. Parsons: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Can they buy tires?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Tobin: Can they pay for their insurance?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Tobin: What can they get on that Government credit card? I tell you that is something that has to be made public, because I

am suspicious of what that group over there is capable of cooking up. I am extremely suspicious of what that Cabinet is capable of cooking up, Mr. Chairman. And I would not be at all surprised if there is more to that credit card than gas. I realize the President of Treasury Board in his release, even though I was not here, I realize he was very vague on the role of the gas credit card.

An Hon. Member: He should be.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible) seventeen years (inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Now, that is another question.

An Hon. Member: Can you buy beer with it?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: Now we have a confirmation. Let me say to the President of Treasury Board, before he issues any of these credit cards, cancel it. Do not permit them to buy groceries, as he has just suggested they can do. On behalf of this side of the House, on behalf of the people of the Province, Mr. Chairman, I beg the President of Treasury Board to change his mind, that groceries not be bought with that credit card.

Mr. Power: Will they be buying beer with it.

Mr. Tobin: That is wrong. Yes, yes, the Member for Ferryland wonders what else you could buy in a convenience store or some other places. What is happening here is shameful. It is shameful! The taxpayers of this Province buying a car, and if for some reason the Minister decides to get out after



what looks like could be six months with 12,000 bucks in his pocket towards his car -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: A gift from the taxpayers. That is nothing short of corruption. It is a corrupt Government that would -

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Buying a car for yourself? Well, Mr. Chairman, one thing we know for sure, the Minister of Finance won't be going out to buy chicken. He won't be buying chicken on his.

An Hon. Member: He already has one.

Mr. Tobin: No, he didn't have chicken, he had turkey. He is already after buying one of them. But for the President of Treasury Board to come into this House - there are some adjectives, Mr. Chairman, the former Member for Bell Island and La Poile, and some other places, would use to describe that. When Mr. Neary was sitting over here, if we were to ever bring in a policy whereby you could put \$8,000 in your wallet, compliments of the taxpayers, plus a credit card to look after everything else, I just wonder what he would have said.

The other question I have to ask is what about the Member for Exploits? Is he entitled to this package? Another question: how many cars are going to be assigned to the Premier's Office under this package? How many cars are assigned, disguised and all, the ones in the car pool? Will the Ministers, Mr. Chairman, park their own personal cars when they have to go out of town and go to

the car pool and pick up a car? Will that happen? Will the Minister of Social Services, for example, park his Government car, his own car, paid for by the taxpayers while the people on social assistance basically starve to death on the measly amount he gives them, will he park his own car and then drive a Government-owned car? That is the question this Government has to answer.

The Minister of Education took the teachers away from sick children in the hospitals, yet he will accept \$8,000 and see his colleagues getting it. It was part of a decision to cut the school teachers in the hospitals for sick children and take the monies for their cars. Is that what this Government is all about? The President of Treasury Board, the old slasher himself, slashes everything.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Tobin: Dr. Slash. Dr. Slash! He won't let the Minister of Social Services have more money.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Tobin: By leave?

Some Hon. Members: No leave. No leave.

Mr. Tobin: I will get back. I will get back.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Dr. Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the

Member for Burin - Placentia West raised a couple of questions about Cow Head, and I would like to respond to those briefly. We want to put Cow Head in a position to get the maximum benefits from any offshore development, and the Hibernia project is number 1. The Hibernia project is there for the catalyst which would put Cow Head and the rest of Newfoundland into position to get the maximum benefits from Hibernia, Terra Nova and all subsequent developments. Recently, as was stated, we did jointly, ourselves and the Federal Minister, the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, agree to release the engineering money. The engineering studies are now going on to be ready to release the project when Hibernia is signed, but not until Hibernia is signed. Because if we do not get an agreement, of course the project will not be released. So we hope we do have all the engineering work completed within the next couple of months so that we can release the project immediately the Hibernia project itself is released. That is the aim of this Government. To maximize the benefits for this Province from the offshore, then Cow Head has to be in the position to be able to bid on all appropriate work. And in talking about the appropriate work, what the Member stated is essentially correct, that we are looking at work in the mechanical outfitting of fabrication areas, and that's the type of work that would be done at that facility. We would hope that Cow Head would be able to bid on all the work possible it can do during that Hibernia development, and Terra Nova, which I would expect would not be far behind Hibernia in terms of timing of the development.

In terms of the assembly of that at the Bull Arm site, I would have to say we have to leave that open at this time. I don't know exactly how that would be done in terms of who would do it.

In terms of the other point that was raised about the role of Placentia Bay, as everybody knows, the role of Placentia Bay has changed considerably because of the redesign and the shift in the construction site from Placentia Bay to Trinity Bay. Right now, I do not expect the same role for Placentia Bay and the other towns around there in terms of the GBS construction, itself. And Bull Arm is now the site, so I would expect Trinity Bay will be the focus of more of that work that would otherwise have gone into some of the other towns around Placentia Bay.

I think that answers pretty well what was raised on the Hibernia thing by the Member for Burin - Placentia West. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Tobin: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I certainly thank the Minister of Mines and Energy for his co-operation and his frankness in answering the questions I raised in this House. I want to thank him for it and there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Energy is on the right track. It is too bad most of his colleagues over there do not follow suit.

The point I was talking about, Mr. Chairman, when I took my seat, was the way this Government are fattening their wallets. The President of Treasury Board,

Dr. Slash -

Mr. Ramsay: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Pardon?

Mr. Matthews: I don't know what he is talking about. Better to be concentrating on the ferry.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, on foggy days he would be good on a boat, coming in to land.

What I was trying to get at before I was interrupted by the compromise Member for LaPoile on Sunday hunting, was the way this Government has tried to, under the carpet I guess, wiggle their way through getting more money for themselves.

When Government changed hands, for example, all the Ministers who had cars had to bring back the keys, and so they should. If Government changes, which it will, if a Cabinet Minister -

An Hon. Member: Is flicked out of Cabinet.

Mr. Tobin: - a Cabinet Minister - what happens? They keep their cars. What happens when the Premier gives the Minister of Finance the flick one of these days? What happens?

An Hon. Member: He keeps his car.

Mr. Tobin: He loses his car.

An Hon. Member: He keeps his car, he does not lose it.

Mr. Tobin: And I can tell you something, Sir, there is nobody more interested in seeing the Premier giving you the flick than the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

An Hon. Member: What!

Mr. Tobin: Because he wants to get into Cabinet so badly it isn't even funny! There is nobody more interested in seeing that happen than the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island. But, if I had anything to do with it, it would be the Member for Stephenville who would go into Cabinet, because the Member for Stephenville should be in Cabinet. And the Member for Carbonear - he is not here today - would be another good choice to replace the Minister of Finance.

An Hon. Member: No, he would have two cars.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, and I would probably get one of them. And the Member for Placentia would probably get two cars, so I would have no problem with either of them going in Cabinet!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, you would be allowed, and you get \$8,000 a year for having it; not only that, you get a credit card, and you can do what you like with the credit card.

Now, I also heard the President of Treasury Board is putting another restriction on the cars, another restriction on the Ministers to buy a car. I have heard that the President of Treasury Board is trying to convince his colleagues that they should buy red cars. I do not know if that is true or not.

Mr. Matthews: And you know what else he is trying to do? Get them to buy from Beothic Ford.

Mr. Tobin: Well, I never heard he is trying to push Beothic Ford.

Mr. Matthews: Well, he is, then.

Mr. Tobin: I never heard that.

Mr. Matthews: Yes.

Mr. Tobin: I think he has a buddy who is a car dealer in Gander.

An Hon. Member: Oh, I see.

Mr. Tobin: Anyway, it is a fact that the President of Treasury Board is insisting the cars be red.

Mr. Matthews: What?

Mr. Tobin: Red, r-e-d.

Mr. Matthews: They should be red.

Mr. Tobin: That is right.

Mr. Matthews: The same colour as the Minister's face when he drives somewhere in it, it will be so embarrassing.

Mr. Tobin: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, to get back to the issue of the Estimates of this Budget and how fraudulent that document has been. There was nothing in the document about new cars, nothing in the Budget, not a cent in the Budget, Mr. Chairman, where they are all going to get an extra \$8,000 a year. But we ask questions.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes. We asked questions about the \$10,000 overtime in the Minister's office, and we could not get any answers. We asked the questions because we were very suspicious, extremely suspicious, knowing the capability of the Cabinet opposite, the way they have introduced such a fraudulent document as that Budget. We were suspicious of what that \$10,000 worth of overtime was, and now we know what

it was for. Will the President of Treasury Board now confirm that the \$10,000 for overtime for the Minister's secretary was indeed put in there to buy a car?

Mr. Matthews: \$8,000 for the car and \$2,000 for groceries.

Mr. Tobin: That is all that is left. The Minister of Social Services said when I asked him a question on the Estimates, 'that was always there. That \$10,000 is something that was there all the time.' We had our Budget here, the last Budget we brought in, and we went through it. No, Sir, it was not to be found. Then the Minister of Social Services said, 'I will get back to you. I will get back to you.' But it was not there.

We asked the question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He did not know what it was for. Nor did his staff. They were going to get back to us on what the \$10,000 was for. I suspect it took the President of Treasury Board, on Friday, to tell us about the \$10,000 that was hidden away, that was deceitfully hidden away in the document. Let me ask the Minister of Finance, is that what the \$10,000 in overtime in your office, for your secretaries, is for? Is that what the \$10,000 is for?

Let me ask the President of Treasury Board, is that what the \$10,000 is for in your office? Some offices got \$20,000 for overtime - \$12,000? So who gets the other car? This is what is happening. This is how deceitful this document is that was presented to the House, Mr. Chairman. I do not know who the Minister of Finance thought he was kidding. There was nothing about

the payroll tax, and on the weekend he tells us he is going to tax the payroll tax, he is going to add on another tax. He is going to tax that tax. This is the type of document that Budget was. What person in this Province thought when that Budget was introduced that they would be paying taxes on food? What person in this Province thought they would be introduced -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) the people's Budget, buying cars.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, the people's Budget, buying cars for Ministers. How could they call a document that would put \$8,000 a year in the President of Treasury Board's pocket, plus a credit card for whatever he wants to use it for, a people's Budget? He just said himself he could buy groceries if he wants to. I would suggest the Minister of Social Services use his to buy groceries for the people who depend on his Department.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Tobin: Because the people are having a very difficult time. We are getting calls by the day up in our office about cutbacks. I have something else I am going to seriously talk to the Minister about in private. It is something I doubt very much the Minister is aware is taking place. I will not raise it in this House, but I am serious. There is something I want to talk to the Minister about.

An Hon. Member: Do not bring it up here.

Mr. Tobin: No, I will not. I will mention it to the Minister afterwards, in private. I will after.

Mr. Chairman, what is happening in this Province today is something that is unbelievable, that the Minister of Finance could stand in this House and say he was introducing a people's Budget which taxed food, taxed clothing, taxed all household appliances, taxed the school boards, taxed the sick, tax the suffering.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Tobin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will get back to it in a minute.

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sit down and listen for a few minutes. Sit down!

It is the first time I have heard a confession by a former Minister of Social Services, or any Minister of the former Government, a Member who now stood in the House of Assembly and confessed that he did absolutely nothing for the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. It will be reported in Hansard tomorrow that he actually said the people of Newfoundland and Labrador who are dependent on social assistance were starving. That is the result of complete mismanagement by his own Government for seventeen years. That is a confession by a former Minister of that Cabinet. Now, if he had made some accusation, that something was taking place today that he or the former Administration had nothing to do with, I could understand it. But I just took over.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Absolutely not. In fact in two Budgets in a row we increased 4 per cent each year on the average income of every social assistance recipient in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. He just made a confession, and that is really something. I will get a copy of Hansard tomorrow and I will be reporting and showing the House of Assembly what the former Minister said. It is good. I guess the message is finally getting through to the people on the other side, that they caused all these difficulties in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I rose mainly to speak about the Leader of the Opposition today in Question Period.

An Hon. Member: A cowardly way.

Mr. Efford: It is cowardly. But apart from that it is serious, that with all the problems facing the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, social problems, economic problems, lack of jobs, as was pointed out to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, the Leader of the Opposition would spend so much time in Question Period, valuable time allotted to the Opposition to ask questions of Ministers, spend so much time on such a miniscule matter as a statement that was made here in the House last week. I would not mind if that person, himself leading twenty Members of his party, was the type of Member who would sit in the House of Assembly and set an example by not calling names. But all you have to do is get a copy of Hansard. For example, I do not mind. They can call me names from daylight to dark, until the clock rolls around and doubles over, but the Leader of the Opposition set an example

for his own party; he called me the night crawler, the peeping tom, the worm and the stovepipe. It even came down to the point where last week one of the Members on the opposite side shouted across and made fun of the fact that I was a diabetic and taking needles. 'Take a needle to keep yourself going,' he said. Now these are people who will stand in their places over there, sanctimoniously, and make reference to the fact that the Minister of Finance made one mistake, and take up half of Question Period, while such a serious situation is taking place in the Province. Talk about setting an example! Now I can understand why, when I had lunch with one of the high officials in the provincial PC organization the other day, and it was not told to somebody else and then told me, he said to me 'the move is on to get rid of him.'

An Hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Efford: That was said to me personally by an high ranking member of the provincial PC organization of the Province. That was not said to somebody else and then told me, it was said to me directly.

An Hon. Member: Did you tell him we are trying to keep him there?

Mr. Efford: Well, I said the best thing that could ever happen to us is to keep him over there. Keep him there for goodness sake, because he is (inaudible) to us. Any Leader of an Opposition Party who would do what he is doing in the House in such a hypocritical manner, and as sanctimoniously, as the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture said, to stand up in the House after all the references

he made to not only me but a lot of other people on this side of the House of Assembly, and every Member over there is fully aware of it, and all we have to do is go back and research Hansard and get all the names. Two seconds after the Leader of the Opposition made these remarks today to the Premier, my critic, my one and only critic for this whole Session of the House of Assembly, called me pigheaded. Talk about setting an example and getting his people over there to follow decorum, you know, I would ask the Opposition, is that setting an example?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: No. Goodness, no. But I mean if you are going to get respect in this House, and if you are going to set some credibility then the Leaders - like the Leader of the Opposition - have to start to set examples. If you are going to start -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: But do not stand in this House of Assembly and point fingers at somebody else when all your Members on the other side are doing the same thing, and the Leader of the Opposition, of all the people over there, is worst of all.

An Hon. Member: You are pointing at him.

Mr. Efford: I have to point once in a while. It is no use not doing that these days if I am to get my point across.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: I said this to him the other day - and so he should.

I think there is going to be a toss up between the Member for St. John's East and the Member for Grand Bank.

An Hon. Member: For what?

Mr. Efford: For the leader. The Member for St. John's East. She sat up there the other day and she tried on the Chair. No question about it. She really started to feel comfortable there until the Member for St. John's East Extern looked at her and said, 'Now, don't be too hasty because I have friends here, other friends that we may be talking to.' And I understand where old anti-confederate is coming from because he knows there has to be a fair democratic race, and you just cannot win and take it over. So, he told her to slack back and don't get too comfortable in the Chair. I understand what he is talking about.

Again, we were talking about the serious down-turn or crisis in the fishery. What does the Member for Burin - Placentia West get better to talk about - \$8000 that we are getting for cars. But half of what he spent when he went over to Norway was to find out what kind of an impact the oil glut in Norway had on Social Service recipients, so he could bring the study back to Newfoundland and set some kind of program up. Is that not right? Now I have spent the last twelve months trying to get a report, trying to find out what kind of a report he brought back from his trip to Norway, and I cannot find anything.

Some Hon. Members: Was it just a trip.

Mr. Efford: I think the concern was then that the Premier at the

time was talking about turning on the taps and the oil was flowing out. I can understand him getting aboard a plane and going over to Norway because we did not want our Social Service recipients to get a big blast or big income of money, and he did not want them to be frightened.

An Hon. Member: Oh, really.

Mr. Efford: This is what it was, a kick-start overheated economy. So the then Minister of Social Services goes to Norway. How much did the trip cost to Norway?

An Hon. Member: Why didn't they accept Mr. Chretien's deal?

Mr. Efford: How much did it cost?

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible) as Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: As Minister of Social Services to Norway.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: I really get a kick out of when I see him stand up in this House and blast this side of the House about getting money allotted for cars and how much we are going to spend in gas.

An Hon. Member: Ask him about his mileage charges when he was going down to his District.

Mr. Efford: Yes, that is another good question. What kind of a mileage charge did the then Minister charge up to the Government for driving back and forth to Marystown and to the Burin Peninsula?

An Hon. Member: And using a gas card.

Mr. Efford: And using a gas card. But what kind of mileage charges were put in?

An Hon. Member: What?

An Hon. Member: Government car, gas card and mileage charges all together.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Probably when he stands up he can explain.

The other thing I would like to have -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: The other thing I would like to have explained, and you talk about the nerve. It is like the Member for Labrador, from Torngat, stood up in the House the other day and accused me of not being interested in helping out the people in Labrador. He was the Minister for Northern Affairs and the only thing he accomplished, and his only concern at that particular time while he was Minister, was putting in a \$25,000 washroom in his office.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: That is right - that is fact. I mean all I kept in my office is a microwave oven. Now where did the microwave come from? What does a Minister need a microwave for? I do not get time to eat a sandwich let alone warm one. You know, what was it over there for? Go into the back room there is a fridge, then there is this big fancy camera over there, and when I developed a picture, I took the film out of the camera and all I could see was the former Minister of Social Services shaking hands with John Crosbie.



Oh my, oh my, oh my. I got a big stack of pictures of the former Minister and John Crosbie. That is factual.

An Hon. Member: No wonder they lost the election.

Mr. Efford: And I can go on and on. Then I sat down by my desk and I reached for the telephone and the first thing I picked up is one of those little controls that you turn on and off television. What is the name of it?

An Hon. Member: A remote control.

Mr. Efford: A remote control right there by my desk by the telephone, a remote control for turning on a TV. I pressed on the remote control and the first thing comes up is one of those stories, soap opera. Now this is what the Minister was at during work - make no wonder, as he said today, the poor people in the Province are starving.

An Hon. Member: Was that a blue movie or what?

Mr. Efford: Now, you know, concerned? Seventeen years of Toryism. Thank God it is over, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. Aylward: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Oh, we could because I never turned it on yet.

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you.

An Hon. Member: By leave! By leave!

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

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to some of the statements -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: I listened with interest to a lot of the statements by the Minister of Social Services. I am not so sure that the camera should have been left there, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Because when the camera was there it was used for Departmental functions, Mr. Chairman, and I understand since I left they have been taking a lot of pictures of pigs being kissed. There have been a lot of sows on the loose, Mr. Chairman, and I think most of the time since the Minister came over, the camera is in the pigpen. I understand the camera belonged to the Department of Social Services and it spends more time in the pigpen than it does in the office. And it is time to remove it from the pigpen. And as it relates to the microwave I believe, I am not sure, but I believe the Deputy Minister probably knows more about the microwave than I do, I never brought a microwave. But if I did buy a microwave I should have been allowed to take it with me.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is the Minister of Social Services can stand in this House and say what he likes. The fact remains that the Minister of Social Services has just been part of a Cabinet that took \$8000 from the people of this Province and put it in his own money. There is no other way of describing it except the Minister

of Social Services, to get that money, \$8000 plus a gas credit card and whatever else you can buy on the credit card, and take off. Now the only trip that we know the Minister of Social Services was on was the one he made to P.E.I., because I believe when they got off the plane the Premier had someone there and said report to the Premier's house.

Mr. Efford: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: That is the only trip we know off because the Premier read it here in the House. When the Minister of Social Services got back he was immediately ordered on Sunday night -

An Hon. Member: Summoned to the Call.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, summoned to the Premier's house. So we know of one trip that the Minister of Social Services has been on and we know that when he got back, he was summoned to the Premier's house. Now I do not know what it is all about.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: Everybody should know where Ministers travel, and I am surprised, absolutely surprised that the Minister of Social Services has not learned anything from the trip that we made to not only Norway, but to the Shetland Islands as well -

An Hon. Member: You should be in the Cabinet.

Mr. Tobin: - where there is a program over there that if implemented, which I had planned to do, and I hope he will, and I hope that he will -

An Hon. Member: The same old story. The same old story.

Mr. Tobin: What is the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations saying now? What is she shouting across the House? Does the Minister know she should not be speaking except from her own seat and only when she is recognized? Doesn't she have any respect for the Chair? Who does the Minister think she is to take this House on her back? What is the Minister trying to prove in this House to be shouting across and interrupting? Now she said today I was like a high school student. She should not be acting like a child the way she is getting on there shouting across the House, and it is not permitted, Mr. Chairman. She is a Member of this House as well as anybody else.

Mr. Matthews: Ask her about the unemployment rate.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, the Member for Grand Bank just said that the Minister should be more concerned about the unemployment rate in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: It has never been so high before.

Mr. Tobin: It was never so high before, it was never so high in one month, never such a jump since this Minister became responsible for the employment in this Province. She should be ashamed, Mr. Chairman. She should hang her head in shame to see such a jump in unemployment in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: That is what she should do. Yes, they are all

around the Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: Why, can you buy supper on your credit card too?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: No, it is not that I can hear what you are saying, it is I took a course in reading lips. I have done extremely well on this side of the House by being able to read many of the conversations that take place. Particularly the ones that take place between the President of Treasury Board and the Premier during Question Period. I can interpret most of them as well. There are some very interesting discussions and some very interesting adjectives at times describing some of the questions, Mr. Chairman. But that is for another day. What is taking place - the Minister of Health is wondering about supper, the Minister of Employment is worrying about the kind of car she is going to get, now that is what is taking place. Wondering if she should -

An Hon. Member: She is wondering if a Caprice is a good car.

Mr. Tobin: No, she did not say a Caprice. No, she did not. I thought she said a Thunderbird. I was not sure. The Minister of Social Services -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: If you did, more power to you.

I will tell you one thing, if your colleagues in Cabinet had anything to do with the kind of car that you get, they would probably give you a Chevette or something like

that. I know exactly how that Cabinet group that you are associated with looks upon the Department of Social Services. So in order to ensure, I would say to the Minister that the Department of Social Services is up there with the rest of them, do not let them downgrade you, go get it. Go get your Lincoln.

Mr. Simms: How come you have not got a Rolls Royce?

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, and more power to him. You have a Minister who is a shareholder in Rolls Royce and is expected to know the concerns of the poor in this Province. That is what I call a conflict. Then you have the Minister of Health, I do not know what he drives, but I do know that he drove the sick out of the hospital in Grand Bank and St. Lawrence. I know that he did that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I read his book one time, what is it? The Welfare Officer will see you now Madam. I am sure the Minister of Social Services has read it. Not that there is anything in it to help the Minister do his job, but that is what is happening in this Province. They are more concerned - the Minister of Employment and Labour is more concerned about the kind of a car she is going to get than she is about the unemployment in this Province. Now that is what is taking place.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: What is that?

The Minister of Finance, the best thing I heard about the Minister

of Finance was someone used it today, that he did not like chicken but today he got a lot of crow. I think that really sums up the Minister of Finance. He did not eat the chicken but today he ate the crow.

Mr. Simms: What about the Premier's Parliamentary Secretary, what kind of a car does he get?

Mr. Tobin: The Premier's Parliamentary Secretary, no, he lost his car.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: The same thing is happening, I would suspect, to the Parliamentary Assistant or the gofer for the Premier, is the same thing that is going to happen here, and that is these cars will be used to drive to work. But the day the Minister has to go somewhere he is going to go to the car pool. At the end of the day, he will have a new car not soiled. His wallet fattened by \$8,000. And I would like to know when the first payment is coming. I would like to know the arrangements for the payments. I would like to know how it is going to be arranged. What way they are going to be paid?

An Hon. Member: \$8,000 upfront.

Mr. Tobin: \$8,000 up front, starting when?

Six months time another eight. Ah, there is something happening here. There is something smells, Mr. Chairman, here in this package that is taking place. I think the taxpayers in Newfoundland should not be taken for granted. Why should some poor old fishermen who goes out there and earns \$2,000 or \$3,000 in the

worse kind of a summer have to come in and contribute towards buying a car for one of those Ministers.

I think that is wrong, it is another example of the despicable Budget that the Minister of Finance brought in. I mean how -

An Hon. Member: That is the wrong book.

Mr. Tobin: I know it's the wrong book. This stuff is much better. I know exactly, I read page fifteen. What person in Newfoundland and Labrador thought when the Minister said he had a (inaudible) Budget that it included giving him \$8,000 for a car. What person? Does the Member for St. Georges support that? The farmers out in your District buying cars for the Ministers? Maybe your District supports it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: What's that?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up

Mr. Tobin: By leave?

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

Mr. Kelland: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that support from the Member for Burin - Placentia West. It was back in the days when we were both associated with a Municipal body here in the Province. He tells me on almost a regular basis that he has been an admirer of mine ever since, and I suppose I can understand that because everybody aspires to improve himself, and if

I happen to be his model that is fine with me, because there is certainly room for improvement, Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that.

Anyway enough of that. I didn't get to finish some of the points which were raised by the Member for Torngat Mountains. He is currently present but he asked a few questions on which I may be able to give some information. I wish I could see the transcripts as I mentioned of the night sessions as well because there are probably some other points that were raised. On Sunday hunting, I think I adequately dealt with that and if I said anything else I would only be repeating myself. Members again from their chairs are saying what my position is and my position is, as it is always, that of Government. As a Member of Government and, well currently, the hon. Members are asking redundant questions. We all know that on the books right at the moment there is a ban on Sunday hunting and that's currently the Government's position. If and when the Government changes that position, why, as a Member of Cabinet, my position would be that of the Government, that goes without saying. Any questions from your chairs to that effect are purely redundant. It is really hard to have a meaningful participation in debate, Mr. Chairman, with all the chatter, actually on both sides of the House to be fair about it.

Mr. Chairman a couple of other questions that were asked by the Member for Torngat Mountains, I believe he asked about whether or not a decision had been reached as to whether or not there would be a polar bear hunt in Northern Labrador this year. He did not

ask what the decision was, he just simply asked had a decision been made. And I told him yes, a decision had been made and that the LIA, the Labrador Inuit Association, had been advised in writing of that decision. He did not ask what the decision was so I do not know if he wants that information or not. He just wanted to know whether or not a decision was made and I confirmed that.

He also talked a little bit about the ferry, the roll on roll off ferry that travels between the Island of Newfoundland and the Labrador part of the Province. I do not think he spoke about the ferry exclusively, he was talking about freight movements and passenger movements from the Island part of the Province to the Mainland part of the Province in Labrador.

But on the ferry itself, a long held view of many people in my District, the Naskaupi District, one of the terminals of the ferry run, is that there should be a ferry which makes a stop in St. Anthony, and that has been pretty widely supported in Happy Valley, Goose Bay and virtually all of Labrador. If I remember correctly I believe Labrador West and the Member for Menihek now, former mayor and so on, and most of the councils up there supported the view that a ferry stop in St. Anthony would be pretty good. It would be ideal in fact. Not to take anything away from Lewisporte, but it would give some options with respect to how people travel. And you have to keep in mind that there are an awful lot of people in Happy Valley, Goose Bay and other parts of Labrador who make use of the ferry that are from the Straits area, both sides

of the Straits, the Labrador and the Newfoundland side.

And there is another consideration, I guess, because you do have some options on how you would make a round trip, in that if you are on your outbound voyage, say from Happy Valley, Goose Bay, if you went to Lewisporte, ideal if you happen to be turning eastward on the Island, but even if not, if you were going westward either onto the mainland or around the western part and up the northern peninsula a nice and interesting, from a tourism point of view, method of returning might very well be via St. Anthony, which is a historic community in the Province as well.

A very strong representation has been made on that. I agree in the sense that I for years supported that concept and the answers were always along the lines that, if you talk to Marine Atlantic, or CN Marine it was in those days, they would say well that sort of direction would have to come from Federal Transport. If you talked to Federal Transport, they seemed to imply that a lot of that decision making would come from Marine Atlantic or as I said, CN Marine in those days. In actual fact, the demand has been quite heavy. I can understand for example, if the Member for Lewisporte, might be upset in some sense or some of his constituents might be upset, if St. Anthony was an alternate or replaced Lewisporte. I do not think anyone every intended that at all. I could understand that from an economic point of view from his community.

But the concept, as I heard it, was more of a loop whereby you are talking about Happy Valley - Goose

Bay, Cartwright, Lewisporte, St. Anthony, that kind of a loop back into Goose Bay. That might serve a lot more people in probably a better way if it was done properly, and was to take nothing away from any of the terminals or any of the stops along the route.

The Member also mentioned that Cartwright might very well be a good staging area for freight bound northward. A lot of it now goes into Goose Bay and the transfer of the freight on the vessels, or from one vessel to another, is done in Goose Bay. He suggested that Cartwright might very well be a better spot for that. There may be some value in that as well. Keeping in mind that Happy Valley - Goose Bay is the economic and service center for the major part of Labrador, with the exception of Labrador West, in some cases, even that from a transportation point of view.

So I think all these things should be examined in great detail. The people in Labrador depend, in the navigation season, quite heavily on the service provided by the vessels that go in and out of Labrador. The use is not only traditional but it is also very necessary. Rates have been pretty reasonable over the years but we have seen some increases in freight and passenger rates in more recent times.

The Member also asked about the Mealy Mountain carbiou hunt. We had said sometime earlier that we have been looking for enough money to conduct a survey of the number of animals in the Mealy Mountain Herd. The best figures we had at that time, and I have no information to indicate otherwise, Mr. Chairman, is that there are

about 2,000 animals in the Mealy Mountain caribou herd. We did not feel, and I do not feel, that would sustain any sort of an annual hunt. Maybe some small quantities could be taken on the advice of biologists and so on, management people, but in no way that I could see would you be able to continue an annual hunt of 200 animals or 300 animals every year and expect the herd to remain as it is.

I do know that a year or so ago when the Member who asked the question, the Member for Torngat Mountains was a Member of the Government, there was a decision made to allow some hunting of the Mealy Mountain caribou herd. At that time, I felt it was the wrong thing to do, based on the information we had at the time. There simply did not appear to be enough animals to have any sort of a sizable hunt, or any sort of an annual hunt without running the risk of destroying that herd. Instead of destroying caribou herds we should be doing what we can to protect them.

Another interesting thing that sort of relates to the wildlife and caribou situation in Labrador is, and I guess it goes back a couple of years, there was an Order in Council, I believe - I do not have the exact time frame, Mr. Chairman - that prevented the Wilderness and Ecological Reserve Advisory Council from actually having any activities in Labrador because of the sensitivity, I believe was the reason given, of the lands claims issues the native groups and organizations are dealing with. However, in recent times, and I think it is general knowledge now, public knowledge, that order has now been lifted. That is not just a

plucked-out-of-the-air decision, but in response to organizations in Labrador. I know the Member for Menihek will be very familiar with some of the aspects of that, because we have had some representation from the Caribou Hunters Association in Labrador West, the Menihek District, and also from the LIA themselves, because these organizations are very, very concerned about the preservation and conservation of our wildlife. So we have now lifted that order.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Kelland: Just to finish that last thought, if you do not mind.

Some Hon. Members: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Kelland: The WERAC group, ourselves, and I assure all Members from Labrador, are very interested in seeing some activity going in there with a view to identifying, and perhaps developing, wilderness and ecological reserves in the Labrador portion of our Province, which we have not been able to do in recent times. I thought that may be of interest to some of the Members. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will continue a little later.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do you want to move that the Committee rise or something? Call it 5 o'clock. It is almost difficult to get into

full flight.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: You are anxious to hear what I have to say? I can move that the Committee rise.

An Hon. Member: You cannot move that the Committee rise.

Mr. Simms: You would not vote against that, would you? We are not going to do that, are we? We are going to move that the Committee rise? The Government House Leader indicated earlier that we might just adjourn in Committee stage and come back at 7:00 o'clock in Committee stage.

Mr. Baker: (Inaudible) solve the problem at 7:00 o'clock. The Member for St. John's East Extern?

Mr. Simms: Oh yes. Right! So, we will carry on as if we were normal.

Mr. Chairman, having only two or three minutes, it is difficult to ask any penetrating questions. I would rather wait until we start a new session back and forth to raise the new items I had. But, again, I am glad that this afternoon a number of the new items I raised for discussion seemed to have been taken on by Members opposite and they jumped into the fray. The Minister of Finance got up and, of course, neglected to apologize to the people he embarrassed with his comments, and his slip of the tongue unfortunately last Friday, although he was given lots of opportunity to do so. In fact, I think -

Dr. Kitchen: The old squawker!

Mr. Simms: He is at it again now,

of course.

An Hon. Member: He is squawking over there! He is squawking over there. Squawk! Squawk!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Finance is very touchy now. He would not listen to the -

An Hon. Member: Squawk! Squawk! Squawk!

Mr. Simms: He would not listen to the Premier's suggestion today, when the Premier suggested that if he made those kinds of comments he was quite certain he would apologize to the House.

An Hon. Member: He would get the boot. He would get the royal order of the boot.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Indeed he did make the comments. Hansard indicates the -

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: The Minister is continuously interrupting.

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

Mr. Simms: He is awfully touchy. If he wants to speak, let him get up and speak. Mr. Chairman, he should not be interrupting us who are speaking. It is not very dignified of the Minister of Finance.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Finance is over there flapping his wings like a chicken - how foolish! What foolishness to be



getting on with, Mr. Chairman. He cannot take it at all. The Premier told him today he should apologize.

An Hon. Member: He told him to sit down.

Mr. Simms: The Premier told him today to sit down; he told him he should apologize if he made those comments. And he made those comments. They are clear in Hansard. But he did not apologize, and that is regrettable. Then, of course, the Minister of Forestry, unfortunately, got up and strongly supported the Minister of Finance, even though he knows full well those comments are damaging to the poultry industry.

An Hon. Member: Shocking!

Mr. Simms: All you have to do is read the editorial in the Evening Telegram today. Read the editorial in the Evening Telegram today, the last paragraph of the editorial, where it talks about the image of the agriculture industry. As a matter of fact, it says -

Mr. Flight: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Let me read the editorial for the hon. Member.

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible) you are the worst Minister yet.

Mr. Simms: I will just read the last paragraph.

Mr. Tobin: Senior Members, too, by the way.

Mr. Simms: The last paragraph says, 'The agriculture industry must take steps to improve its image. It is a matter of life and

death.' Now that is what the editorial says. So obviously the people out there who write editorials and those kinds of things don't agree with the Minister that it is in the best shape it has ever been in. Obviously there are lots of problems.

But the topic of that particular editorial has to do with the image of the agriculture industry, and that, Mr. Chairman, was what the questions were about today from my colleague, the Member for Kilbride. Because the comments of the Minister of Finance do absolutely nothing to enhance the image of the agriculture industry, and I am sure the Premier will indicate to the Minister of Finance that he should do something about it and apologize to the people he embarrassed over the last few days.

Mr. Chairman, it being 5:00 o'clock, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

Being there is no motion before the House -

Mr. Simms: I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday,

at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the motion to adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m. was defeated.

Mr. Speaker: There will be somebody in the Chair this evening at 7:00 p.m. The Speaker will be unavoidably absent. I inform hon. Members that it has been agreed that the Member for St. John's East Extern will assist the Chair in carrying out the duties of Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 33(A)

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

The House resumed at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

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

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I sat by this afternoon and listened to what was going on and I thought that perhaps tonight I should stand and make a few comments on some of the things that were said earlier today.

Mr. Chairman, the topic I would like to deal with first, is the topic of the Ministerial car allowance.

An Hon. Member: Now, now!

An Hon. Member: This should be good.

Mr. Baker: Now Mr. Chairman, I want to deal specifically -

An Hon. Member: Straight faced now, do it with a straight face.

Mr. Baker: - with the comments made by the Member for Burin-Placentia West.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Baker: Mr. Chairman, there is an impression given that somehow there was something wrong with the car allowance.

An Hon. Member: There certainly is.

Mr. Baker: An awful lot of words were uttered, some of them having to do with buying groceries, and

using a credit card for all kinds of things.

Now Mr. Chairman, I understand that in the course of debate back and forth in this House, we have become used to, over the past number of years, saying things that are inflammatory and say things to stir people up, and so on, and sometimes we tend to forget that, at this present time, a lot of what we say in this House is being recorded, and that perhaps the wrong impression may be given in the Province as a result of these comments that, I feel, by and large are made to provoke other comments.

Now Mr. Chairman, Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition and the Speaker will receive, instead of a car, we are taking all the cars back, will receive a car allowance, a taxable allowance of \$8000 per year -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Baker: - and be given a gas card.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: I would like to deal with both sections, Mr. Chairman. First of all, the \$8000 taxable allowance. That \$8000 taxable allowance is, in effect, much less than any other Provincial Minister in Canada is getting, and is much less than we have been used to down through the years here in this Province.

Ms Verge: Oh, come on!

Mr. Baker: It is a saving of money.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: I do not believe that.

Mr. Baker: Merely because it is taxable, a fair amount of it comes back to the Government through taxes and so on, but Mr. Chairman, I would like to compare, as an example, let's pick one hon. Member, the one who was talking about it, let's pick the Member for Burin-Placentia West

Ms Verge: How about picking the Member for Humber East.

Mr. Baker: Well, the amounts would be much greater if I picked the Member for Humber East. The Member for Burin-Placentia West.

As an MHA, I suppose I could say, that the Government is paying for the Member for Burin-Placentia West's car.

Under present arrangements, as MHAs, the MHAs get fifty trips a year, back and forth to their Districts, at the normal rate. Now, fifty trips a year, each trip being worth about \$140, that is sort of approximately the rate to Burin-Placentia West. Fifty trips a year would amount to \$7000 that the Member for Burin-Placentia west gets for the use of his car, \$7,000.00. But, Mr. Chairman, you have to notice that is tax free, it is not taxable income. That is tax free. The Member for Burin-Placentia West gets \$7,000.00 a year, tax free, for the use of his car. Mr. Chairman, I would put to you, and I am sure you would agree, that the Member for Burin-Placentia West, is actually getting a much greater benefit than the Ministers of the Crown. So, Mr. Chairman there is not doubt in my mind that the

\$8,000.00 car allowance the Ministers are getting is in fact a very small amount in comparison to the amounts the Members of the House of Assembly will get.

The second thing has to do with the use of a gas card. The use of the gas card is simply that. It is for the purchase of gas, for that car, and none other. It is not for the purchase of repairs, not for tires, it is not for mechanical breakdowns, it is not for anything like that, it is simply for the purchase of gas and nothing but, the purchase of gas.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should speak about some of the things that are not going to happen, some things that are not going to happen. You will not find in this Government, we have not found in the last year and you will never find again I suppose, because the cars are disappearing, Ministers who have use of a Government car and at the same time charge for mileage to the district. You will never find that, it will never happen. You will not find Mr. Chairman, you will not find Ministers taking their cars on prolonged tours of Canada and the States in summer. You will not find that. Because the cars are no longer provided. In short, Mr. Chairman, you will not find any of the abuse that so far has been mentioned. You will not find any of it. You will find that in this matter, we are being totally honest and above board, we are being totally straightforward with the people of the Province, and that, Mr. Chairman, is the only way, only way to go.

Mr. Chairman, Cabinet Ministers I suppose, if they want to, could abuse an awful lot of their privileges, and I would suggest that if there is any proof of

abuse of privileges, backed up by factual information, then, Mr. Chairman, it should be brought out in the open. We have a lot of privileges that I suppose are open to abuse, now I will just mention one of them. Ministers have been provided for some years and are still provided with an entertainment allowance, we are provided with that. Now the guide lines are that Ministers up to \$75.00 a day, can claim for entertaining that they do, without actual receipts. And we have an upper limit I believe of \$300.00 a day providing we provide the adequate documentation and receipts. Now we have that per day, so I suppose a mischievous person could all of a sudden say, ah ha, Ministers are getting an extra \$300.00 a day. And that is simply not correct. The allowance is there, and perhaps it is open to abuse, but Ministers in this Government are not abusing that. We do not find Ministers who come in and in the morning put in their bill for \$75.00. We do not find that happening. Ministers do not do it. It just does not happen.

I would put to this House and the people of the Province, I suppose there are lots of things that we are involved in that would be open to abuse, but I would say to you that that abuse is not happening, and will not happen in this Government - it is as simple as that. We have to do what is sensible, and I know the Members opposite can pretend outrage, can put on the fake show of outrage, but they know deep down, when you come to being sensible about it and talking sensible outside the House. And that is a sad comment, because you think this is the place for talking sense.

When you get to talking about it,

all members realize what the situation is with regards to the \$8,000 taxable car allowance they realize it is not what they are pretending it is. They realize that that is less than what Minister's now have, and have had for a number of years.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Baker: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I will have another chance.

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

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

I must say it is good to see a very nice independent, impartial person in the Chair for a change in this House, I think we are going to have to keep him there.

Mr. Tobin: I would like to remind the Member that we are discussing interim supply.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I lost track. I was so delighted to see you in the Chair that I lost track of what we were doing.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to have just a few words this evening on what the President of Treasury Board is trying to put off on this Province as a savings to the taxpayers, to the people of this Province.

An \$8,000 a year fee, to me, while I was in Cabinet would have been a gross overpayment to me as a Cabinet Minister, because I live

here in St. John's, where most of the Cabinet Ministers live. I did not ordinarily take that car over the road on business. If I had to go on business I would probably fly to one or the other communities, either Deer Lake, Corner Brook, or Stephenville, and I would rent a car at the time.

But what is going to happen now, Mr. Chairman - and right now the Cabinet Ministers and some Cabinet Ministers when we were there, who had cars, and who lived in other areas of the Province, went home to their Districts, sometimes went on business and took their car to other parts of the Province. Sometimes they would not, they would leave that Ministers car here and go on about their business or go back to their District without the car.

What is going to happen now for Members in St. John's, who had a car, no doubt, who did very little driving on it, you would not necessarily use up the mileage limit so it would have to be renewed every three years, you could get it renewed automatically. What we did have, is the car that I had, when I left the Department, I left the car there, very low mileage, good car. I do not know who is using it now, maybe one of the Ministers are, the Minister of Municipal Affairs probably. It was a good car, that had I been there for three years, I could have owned. It was a brand new car.

Under their system now, if I was there, I would have a new car tomorrow. I would have \$8,000 put in my pocket for the next three years. Just in case the hon. Members are not aware, the car benefit that was given to Cabinet Ministers at the time was

potentially taxable too, if you wanted to do it. I did not do it, because I did not use it for private. But if I used that car privately, I had to indicate this to the income tax people at the end of the year. I had to fill out a slip every year to say that that car was used privately and if it was, which undoubtedly the new cars you are going to get are going to be used privately, because it is going to be your car. So that is why you are paying the income tax out of it, you are not paying the income tax on the Government use of that car, that is free money. So what you would ordinarily use your car for, for private use which I did for my second car, which I had home, I had two cars actually and a motorcycle, plus this Government car, so I did not need to use a Government car for my private use.

And I did not use it because the car was well-known in my District, and if I had to drive in the road a few times or go to the cabin in that car, no doubt, the Sunday Express or some paper would have heard it very quickly, and probably the Minister of Social Services or the Transportation Critic, at the time, would have, but, I mean, it was not necessary for me to use it and it was not possible for me to use it because certainly someone would have complained that I was using the car personally, as was done by one of our Ministers when it was thought that he used the car for personal reasons, but he was not using it for personal reasons, he was on combined Government business and vacation at the same time.

But Mr. Chairman, what we have now is a supposed tax saving to the people of the Province. We have

an \$8000 benefit to every Cabinet Minister, we have in every three years, \$24,000 will go towards the car that you are going to buy if you want, the maintenance, at least the gas for sure, which is non-taxable, the gas that you are getting is non-taxable, and that can be used for private or public use, so that gas card is a blank cheque to print money, in by mind.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Aylward: Because no matter what driving you do, no matter what driving your wife does, and no matter what driving your family does, if you have two kids, like me, who have their licence and they were using my car if I was a Cabinet Minister now, I would go through quite a bit of gas. And I would keep filling the car up and, obviously, as happens now, my kids would keep emptying it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: And that would be personal use that you would have on that gas card.

An Hon. Member: What are you going to do?

Mr. R. Aylward: You would have that on the gas card plus an \$8000 gift from the people of this Province.

An Hon. Member: Right on.

Mr. R. Aylward: So in three years' time, unlike what happened to me when I finished being Cabinet Minister when I laid on the table the keys to that car, in three years' time, every Cabinet Minister, fifteen of them, will have a new car, or a good car, because they are living in St. John's, they are not going to use

them when they are on the road, they are only going to be using them around town. They will have a new car, they will have a gas card for three years and the taxpayers of Newfoundland will have nothing. And if costs \$12,000 a year for Cabinet Ministers to have cars, it will cost more, and this is where I say the deception comes in or where the people of the Province are being fooled, because in the announcement it was said that this is a cost saving matter, and that is wrong.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Aylward: I cannot say it is a lie because you are not allowed to say that in here, that is not true. It will not save the taxpayers of this Province one nickel, as a matter of fact, with the way the gas cards can be used, it will cost the taxpayers of this Province much more than the \$12,000 if that is a correct estimate, and I do not doubt but it was.

But the \$12,000 that it was costing, at the end of the three year period, there was a \$15,000 car there in that driveway. And I do not know if you would put that into your calculations, which I doubt very much, but if you did, okay. But in three years time, there would be a twelve to fifteen thousand car left with the people of this Province to sell or get rid of or have someone else use it. And that is where the deceit is, is that this is not a cost saving item in this Budget, it is a way for Cabinet Ministers to look like they are doing a great thing by giving up their car and, whereas in three years' time, they would have a greater benefit, a much greater benefit than had the



car been kept, and not been renewed for two more years maybe, maybe you would not renew them every three years, maybe you could do something like that. But once they got unsafe, obviously you would have to renew them.

But when I was in Cabinet, it would not have been necessary for me to renew a car every three years unless it rusted to pieces and fell apart. But for the use it was getting while I was in Cabinet, I do not think it was necessary to renew it every three years.

An Hon. Member: Did you drive it to work and home?

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, I would drive it to work and to home.

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, that is personal use. I parked it home. I parked the car home, when I went home in the night.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. R. Aylward: I had an indication from the Premier of the Province at the time that I was on call for twenty-four hours a day. That convenient letter allowed me to take the car home, but did not allow me to keep it in my driveway this year when I turned it in. That convenient letter did not give me a \$24,000 car.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Aylward: That convenient letter let me take it home and park it in my driveway. That is what it did.

MR. BAKER: You said a while ago that you had no personal use.

Mr. R. Aylward: I had no personal use. That is not personal use.

Mr. Baker: Tell the income tax people.

Mr. R. Aylward: The income tax people audited me two years ago. They did not say it was personal use. So if the Hon. Minister has some difference with the income tax people, maybe he should write the Minister of Revenue and say that they are not doing their job right. I mean, if they say it is not personal use, I cannot see why I would say it is personal use.

Mr. Baker: It was said because it favoured you.

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes. There, the Minister made my point, that your \$8,000 is very easy to accept when it favours you because you are going to get a \$24,000 car out of it. That is why you do not see the deceit that is being inflicted on the taxpayers of this Province, where you are saying this is a tax saving method.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. R. Aylward: By leave?

An Hon. Member: No leave, no.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am very pleased to follow up on the comments made by the previous speaker.

Mr. Chairman, I have to shake my head, I really have, at the twisting and distortion that just went on. It is shameful.

The admissions are what really surprised me, Mr. Chairman. First of all, the Member for Kilbride talks about \$8,000 that we got to put in our pocket. He conveniently overlooks, and will continue to conveniently overlook, that this is taxable money. So we do get a portion of it, certainly, but certainly not the \$8,000.

Ms Verge: Well everyone's benefits are taxable.

Mr. Baker: Except you for your travel. That is not taxable.

An Hon. Member: Or yours.

Mr. Baker: This is.

An Hon. Member: Car allowance (inaudible).

Mr. Baker: No, no! That is the other convoluted logic that is being used. Because I am getting a car allowance, I do not get paid for mileage when I use the car.

Mr. R. Aylward: You get paid for the trips to your district.

Mr. Baker: No. I cannot get paid mileage for trips to the district. No! No! No! How many times do I have to say it? We are not into getting paid double. Maybe you were, but we are not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, first of all, as individuals -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Baker: - we do end up with

money for ourselves in lieu of a car, certainly. There is no doubt. But it is not the amount that the Opposition is trying to claim, for the very reason that I mentioned. Because now we do not have at our disposal the mileage. We have to pay tax on that, except when you claimed mileage.

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

Mr. Chairman: A point of order, the hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: The hon. House Leader is pointing his finger at me when he says, 'You claimed mileage,' and I would like to tell him that I have never claimed mileage.

Mr. Baker: I was -

Mr. Chairman: To that point of order?

Mr. Baker: No.

Mr. Chairman: I rule there is no point of order. Certainly the member took the opportunity to clarify a statement that had been made by the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was using the collective 'you'. If I offended the member, I apologize.

Mr. Chairman, there was one admission in the member's comments a few moments ago that amazed me. It was very quickly picked up by some members on this side. The member said, 'I had a car when I was a minister. I did not use it very much. I did not have any personal use.' Then he goes on to describe how he was driving back and forth to work in it. Now,

under The Income Tax Act, that is personal use. Under the definitions in The Income Tax Act, that is personal use. He also admitted that members opposite did not claim that personal use on their income tax. That is amazing. Because giving a car to anybody in any business or anything anywhere in Canada is a taxable benefit to the extent that it is used for personal use. For instance, if the hon. Member for Kilbride used that car only to go back and forth from his home to work, to Confederation Building and so on, and did not use it for anything else, then when he made out his income tax returns he had to claim 100 per cent personal use for that car. Then the car would be depreciated over the period of the year, the cost of the servicing and gas for that year would be added on and in the type of car he describes that would probably be a taxable benefit of \$7,000.00 or \$8,000.00 on which he has to pay maybe \$3,500.00 income tax. And he is now saying that Members opposite when they were in Government did not claim that, and therefore, did not pay the income taxes. This is astounding, an astounding revelation. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that in relation to this issue, there are a lot of astounding revelations that can be made. A lot of them. A lot of astounding revelations, and that was the first one. A lot of astounding revelations that could be made. Mr. Chairman, that is all I want to say on this particular issue at the present time

Mr. Chairman: The hon, Member from Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you Chairperson. What gall the Members of the Government have after only a year

in office, what they have done is give themselves a second salary increase in twelve months. With their majority in the House of Assembly, they increased remuneration for MHAs, and now the Cabinet have given themselves a pay increase of \$8,000.00 per year.

Mr. Chairman: Point of Order. The President of Treasury Board

Mr. Baker: It is well known that the increase in remuneration given MHAs is as a result of a decision made by the previous Government to turn it over to an independent group who would then after every election decide on MHAs salaries, we did not give the increase to MHAs. The hon. Member knows that and should not say it.

Ms Verge: Chairperson, I stand corrected, the Government have actually given themselves three salary increases this year.

Mr. Chairman: Are you speaking to that point of Order?

Ms Verge: Yes, Chairperson, to the point of order, I am saying that I made a mistake earlier, the Government have not given themselves two pay increases this year, they have actually increased their salaries three times.

Mr. Chairman: I rule that there is no point of order, but the President of Treasury Board took the opportunity to try and clarify a statement made by the Member. The hon. Member from Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you Chairperson. This Government have increased the basic pay of all Members of the House, this Government have increased the salaries of Cabinet Ministers, and now they are jacking up the Cabinet Ministers

salaries by another \$8,000.00 a year, plus they provide Cabinet Ministers with credit cards for gas. Mr. Chairman, it is clearly a third salary increase, and there is no justification for it. Not only that Chairperson -

Some Hon. Members: (inaudible)

Mr. Chairman: Order please, order please!

Ms Verge: Chairperson, I would like to clarify. No I did not ever have a Government gas credit card, nor did I ever use a Government vehicle, I always used my own vehicle, in ten years in the Cabinet I used two vehicles, I used a 1977 Volkswagon Rabbit which I had for eight years and then I used a 1985 Volkswagon Getta which I still have, it is five years old. Chairperson, my district is on the West coast of the Island, I travel back and forth between the capital and my district as often as I can, frequently, I get reimbursed for most of these trips by the House of Assembly, and Mr. Chairperson, I would like to refute what the Government House Leader tried to say earlier, in confusing travel between Members districts and the capital and Cabinet Ministers driving in Government cars. For those Cabinet Ministers whose districts are some distance from the capital, such as the Minister of Health, there is no way that he can use a Government car to travel from St. John's to Roddickton. He is going to generally have to fly to Deer Lake or St. Anthony, and then rent a car there to get to his district. So any Government car that he had for his first year in Cabinet really did not benefit him in getting back and forth between St. John's and his district. But,

Chairperson this is the third salary increase this Government have given themselves in their first year in office. Yet they piously pretend that they are being frugal. They self-righteously say that they are cutting expenses and eliminating extravagance. I call that gall. I also say it is misleading the people of the Province.

At the same time as they have given themselves a third salary increase, they are doubling the budget of Newfoundland Information Service, without any justification. Newfoundland Information Service primarily distributes news releases from Ministers to the newsrooms of the Province.

Now, every Minister's office has a fax machine. Most Departments probably have several fax machines, and these fax machines can be used to get Ministers news releases distributed to the news media instantly. I see less justification than there ever was, for Newfoundland Information Service, and fail to understand any good reason for the increase in the Budget.

We contrast the increases in Government Member's and Minister's salaries and benefits, the doubling of the Budget for Newfoundland Information Service, which distributes Ministers news releases, with the cuts being made by the Government through this latest Budget. They cut hospital schools outside St. John's. They have not made any reduction in the teaching staff at the Janeway, but they are eliminating completely the hospital schools outside St. John's. These schools are located at the Central Newfoundland Hospital in Grand Falls, Western

Memorial Regional in Corner Brook and Curtis Memorial in St. Anthony in the District of the Minister of Health.

Mr. Chairman, these Department of Education School Teaching Programs are extremely valuable for young patients; inpatients at the three hospitals, and outpatients at Western Memorial. The Minister of Education has not given any education reason for eliminating the programs.

The NTA and others involved in education have concluded that this is a Budget decision, perhaps made in haste, in the days leading up to the Budget being delivered. There was no consultation with anyone involved in education or health, and they claim that it is detrimental to the education and health of children and adolescents who have to be hospitalized.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Verge: I join my colleagues in the House in welcoming the Member for St. John's East Extern to the Chair. I am sure with his capable leadership and ability to maintain discipline, that we will have greater order in the House than ever before. Woe betide the Member who crosses this Chairperson.

As I was saying, Chairperson, the Government's decision to eliminate the hospital schools outside St. John's is assumed to be a Budget decision. A measure designed to save money. The savings are relatively modest; there are four teachers salaries involved. Yet the same Government has just given Cabinet Ministers a third pay increase in twelve months. What kind of priorities does this Government have? More money for

the Ministers, elimination of hospital schools for young people who have to be treated by hospitals.

Chairperson, this Government while claiming to put education at the top of its priority list, has greatly reduced the spending power of school boards throughout the Province this year. I have heard from several trustees and superintendents and they are extremely worried about the situation they are now facing. A number of them, individually, have estimated being between -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Ms Verge: Chairperson, I missed the remarks of the former NTA president sitting on the Government benches, but in case he was comparing the current situation to what has happened in the recent past, let me remind him of the statement of the Provincial School Trustees Association, which is that this is the worst Education Budget in living memory. Chairperson, as I was saying, I have heard from several school trustees and superintendents, and I assume the Minister of Education, when he attended their Provincial Convention in Gander on Friday, you heard from some of them as well.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Ms Verge: They are facing extremely difficult financial times. A number of them estimated being between \$100,000 and \$200,000 worse off this year than they were last year.

The basic funding for fixed overhead costs is far below the projected inflation rate for the

year. It is 0.7 per cent contrasted with an estimated 4 per cent inflation rate.

Compounding the problem is the freeze in the Budget for student transportation and the underfunding of teacher aids or student assistance. School Boards are going to be making representations to the Government, as I say, I assume many have already to the Minister of Education.

Mr. Chairman, these people are quite upset and quite shocked and disillusioned, actually, since this Government is made up of several teachers and -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Ms Verge: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I will return to this later.

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

An Hon. Member: Oh my God, what did he do now.

An Hon. Member: Who? Mr. Who?

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, on Friday morning in this Legislature, I was speaking on the topic of traditional Newfoundland foods, their contribution to the economy and to the health of Newfoundlanders. I mentioned specifically the contributions of seal meat made to the household economy of thousands of Newfoundland families a generation or so ago, and deplored the fact that we seem to be getting away from these traditional, nutritious foods, seal carcasses, cod roe, bake-apples, partridge berries and blueberries. I indicated my

strong belief that modern marketing and packaging techniques must be used to make traditional foods more convenient for modern Newfoundlanders and for export.

Mr. Chairman, I am a proud Newfoundlander. I respect our traditions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Kitchen: I believe Newfoundlanders have a lot to offer to each other, to this country and to this planet. We must have more pride in what we are, and in what we and our forebearers have accomplished. We have built here on this rock, a great civilization. Our traditions and our know-how must be respected, and we must not believe that the ways and traditions of others are necessarily superior to our own. This has been a favorite topic of mine for many years.

However, Mr. Chairman, during the course of my remarks, I used in a generic sense, a phrase which I wish I had not used. Namely, Kentucky Fried garbage.

I have received today a letter from Mr. Christopher Rusted, General Manager of Kentucky Fried Chicken, Marquis Limited who feels that their trademark, their company, their staff and employees have been distressed by that remark. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention to cause any distress to anybody and since my remarks have caused distress, I unreservedly and without equivocation, apologize for that unfortunate phrase.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Kitchen: I apologize to them

and to anyone else similarly affected. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: Good speech.

Mr. R. Aylward: Mr. Chairman, I said today in the House of Assembly that had the Minister apologized earlier today I would not have made the remarks that I did in the speech today.

Mr. Chairman, right now I want to congratulate the Minister for apologizing to the people that he did, no doubt, cause stress.

Mr. Chairman, I find it very interesting to note that the Minister had his statement typed up, and printed out, I am not sure if the Premier did it for him or not, but I am glad to see that the Minister now is considering, Mr. Chairman, is giving great consideration to the language that he is using in this House of Assembly and he is taking the time to write out the speech so that he will not -

An Hon. Member: Get into any more trouble.

Mr. R. Aylward: - get into any more trouble which is the kindest way to say it, yes. And I appreciate very much that the Minister did apologize to the people who work with the Kentucky Fried Chicken franchise or industry in this Province who contribute quite a bit to the economy of this Province, that industry, I know, provides a lot

of opportunity for young people to start their working career in this Province, as does most of the fast food industry in the Province, and I commend the Minister for making the statement that he just made and that is the end of it as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Chairman, now to get back to the car allowance that was referred to by the President of Treasury Board there a little while ago. There is one difference; he said I made a couple of statements now that were embarrassing or damaging, I guess is the way he was putting it, Mr. Chairman, but the difference between me and the Administration who were here before, is that we are not trying to hide anything. Anything you want to know, anything they did, just ask me a question and I will give you a truthful answer. And it is Revenue Canada who said that I was not, when I was audited, who said that it was not illegal for me to take that car home. I mean they were the ones who said it, not me, I did not make up the ruling myself. Three years ago, when I was audited, Mr. Chairman, all that information was made public, and the reason I was audited at the time, I think, was because I had a house that I was renting and I was losing money on it, and the reason for that is because I never had enough time to go look for a tenant at the time, and that is what drew my name out of the millions of people who were audited that year.

But, Mr. Chairman, the difference now, as I have said before, with that \$8000 car allowance is, and the deception that is being created, is that it is not a tax saving. I mean it is a benefit to the Ministers and it is a tax loss

to the people of this Province. The \$8000 plus the gas card plus the loss of that \$15,000 car or \$12,000 car at the end of the three year period, is a cost to the people of this Province, and that is where, I do not mind that the Ministers got their \$8000 car allowance, that is not the big problem with me, the problem is that they are trying to suggest to the people of this Province that it is going to save the people of the Province money, and that is where we differ on this point. I do not believe, and I think any auditor, and probably I hope so anyway, that the Auditor General when he is doing his studies, when he compares the cost for Ministers cars at one time in this Province, and the \$12,000 cost as was said and the statement by the President of Treasury Board, that this is going to save the taxpayers of this Province, I hope the President of Council is right, but I doubt it very much, I do not believe it, but I hope the Auditor General does have a look at it and we will see if the cost in three years time will work out to be a savings of whatever it might be to the taxpayers.

The taxpayers will be paying the \$8000, the taxpayers, at fifty dollars a week gas, will cost them another twenty-five hundred dollars, so in direct cost to the taxpayers right now, it is \$10,000 or \$10,500 in direct output for a fifty dollar gas bill. Now that is the gas bill that I use in my vehicle just to come back and forth to work and do my regular District work, it costs me about fifty dollars a week to drive the vehicle that I own now. So if we have a fifty dollar bill for gas during the week, every week of the year, about twenty-five hundred dollars, roughly I guess that

would cost, and we have an \$8000 allowance to the Cabinet Ministers or in the \$10,500 range of the direct tax dollar output. We say that is going to save \$12,000, so we are only looking at fifteen hundred to two thousand a year for a saving. Now the new car, the car that was left, when I left the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the car that was left was certainly worth more than \$6,000.00 for the three years of just the tax savings that we can see you can get, you are going to save \$1,500.00 a year from the \$12,000.00 that it costs now, and you have no car at the end of the three year period. And that car was definitely worth more than the \$4,500.00 to \$6,000.00 that potentially could be saved from the difference of the \$12,000.00 we are talking about. The cost of the Minister's cars as was made in the statement by the President of Treasury Board, the cost of a Minister having a car was \$12,000.00, now if someone did not do their homework on the cost of a Minister having a car which would include gas, which would include maintenance which would include depreciation, we have better public servants in our system than that, when they look at costs of something they do not just look at the cost of the car or a depreciation value. If the Minister of Treasury Board's statement is incorrect let him get up in the House and correct it and then I will do some other estimates and maybe he can show me then that he is right. But, right now, if you have an \$8,000.00 credit to the Cabinet Ministers and you have a \$2,500.00 gas bill you are talking \$10,500.00. The savings is \$12,000.00 so you have \$1,500.00 left over per year for three years. What do you have at the end of three years, you have



\$4,500.00, or even up to \$6,000.00, I will give it that far and a car the one that I bought was in the \$18,000.00 bracket, I had it for three years, and even if it was only worth half of what it was in three years time which was ridiculous it would be worth at least \$10,000.00, but even if it was worth only half it is still \$9,000.00, so you are going to save \$4,500.00 and you are going to loose a \$9,000.00 benefit minimum on the car that was left there before.

An Hon. Member: Right on.

Mr. R. Aylward: And the Minister of Treasury Board still does not see it, I will go over it one more time for him now. One more time, it is very simple. Very simple logic, I am not trying to complicate this for anyone. Ok, well, I mean if the Minister of Treasury Board should understand, that if the tax payers are going to pay, I am not saying that the Minister should not have a car allowance, I am not saying they should not have a car, I had a car when I was there, I am not arguing that point. I am arguing the point that you are saying it is a savings to the people of this Province. And the \$8,000.00 a year for the allowance the \$2,500.0 a year, that is only \$50.00 a week which a large size car which is another \$2,500.00 so it is a direct \$10,500.00 per year, per car. And that car at the end of the three year period, the car that is left, will be worth more than the \$4,500.00 that you are saving. You are saying an \$18,000.00 car is not worth more than \$4,500.00 at the end of three years. Well I would not buy that car, do not buy the car that you are going to get. I give you a little advice. Yes, repairs and

tires and maintenance, that could come into it, but if someone did a cost analyses for you and told you that the cost of a Minister having a car which was stated in your statement, did not say that. If someone did up an estimate for me of the cost of me having a car for my business and he only took into consideration the cost of the car or the gas I burnt and he did not take into consideration the maintenance and the tires and repairs, I would fire him. I mean if he told me the cost was \$12,000.00 I assume that that cost covers the costs. Okay, so over four years, we are doing it over four years now, over four years you got \$32,000.00 in \$8,000.00 allowances. You got a gas still at \$2,500.00 a year, if that is what it is going to be, so that is another \$10,000.00. Now it is costing \$48,000.00 in four years at \$12,000.00 a year so that covered everything maintenance and tires and the whole works it cost Government, but it is still the same logic you are only adding another year on it. It is still the same logic if it costs now the \$8,000.00 you are getting plus \$2,500.00 gas in the three year time period the car will be still worth more than the benefit. In four year, it will still be worth more. An \$18,000 car is still worth in four years, I know it, because I bought an \$11,000 car five years ago and I turned it in this winter on a second hand 4 wheel drive. I paid \$11,000 for the car, and I got \$4,500 on the turn-in for it. I could have sold the car for \$3,200, I had an offer for \$3,200, but it was better for me to turn it in because it took the taxes off the other end, and the other guy went in and bought the car. And the logic still holds,

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: I can table the calculations very easily, if the Minister of Finance needs them. I am sure he has people in his office that are more competent.

And I still say that the Auditor General in three or four years time, will be looking at the statement made by the President of Treasury Board, saying that this will be a savings, and I am sure that the Auditor General -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. R. Aylward: - will find that this is a cost, and hopefully we will have the same experienced Auditor General who the Minister of Treasury Board worked with very cooperatively during his time as President of Public Accounts.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Chairman, before I get into my speech, I want to compliment you sir, on the job that you are doing of chairing this House tonight. In my years in this House, you are doing the best job, save your immediate predecessor, who also did an excellent job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: Mr. Chairman, the Member from Humber East; I am glad to see now that she is defending educators. I am glad to hear her do that, it is right and proper that she should do that.

However, I remember just a few

years ago, when I actually pitied that hon. Member who was then Minister of Education. When she went and met with a group of teachers, Mr. Chairman, they booed her, they heckled her, to the point that I was a Liberal; she was a Tory, they tell me I am still a Tory, I do not know if I am or not. But I remember when she and I were on different sides of the fence, as we still are, and had I been in her position at that night, as a Liberal Minister of Education, and had the NTA treat me the way they treated her, I would have walked out of the building -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Decker: - and told them that I would come back when they had better sense. Now, that is what I would have done on the issue. I pitied the hon. member, and I could only praise her up.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Decker: Mr. Chairman, that is all water under the bridge, as far as that Member is concerned. Now she is a great defender of Merle Vokey and those people, and I want to hand it to her.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of talk about the car. Here is the bottom line for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, here is the bottom line for the people all over the world. A wonderful thing when this mike is on, people in Moscow, or people in London, England, can sit down and listen to what we are saying in this House. It is a wonderful thing to have the media and the radio, and

we can send our voices out all over the world. Well, what I want to say to the people of the world is this; the bottom line is this -

An Hon. Member: Now, spike!

Mr. Decker: - by the way, where is the hon. spike tonight, he is not here, I don't see him. The hon. spike has missed quite a few days this last few days, is there something going on in the kennel club, or something.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: Mr. Chairman, I am being diverted, and I would like to have your protection sir, I am sure you are going to do it, because you can control this House in such an amazing fashion.

Now, the bottom line to the people all over the world is this; Ministers cars cost the taxpayers of this Province approximately \$300,000 in the past, and it is an accepted fact, an accepted principal that Ministers should have access to some sort of transportation. Both sides of the House are admitting that. As a result of this change, the cost of Minister's cars to the taxpayer, taking into consideration depreciation, taking into consideration the resale value of the car after it has been written off for tax purposes, taking all that into consideration, the cost per year will be \$150,000. A saving, Mr. Chairman, of \$150,000.

An Hon. Member: Not true, not true!

Mr. Decker: Now, Member's opposite can get up and they can talk all they like.

An Hon. Member: They can rant and

roar.

Mr. Decker: Thanks the Member for Grand Bank, they can rant and roar all they like. The bottom line is this; there will be a saving of \$150,000 to the taxpayers of this Province. That is the bottom line.

Now, Members opposite are talking about the perks, and the way that this can be manipulated, what you can buy with a gas card, and all this sort of thing. Now, maybe Mr. Chairman, Members opposite, this Cabinet has only been in office one year, I am quite prepared, as Minister of Health, to table the expenses of my car, my entertainment, my allowances for the past year, on condition that we would do the same for all the former Members of the Cabinet over there.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: The Member for Kilbride says it is quite all right. Quite prepared to do that and show if nobody was using a Government car and claiming mileage, that is quite all right, there is nothing to worry about.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: But if there was someone over there who was.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: If there was someone who had a Minister's car and drove to his District, and also made a claim through Mr. Murray up in the office, then I would ask that hon. Member to maybe think twice before we agreed to table what actually happened because, I would think, there might be people who did that. It could well have happened. But we have, right now,

a very prudent group of Ministers, maybe the most prudent, careful, cost conscious group since the history of this Province, Mr. Chairman, and we are trying to save.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: Maybe, maybe what happened to hon. Members opposite is that they were in power too long. I mean, that is the beautiful thing about democracy, after you are in power too long, the electorate turf you out.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: Maybe that is why they were abusing the system.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Decker: I can refer to one particular Minister's claim, Mr. Chairman, he did not give the names of the individuals he used to take up for entertainment, but he used to tell their occupations. He always used to tell about their race, I do not want to give the hon. Member away, Mr. Chairman. And sometimes I would have to question it. I would have to question whether or not the expense account was being padded. But I am quite prepared to table mine, and I would think my colleagues are, on condition that we table it all, all the ones which were in the past ten or twelve years. Let it all hang out, Mr. Chairman. So that is what they want to do, the bottom line taxpayers will see that right now we are doing it a lot less expensively than they did it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Humber East talked about the hospital schools being closed and she referred specifically to St.

Anthony. Now Mr. Chairman, let me say up front I agree with what we did in St. Anthony. I agree with it and I guess the hon. Member would realize that I would not be sitting in the Cabinet today if I disagreed. The whole idea of Government is you agree with what you do and when it comes to a time, on principle or whatever, then you can step down graciously.

However, I would like to have been able to put hospital schools in all the hospitals in Newfoundland and Labrador, I would like to be able to do it. But as the President of Treasury Board pointed out the other day, in Government you have to make choices. We do not have enough money to do all the things that must be done. So you have to make choices. And someone has to make a judgment call. Last year, it was hon. Members who had to make the judgment call. This year, it is this Administration which has to make the judgment calls.

Now, let me tell you some of the things that came before the Treasury Board when we were making the decision about those hospital schools. Before this Administration came in power, Mr. Chairman, you will be aware of the move to put the handicapped children, the physically handicapped children into the school system, to integrate them into the school system, a good policy, a good, small l, Liberal policy which the previous Administration brought in. But what was happening in the schools, Mr. Chairman. We had people, physically handicapped to the point where they had to be carried into the schools, and it is still happening, in wheelchairs, one on one with the teachers, but a lot of those handicapped people were

so ill that they had to be fed, not with a spoon or a fork, but they had to be fed with a tube there in the school system now. In the school system right now, a lot of those handicapped children, through no fault of their own, have to receive several injections in the run of a day.

The previous Administration did not have one cent made available for the health services to those handicapped children. It costs this present Administration, in this year's Budget, approximately \$250,000 to put in place consulting nurses so that they could go in and make sure that those physically handicapped children got this very essential service in order to allow them to stay in the school system. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, we were spending approximately the same amount to keep hospital schools open in Grand Falls, in St. Anthony, in Corner Brook and various places.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: About \$250,000. So, it was a judgment call where, ideally, we would have been able to do both and more besides.

But we had to make a judgment call.

An Hon. Member: It was a bad judgment.

Mr. Decker: Okay, so the hon. Member for Grand Bank; you are telling me that if you had to choose between the hospital school in St. Anthony where an average stay is four and a half days -

Ms Verge: And more salary for the Ministers.

An Hon. Member: Or your car.

Mr. Decker: Or a saving of \$150,000 which we did.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

The hon. Minister's time has elapsed.

Mr. Decker: I would like to have leave to finish my sentence, but you are not going to give it to me are you?

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I just want to go over it once more now, the hon. Minister of Health gave some figures that there will be a savings of \$150,000 in a four year period.

Mr. Decker: No, one year.

An Hon. Member: Oh, come on!

Mr. R. Aylward: Oh, he decided not to break it down, so that a person who is not as knowledgeable about finances as he is could understand it, so I am going to try, for his sake now, to break this down, in what the car savings will be over a four year period as was just suggested by the President of Treasury Board. It was done on a four year period. So, right now, in a four year period, at an \$8000 car allowance, the Ministers will get \$32,000, and if they spend fifty dollars a week on gas, it will cost another \$10,000, so that would be a total of \$42,000 would be the cost over this four year period.

Now Mr. Chairman, under the \$12,000 cost, as was mentioned in the President of Treasury Board's statement, the \$12,000 cost would cost the taxpayer \$48,000 at the

end of the four year period, so that is the savings, it looks to be a savings, of \$6000 over that four year period per car. Now if that is the case, what is missing in that savings, Mr. Chairman, if the car costs, in the first year, \$18,000, which is a reasonable price say if these were the cars that we have, the second year it would be around twelve, I think that is probably a bit low, but we will say twelve, the third year, that car would be around ten, I do not know if anyone over there is involved in used cars, but that is roughly about what it would be, and in the fourth year, that \$20,000 car would be worth about \$8000. So we have a \$6000 saving which is easy to compute, \$42,000 from the expenses and \$48,000 is what it would cost for the \$12,000 before. So we have the \$6000 saving and at the end of the four year period, we were left with an \$8000 car. So that seems to me that the new policy brought in by this Government is going to cost the taxpayers a minimum of two thousand dollars.

Now, if my figures are wrong, just to check my figures, I wanted to have a look at the paper here to see what a four year old car might be worth to see if my calculations were wrong, and just looking in today's paper, in the Telegram of May 13, I think that is today, anyway. Yesterday's paper is it? Okay, the prices of a four year old car did not change a big lot from yesterday to today, I do not say, so we will use yesterday's paper, and we will look at a 1986 Celebrity, that is all that describes it here, that is a four year old car today, what a 1986 Celebrity would be. That Celebrity is a cheaper car than the type we used to use, I forget the name of the ones we had.

An Hon. Member: Caprice.

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, they were the next up the line from the Celebrity. But a 1986 Celebrity today, a four year old car, in the paper yesterday, is worth sixty-four hundred dollars. Even at that price, we are still losing four hundred dollars per car.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Aylward: Mr. Chairman, a 1986 Olds Calais, I believe, I have got it overlined here, which probably would be closer in the line of what the cars we had were, it might be a bit closer, it still is not as good, but the price of this 1986 Oldsmobile, a four year old car, and still we are looking at supposedly saving six thousand dollars a car right now, but if we had the car left at the end of a four year period, this 1986 Olds Calais, if that is what we had bought, would be worth \$6790. That, Mr. Chairman is a loss of seven hundred and sixty dollars per car to the taxpayers of this Province.

So, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see where anyone can say that the new policy is going to save the taxpayers money. Mr. Chairman, to go over it again for the President of Treasury Board who just came in.

Mr. Baker: I was listening to you.

Mr. R. Aylward: Okay, from the \$42,000 it will cost now for the \$8000 plus \$10,000 in gas, and the \$48,000 which it would have cost under the \$12,000 per car, is a six thousand dollar difference. And what would have happened if we were there, that car, starting off at \$18,000 would be worth twelve the second year, ten the third year, and probably around eight

thousand, was my guess.

An Hon. Member: Four thousand.

Mr. R. Aylward: Okay, so the hon. Minister says four thousand, I am glad he said that because I looked at my figures and not knowing the used car market very good, I went to yesterday's paper to see what a four year old car might be worth. And a four year old car, we are trying to save six thousand dollars per car now according to the figures, this paper of yesterday says a 1986 Celebrity, which is not the type of car that we had, it is the one down the line, a 1986 Celebrity, yesterday, was worth \$6400, so you lost four hundred dollars right off the bat.

An Hon. Member: How many miles are on it.

Mr. R. Aylward: Oh, it does not say I do not know what the miles are on it, but I mean, that is a cheaper car no matter what miles are on it. Well they are advertising for \$6,400.00 and that is not the only one here, there is an Olds Cutlass, or Calais which is closer to the type of car we had, and that today is worth \$6,790.00, an 1986 Olds. So that is a four year old car that you are going to loose \$790.00 on, Minister of Finance, rather than save tax dollars and I would say that because the Minister of Finance is very concerned about how tax dollars are being spent and collected and he does not want to raise taxes, he should have a look into this personally, he should have a look into this policy himself. And I think that if he did look into this policy and did some, just basic arithmetic, he would find out that this is going to cost the taxpayers, he is going to have to

raise more tax dollars in the next four years to cover the cost of this new policy, and if the Minister of Finance did have a look at it, and convinced himself that the figures I am giving are correct, and they are open for scrutiny, I do not disagree with that. But, Mr. Chairman, he is going to have to raise the payroll tax a little bit in the next four years so that he can cover the cost of this new policy. It is not a savings to the taxpayer, that is the only point that I am trying to get across here tonight. You are not fleecing the taxpayer, you are not going to take a big pile of money from them, I am not saying that, I mean a Minister deserves to have a car, a Minister deserves to have transportation.

Mr. Chairman: Order please there is too much talking going. We have about five conversations going at the one time. We could do with five conversations less. So we will give the hon. gentleman a chance to be heard. The Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you Mr. Chairman, for your protection, I appreciate it. Well Mr. Chairman, if the Minister for Finance, did look at it, just a simple calculations that I did tonight, the best you can do is to loose \$400.00 a year on it, and the worst according to this paper for a car that would be close to what we are looking at, you would loose \$790.00 per car and for a car that is a Pontiac Sunbird, four cylinder, four door in good condition 70,000 kilometers is worth \$5,700.00. So you might save if you made sure that they all bought 1986 Pontiac Sunbirds, maybe in that scenario you might be able to convince people that

you are saving \$300.00 per car in a four year period, but to change the policy and not have a car left at the end of the year, Mr. Chairman, I was hoping to be able to find the same type of car, I believe it was a Capri, the Chevrolets we use to use.. But there are no Capris in this paper yesterday, and all the rest of them are older than 1986, but if we did it in a three year period some of these cars would be worth a lot more, you would lose a lot more money in a three year period, Mr. Chairman. A three year old car here is a 1985 Plymouth Voyager, I do not even know what that is. Five passenger, 2.4 cylinders, so on, and so on, it is worth \$8,000.0, Mr. Chairman, at the end of a three year period. And I can table those for the Minister if he wishes to check the figures.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. The hon. Members time has elapsed.

Mr. R. Aylward: I think I have convinced him to change it, at least.

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

Dr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate you for the splendid way in which you have conducted this evenings proceedings - and I feel honored to speak with you in the Chair, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you.

Dr. Warren: There are two or three issues that I would like to address rather briefly. I did attend the school trustees meeting in Gander on Friday. It was quite an interesting session. I like to meet groups throughout the

Province and discuss the issues head-on with them. I was expecting quite a discussion on Friday, and we had an interesting debate about educational funding.

I was pleased to find that the trustees understand the situation this Province is in. The trustees, with many others, acknowledge that the Province is in a difficult financial position. They understand what the Federal Government did with respect to transfer payments earlier in the year. They, themselves, are involved in budget making, and they know how difficult it is to provide the level of service that we need, with the limited resources that we have, at the high cost that services are in various parts of this Province.

I did explain to them, something I do not think they understood earlier. In addition to the \$50 million that we increased the education budget by this year, was another \$3.5 million. That \$3.5 million came from last years funds that Government had left, and that \$3.5 million was similar to the \$21 million that the Government found to put into pensions. I do not think that people have acknowledged that the Minister of Finance, at the beginning, in his budget, this year announced that we were going to put \$21 million into the pension fund. That is a tremendous contribution to that fund, to try to build up the pension fund for teachers and others in the Province. We found another \$3.5 million for last year, so this year we have an increase in the education budget of about \$53.5 million. That is an increase of about 7.4 per cent. When you break in down by elementary, secondary,



post-secondary, it is about the same percentage increase in each.

I tried to point out something else to the trustees; the size of the education component of the total pie increased this year. About seven or eight years ago when I was doing analyses of budgets, the education budget, made up about 27 per cent of the Provincial Budget at one point in time. That decreased over the years, and I can get the statistics for my hon. friends across the House, if they want them.

It came down over the years, 27, 25, 24 as a proportion of the total budget, came down to about 23 per cent last year. This year we moved it back up a little bit. It has gone back up to 23.5 per cent. We increased the actual dollar amounts for education, and we also increased the proportion of the total budget that is devoted to education this year slightly, not enough, but slightly.

We stopped the downward trend. I think that is the way to put it. And of course, this year, my hon. colleague knows, that we put some extra money into health, social services and other things as well this year.

Now, on the letter that has been quoted in the House. I have not received a large number of letters. I gather there are some being sent to me. I received one the other day from the Port au Port School Board. The Minister of Finance addressed some of the problems with that letter, and you read it in the House, and there were some flaws in it; but I am preparing a detailed response to that letter to send to my friend, the school board chairperson and

the superintendent in that area.

There is another letter in the press, that was quoted in the House, from the Green Bay Intergrated School Board. The Green Bay Intergrated School Board said a number of things here that were not quoted in the House. One, for example, Mr. Chairperson, the Superintendent from the Green Bay Intergrated School Board, speaking on behalf of the Superintendents of Education in the Province, said in the letter; education in this Province has always been underfunded. He acknowledged that we have a long term problem with school funding.

I might say that, I went back and checked the statistics for his District. In 1986-87, his District received \$85,000 from the school tax equalization fund. In 1987-88, his District received \$106,000, it went up \$21,000. In 1988-89, school tax equalization provided for his District, \$175,000. Last year, the first year of this Government in power, his school district grant from tax equalization went from \$175,000 to \$420,000. An increase of \$245,000 in one year. And we kept it at that level this year. So we did make substantial increases last year, this year not as much, but we did maintain that level of service.

From the two or three letters that I received, I agree with a number of things. There is not enough money. These are difficult times, but we are going to ensure that these amounts are increased in the future. There is one other thing that comes through in the letters, Mr. Chairperson, and that is that the trustees acknowledge that the grant system is flawed. The way that we distribute funds to school

districts in this Province must be changed. I have indicated to the House that we will change that.

We cannot, in the future, finance education on a per student basis. We must relate the funding more to cost and to need. In small areas we have small schools, they need more money per student to provide equal opportunity than they do in bigger areas. You must spend unequally in order to provide equality of educational opportunity.

Hospital schools have come up, and these are difficult decisions. As the Minister of Health said; we had some options before us. We decided, Mr. Chairman, to terminate the three schools where the students were staying for short periods of time. But I mentioned to the House that we are going to ensure that students are not impacted negatively. I think that was the term I used. We are going to ask school boards to examine the needs of students who are in hospitals for longer periods of time, and we are going to find a way to help them. We will work out the details between now and September, so that students who are going to spend extended periods in hospitals, not just in Corner Brook, Grand Falls, and St. Anthony, but other hospitals as well, that they receive educational services. It may cost some money, but it will not cost as much as what we are spending at the present time.

Mr. Chairperson, one other thing I found in Gander, there is tremendous support for something that you and the present Minister of Education has supported in this House. For interdenominational sharing. I explained to the trustees, the Governments

intention to promote interdenominational cooperation and to develop a strategy for that, so that much more sharing can take place over the next few years.. I found tremendous support among the trustees for this approach, this policy. They want to work with us, the churches want to work with the Government in ensuring that we get the best value possible for the limited dollars that we have in this period of fiscal restraint. There is tremendous support for this, and I will continue my meetings with the churches, and with the school boards, to ensure that in the area of bussing, in the area of school superintendents and consultants, specialists teachers, school sharing, that in many parts of this Province, we share the facilities and the services that we have, so that we get better service for the limited dollars we have.

I might say, in conclusion, that I really enjoyed the session with the superintendents. I take every opportunity to meet with them, and they will be, I am sure, meeting with me later on, about other issues. I really did enjoy the Gander session, and their approach was one of great understanding, and of course they are interested in seeing changes in the grant system, so we can provide greater equality of educational opportunity in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

I want to make a few remarks this evening based upon what has been said by some previous speakers. But first of all, I would like to touch on the car allowance that the Ministers have granted themselves, and that-

An Hon. Member: Do you want to see some prices on some new models?

Mr. Matthews: Sorry.

Oh I welcome the Minister of Social Services getting up after me, because he is the only one over there who attempts to cover off what I say with any amount of credibility.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, I think the Member for Kilbride has done an excellent job this evening going through this whole issue of car allowances -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: - and really he has picked some holes in the President of Treasury Board -

An Hon. Member: Phil, that is the same speech as you had last week. The same speech as you had last week.

Mr. Matthews: - on this whole issue because what we are seeing here is that, in essence, they are going to end up with a car after three or four years owned outright by the Ministers, and after receiving about \$32,000 in taxpayers money, and after the announcement was made, I was in my District, when I went in Thursday night actually, and on Friday and Saturday, attended two functions in the District, a number of people raised the question of the

car allowance for Ministers. The point that most of them picked up on was the fact that the cars will now be properties of the Ministers and not the properties of the Province, they will not be Crown assets, and a lot of them found that quite disturbing. Because they see that with the schedule of payment, that it is conceivable that Ministers opposite will receive \$24,000 in less than two years towards buying a car. And that means that they will own them outright in that length of time. You can get a half decent car today for \$24,000. And if you get \$24,000 inside that two year period, you will own that car and, as a matter of fact, you can start getting another \$8000 to start buying another one.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Sorry?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Oh no, we went through all that tonight. The Minister of Social Services was late coming in, I realize he has got a pretty busy schedule and so on, but I know his absence was justified, but we have covered all these angles tonight, and in essence, what the Member for Kilbride has shown tonight, is that, the Province is not going to save any money in going this route, in essence, the Ministers are going to be, personally better off, and the taxpayers of the Province are going to be worse off. Now that is the conclusion that we have come to, that we have drawn on this particular issue, but I do not want to belabour that point any more, Mr. Chairman, and I want to say that Ministers should be provided transportation, they should be provided the credit

card, I have no problem with that whatsoever, any Minister of the Crown in this Province should be compensated accordingly and provided with that kind of a service. But I would much rather have seen it stay the way it was, quite honestly, than to see this \$8000 being given to the Ministers in payments and then they end up owning the car, as opposed to the people of the Province owning them because, you know, a Minister could get the flick in a year and a half or two years, and could have conceivably received sixteen or twenty-four thousand dollars but the car is the Minister's, it is not the people's car. And I think that is the problem.

Now there are a couple of other things, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to allude to. I wish that someone, whoever is the Minister's speech writer over there, I wish someone would change his speech, because it is the fourth time we have heard the Minister of Education give the same speech, with the same quotations, the same figures, and never before, in our history, has education been stagnated as much as it has in the last fourteen or fifteen months in this Province by the Minister of Education.

He was up to the University, he has prepared more papers, and Royal Commission Reports to this Province on education than anyone else in Newfoundland and Labrador, so if there is anyone had a chance to influence education in Newfoundland and Labrador, it is the current Minister of Education. But what we have seen since he became the Minister of Education, Mr. Chairman, is a total stagnation of education in this Province.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No progress, just fancy talk, I agree, I agree, I agree and then he does not agree. Yes, EEE, triple E, better scholar for the dollar, on and on we go, but no action. No action, lighthouse for schools or whatever it is. Yes, I say yes we might be going back to the days of the lighthouse with this Minister with his increased electricity and so on that is going to strike the school boards in this Province. Freeze on bussing, what do we see as the real increase in school boards education for the secondary schools in the Province, amounts to what, 0.7 per cent increase when you factor in inflation and other things, so for the real saviour of education, who is now the Minister of Education, to let these things happen in this Province I think is absolutely ridiculous, for a man who is supposed to be championing the cause of education. And he came back from the meeting with his trustees and he has hardly been able to get a word out since because he got roasted. Yes he got roasted. He was put in a roaster out in Gander and he comes back today, and he got enough strength to get up tonight, he recovered enough tonight to get up and say what a wonderful meeting he had.

Some Hon. Members: (inaudible)

Mr. Matthews: What was that? What is he saying over there. Roast, yes roast a chicken, Mr. Chairman, old St. Hubert himself. Old St. Hubert. We got the name on him now, we even sent him over the ad now, we deliver at St. Hubert's. We got the name on him. What I want is to get serious, Mr. Chairman, for a

moment, and talk in particular about the Department of Fisheries and so on in the Budget. Over the last few weeks we tried to make some points on the estimates of the Department of Fisheries, where we see the Budget actually decrease by 2.1 million dollars this year, and I asked the Minister a number of questions on the Budget a few weeks ago, Estimates Committee, and the Premier and they all, yes we are going to get answers, but we have not seen any yet. So I just want to bounce a few things off the Minister, maybe when he gets a chance either tonight or over the next day or so, he might get up and give us a few answers on some of these things.

Ask the question about the amount of money allocated for the middle distance effort, there is \$300,000.00 I think it is this year, \$310,900.00 this year under sub heading title, I think it is Middle Distance Fishing Effort, or something like that. Sub-head 3106 on page 121. Increase of \$53,900.00 over last year. I would like for the Minister if he could to please explain, I am sure there is a good explanation for it, but I do not know, and I would like for you to inform us, it is probably something to do with the boats, or paying the boats or mortgages or something, I do not know. And then, Aquaculture, I asked the point a couple of days ago on Agriculture where under sub-heads 3104, again, on page 121 Industry and Support Services, we see a reduction under that particular sub-head of \$48,700.00 when we are in a crisis in the fishery, the point I made the other day is, you think there would be greater support for aquaculture if we are going to go about a diversification within the

fishery trying to fill the void, because of the crisis with our cod resource particularly. So I wonder if the Minister could try and answer that for me. Inshore fishery support, sub-head 3108, there was \$300,000.00 there last years and there is no money this year. I am wondering why that is, and what impact that reduction would have on the fishing industry, and Special Fisheries Response Program which we have quite a spat over last fall when the Federal Government came in and we said it was inadequate, and last year the Province had budgeted \$150,000.00, that is on page 124 of the estimate sub-head 4103. This year the Minister of the Department has budgeted \$80,000.00, now if ever there is going to be a need for more money into a fisheries response program if all the predictions come about as being accurate, with the problems with the resource, and as late as today the Atlantic Fish Advisory Group are saying that it looks like it might be 25 per cent from the year 1987.

An Hon. Member: 1.2 million and \$900,000.00.

Mr. Matthews: It could be in far more serious shape than we thought. 25 per cent, so that is very, very serious. If all these things that they are predicting or saying fall into place, we are going to have a very serious situation in the Province this fall if the inshore fishery is such a failure. So I was just wondering why the Minister did not see to it that there was more money for that particular issue. So, again on the Fishing Boat Bounties there is 3.6 million budgeted last year and this year is has been reduced to three million. That is a \$600,000.00

reduction. I am wondering if the minister could, when he gets a chance, react to some of those concerns I expressed over the last few weeks. I think when you look at what has happened already to the fishing industry and what we can expect to happen over the next few years, that for these particular budget sub-heads and allocations from the Department of Fisheries to be reduced by those amounts, that it give me great concern, because I would have thought that if ever there was a time where the Provincial Government should have been providing funds to, I guess, to be prepared more financially to deal with this very serious downturn in the fishery industry that has affected thousands of fish plant workers and fishermen around the Province and hundreds of communities, but instead in some of the vital areas there is less funny. So the President of Treasury Board should be tired after doing what he did sir. Giving himself \$8,000.00 for the next three or four years, \$32,000.00.

An Hon. Member: A new red car.

Mr. Matthews: If I gave myself that kind of a raise I would be up nights, not able to sleep. I would not be able to sleep. I do not care what you tabled from last year, or the last five years, that is up to yourself, if you feel like you want to do that, go right ahead. Let me just say this, anything I did, when I was Minister -

Mr. Chairman: Order please, order please. The hon. Members time is up.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, sorry Mr. Chairman, I was provoked by

the Minister of Health.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member for LaPoile.

Mr. Ramsay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Verge: Where do you stand on Marine Atlantic?

Mr. Ramsay: On the deck.

Mr. Chairman: Order please, order please.

Mr. Ramsay: On the deck yes. I probably spent more time on the Marine Atlantic vessels than any other Member here in this House.

An Hon. Member: It shows.

Mr. Ramsay: My sea legs, I do have my sea legs yes. Even the rocky and wavey motions coming from the other side. I wanted to go back to the matter that was brought up earlier about what constitutes a taxable benefit to any individual, and I think the convenience of power in the past certainly allowed the Government of the day to, the word is not necessarily manipulate, although that was the implication, would allow one to utilize the system to ones personal benefit, much in excess of the \$8,000.00 car allowance of which we speak, The taxable benefit: the hon. member for Kilbride did mention the utilization of his Cabinet Minister's vehicle back and forth to his home, provided of course, as I did hear him, that there was a letter written by the Premier, stating that there would be an on call twenty-four hour provision. That of course is a provisio to allow Revenue Canada with a matter

that could be referred to, if it was questioned. The truth of tax law as we now understand it, is that something like that, that is in question, as to whether it is a taxable benefit or a non taxable benefit, it is provided in written form as to exactly what the procedures are to Revenue Canada for a ruling. As I understand it in this case there was no ruling requested.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Ramsay: There was a ruling requested?

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Ramsay: Rulings normally take two to three years, as I also understand. So maybe the ruling is not completed yet.

An Hon. Member: It was done in two other provinces.

Mr. Ramsay: It was done in two other provinces? It does not necessarily mean Revenue Canada ruled on it.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Ramsay: I see. Alright, so there was a ruling to that effect. The truth of the matter is, I suppose the convenience aspect of it was still there.

An Hon. Member: There was no ruling.

Mr. Ramsay: Oh there was no ruling. I hear two different versions, so I guess that is the reason why we have two sides of the House here. But we perceive, we talk about in politics, we talk about perception. And the perception of a possible abuse, is what we are speaking about with

regards to the overall view of Government, no matter who be in Government, be it us on the Liberal side of the House, or those on the opposition, the Tory side of the House or independents whatever. That is the kind of perceived abuse that makes the public hold politicians in general, in Government in particular, in low esteem. And I feel that is the kind of thing that we certainly are on the road to, not really cleaning up, but we are on the road to changing, and hopefully change peoples perception of what we are all about, the reason why we are here.

I also note the idea of per diems, and was brought up about Members in Cabinet being able to claim seventy-five dollars per diem or three hundred dollars per diem.

I read in the Treasury Board Rules and Regulations on what was allowed to be claimed, and was somewhat alarmed in hearing that oftentimes, as I understand it -

An Hon. Member: Where did you get that from?

Mr. Ramsay: The Treasury Board Travel Rules and Regulations, it is written right in there, when you travel, Departmental travel rules and regulations.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: That is three seventy-five per week for, say, fifty weeks a year, would add up to about \$18 thousand approximately, \$18 thousand, if a former Cabinet Minister was, I suppose, had all of these extra seventy-five dollars per day incidental expenses, would be able to claim, tax free, another \$18 thousand a year. But I do not

know if that has ever been put on paper or if it has ever been presented to the House of Assembly, but it would be interesting to note if any Cabinet Minister ever did actually have those expenses. If they did, or if they did not, regardless, but if any one Cabinet Minister or former Cabinet Minister or Cabinet Minister here, who has the same opportunity, ever did do this kind of thing, I think it would be the kind of incident or situation that would certainly require further investigation, just to determine how a Cabinet Minister could possibly come up with this kind of expense.

An Hon. Member: Eight thousand dollar gift certificates.

Mr. Ramsay: Now \$16 thousand, of course does not take a mathematician to know, that is double the eight thousand dollars but if you subtract the \$12 thousand current expense, we are coming in with a case of apples and oranges, as was mentioned only in a different light. We are the apple, I guess, of the tight-walletted eye, versus the frozen oranges of the past.

Also, Members opposite did mention that, in general, they try to put the image that this budget that was so lauded and so well appreciated by the people of the Province, the public of the Province, is not really as good a document as was originally thought.

Now to look at what we have done in our year in power, you have to not only look at this budget, you have to look at both. And to look at what we have done in the field of education as an example, the changes in the amount of funding, and not in a global way, that

really distorts the picture, for us to say that we put x-many millions of dollars, that is not going to give the public a chance to see how that affects the individual. The school as a community organization, how does it affect the increases in student aid, how does that affect the average university student. And it takes some digging, I suppose, through the Estimates Committees, and what have you, to come up with a figure that brings it to the lowest common denominator as to just what this means to the average student. Now as I understand it, for student aid alone, it means a difference of about two hundred to two hundred and fifty dollars per student per year or per student per term, sorry, as I understand it. So, that is the amount that our increase in the student aid budget has had an affect on an individual. So the amount is over and above the actual increases that are spoken of as being tuition increases that are hurting education in the Province.

To look at school tax equalization, we talk about x-many millions of dollars, \$10 million versus \$4 and three-quarter million but if we looked at it from an average school board say, use a figure of, a school board normally that receives a school tax equalization grant of two hundred thousand dollars, they would now be receiving nearly five hundred thousand dollars. It is quite a hefty increase in the school tax equalization grant to the various school boards. Now understandably, some of the school trustees may be quite upset because the same increase we gave the first year we came in, we cannot give the second year. But if you look at it in the overall,



in a two year period, the amount of increase is very, very significant.

It is a very significant increase to double the amount of available school tax equalization funding. If you are comparing it to what the status quo was over a year ago, you have no problem saying that, we are doing great things for education. We are making great strides in educational finance.

The House opened May 25th of last year. Am I correct? Therefore, the Budget was brought down later than this, so we have had two Budgets in less than a year. If you go back one year, the status quo was \$10 million less in school tax equalization, than it is today. And that is one year, a \$10 million difference. If you bring that down to what the average school board is realizing, it is in excess of double of what they were receiving prior to us coming into office. And that is in less than one year.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Ramsay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I ran out of things to say right there, my paper was used up.

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Power: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to say a couple of things, and pass a couple of comments.

The first one I would like to pass is about the car allowance, and say exactly what I believe about the car allowance.

An. hon. Member: What about ATV allowances?

Mr. Power:

ATV allowance or ATV restrictions, we can talk about them whenever you get around to have courage enough to do them, and your Sunday hunting and all the other things that you fellows are procrastinating on, because you are afraid to govern already, and you have only been there a year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: They are a bunch of chickens.

Mr. Power: When you get around to doing it, the Sunday hunting is one of the things that the Minister should make a decision on. The Minister recommends to Cabinet, process has all been gone through, all the persons who signed the petitions, who made all of the the reports back to Government; it has all been done. The hunting season is starting, particularly on September. People would like to know, to plan their holidays, to get time off from work; all those poor people who cannot afford to get off in the middle of the week, most of the hunters in Newfoundland.

An Hon. Member: For the last couple of years when we were there, there was Sunday hunting anyway, the Court ruled that it was Sunday hunting.

Mr. Power: For the last three year we were there, Sunday hunting - in the meantime, the Government that we were part of, I think, did

make a mistake, when they appealed the Sunday hunting ruling against Mr. Rice, I believe; and it caused it to go into Supreme Court, who would not even hear the case, which I think was really ridiculous. That in this country you can not get that kind of thing heard before the Supreme Court of Canada, which is something that maintains the rights of a lot of people are being infringed on.

I think this Government has all of the information, and has everything necessary to make the decision, except the fortitude to do it. You just simply lack the willpower. All of a sudden you are already - and I will say the same thing about your car allowance, which is the comment that I will make - the car allowance. I do not know why the Premier and the Cabinet, primarily the Premier, did what he wanted to do with car allowance. I know, the majority of Cabinet Ministers did not want to have their cars taken away. They did not want the car allowance. The majority of Ministers, the majority being eight of the fifteen at least, wanted to keep their cars.

Everybody knows what happened. All of a sudden in the first year of your term of office, the Premier has the power to overrule the majority of Cabinet. It is a very, very dangerous situation to say the least, in a first year of power. If he were there for twenty-three years, or even ten years, I could understand how a Premier gets enough of power to overrule his Cabinet; but it is hard to find a Cabinet that does it in the first year.

All I can say about the - I suppose you can call it smoke and mirrors, if you want; when you

listen to the figures that are being dealt with about the car allowance, \$8,000 for a car allowance. A credit card that is going to cost the taxpayers of Newfoundland \$2,500. Twenty-five hundred dollars if you may be living around St. John's; maybe a lot more if you use your gas card and you happen to be the Member for Gander, if you happen to be the Member for the West Coast. Is a Member for the West Coast, a Minister for the West Coast, with a gas card going to have a higher gas bill than maybe the Minister of Finance from St. John's West? The answer is yes. The Ministers from outside the city are going to have to spend more money. Even if you average it out at \$2,500, or whatever you average it at; in real terms, you are saving the taxpayers of Newfoundland little and nothing. Now you could call it smoke and mirrors, but smoke and mirrors is usually a term that I associate with trickery or magic, or something else.

An Hon. Member: Charlie you had cars and gas cards, what did you do.

Mr. Power: It was the right thing to do. To think that this Premier can over-rule the Cabinet majority that you had, that you can take away the car allowance of the Chief Executives of this Province, a group of people, fifteen of you now, there used to be twenty-three of us, and it was tough enough with twenty-three to try and do anything in this Province with little or no money to work with, whether it is education or health or social services or any place else, now you are down to fifteen Ministers to try and do the same job.

An Hon. Member: A better job.

Mr. Power: Oh well, a better job. But how can fifteen Ministers do a better job if one of the simple tools of doing an Executive job is having a car, having access to a car, not having to worry about keeping travel documents, how many miles you went between a and b.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: All I am saying as the Member for Ferryland is that every one of the Chief Executives of this Province, the \$3 billion that you spend, you should have all the tools that would normally be available to any executive. And a car privilege in any corporation in North America, for sure, is standard procedure and it is unfortunate.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: I do not care if you use it or not, it is unfortunate -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Power: - to have the option taken away from you, and you should not have had the option taken away from you because it is a tool that you need to serve Newfoundland, and I can tell you that I served in both Cabinets. One when we had a car and one when we did not, and I tell you, when I was Minister of Forestry and required to travel to Central Newfoundland where most of the forest industry was in the west coast, I was deterred from doing it when I had to use my own car and my own gas and pay my own expenses. I was, at least not deterred, maybe encouraged, maybe to give better service to the people of rural Newfoundland.

An Hon. Member: When you flew to

Deer Lake or Corner Brook, did you rent a car?

Mr. Power: Of course, because you have to have a car to do business. But how often did I drive out. How often do you drive. How do you get a flight to Gambo, how do you get a flight to Glovertown, how do you fly to Bay D'Espoir. You do not fly, you use a Government vehicle and that is meant to do, it was meant to give good service, and I, for one, am convinced that the Cabinets that we were a part of when we had Government vehicles, we gave better service to rural Newfoundland. And all I can say is that I am sorry that you lost the cars and I know it will be more difficult for you, it will be time consuming to keep records and to go through all the other process and that is not what the Chief Executives of this Province need to do.

When you look at the budget that you just done, the budget that we are now discussing, when you look at the fact that there really are no jobs created in your budget, when you look at the fact that you do not have the money to do the things to education that you would like to do, when you look at the fishery in this Province, what has been this Province's response to the fishery crisis, deep sea, quota cuts, inshore, plant closures. what has been your reaction. Honest to God, just tell me. Which dollar have you committed, which dollar have you really spent outside the normal outlay of the Department of Fisheries in the last six months on the fisheries crisis.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: You have committed \$14

million to FPI and National Sea. The companies who got, to a very large degree, the Newfoundland fish stocks in the state that they are in, not just the Portugese and the Spaniards, and not just the Nova Scotians and the other Canadian companies, but our own National Sea and FPI who overfished, who culled fish, who threw away more fish than some of us have caught in the inshore of Newfoundland, who now have to take some of the blame and some of the hard years for their own mismanagement, not just the Governments of Canada or the scientists mismanagement but their own company mismanagement.

And I will say that how much money has this Government, in this budget, in the last six months, in the last three months since the budget was done, how much have you really spent, actual dollars spent out of this Government's pocket to solve the fisheries problems. And the answer is zero, you have not spent a cent.

You can talk all you like, you can send poor old Dr. House up to Ottawa as often as you like, you can prepare as many letters as you like, but the reality is that what you are saying about the fisheries problems in Newfoundland is that it is either the former Administration in Newfoundland or the present Administration in Ottawa. Both happen to be Conservatives, and it is the normal political process to blame all the problems on the other political party, very normal, this Government is falling into the trap already. The only two approaches you have to everything is to blame things on Ottawa or to blame things on the former Administration. The reality is that after one year in office, you

are beaten down by the bureaucracy already. You do not really have any great ideas to create jobs, you do not really have any great novel ideas to improve the fishery, you have not really done anything innovative in education except to add small process to what we did in our community colleges, and you have not done all that you said you were doing in the election campaign either.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: Okay, you may have done some things but you have not done all the things that you promised us for in the election campaign.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Power: So when you look at what has happened, look at what has happened in the last twelve or thirteen or fourteen months of your Administration, when you look at what has happened since the Budget, the real things you talk about should not be car allowances. The real things are; how are the people in rural Newfoundland going to stay in rural Newfoundland for the next twenty or thirty years? How do they rear their children? Why are you going to need schools in most places? You will not need them down in Fermuse, in my District, three years from now; because we are not going to have a fishing industry in that town, and without a fishing industry, we do not have anything for people to stay there.

We simply have had bad fisheries management in a plant. We have no access to fish. We cannot get any support from this Provincial Government, except to say, that if you are in an area that has enough licences, then we will think you

are redundant, and we will downsize the fishing industry.

That is something that each individual Minister - the Minister of Social Services is going to have more to do with it than anybody else. When you have all decided, as a collective group of Cabinet, 15, have decided to downsize the fishing industry. You have decided to put 10,000 people out of work, is what you have done. Ten thousand more people out of work than what we already have. Now, if that was only 10,000 out of our work force of 235,000 - 240,000, if we only put 10,000 people in the fishing business out of work in the next three years, and that is all we had unemployed, then maybe we could live in this Province. But we are not doing that, you are putting 10,000 more on top of the 50,000 maybe, that we have right now. I suppose, is it 50,000? 45,000? And when you guys were on this side of the House, you would say there was another 25,000 who were not seeking work anymore.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Power: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Some chance.

He was doing a good job as far as speaking and vocabulary. But the point he was trying to make was very discouraging actually. I did not know whether we should stand up or if we should just leave the House of Assembly.

An Hon. Member: You should have given him a little applause.

Mr. Efford: Give him a little applause.

Mr. Chairman, I want to first touch on the cars, and I am not going to talk about the cost of the cars where they have cost a lot of money previously. I just want to touch on one point.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Efford: The first time in seven years I have not got a word to say.

The Member from Harbour Main, he can give us some examples about using cars and about the responsibility of saving the taxpayers some money.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Efford: No, seriously. You stand up in the House of Assembly and you talk about what the cost is; and the \$8,000 that the present Ministers are going to derive from the cars, and that they are going to own their cars within three years, and that it is going to cost the taxpayers the full amount of money, it is not going to be no benefit to the people, and a complete waste by this present Government. Now you got to make your point, but if you are going to make your point, make them, and tell us a better effort or position that you would take, and not what you done in the last Administration.

An Hon. Member: Should have kept the cars.

Mr. Efford: We should have kept the cars. We should have drove the cars all over New Brunswick, all over Canada, and all over the United States. And using the gas cards.

An Hon. Member: All over the United States, that is terrible.

Mr. Efford: Well, all over Canada. Let us go to the point, we will talk about the United States after. First of all, let us go all over Canada. How many Ministers in the former Administration took their cars to mainland Canada and used a credit card that was provided by the Government? Was there anybody on the other side done that when they were Ministers?

An Hon. Member: I know of one person.

Mr. Efford: You know of one, there was more than one. And the hon. Member for Harbour Main knows full well there was more than one Minister.

Mr. Doyle: No, not that I am aware off.

Mr. Efford: And what credit card did they use? Did they use their personal credit card or did they use the Government credit card.

An Hon. Member: Government credit car for gas.

Mr. Efford: Exactly, now if you are going to throw slaps across this side of the House of Assembly, look in the mirror before you start throwing.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Yes, the then Minister of Municipal Affairs goes

up to all of the municipalities, all over Canada, looking at the town councils, the counties, and see how they have put in their water and sewage systems and maintained their offices, run their little counties, and bring back the report. Why don't the Member then, table a document that he reported back from that trip.

An Hon. Member: You got it, table it.

Mr. Efford: Something like the former Minister of Social Services, going to Norway.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: But, if you use a car within the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and you use it for your ministerial work -

Mr. Power: So what you are saying is, if someone makes one mistake, they should never get a second chance.

Mr. Efford: No, no, I am not saying that nobody should not be allowed to make a mistake. I am not saying that we should not use the car. But listen, you are the fellows who are standing up there pointing the fingers across, and talking about a credit card, and talking about can you purchase tires, can you purchase mechanical work, can you purchase insurance or whatever with your credit card? You would like for us to stand up and say yes. But you are going to be disappointed, because you cannot. There is only one thing you can purchase and that is gas. And that is it, that is the extent of it. So to all your other questions, the answer is no. Getting on to the second point about the fisheries, you know, who do you blame the

fisheries on? Did anybody cause the problem? Was it a plan by the present Federal Government in co-operation with the former Provincial Administration, to do away with the inshore fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador? Did the problems happen over the last ten or eleven months, did now the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador just turn down? Should Newfoundland today take full responsibility of what is happening, the Provincial Government today? Should we take the full responsibility of what happened? We have a Federal administration who has been in total control of rules, regulations, licensing, quotas, ever since confederation they have had total control over the fish management resources on the Grand Banks. They have allowed it, they have allowed it to deteriorate where next year they are talking about decreasing quotas to approximately 155,000 ton - it was on the news this evening. Is that what is supposed to happen; the Federal Government created all the mismanagement and the taxpayers and the Provincial Government of Newfoundland and Labrador will pick up the bill. No, I do not believe for one second there is one individual on the opposition believes that. I think you are making the point because you have a job to do and because you are the opposition, and you want to try to point the finger, and that is your right. But do not tell me over there, that you people, actually believe, that the taxpayers of Newfoundland and Labrador should pay the price in the fishery for what the Federal Governments of the past and the Federal Government of today have caused. Don't be so ridiculous.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Efford: That's got nothing to do with it, the whole point is, who caused the problem? Who should pick up the bill? Now if the Federal Government of Canada was not part of the wrong doings in the fishery, if they had no control in the rules and regulations and it was totally a Newfoundland problem then by all means the Provincial Government in Newfoundland and Labrador regardless of the political stripe should pick up the bill. But it is caused by the Federal Government and you do not expect anybody in this Province to pay the bill? Now let us suppose that we decided tomorrow or not tomorrow, but a month ago, that we would pay the bill, and the bill to replenish the Newfoundland fishery diversification program was going to cost \$300 million, and we said we are going to pick up that bill. Or we are going to pick up twenty-five or forty per cent of that bill. Would the Federal Government consider putting any money into it. What do we want to help those people down there for, they are going to solve all their own problems. And the burden would come back totally on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. That would be a wise decision? That is the way you people act, that is the reason we are in the mess we are into today. That is the type of mentality you people had. That is the problem. No administration, I mean the Government is a business, and you are not going to spend money out of a business, you are not taking in, if you do what will happen? You will bankrupt the business, and spending money on the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador today, before the Federal Government has any input into it, is like two businesses side by side, one business finds it

difficult with no relationship to the other business, and the other business as well, we are going to help out. We are going to pay all their expenses, we made a profit the year, so we are going to pay all their expenses. That is as much common sense as what the Member from Ferryland just said. It is a Federal responsibility, and the Federal responsibility must do something about the financial cost, and then they must do something about the mismanagement in the rules and regulations. They must do something about the overfishing. Not one member on the other side will stand up here and lambaste the Federal Government, for not doing something serious over fishing on the Grand Banks, about the fact that for the last seven or eight years, what has happened, the draggers out on the Grand Bank, foreign and Canadian, this is what has caused our problems, foreign and Canadian have had grinders installed on the draggers, for what reason, that they could pick up the large fish? Twenty-four inches and up because that is the highest price fish, take all the fish below that and put them in the grinder and pulp them overboard. Now for every hundred thousand pound of cod that was hauled up in the drag net they would keep about twenty-five or thirty thousand pounds of large cod and throw away the rest of it. Now can anybody over there say that that did not happen. Every dragger on the Grand Banks, foreign and Canadian, have been doing that. How come the Federal Government did not stop that. What do they do. Every Newfoundland boat that goes out on the Grand Banks, sixty-five foot and under, there is an observer aboard, every boat that comes from Nova Scotia and every

other dragger, there are no observers aboard. And it is still happening out there today. I do not hear one Member on the other side saying anything about that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: That does not make any sense.

An Hon. Member: Can I tell you something?

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Tobin: I just came in from the tail of the Grand Banks the other day and there was more Nova Scotian sixty-five footers out there than there is anything (inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Exactly, Nova Scotia boats, and what is happening to all the product they are catching, the product is being caught and is being processed, but on top of that not only is the product being caught out there, but the waste in catching their product. That is the reason our stocks are down, for every hundred thousand tonnes of product -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Efford: - that was was brought in last year, there was at least two hundred thousand tonnes of fish caught, and that is the problem Newfoundland is having and it is a Federal responsibility.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you Mr. Chairman. It is interesting to sit and listen to the Minister of Social Services. I think there



should be a Cabinet shuffle coming up soon to make the Member the Minister of Fisheries. He seems to know a lot more about fisheries than anybody else over on that side and, I suppose, that is not really paying him a very big compliment, but the Minister does come from a fishing District, has had long affiliation with fishermen, I presume, in the District, and consequently, is very close to the sea and is aware of some of the things that are on-going, unlike a good many more.

However, the Minister, as all Ministers over there, all Members, quite often forget their Bible and the real change bulletin they sent around during the election. When they talk about the fishery, they talk about a Liberal Government will recognize the Department of Fisheries is a key industrial division of Government. I wonder why it has been forgotten.

Ms Verge: Oh how the mighty are fallen.

Mr. Hearn: Initiate a Canada/Newfoundland Fisheries Board, develop and implement a workable catch failure insurance or assistance program

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hearn: It did not say anything about it being a Federal responsibility, if they are going to implement it. And I wonder now, why we have many areas, including the southwest coast, in particular, where they have had a complete failure, why the Province has not gone out and done something to help them. You say it is a Federal responsibility, but your own election propoganda said you would develop and implement a workable catch failure

insurance or assistance program.

And then we have; expand secondary fish processing, and we have seen the very opposite. I wonder, you know, as we send Dr. House and his group around the Province to try to identify possibilities for employment, and while he is doing that, while he is out dreaming up, and I say dreaming up because the wish list that we saw that was sent up to Ottawa had to be a pipe dream of, mainly of failed plans in the years gone by, some of them dated back to the former Liberal Administration. When we see this, and while this is happening, we see the fishing industry collapse around our ears, and we can blame the Feds for the lack of management, and rightly so, nobody has put any more blame on them than we have, we can blame the Feds for the lack of surveillance, we can blame them for letting the by-catches being thrown away, the discards being thrown away, we can blame them for the way the licencing program is all mixed up, how we have more people with licences than we have people who fish, there is something wrong with that, we have a lot of people with licences who have them for other reasons, we can blame them for the things that they are responsible for and they deserve the blame.

But we cannot blame them for things that the Province can do something about, and many of the fish plants that are closing around the Province today could be kept in operation with any leadership and guidance and, perhaps in some cases, some financial assistance from the Government opposite. But what have we seen? We have seen a complete abdication of responsibility. There has been

absolutely no effort at all by the Government across the way, to help keep the industry alive in many parts of our Province. Not only in Tory Districts.

We saw a couple of examples where miraculous moves occurred because of the direct involvement with certain people opposite. We see other areas, including Jerseyside, in the District of the Member for Placentia; where with any help or leadership, an operation could be in operation right now, successfully. We can name several others across the Province.

A plant closes, so what. Not our problem. It is our problem if you are trying to create jobs and provide jobs in rural Newfoundland. In spite of what people think, a lot of jobs can still be provided within the fishery. A lot of jobs that are lost, have been lost over the last few months, could have been protected and enhanced with any leadership, and sometimes with proper guidance and some financial assistance. Leadership would have done the trick, and it has not been there at all, in any respect.

Some of the other things that are mentioned tonight; talk about the chicken story. The Minister, when he was speaking, when he made his ill conceived, or ill timed remarks about the Kentucky Fried Chicken, was talking about the need for Newfoundlanders to get into the basics, to get back to eating fish, seal, bakeapples, partridgeberries, and whatever else.

I have no disagreement with the Minister on that. I would say to the Minister; perhaps if he took time to get out around rural Newfoundland, he would find that

many people are eating fish, seal, partridgeberries and bakeapples - bakeapples if you can afford to buy them, which most can not, if they are fortunate enough to be able to pick some they might be eating bakeapples. They are eating them, not necessarily because they feel they should be eating Newfoundland products, but in many cases because they have absolutely no choice.

The economy in rural Newfoundland, this present year, is the worst that I have ever evidenced. I never before had people come up to me, older people, and ask how can they get out of the fishery. I have never seen it happen before. The economy of most of rural Newfoundland has collapsed completely, because in most of rural Newfoundland the economy is built on the fishery. As our resource lessens, and as our markets are put into bankruptcy; and as the plants which would provide the markets, also provide jobs in communities, are allowed to close, then off course, there is no money in circulation in rural Newfoundland.

What do we do to build a strong rural economy? Number one: the fishery is one of the leading lights, it has to be bolstered up, has to be assisted.

The Minister of Social Services, who knows so much about the fishery, must also know that as he assists people in the Province when they are having a hard time; his Department comes in, and they assist the people financially, to help them get back on their feet again. The fishery is, to some extent, like that, there are times, in the fishery in particular, when people need some kind of an incentive, some kind of

a boost.

You cannot treat the fishery as you can most businesses. Anybody who wants to run the fishery in Newfoundland the same way as you would run a business on Wall Street, Water Street or any where else; then that is the day that rural Newfoundland starts to crumble.

I am not advocating wholesale handouts. If you look at the record of the past, you will find that a lot of money was provided in relation to loan guarantees to fishing companies and to fish plants. On very few occasions did companies default on those loans. Look at the numbers involved. We have many operations out there today that are extremely solid operations, who in the past, have had the occasion to come to Government for some assistance. Government never had to pay out for those. Unfortunately, there are some of those who came and got money and, sometimes it maybe through no fault of their own, lost it and Government lost. There were some who probably came and got money and lost it through a fault of their own, and Government lost again. But I would say that that is the exception rather than the rule that Government, perhaps, is the decision maker, the Government has to be in the same position as a banker, but a banker with a conscience, he has to know who should get assistance and who should not, but you just cannot slam the door and say nobody gets assistance. You have to weigh one factor with the other. Sometimes it means more than just giving money to companies that are there, sometimes it might mean -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Hearn: - just going to solve their problems. But basically, in summing up, let me just say that Government has to decide who should be helped so that the people will not be the ones, companies really do not matter, whether the owners are local, national or international, where the profits go, it does not make a tremendous amount of difference as long as bread and butter is kept on the table of Newfoundlanders, and that is what we are forgetting right now.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you Chairperson.

We were pausing expecting a Government Member to rise. Their attendance is down a little tonight, but we assumed they would have something more to say about the fishery or the economy or education or health or transportation, we assumed they would have some further contributions to make to our deliberations this evening.

Chairperson, when I spoke earlier this evening, I pointed out that this Government's priorities are wrong in many cases. They have not provided, in this year's budget, adequate funding for school boards to function in the next year, they are leaving many school boards seriously short of the requirement to maintain their operations at the level they have been functioning for the past year. They have also planned to eliminate all the hospital schools outside of St. John's.

Chairperson, I find this quite startling, first of all because of

the promises -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Ms Verge: - the Liberals made when they were campaigning for election, a little more than a year ago, secondly because of the pledges the Premier and the Ministers opposite have made since they formed the Government, to stress education as well as health and development in their spending priorities, and third because the present Cabinet is composed of one former president of the Newfoundland Teachers Association, two former education administration faculty members from Memorial University, and the Premier's Parliamentary Secretary is a former president of the NTA. So, given all of those factors, it is really quite amazing and disillusioning to discover that the Government has downgraded its effort in children's education.

The Government re-combined the Department of Education with the post-secondary and adult education component of the old Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies and revived the Department mandate that had existed prior to 1985. In doing so, Chairperson, the Government has downgraded its effort in children's education. There have not been many initiatives taken in the re-combined Department under the leadership of the present Minister of Education over the past thirteen months, but what efforts there have been, by and large, have been in the area of adult education, of post-secondary education. Mr. Chairman, school board members, school trustees, superintendents and school administrators as well as the Newfoundland Teachers Association leadership, I say to the Member

for Exploits - who is pretending that he is not listening - are becoming increasingly concerned and worried. Chairperson, while the Government have shortchanged education and failed to live up to the election promises in post-election pledges, they have uttered rhetoric. They have increased spending on other areas. As we see and hear tonight, they have increased salaries and benefits for themselves. They have also doubled the budget of Newfoundland Information Services and, Mr. Chairman, how are those increases going to help the people the Government is elected to serve, how are those increases going to redress social injustices and inequalities in the Province.

Chairperson, the Member for St. Mary's The Capes, referred to an election pamphlet that was circulated to every household in the Province a bit more than a year ago. It was a glossy, full colour brochure with a picture of the now Premier on the cover, and the slogan 'Liberal a real change.' Inside the brochure, was the Liberal election platform with pledges under several headings. As we pointed out before, Chairperson, one of those headings was not the constitution. There was no mention in this brochure of the Meech Lake Accord. Several important subjects were listed; agriculture, education. Now lets pause and see what the 'Liberals for real change' promised to do in education, if they formed the Government. Chairperson, they promised that a Liberal Government will provide students with equal educational opportunities regardless of where they live in the Province, and reform the school tax system to make it more

efficient and equitable. What have they done, Chairperson? They have, as I said before, in this budget given the thirty one school boards in the Province less purchasing power than they had last year. They have fallen way short of the recommendations of the Roebottom/Warren Task Force on Education financing, which was presented to the Government last spring. This fellow Warren interestingly enough is the same Warren who headed the Royal Commission on Education in the late 1960's, the same Warren who worked at Memorial University in the Education Administration Department for many years, the same Warren who studied school taxation in the early 1980's, and the same Warren who is now the Minister of Education. Is that not amazing? Now, Chairperson, the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes and many others in the Province expected that the present Minister of Education would use his current power to implement the recommendations that he made in his former positions. That was a normal, logical expectation. People thought that the man meant what he said, when he served on the Education Financing Task Force, and when he called for major increases, not to be phased in but to be implemented immediately last year. People expected that once he had the chance, he would implement fully, not partially, the school tax equalization grants. Not phase it in, Chairperson, but implement it fully right away.

Now, we look at the second budget brought down since this Minister was in office, and we are disappointed. Chairperson, this Minister of Education, when he worked on the Education Financing Task Force Report, called for the

Provincial Government to pick up all the cost of student transportation. What do we see? We see a freeze on the budget for student transportation. So, this is quite startling.

Now on school tax, what has been done? Chairperson, the President of Treasury Board says abolish it. Some of his colleagues, when they were campaigning, promised that they would abolish it.

Chairperson, what this real change Liberal Government has actually done is keep the old school tax for children's education, subject the St. John's School Tax Authority to the payroll tax, and then tax all the school boards around the Province who are receiving the revenue from school taxation. Then they implemented the payroll tax, saying it is for post-secondary education and health. So, in effect, the real change Government has given us real change, now we do not have one school tax, we have two school taxes. We have the old school tax for children's education with higher rates approved by the Minister, and we have the new payroll tax for post-secondary education and health. What else did the Liberals for real change promise when they were campaigning for election, Chairperson. They promised electoral and Governmental reform.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Ms Verge: Now they did deliver on one of these promises, at least in part, they did reform procedures in the House of Assembly. They did set up the Legislative Review Committees and we, in Opposition have consistently praised that move on their part. However, they have not yet placed limits on

campaign expenditures and donations during general elections. They have not introduced effective conflict of interest legislation for Ministers, although the Premier pulled an interesting manoeuvre with respect to the Minister of Social Services last fall.

Mr. Efford: What was that?

Ms Verge: What else did they promise, Chairperson. On the environment, they promised to enact laws to stop all manufacturing processes from polluting our air, water and soil. The people in Corner Brook are waiting for the Government to deliver on those promises. The people who have particles of soot raining down on them, the people who have cement dust raining on them.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Ms Verge: Oh Chairperson, I was just getting warmed up.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Ms Verge: Thank you.

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, I want to have a few words on some of the comments made by Members on the other side of the House, and the Member for Grand Bank, earlier, raised some questions about some of the items in the Estimates of the Fisheries Department. He talked about reduction in the middle distance fleet, in the cost of their operation this year, and that can be explained, of course, by virtue of the fact that the

middle distance fleet is now in the process of changing hands and, of course, except for the normal maintenance that is incurred by having them tied up, insurance, and this sort of thing, the cost of their operation has been considerably reduced and it is reflected in the budget this year.

He talked about another item in the Fisheries Estimates, I believe it is Inshore Fishery Support, last year, the actual spending amounted to \$300 thousand, and of course, this year, there is no amount in that vote, and that can be explained by the fact that that \$300 thousand last year was the tail end, I suppose you would call it, of an interest free loan program that the previous Government initiated to assist fishermen on the southwest coast and on the northwest coast of the Province, and that \$300 thousand was the amount expended by Fisheries to conclude that program.

He talked about aquaculture, and I have not got all of the details on that vote, but I am told that there was a transfer of funds from current to capital account, but the actual spending in that division within my Department is pretty well on a par with last year, but I will provide all the details on that, probably before this time tomorrow night. So, Mr. Chairman, these are two things. Mr. Chairman, I heard some comments coming from the other side of the House tonight and other times about the fishing industry and about the Federal Government's response program, and I was surprised I might add today, that the Minister came to the Province and made the announcement when the hon. gentleman from Grand Bank appeared to be wholeheartedly in support of the program, I

believe I saw him on television or read an account of what he said. It surprised me. If he says he is not I will accept his word for it. But certainly I think the impression was conveyed at the time that the hon. gentlemen, as his colleagues, did in fact agree with the Federal Government's response program.

That did surprise me given the fact that first of all there is nothing contained in the program to alleviate the very serious problems that are now being experienced by the small boat fishermen on the Southwest coast of the Province. Shortly after the Minister made his announcement last Monday, I sent a letter to the Federal Minister expressing some surprise, and in fact disappointment, that he did not address that problem in his program. I think it is a shame and I think the hon. Member will agree, he is nodding, I would assume he agrees with what I am saying, it is a shame that the Federal Government did not see fit to include some relief to help alleviate that very serious problem, because if ever there was a group of people in the Province who are suffering today, because of the poor mismanagement or bad management of the Federal Government in terms of fisheries, then I think that fishermen on the South coast are probably suffering the most, and it is regrettable because I know a lot of those fishermen. I recall one time, when I held this position before, I visited Burnt Island, or Isle aux Morte, some place on the Southwest coast of the Province and it was a night in November. It was hardly fit to be outdoors yourself on land, and there was a lot of confusion on the waterfront. I went down in my car

to see what was going on and there were a lot of boats, about forty five, thirty eight, forty foot longliners, that were leaving at about eight o'clock at night in a vicious storm, heading out for the St. Pierre Banks to start fishing. I thought to myself, what kind of men are they? I do not think I would have the courage to go across the harbour that night in a boat, but they were then preparing themselves, in a very good state of mind, I might say, singing a few songs, and having a good time for themselves, they were on the hand of going out to the St. Pierre Banks in very severe weather. I make that point to illustrate what I said earlier, that the South coast fishermen are no doubt amongst the best in the Province, and it is regrettable they are now called upon to share a disproportionate share of the burden of what has happened to the fisheries in recent years, by virtue of bad management on the part of the Federal government. I had the privilege of attending a meeting on Friday past in Ottawa, a meeting called by the Federal Minister, of the Atlantic Provinces Ministers of Fisheries, and I came away from the meeting disappointed, in that I do not think we accomplished anything quite frankly, and I said as much at the meeting. I am not really blaming anybody, I suppose it is difficult to get together for four or five hours and expect to solve all the problems of the fishing industry, but there were no decisions made, we just sat around a table and rehashed a lot of things that have been said a thousand times before in the past six months, and the Federal Minister did not appear to have any solutions to the problem.

The Minister from Quebec was there and he was very concerned that Quebec was not included in the response package, and I share that concern, because it seems to me that a fishermen, whether he is living on the North shore of Quebec or on the South coast of Newfoundland, if he is suffering tough times, the pains of hunger or the embarrassment of poverty can be just as severe. So I think the hon. gentleman from Quebec had an excellent point and he expressed himself very well, but Mr. Chairman, I guess to sum up, to say in a nutshell how I felt about the meeting, I think it was merely window dressing, I think the Minister felt he had an obligation to call the Ministers together, and I expressed concern at the beginning of the meeting, regret that the meeting we attended on Friday was not called the previous Friday, before the Minister came into the Province and announced his big \$545 million so called response program, because I said; surely the Provinces deserved the right to be consulted, to be given an opportunity to have some input into the decision making process.

Mr. Chairman, again I say, the Minister's \$543 million announcement - of course that is a very misleading figure. I think the Members opposite will have to agree it is misleading in that, included in that amount are other programs that are ongoing, regular programs that would normally be available anyhow, for example unemployment insurance. I think there is a pretty sizeable amount of money included in that \$543 million program that included benefits under unemployment insurance. It included, probably, over \$100 million for surveillance, scientific

research. These are ongoing expenses that would normally be incurred with or without the crisis that we are now going through.

I expressed some concern, at the meeting of my colleagues in Ottawa, on Friday, as to the Government's intention of downsizing the industry; eliminating large numbers of fishermen, putting a freeze on any additional full time licences, or the progression of part time licences to that of full time.

Not that we do not agree that, maybe there is a need to rationalize the fishery. I think we have made our decision abundantly clear. Before you start telling Newfoundlanders to leave the fishing boats, to forfeit their licences, or their right to a licence, then I believe that there must be an alternative for them. And of course, to provide that alternative, in terms of economic diversification, the amounts announced by the Minister is not even a pittance, it is almost a joke. Ninety million dollars divided amongst four, maybe five Provinces over a five year period. That amounts to about half of what one of the Sprung Greenhouse pods would have cost. I think the former Minister and the now Member for Kilbride, would have to agree that the Sprung Greenhouse, I believe, cost about \$20 million.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

An Hon. Member: By leave!

Mr. Carter: May I have a moment to -



Mr. Chairman: By leave!

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, to conclude.

The \$90 million that is being allocated to rebuild the economy, and to provide alternate sources of employment for fisherman, who will probably be displaced from the fishery, will do very little, in fact it will do nothing.

The Minister of course, in rebutting that argument said; we have ACOA, and it is our intention to make funds available under ACOA.

Well, ACOA as we all know it, is not working. In Newfoundland today, we have the dubious distinction of having 33 per cent of the original disparity in the Atlantic area. Yet, only 23 per cent of ACOA funds come to Newfoundland. So ACOA, as well-intentioned as the program was when it was first announced, is not filling the bill as far as Newfoundlanders are concerned. We are going to have to do better than that, Mr. Chairman.

I will not abuse the privilege that they have extended to me by allowing me to clue up my few remarks, but certainly I hope to be able to have more to say on this before this debate adjourns.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Such eagerness over her to speak. I think the Member for Menihek wants to take part in the fisheries discussion, I believe he wanted to talk about the caplin fishery, but I would just like to make a few comments to the

Minister of Fisheries and say to him that he mentioned the coverage, the day of the announcement, and of course, I did an interview with NTV at the time, and went to a general reaction to the announcement, and I said there were some goods and some bads to it, there were some benefits and some negatives to the announcement. And, of course, as it has happened to you I am sure many times in your long political career, the things that they take out of the clip to carry on you, that sometimes you are glad they did, but most times you wish they had not. But there were some aspects of the package that I thought were directed in the proper direction. And as the Minister said, when you look at the surveillance issue, as important as it is, and I thought that was a positive in the announcement, that there would be another \$150 million, I believe the figure is, for surveillance off our coast, and to cut down on some of the problems that are being experienced, of course by foreign overfishing and so on, particularly.

The Minister is correct again in alluding to a significant amount of money of the \$584 million is for on-going programs, and that amount is \$130 million for on-going programs, such as Unemployment Insurance and the program for older worker adjustments, and so on. So yes, of the \$584 million, there is \$130 million for programs that are on-going.

And the Minister is again correct in the very serious problem that we have in the South Coast fishery, and for any of us here who is knowledgeable at all about that particular aspect of the

fishing industry in the Province, that region of the Province, you are absolutely correct.

I was called late last week by someone from the Sunday Express, and asked what I thought about the fish aid package, and talked about what else is needed in the Province. And I read the Sunday Express today, and I read the article and saw comments attributed to the MHA for Fortune - Hermitage and myself, and really we were both on the same wavelength on that, is that it is going to take a concerted financial effort to address this very serious problem that fishermen are experiencing right along the south coast, all the way up to the southwest corner. And I said to that interviewer that the amount of money is going to be massive, and to address it properly, in my opinion, the amount would have to outweigh what we have seen come down in the package of last Monday, because it is a very serious problem.

Now some people say that it is no good to throw money at the problem, but for those people that are into the fishery and who are making a very concerted effort, a genuine effort to make a living from the fishery, that this winter have just not been able to do that. As a matter of fact, most of those people who have given their best to fish, and for different reasons, of bad weather, lack of fish, that they have not been able to pay their expenses that they have incurred in their fishing effort. They have not been able to meet their expenses of fuel and other things that they have incurred, not been able to take a cent towards contributing to keeping their families alive, there have been hospital bills

that have not been able to be paid, they have not been able to buy clothes for their children and on it goes. It is a very serious situation. And they have not been able to get help anywhere.

So the Minister is correct in saying just how serious and how exaggerated this problem is. And I want to say to him and with him, I guess, and to try and impress upon the Federal Minister of Fisheries and the Federal Cabinet that this is another aspect of the Newfoundland fishing industry that must be looked at very seriously and very quickly because we do not have a lot of time. These people are financially hurting badly.

But having said that, I would just like to reiterate and say to the Minister of Fisheries once more, and to the other Ministers of the Cabinet, that a lot of aspects of the Federal fish aid package where the funding is deemed to be inadequate, and the Minister alluded to the \$90 million diversification fund outside the fishery, \$50 million diversification fund within the fishery, that yes I would say the Minister is correct in saying that that is an inadequate amount of money.

But the Provincial Government has an opportunity here to get involved financially to help the fishing industry in the Province and, I think maybe, the Government is seriously considering putting up some of its \$110 million that it said it was prepared to put into the Federal/Provincial aid package if it came about, but now that we know it is strictly a Federal package, then that is a golden opportunity for the Provincial Government to come up with programs to compliment,

supplement or do whatever you want to call it with the fishing industry in this Province to make the inadequacies less inadequate, and I hope the President of Treasury Board, in his very influential position in the Government, and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Fisheries, will think very seriously about this, because if you are willing to put \$110 million into a joint Federal/Provincial program, then it is obvious that you have made a commitment

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: One hundred and ten million dollars, Provincial money.

Had you indicated that to the Federal Government, that you were willing to do that, then I think that the Government should get very serious about spending that \$110 million

An Hon. Member: Where did you get that figure?

Mr. Matthews: In the Premier's letter that he sent to Mr. Valcourt, \$110 million over five years, in a joint Federal/Provincial fish aid package. The Minister of Fisheries knows that.

That is what I am talking about, that is what I am talking about now.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, I did not say the offshore package. No, to spend as you see fit, to address the problems in the total fishing industry, and if the Provincial Government, in its judgment, wanted to throw that \$110 million,

I don't mean throw it loosely or to waste, if they wanted to take that \$110 million and target it directly at the problems in the inshore, then I think that would be a wise expenditure of funds, and I would have no difficulty with it whatsoever, as a matter of fact, I would applaud and compliment it. And I think the Provincial Government should very seriously look at that because, I do not know what, if Ottawa, if the Federal Minister is seriously looking at addressing the needs of the inshore fishery.

But the day after the announcement, I said publicly on a number of occasions, as a matter of fact I called one of the talk shows in town, who at that time had Mr. Cabot Martin on, and I told him that the very obvious weaknesses in the Federal package was the omission of addressing the inshore problems, and the three items that I have said before and I will say again, because I very strongly believe that there should have been an agreement in principle to compensate the inshore fishermen who are going to have reduced landings because of the crisis in the fish stocks, and as of today, when we hear the comments and reports coming out of the Atlantic Fishery Advisory Committee, whatever they are called, the Groundfish Advisory Committee saying that the stocks are in worse shape than they thought, probably to the tune of 25 per cent because they overestimated the spawning effect of 1987, then that increases the chances that this year's inshore fishery is going to even be more disastrous than last year.

So they should have recognized that and should consequentially be willing to compensate, they should

compensate the inshore fishermen for changing the gear types and enlarging the mesh size which are going to, again, result in reduced landings. So there is no question, Mr. Chairman, that it is incumbent upon the Federal Government, having addressed those very concerns in their fish aid package of last Monday, to talk about larger mesh size, for the purpose of conservation, they have recognized, I hope the Federal Minister has recognized, that by asking the fishermen of the Province to go to a larger mesh size, we will see reduced catches and reduced earnings by inshore fishermen.

I say very sincerely to the Provincial Government that the thing is that a lot of the inshore people do not have time to wait. They have been hurt very badly over the last couple of months, and I think that the Minister of Fisheries and the Provincial Government would be very wise if they very seriously considered putting up that \$110 million, or a portion of it, to address the problems of the inshore fishery.

So, having said that, I would just like to conclude my remarks, Mr. Chairman, and thank the Minister for answering a number of questions that I raised about the Budget in the Department of Fisheries.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Member for Eagle River.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to rise this evening and acknowledge the contribution that Members of the House of Assembly have made to a very important issue in my riding and tomorrow,

Mr. Chairman, some eleven hundred people from L'Anse-au-Clair to Nain will have their Unemployment Insurance benefits come to an end. Mr. Chairman, this is something that has not happened in the past number of years, the ice conditions on the coast of Labrador have never been as bad as they are today in quite a number of years, and Mr. Chairman, you certainly have to be there to understand what it is like not having any income coming into your household in that part of the Province, and even when the ice goes away for that matter, you do not have any knowledge that there is going to be any income for the coming summer.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is quite a serious issue, and this evening I circulated a letter which I will table, and I am very, very pleased that all hon. Members with one exception, Mr. Chairman, signed this letter, and I have to make note of it because, Mr. Chairman, I had no problems voting for the reinstatement of womens programs in this country, and I do not understand why the Member for Humber East would not support the fishermen of Labrador. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this will have some impact on the Federal Minister of Employment and Immigration, I hope that she is sensitive to the fact that all Members of this House, as I said with one exception, tonight have signed this undertaking, and have acknowledged the seriousness of this issue and that there is a lot of compassion, Mr. Chairman, apart from the partisan nature that does accompany this legislature, it is certainly encouraging to know, that at the end of the day when it really comes down to it, when people are really hurting, that hon. Members here do put forward

their best in themselves and have no problem supporting the issue that I put forward here this evening. Mr. Chairman, I just want to acknowledge that and certainly I hope that the Federal Government through this Minister will see that the benefits are extended until the ice moves out from our shore, because that is something we have no control of and in the future, Mr. Chairman, I hope there will be changes to the effect that the whole regulations will be changed and that the benefits will be expanded to cover a larger period of time. Because, if you look back over the last twenty years, you will see that certainly either the ice has been in or the fish has not come inshore anywhere before the first of June and sometimes the first of July. So, Mr. Chairman, it is unconscionable that we have to be here now going into the 1990's, and still have some eleven hundred people in a particular part of the country that have absolutely no income coming into their households, and they have to try and prepare for a coming season in the fishery which has all of its associated expenses. So, I want to go on record, Mr. Chairman, to thank all hon. Members as I said, except the Member for Humber East, to thank them for their concurrence with this request, and I hope that at the end of the day our wishes will prevail. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader. The Member for Grand Falls.

Mr. Simms: I apologize for my tardiness your hon., but I understand things went very smoothly and there were some great

speeches tonight. I am disappointed I missed the speech from my colleague the Member for Ferryland, I understand he gave a magnanimous speech tonight. So all my colleagues tell me, and I understand I missed some other exciting events. I understand the Minister of Finance had a statement tonight which I was pleased to hear about, delighted to hear about. I understand my friend, the President of Treasury Board started things off early on at seven o'clock, I understand that he raised an interesting topic, I suppose he thought by raising it that would be the end of it, but I understand all he did was make it flare up again. And that was the issue of the car allowances for Ministers, as I am told. I am just trying to get a feel for what had transpired earlier tonight.

An Hon. Member: Why are you doing this?

Mr. Simms: I want to ask him a question. I am glad he asked. I am glad he interrupted. I want to ask him a question with respect to the car allowance.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Mr. Simms: Well, you will find out. The Minister will find out soon. I am just trying to get my thoughts together.

The Minister, in his statement, I believe in his statement, if not, in his statement verbally; indicated the car allowance for Ministers will track the fiscal year as opposed to the calendar year. Is that correct? The car allowance will be paid during the fiscal year as opposed to the calendar year. In other words, effective the beginning of the

fiscal year as opposed to effective last January, for example. Is that correct?

An Hon. Member: We don't know.

Mr. Simms: So it would be effective April 1st, as opposed to January 1st. Is that correct?

An Hon. Member: We don't know.

An Hon. Member: It should be prorated from the time they give up the Government vehicles.

Mr. Simms: That is precisely my question. If the car allowance is effective April 1st of the fiscal year; does that mean that Ministers will get the car allowance for the months of April and May while they still have their vehicles, or will it in fact be effective, June 1st, which I believe is the date that he publicly said the Ministers -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Mr. Simms: From the time they give up their cars, to June 1st. Okay, good.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Mr. Simms: The reason I am worried I say to the Minister of Social Services; the clear impression was the car allowance would be effective the fiscal year beginning April 1st. I wondered then why Ministers would get the car allowance for the months of April and May if they still have their cars. Now, the President of Treasury Board has cleared it up.

An Hon. Member: Some of us do not have cars.

Mr. Simms: Some do not have cars, so they would get it

effective April 1st.

An Hon. Member: I am not planning a trip across Canada.

Mr. Simms: No more am I, unfortunately.

So the ones that did not have cars would get it effective April 1st, the rest that have cars, are not expected to turn them in until June 1st, would not get their car allowance till effective June 1st. I am glad we clarified that particular point.

I also want to make a comment on the letter drafted by the Member for Eagle River. The prayer of the letter, as opposed to it being a petition, it is a letter as I understand it.

Pardon?

An Hon. Member: It is not a petition.

Mr. Simms: No, it is a letter, and I signed the letter, I know what the issue is, supporting it. The Member is going to Ottawa tomorrow, did he say? I forgot because I was in a hurry out in the corridor.

An Hon. Member: Sending a fax.

Mr. Simms: Oh, you are just faxing it off. I thought you said you were going tomorrow.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Oh, you are doing the television road show.

An Hon. Member: The Member for Torngat Mountains is going to Ottawa.

Mr. Simms: That is right. The

Member for Torngat Mountains has a meeting, I think, with the Federal Minister later on the month, the 24th.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: The Member for Humber East is entitled to sign whatever she wishes.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: The hon. Minister of Social Services should not get too excited. Don't burst a vein there, just relax.

I wanted to say to the Member for Eagle River, that I think the prayer of the letter, and the effort of the Member is commendable.

An Hon. Member: Yes, it is. Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: Nothing has changed the two or three hours I was gone. Nothing has changed at all.

His actions are commendable. I hope that his actions, combined with the actions of the member for Torngat Mountains, pay dividends because we are not interested -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: The Member for Torngat Mountains has a meeting with the Minister of Employment, herself, Mrs. McDougall, on the 24th. Already representation has been made by the Opposition on the issue to the office.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, I know he acknowledged it.

The point I wanted to make is that

it is a good example of an effort in a nonpartisan way. The issue is too important to make it political. I commend the Member for Eagle River as I commend the Member for Torngat Mountains who I think, while working at this, trying to resolve this issue, in different ways; their primary objective is the same. And that you are toe to toe, cheek to cheek, and jowl to jowl on that particular issue. I commend you for your efforts.

I wanted to ask a question, while I have a moment, of the Minister of Education. I do not know whether he will have time to get up and answer me or if he wants to, and I should say to the President of Treasury Board, did he respond to any of those forty or fifty questions

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Simms: You promised you were going to respond tonight, and I do not know if he did.

An Hon. Member: He said everybody has to buy a red car.

Mr. Simms: So you did not respond to the questions. We will hear them tomorrow, maybe?

An Hon. Member: The Minister of Education (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: No, I want to ask the Minister of Education if he would clarify for me once and for all, this issue of the date when the decision on the location of the university is going to be announced, because I can tell him quite candidly that out in central Newfoundland there is some misunderstanding, and I say to my friend, the Minister of Forestry, maybe it is just a

misunderstanding, but even he, I think, will admit that the press -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Now do not be nasty. The press may have misquoted him, the press may have twisted his words, I do not know, but even the Minister of Forestry, for all his partisanship, would have to admit there is some misunderstanding out there about the issue. And I have had calls about it, saying did Mr. Flight say this, did he say that. And I said, well I understood that he said a couple of weeks, the Minister of Education told me that it was a few weeks or something. So I wonder if he might take advantage of the few minutes remaining to let those communities, those nine communities who are waiting; they have made a good effort, they have all put forth good presentations, good proposals, the Minister himself went out and listened to them, to give them a chance to make their presentations verbally, not orally, verbally, and so I think he owes it to those people in those communities, some clear explanation.

It was delayed a couple of times, the last announcement he made when he apologized for setting dates, he said he was sorry he set dates he should never have done that, and now the impression is that the movement to announce the decision now is indefinite, or the delay is indefinite. And that was fine and dandy if it was indefinite, well then it was indefinite, but then the Minister of Forestry had to go and say that he expected an announcement on it in a couple of weeks.

An Hon. Member: A few weeks.

Mr. Simms: A few weeks, well whatever he said, the Minister of Education said it was indefinite, he was not putting any date or any time on it.

An Hon. Member: What is the President of Treasury Board (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: So perhaps, the Minister of Education could take advantage of the last couple of minutes tonight to explain clearly what the situation is, and maybe he can say when he expects to have the announcement, even if he has got to say I expects to have it no later than the end of July, or I hope to make it before the end of July, or whatever, or I intend to make it when the House closes. Because if that is his intention, they would like to know that if after the House closes, that is what your intention is.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Minister of Education.

I want to remind the Hon. Minister of Education that you have about two minutes.

Dr. Warren: Mr. Chairperson, I was going to give a long speech on this issue. I have clarified that issue in the interview with the press on Friday, I indicated that I have learned a great deal in the past year, and one thing is not to put too many specific dates on things when you are not sure how long it is going to take to do something. We are moving along with the analysis of the proposals, and in due course we will make an announcement, but I did tell the press on Friday that I think you misunderstood the Minister of Forestry, I think he said not two, a few. I think that is what he said, a few weeks. And



I confirm that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Dr. Warren: I told them that in due course we would make the announcement.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The Hon House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you Mr. Chairman. If any confusion exists there, I am sure the Minister of Education has straightened it out, except I do not think he could really straighten out the confusion that exists in the mind of the Opposition House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform hon. Members that the motion that we will bring in for debate on Wednesday will be the motion put

forward today by the Member for LaPoile on the fishing situation. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow at 3:00 p.m.