



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 36

---

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

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

Thursday

[Preliminary Transcript]

17 May 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, before we move to routine business of the day, I would like to beg the indulgence of the House just for a minute or so to bring to the attention of the House the passing of a very famous, a very great former Newfoundlander, in the person of Mrs. Florence O'Neill-Hutchinson. Mrs. Hutchinson was born at Witless Bay in Newfoundland and she was the first Canadian woman to earn a doctorate degree. She made her reputation, Mr. Speaker, as a pioneer of adult education, promoting in particular literacy for the poor, not only in Newfoundland and Labrador but eventually in other parts of Canada.

Mrs. Hutchinson began her teaching career in a one room school in Placentia Bay and then moved to teaching literacy reading and writing to minors in the St. John's, Bell Island area. She gave up teaching because she was suffering from exhaustion and malnutrition brought on by her habit of giving away her lunch to students who had none, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that's a great tribute to this pioneer educator from Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mrs. O'Neill-Hutchinson earned a Bachelor's degree from Dalhousie University in Halifax and then she returned to her native Province teaching literacy in the outports using her own innovative techniques. She later earned her Doctorate Degree from Columbia University in New York where she

was a Carnegie and a Rockefeller scholar. Even though she was offered a very lucrative job in the United States, she returned to Newfoundland where she became Head of the Department of Education's Adult Education Program. In 1963 she left Newfoundland to head up the Adult Education Program of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in Ottawa where she retired in 1970. In 1974 she was awarded the Order of Canada for her work amongst illiterate people in all parts of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate for this House to note the passing of this great Newfoundlander, this great Canadian and send appropriate condolences to Mrs. O'Neill-Hutchinson's family.

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

Mr. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, Members on this side, would indeed want to be identified with the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. Dr. Florence O'Neill-Hutchinson, I guess, was one of the greatest adult educators who ever lived. Personally being involved in adult education in this Province for some twenty years, I read with great interest the works of Dr. Florence O'Neill-Hutchinson. As a matter of fact, only recently I made representations to the Minister of Education and the Government that her memoirs should be published. I think it is great in the terms of the history of Adult Education in this Province, and I hope that we can salvage some of her work. Also I remember when I was a public servant within Government, when myself and Bill Shallow, who was the Director of Adult Education, suggested that when the Division of Adult Education took over the Parade

Street premises we would at that time make the recommendation that that campus would be named in honour of Dr. Florence O'Neill.

I have already talked to the Minister of Education and suggested that in the reorganization of the post-secondary system there should be some place in this Province that could be named in honour of this great person. She was the first woman in Canada to receive a PhD in Adult Education. And for those people who are concerned about women's rights, she led the way in terms of rural Newfoundland. People like her have made a fantastic contribution to the whole field of Adult Education and to the whole field of adult learning.

I was trying to confirm she had passed away because only recently she attended a National Adult Education Conference celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the CAEE. I am sure we all would like to be identified and have the House send letters of condolences to the family.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

#### Statements by Ministers

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

Dr. Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As Minister responsible for the Newfoundland Liquor Licensing Board I am pleased to inform this hon. House of several changes to the Liquor (Licensing) Regulations:

1. The Hours of Operation for

Liquor Establishments on Sunday Evenings (Monday Mornings) of statutory long weekends will increase from the current 12:00 midnight closing to 2:00 a.m. closing, on a trial basis for a one-year period, effective Sunday, May 20, 1990. This change in hours will assist small businesses involved in this industry. There will be no increase in licensing fees for these extra hours.

2. Mr. Speaker, the closing hour for the serving of alcohol in restaurants will be reduced from the current 3:00 a.m. closing to 2:00 a.m. This change will keep the closing hour of all liquor establishments consistent at 2:00 a.m. We believe that this change will not cause any undue hardship to these small businesses because the sale of food is not affected by this change.

3. Mr. Speaker, the liquor licence renewal fee for small tour boats will be amended to be consistent with the fee paid by other types of establishment. The fee will decrease from the current amount payable of one thousand dollars per year to the basic licence fee of two hundred dollars; plus one hundred and fifty dollars for five thousand dollars of purchases or fraction thereof.

Mr. Speaker, this Government believes that these changes are positive for this important segment of our business community. However, the Newfoundland Liquor Licensing Board will monitor the changes very closely.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the

Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will just briefly respond to the Minister's statement. I am aware that the Hospitality Newfoundland people are quite supportive of these changes. And with respect to the first item, the hours of operation being extended on Sundays on long weekends is, I guess, only on a trial basis. It is somewhat similar, I suppose, to a change that was implemented a couple of years ago during the famous double daylight savings time period. I understand it worked out positively for the business community, the tourism business community in particular, so we will have to wait and see what the reaction is and if it works out. Hopefully it will be successful and not too many people will be upset by the change.

With respect to the second change of reducing the hours in a restaurant from 3:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., I am not so sure if that will be a positive move. I suspect there are a lot of restaurants that perhaps do a fair business after the clubs close. People leave the clubs at 2:00 a.m. and would probably go out for a bite to eat and maybe like to have whatever their favorite refreshment might be. So I am not so sure if it will be positive. We will have to wait and see on that one as well.

Finally, with respect to the renewal fee for small tour boat operators, I think that is a very positive move and I am very pleased to see the Minister do it. It will be a break for them and I suspect there are others in the tourism industry who would like to see further breaks

announced by the Minister, particularly with respect to payroll taxes and things of that nature, which I expect he will be announcing in due course. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Before calling Oral Questions the Chair would like to make a couple of observations, with the indulgence of hon. Members, about the proceedings in the House yesterday with respect to Question Period, and I do this for the future guidance and direction of hon. Members, and the Chair as well.

I want to remind hon. Members, again, with respect to the Question Period, that the Speaker's ruling related to Oral Questions are not debatable or subject to appeal, and the reasons for this is quite obvious because many of the calls made by the Chair are judgement calls, and if we were permitted to debate and appeal these judgement calls we would be in a state of chaos just about continuously, so that is the obvious reason for that ruling.

The Chair would point out however that the Chair has, at all times, entertained points of order, particularly at the end of Question Period - particularly and specifically - particularly if there was something glaringly wrong developing and that a Member might respectfully and diplomatically bring to the attention of the Chair, and the Chair would then be happy to decide whether it is debating the Speaker's ruling, where the Chair would obviously make a ruling, but as long as there was no debating of the rulings or reflections on the Chair, the Chair would

entertain such points of order by any Member.

Having said that I want to allude specifically to the situation that did cause a bit of heated debate yesterday near the end of Question Period, when the Member for Fogo was carrying on with the continuous questioning of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations with questions relating to unemployment in the Province and generating employment. Before I address the matter specifically I would like to, for the benefit of hon. Members, just read a couple of quotations from Beauchesne for the future guidance of all hon. Members. Beauchesne, Page 123, Section 416, Replies to Oral Questions. (1) A Minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for refusing, and insistence on an answer is out of order, with no debate being allowed. A refusal to answer cannot be raised as a question of privilege, nor is it regular to comment on such a refusal. A Member may put a question but has no right to insist upon an answer." But more apropos to the specific situation, first of all, the Chair would like just to read the question that was posed by the hon. Member for Fogo. He said, 'my question is to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. Since this is National Tourism Week and the Province is attempting to promote tourism as an economic catalyst, and the present employment generation program to a large extent does not address the problem of the tourist industry in Newfoundland, will the Minister immediately implement a program to create employment in the seasonal tourist industries in this Province?'

The Minister then proceeded to stand, that is the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, as did the Minister of Development. The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations then yielded to the Minister of Development. The Chair, feeling that the gist of the question was related to tourism, acknowledged the Minister of Development. Then, of course, hon. Members proceeded to question whether that was the proper thing.

The Member, from his experience, quoted Beauchesne, page 123, paragraph 418, and this says: The Speaker has stated, "Hon. Members may not realize it but questions are actually put to the Government. The Government decides who will answer."

What one must take into consideration along with that though as well, is Beauchesne, page 121, paragraph 409, (6) "A question must be within the administrative competence of the Government..." Though the Chair did not address that specifically, I alluded to the fact that I recognized the hon. Minister for Development was responsible for tourism. That is why the Chair recognized him, realizing, or thinking, that the gist of the question was in that particular area of competence and allowed the Minister of Development to proceed.

As I have said before, it was a judgement call. Even though the Government has the right to indicate who will next speak, one assumes they will select the Minister who is within the area of competency, quite obviously. Sometimes that is difficult for the Chair to decide because there might be an inner Cabinet chairman, or someone who is more

familiar with the item raised, than the hon. the Minister. So the Chair has to consider both these considerations. Having done that I think hon. Members can understand, with the question, why it was that the Chair proceeded to recognize the hon. the Minister of Development.

Now if a similar question had been asked, or for example if an hon. Member asked the Minister of Fisheries about amalgamation with municipalities, then I think the Chair would obviously have to make a different decision with respect to the competence. So I want hon. Members to understand that the Chair has to weigh these two criteria, the criteria of the Government deciding who will speak on their behalf and the other stating that it must be within the area of competence.

### Oral Questions

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

Mr. Rideout: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, again yesterday, showed, in our view, unbelievable arrogance and even contempt for the unemployed people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that 150 or so people will not have job opportunities in Roddickton this summer because the fish plant in the community has burned down, will the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations tell this House whether or not her Employment Generation Program - her employment Generation Program - will be used to generate employment opportunities for those people in Roddickton this summer

who are facing unemployment because that employer in the community will no longer be in existence, Mr. Speaker?

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

Ms Cowan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Employment Generation Program was aimed to help unemployed people wherever they might be in the Province. At the moment, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows, the only monies in that program at this time will come from slippage. If there are appropriate applications from the Roddickton area, let me assure the Leader of the Opposition that they will be considered, and if they meet the criteria, then, indeed, those individuals will be employed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, on a supplementary.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, now, perhaps the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations would tell the House where the funding is going to come from, since all the funding in the program has already been committed. Would the Minister tell the House how she is going to fund those applications?

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

Ms Cowan: If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was not so busy thinking about his next question he would have heard me say that the only monies to come at this point in time are from slippage, which will surface from time to time as the year rolls along.

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

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, let me direct the attention of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations to another area of the Province, Daniel's Harbour, where 150 or so permanent jobs will be lost this year because of the closedown of the Daniel's Harbour mine. Will the Employment Generation Program have a special component in it to address the unemployment problems the community of Daniel's Harbour will face this year, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Simms: A good question.

Ms Cowan: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: I would once again, Mr. Speaker, assure the Leader of the Opposition that unemployment in this Province is a major concern of this Government. My answer to his question is the same as the early question.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Ms Cowan: If there are applications which are appropriate and monies are available, they will be given due consideration. At the same time, I would like to also draw the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's attention to the fact that there are other employment programs which are going to deal with some of the problems of individuals in Daniel's Harbour when the mine closes, for example, the POWA Program.

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

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are now leaving this Province in droves, 7,606 of them in the last eight months of 1989, will the Minister seek to remove the cap from this Employment Generation Program, or is her answer to the people in Daniel's Harbour and Roddickton and other communities going to be the same as it was in Fogo, go on the dole? Is that the Minister's solution?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: I have found, Mr. Speaker, as I travel around the Province, that the members of the population of Newfoundland and Labrador are very much aware of what we have to face as a Government, that there is not enough money to go around, that we have to have priorities, and that we, this year, established certain priorities and we are sticking to those. Some of those priorities are not showing up in the Employment Generation Program, and the Opposition wishes to make a big to-do about that, as if we did not have any employment programs in place. That, of course, is totally erroneous. We have several in my Department, and many in other Departments.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, when I talked yesterday about cleaning up the abysmal mess left to us in the last seventeen years, you know, I am quite honoured actually, I am really flattered, that the Opposition has such a high respect for me that they expect me in one

year and a couple of months to clear up problems they could not deal with in their seventeen years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: Way to go, Patt!

Ms Cowan: I thank them very much for that vote of confidence. I also thank the Opposition House Leader who, on another day, said that I was very honest and straightforward. I took that as a very high compliment from that group of people.

Let me just point out something, and I am going to table this afterwards. In fact, I am very happy to table it. Let us have a look at youth unemployment in the last few years in this Province. I wonder how the Opposition coped with that? I do not really know how they coped with it. By the look of the statistics, they did not cope at all. And they love statistics, by the way.

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

I would ask the hon. the Minister to take her place. I will ask the hon. the Minister please to get to the answer quite quickly. It is a rather long and general question I realize, in terms of unemployment, but the Minister should try to address the question precisely and not cite all the programs Government have. I give the Minister a half minute to please clue up.

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I will try to get to the point, but I think it is imperative for me to deal with a couple of statistics - I will try to keep it short - just so we have the record straight. And when I make comments like, you

know, there are a lot of things to clear up, the general public will understand. I do not know if the Opposition will understand or not, but perhaps if they have a listen to this: In 1979, 25 per cent youth unemployment in the Province; 1980, 21.6 per cent; 1981, 24.3; 1982, 29 per cent; and in 1985 it was 33.2 per cent. They know as well as I do, and everybody in this House knows, that these are problems which have been in Newfoundland for many, many decades; it is going to take some time to straighten them out. I have heard the hon. the Premier say on many occasions that he hopes that in five years time we will start to see some relief from this terrible economy we have fallen into, and that is our goal. We are putting in place plans which we hope will start to reach fruition in about five years, and will continue to escalate as time passes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: Way to go, Patt!

An Hon. Member: And 30,000 people will be home six months after.

Mr. Rideout: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister continue with her honesty, forget her ego, and admit that the real difference in youth unemployment was made as a result of the Youth Strategy Program that was signed two years ago, which she or this Government had nothing to do with?



Mr. Simms: Right on! Right on!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, since I was rather intrigued to hear the Minister tell the House some statistics of the difference in unemployment rates, I wonder if she could confirm the following: That the unemployment rate in Newfoundland and Labrador from September 1988, after this Government took office, which was 14.8 per cent, to September of 1989, was up to 15.7; the following month, October, from 14 up to 15.2; November 14.1 up to 15.8; Mr. Speaker, 12 per cent in December up to 16 per cent in December of 1989, after this Government took office, 16 per cent in February up to 17 per cent; and last month, April, from 17.2 per cent up to 18.6 per cent. Can she confirm those statistics as well, and is she as proud of those unemployment statistics as she is of the other ones she just touted?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Ms Cowan: I have never been proud, Mr. Speaker, of the unemployment statistics in Newfoundland. In fact, in 1987, my pride reached an all-time low when I realized that 18.6 per cent of the population was unemployed during that particular Administration which now occupies the Opposition benches.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the

Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What a very interesting response. I believe she implied that she wasn't very proud in 1987 when the unemployment rate for Newfoundland was 18.6 or 7. Well it's 18.6 now in April of 1990, under her Administration. Is she proud of that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I intend to answer the question that was asked, at the request of the Minister, because I am having the statistics assessed and I want to tell the House the progress I have made so far. It is being done in detail, and I will table all the information for the House. But, for example, what the Member was talking about was the difference between April, 1989 and April, 1990, and it is up 1.4 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, that sounds like there is a big difference and everything has deteriorated in that one year. Now, last month, those hon. Members opposite were not asking about the comparison because it was down eight-tenths of 1 per cent, below what it was in March, 1989. That's right, it was down below.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, every once in a while you will get these inexplicable fluctuations, partly due to the fact that these are not actual figures. These are test examples taken by Statistics Canada, so you will get these kinds of fluctuations. But, Mr. Speaker, the Government has

announced in the past that it is not an aspirin Government. We don't give aspirin for pain, we go to the root cause and correct the fundamental problem of it, and that's exactly what we are doing. Our remedy, Mr. Speaker, is not going to be aspirin it is going to be surgery, when surgery is needed to correct the problems of the past.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is rather nice to have the Premier back, I guess. To a certain extent, I am surprised at his humour. I hadn't seen it before in the last year, but it is nice. I guess the old line that was used this morning by somebody who said, 'Where was the Premier? They said, he was in the hospital. How come? Because he lost his nerve' - is probably very appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary - again I will try - is to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. And I hope nobody will jump to rescue her, she can handle herself. Yesterday the Minister implied, and indeed I think she said, that in looking at their priorities, the Employment Generation Program was one that they cut, or they capped. She even said and I quote: 'Everybody in Cabinet was sorry about this.' Today she said unemployment is a real concern of this Government. Can she tell us, then, how she could indicate yesterday that job creation is not at the top of this Government's priority list if she is so concerned about the unemployment rate? Isn't that a contradiction?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the

Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms. Cowan: The Opposition are displaying, I think, Mr. Speaker, their ability - I suppose you could use the word ability. I don't like to use a positive word when I am talking about the way they go about twisting what is said by myself or by other Members of the Cabinet in this particular House. I don't think there is any question, nor should there be any question, of this Government's commitment to employment. The Budget in my particular Department is much higher this year than it has been in the past, and I think that's indicative of our commitment to employment. There is work being done throughout this Government to build and then reinforce our economy. Mr. Speaker, I really don't know who I am speaking to over there.

Some Hon. Members: Then sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Ms. Cowan: It is quite obvious they can't bear to hear the answer, because our Government is going around doing it in the right way, not by putting on band-aids or giving aspirins, as the Premier said. We are trying to heal the disease which has been festering for the last seventeen years, and that is simply put.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Another supplementary to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. It is not only us, by the way, who are quoting the Minister. I think if she reads the press coverage of yesterday's Question Period she

will see clearly what was said by herself, and if she reads Hansard.

Anyway, let me ask her another question, Mr. Speaker. She also said in Hansard that she was sure that down the road - these are the words she used yesterday - 'monies can be found to put into that program.' I wonder if she could be a bit more specific and tell us exactly when she expects to have this money. Does down the road mean in one month, in two months, or in two years? What does down the road mean?

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

Ms Cowan: I would like to comment on his reference to what was said in the newspaper the other day. I sometimes think that perhaps the media has taken pity on the Opposition and is trying to assist them in doing a better job.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

I would again ask hon. Members on both sides, on my left and to my right, to please try and restrict their comments to the questions at hand, and give the answers without embellishing them with debatable items and other adjectives which the Chair could use but doesn't prefer to at this time.

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker. When there are such preambles before they get to the question, you sometimes do not know where the question is, and to what you should be responding.

I think the hon. Member who just directed the question to me did not read Hansard correctly, nor was I quoted correctly in The Evening Telegram. I think I will repeat what I said, reading it verbatim from Hansard, and that will answer his other question.

After the Leader of the Opposition got up and was tremendously agitated, I tried to reassure him about our position as a Government so he would feel better. So I said, "Mr. Speaker, my goodness! I do not know why anyone would get so upset about that. I have said this Government is committed to having people employed. We are doing everything we can. As I said the other day, we are putting money into long-term programs." I pointed out, "There is the Minister of Development, just arrived, one of the key figures in this, a key figure in our long-term goals to getting most of the people in this Province employed." And then I said, "I can say once more to the Leader of the Opposition, if it will make him feel any better" - I was concerned about his emotional state - "that he need not get so upset."

Mr. Rideout: You should be concerned about your sanity.

Ms Cowan: "We are monitoring, we are being careful, we are trying to spend money in a judicious way, balancing the needs of those who are currently unemployed while trying to build the economy so that their long-term needs for employment will be met at the same time. It is not an easy job, but it is one which we relish and look forward to seeing reach fruition." Now that is what I said yesterday. If that in anyway reflects us as an uncaring

Government, or so on, then I would have to question the ears of those who heard my response yesterday.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable! First she tries to blame everything on the media, and then she quotes from some page in Hansard which has nothing to do with the question I asked her. I asked her, and I quoted for her what she said in Hansard - 'I am sure down the road monies can be found which will be put into that program.' That is what she said, and I asked her, What does down the road mean, this year, this month, next month, or when? That was the question.

Mr. Rideout: When?

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

Ms Cowan: When the money becomes available, and when Cabinet in its wisdom makes that decision.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. I would like to ask the Minister, how many applications have been received by her Department for the Employment Generation Program this year, and how many have been approved?

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

Ms Cowan: That question I will find out the answer for. I have been waiting to provide it to the

House. I know the hon. Member has asked me for it before, but I was waiting till the most recent batch of using slippage has been awarded, because I prefer to give accurate statistics when I speak, and that will be brought to the House as expeditiously as possible.

And you gentlemen know, having been in Government for some time, that it takes a little longer. The word 'expeditiously' outside the House means something different than inside.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I realize that it does take a fairly long time for the Minister to bring answers to the House. We are looking for answers on the Employment Generation Program, and, as well, on the funding to Fishery Products International since January 5.

But let me ask the Minister, can she confirm that indeed there have been 1,500 applications received by her Department and 400 approved, for a percentage approval of 28 per cent of applications brought in under this Department - that there has been 28 per cent of those applications received which have been approved? Does she have a rough idea of whether that is accurate?

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

Ms Cowan: I am not going to stand up and give rough ideas. I will get the accurate information as soon as it is available, and then those questions can be dealt with.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member

for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister inform the House when the last approvals were given under the Employment Generation Program?

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

Ms Cowan: No, I cannot remember. It was some weeks ago, and we have some now in the works to be approved. I do not recall. It has been several weeks.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would several weeks be the first week of April, or would that be a couple of months? Would the Minister know that?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Matthews: What this shows, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a Minister in charge of Employment and Labour Relations in this Province, particularly the Employment Services Division, who does not have a clue about what is going on with employment in this Province.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman is on a supplementary. He is quite aware of the rules of the House, and I ask him to get on with his supplementary.

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: I apologize for that, Mr. Speaker.

Let me ask the Minister a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the approval process carried out by her Department under the Employment Generation Program, can she explain to the House and to the 1,498 applicants under the program how come applications which were received very early after the program was announced have been rejected, and applications which were received much later have been approved? Can the Minister explain why that could happen, and maybe the process of how these applications are processed and approved?

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

Ms Cowan: When the program started, we envisioned having much more monies in the program than we did and we began accepting, if they fit the criteria, different programs as they came in. Then, when it became apparent, thanks to your friends in Ottawa, that the Government was going to be hard-pressed for funds, and we had to start looking at how we would spend our money most expeditiously and judiciously, we decided that we would focus only on the rural areas with high unemployment. So that means that it did change somewhat, that you might have seen a difference in the geographical areas and so on, where people are getting their programs approved.

Do you not want that again? The Member doesn't seem to want focus on his District.

Mr. Simms: Answer the question.

Mr. Matthews: I can tell you what was in my District and what you approved. It was not very much.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Ms Cowan: Perhaps it was the criteria. That is all I can say. If the gentleman has some very real concerns, instead of making political points out of it, I would expect him to come to me and say, Look, I have these people who are really needing it. Some of the other people did, some of your colleagues, and I was only too glad to listen to them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With regard to this program, Mr. Speaker, in my district there were twenty-six applications, two were rejected, four accepted, and twenty are 'pending'. Now, I gather the only money we have available is through slippage so I would ask the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations, given current rates of slippage, how many of the pending twenty in Green Bay can reasonably expect funding this year?

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

Ms Cowan: When we are examining it I shall tell the hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, through you, that if his district shows there is high unemployment and if there are applications there which meet the criteria, then they will be approved. As to how many that will be, there is no way I can predict that.

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

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. I have a farmer in Green Bay who, under the old PC employment program, used to provide seasonal work for a half dozen people. He cannot afford to hire anyone for a sixty week period, so I would ask the Minister is it not better to provide seasonal employment to a half dozen people than to bring in a program that provides no employment for anyone?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Hewlett: Mr. Speaker, I have laid off fish plant workers in Green Bay whose UI claims have run out and they do not have enough stamps to start a new claim. Their choice, welfare or move. So I would ask the Minister, are the Liberals back in the resettlement game again?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: It is not the Provincial Government that is into a program of resettlement, Mr. Speaker, but the Federal Government.

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

Mr. A. Snow: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. On Monday, May 14, the Minister made a statement in this House, and I quote - and this is from Hansard. It is not from any media; it is not from the Evening Telegram nor the Sunday Express.

I say it with some hesitation, in the sense that I don't want to see the people at Hansard attacked.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Snow: I quote: '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 them.' I want to know now, since the unemployment figures have been announced and they are at almost 19 per cent, can the Minister now tell me is the time now right to act?

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

Ms Cowan: It is always the time to act to try to correct unemployment in this Province. We are acting, and again I could reiterate a number of points where we are acting. Perhaps the gentleman would like us to take away some things. Perhaps we should not have as many hospital beds, maybe we should take back some of the social workers we found. There are priorities we have to meet, and we are doing our best. We are putting forth our best efforts to reach those goals, and those goals include unemployment.

I am really amazed at the sudden interest in the Employment Generation Program, when they have actually known that we were not going to put new monies into that program at this particular time. They have known that for six to seven weeks, and it has only been in the last few days that suddenly they have started asking me all those questions about it. I

wonder how high their priority is when it comes to addressing the unemployed in this Province?

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

Mr. A. Snow: Mr. Speaker, we did grill the Minister in the Estimates; we did not get the answers then, and we are still not getting the answers. We are raising the issue now because we have a concern for the unemployed of this Province. We are not just directly concerned about car allowances, we do have a concern for the unemployed. Now, what does the level of unemployment have to reach for this Government to have a concern for unemployment?

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

Ms Cowan: I guess that speech reflects that the gentleman came into the House just recently and has not really assessed the performance of the group with which he now sits. If he had taken the time to sit down and examine those statistics, he would have been embarrassed to stand and make a statement like that.

We are addressing the needs of the unemployed in this Province. The game is, of course, to make the Opposition look so wonderful, they have so much support for the unemployed, and we over here do not care. Isn't interesting, again, how that group's arrogant position when they were on this side has flip-flopped so quickly as they have crossed the floor? Our Government is committed to resolving the unemployment program in this Province. We are working diligently to do so, and that is understood and respected by the

people we represent.

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

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. Yesterday, in response to a question, the Minister said and I quote: 'The money will be going to areas in the Province where there is a high rate of unemployment.' If that is the case, can the Minister tell me why only five applications and five jobs were provided under the program, of the several that were submitted from the Fogo District, and all of them that came were in the first week or two weeks of the program?

Mr. Simms: That is a priority too.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: I would be quite glad to check those statistics. Again, I am surprised, because this gentleman who just rose from the other side, I think of him as one of the more sincere people on that side. During the evening they questioned me on my Estimates, he asked me some questions which I thought showed a great deal of sincerity and caring, and I was impressed. But there he is again, falling into the same trap as some of the other Members. If he had that concern, why didn't he come to me and I could see if there was some problem. I would have been only too happy to do that. I am here to serve the people of the Province in unemployed areas, and I would be quite willing to entertain anyone from the opposite side of the House.

An Hon. Member: Way to go, Patt!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to debate the Minister, but in the Estimates -

Mr. Speaker: No, and the hon. Member is not permitted either.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Nor is the hon. Minister.

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

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, will not the Minister acknowledge that in the Estimates I had to give her all kinds of information about her program and the Challenge '89 and '90 Programs? And, furthermore, the Minister, who in this House and to the media said the people of Fogo will simply have to resort to welfare, and the Minister by making that statement was admitting there is a severe employment situation in rural Newfoundland, why did she not address the problem by creating some jobs in Fogo District, and throughout the Province in general, if she knew such a problem existed?

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

Ms Cowan: Thank you. She and her Government are attempting to do just that.

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



Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, in her answer yesterday, the Minister criticized the previous program of the PC Administration and said it was demeaning to the people. Does the Minister not consider it to be demeaning to be sending the people to Social Services, and 7,606 people out of the Province entirely? Is that not demeaning to Newfoundlanders as well?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Ms Cowan: We do not want to see people on social assistance, Mr. Speaker. And as a result of that, the Department of Social Services, working along with Education and my Department, are conducting a pilot program this year which I heard, standing out there in the hall, this fine Minister of Social Services explaining very well to his Committee, when he was being grilled by the Estimate Committee. And that is a direct attempt to remove anything that might be demeaning from welfare. It is a program that is going to develop people's job skills, take them into the work force, follow them through the work force, provide consultation to them to help them adjust to the work force, and hopefully see them develop a permanent attachment to one particular job.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

**Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees**

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

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to report today that I am tabling in the House the Legislative Report of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, 1989 Program Planning and Review.

**Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given**

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

Ms Cowan: I have today, Mr. Speaker, to table in the House two agreements that have been requested by the Opposition and which, now that I have had an ample time to consult with a variety of officials and make sure that there is nothing divulged here that would be inappropriate as far as the two companies are concerned, I can now table the Adjustment Program for Fish Plant Workers Agreement made at St. John's, in the Province of Newfoundland, this 14th day of April, between Her Majesty the Queen, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, and National Sea Products Limited and the other agreement is made between this Government, Her Majesty the Queen, and Fishery Products.

An Hon. Member: What are the dates again? It is important.

Ms Cowan: April 26th for one, and April 14th for the other. You will see now, it is coming.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

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

### Petitions

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

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

I have another Petition to present, Mr. Speaker.

Again, as I have been doing for the last number of days, I have one on the Air Subsidy Program.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when I presented a petition from 220 people in the community of Hopedale, the hon. House Leader said there would be answers coming before the end of the week. Mr. Speaker, today is Thursday, we have one more session after today, and the Minister had opportunity today to advise the people of Newfoundland and Labrador what the answer would be.

Mr. Speaker, we only have one more day this week where he can make that announcement. In fact, I understand that the announcement has been available for the last number of weeks but, for some reason, and I think it is working, the Government want to keep back the announcement until the House is closed. They were planning to keep back the announcement of their program and make it after the House closed, sometime during the summer when most people are on their holidays.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the people in Labrador know what this Government is up to, and therefore, day after day, they are

asking me to present petitions in this House to make sure that this Government will come up with the answer they want - not what this Government wants, but what they want - for the Air Subsidy Program to be reinstated as it was in the past, or even improved.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, I believe, is going to respond today, I have a feeling he is going to respond to this request, because it does tie into the \$100,000 amount in his Department that they have advised the sports and recreation groups could possibly be cut from his budget. The Minister has not told them that is not going to happen. He has put them on notice that, we are going to save \$100,000, and will save it on the backs of those people in sports and recreation, who travel in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is important to my hon. colleague from Placentia, because he was - I have to give credit where credit is due, because the hon. Member, a number of years ago, some 23 years ago, was instrumental in advising the former, former, former Government about instituting this program, and it is ironic that this individual was working in Labrador and gave a contribution to the people of Labrador to have this program initiated and now, here he is, a Member of this House, on the Government side of this House, who will be a party, in this Government, to reducing this subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, I would think the hon. the Member for Placentia will have a very serious decision to make when this Government makes a decision. So if there is any cut

at all in this particular program -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member has about a half a minute left. I wonder would he allow the Chair to interrupt just for a second? I was passed a note about students, and I see they are leaving the gallery, and we would like to welcome them, acknowledge their presence, and extend them a warm and cordial welcome. They are thirty Grade XII students studying democracy - from the Holy Trinity Regional High School of Heart's Content, accompanied by their teacher Miss Maureen Robinson and their bus driver Mr. Albert Jackson.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member - a half minute.

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

It is very interesting that those students really got a good lesson in democracy today from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, in cluing up as you said, I only have about three or four minutes left.

Mr. Speaker: A half minute.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my hon. colleagues opposite that, please on behalf of the thousands and thousands of people in Labrador who use the Air Subsidy Program, who use the Sports and Recreation Program, for the sake of those people keep that program in place, and if you do anything increase the subsidy. Because, Mr. Speaker, our great Province in 1949 consisted of Newfoundland and Labrador not just

Newfoundland. And make sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Labrador have access to the Island part of the Province in every way possible. And I refer this to the Department to which it refers, or I should say Departments, because it refers to the Department of Works, Transportation and Services and also to Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have many, many more petitions that I will definitely be delivering during the next number of days until this Government makes a statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up. It has been up for sometime as a matter of fact.

Mr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to rise to have the opportunity to speak in support of the prayer of the petition for the people from the hon. Member's District. The hon. Member has presented many petitions on behalf of his constituents.

An Hon. Member: Aply presented.

Mr. A. Snow: Very capably and very ably presented the petitions, and spoke to them. And I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in support of this particular petition. Of course, we all know there were two programs to support subsidy

programs, to support transportation to and from Labrador available to Labrador residents. One was the Labrador Travel Program. And of course, the first Subsidy Program for air transportation to and from Labrador was the Labrador Air Passenger Subsidy Program, and it was undoubtedly the most used program. It seemed fit to offer to the residents of Labrador back in the mid 1960s or early 1960s and it was brought in for numerous reasons. It was brought in by the previous Liberal Administration.

It is interesting to note that it took another Liberal Administration to cancel the program; a program that was very beneficial to the people of Labrador, I might add, a program that saw about 6,000 people apply for a subsidy last year. That 6,000 people comprises a figure of about 20 per cent of the population of all Labrador. And when we look at the number of people who would be restricted from applying for a subsidy to fly out of Labrador, we can understand this probably truly represents a greater percentage of the people who could qualify under the guidelines established under the program. There were several restrictions over the years placed on the program by different Administrations. I firmly believe, and so do most of the people in Labrador firmly believe, that both programs should be re-introduced and indeed they should be enhanced. The Travel Subsidy Programs to and from Labrador should be enhanced, the high cost of travel to the Island portion of the Province from Labrador inhibits quite a bit of travel and, of course, this is not good to have this feeling of alienation developing within

Labrador.

It is interesting to note that the vote for this particular amount of money came from the Ministry of Transportation and Works. That particular Department has completely disregarded the people of Western Labrador, specifically, when they talk about the role of what they should be doing in the maintenance of transportation modes in our area. The highway is completely deteriorated now, and the fact that his Department did not see fit to see that the snow should have been removed in the spring to make it a lot more convenient for the water to run off and thus to facilitate the road drying faster. And we are seeing now that the road is in terrible condition because of the contractor moving their heavy equipment down to start this summer construction season.

But speaking to the transportation program, I brought that up in light of the fact that I think the present Minister does not understand the needs of any of the transportation methods and modes in Labrador, and that is probably the reason why this particular program was cut, slashed, removed from the people of Labrador. That, combined with the Minister of Finance and his approach to removing this so called benefit he referred to, because the Federal Government gave the residents of Labrador a tax benefit. He was quoted in one of his speeches as suggesting that was the reason why he felt that the program was cut, because the Federal Government decided there would be a tax benefit package available to the residents of Labrador with regard to travel out of Labrador. And I notice he is nodding in agreement with me now, that is why he agreed

with cutting, slashing and gutting the programs and being prejudicial to the people of Labrador, and he is nodding in agreement with that. That is too bad. I hoped he would come into Labrador and explain to the irate residents there why that program should not be in place, and he would not be so pleased, and he definitely would not agree with cutting the program.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

#### Orders of the Day

Mr. Decker: Order two, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### Committee of the Whole

Mr. Chairman (Snow): Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Health is very anxious to get the question put on the estimates for the Executive Council and the Legislature and Consolidated Revenue Heads that we have been debating now for the last number of days. But I say to him that he might as well sit back and relax because until the three hours and fifty-eight minutes have expired,

that we are entitled to have to ask questions, the question will not be put, at least from our perspective it will not be put.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen over the past - I am just waiting for my notes unfortunately - I have a bunch of questions that are still outstanding, and with less than four hours remaining I would have hoped by now that the Government House Leader, the President of Treasury Board, would have responded to those questions that have been outstanding now for well over a week. I have them listed just in case they have slipped his mind. As soon as I get my notes from my office I will run through some of those for his benefit. But in the meantime there are always other topics of interest that one can get onto.

The Minister of Social Services is always anxious to get up and speak in the debate on something or other. Perhaps he would take advantage of the occasion. I would like to see him get up and take advantage of the occasion to tell us what is going on at the youth correctional centre. I think it would be a timely topic to address.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Oh well. You were going to sit back and relax. I think it is better when the Minister does participate. He does add something to the debate. Now, sometimes, unfortunately, sometimes his speech is rather repetitious. He gets up and he attacks the Government over Sprung, he blames everything on the seventeen years of PC rule, and if not on that, then the Federal Government. That is his standard speech. I would like to

hear him say something productive. I would like for him to offer some explanation to the House, and to the public at large, as to what is happening at the youth correctional centre. All we hear about in the public, of course, is -

Mr. Efford: Why don't you ask me some questions?

Mr. Simms: If the Minister would stop interrupting me I will be able to finish my sentence. He will get ten minutes, I hope, sometime to answer this. I would like for him to explain to the public what the problem is down there at that institution, because publicly there have been a lot of concerns expressed. The workers down there, I believe, have gone out twice now in the last couple of weeks. They have left their jobs, left the workplace and gone out and picketed, or whatever they have done, so it is pretty obvious that something is wrong. Now, it may be an internal problem. I understand it has to do with their own inability to be able to access their personnel files. As I understand it, their inability to access their own personnel files is one of the big issues. What exactly does that do to the institution itself? While the workers are upset over this does that create a problem? I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy some questions the other day and he answered some of them, but I think there were a couple of questions dangling that he would be familiar with. I do not need to repeat them, I am sure. Hopefully, he will take advantage of the opportunity presented during this debate to get up and respond to those couple of questions. But I want to direct the five or six minutes I have

left in this ten minute portion, some questions to my friend the Minister of Education once again, who has just come into the House. He would be aware of all the concerns that have been expressed about the Government's decision, his Department's decision to close down the pediatric schools, we will call them, the schools in hospitals, and layoff the teachers in three hospitals outside of St. John's, Grand Falls, Corner Brook, and St. Anthony.

He is aware of that issue, well aware of it, because concerns have been expressed by parents, by children, by former patients, by nurses, the professional people in the hospitals, and so on, but most recently he has received a communication from the hospital board in Grand Falls. I would presume he has had a chance to read it as it is a week old. I happen to have a copy of the communication, but in that communication, perhaps he will even admit, in that communication there were a couple of interesting arguments put forth by the board, and I just want to relate a couple of them to Members of the House.

They are familiar with the general arguments that have been put forth by Members of the Opposition and by some parents and so on in the public media, but in their letter they expressed concerns, first of all, of course, about the process that took place leading up to the decision to close these pediatric schools. They point out that in fact there really was no consultation with any of the health care professionals or indeed any of the teachers that were to be affected by this change. They do say that the hospital administration was notified.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if a couple of the Ministers opposite might be able to go outside and have their conversation? They are speaking rather loud and I am losing my train of thought.

They did say that the administration received a telephone call on an informal basis, but confidential basis, advising them that such a move might take place. Now, that is all they received. There was no consultation, no particular ability to discuss the issue because they were told it was confidential. That is one thing they were concerned with, the process. But, here is the point I want to raise with the Minister. They have stated some concerns about the rationale used to close these pediatric schools, and they do say it is true that school age patients, who have been admitted to the hospitals in recent years, have had shorter lengths of stay. And they point out that the Central Newfoundland Hospital Centre provides services to 350 to 400 -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: This is a very serious issue, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to have the opportunity to explain it to the Minister of Education.

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

Mr. Simms: - to the 350, 400 patients annually. They point out that these school age patients do have shorter lengths of stay, as the Minister said in his statement. They do point out and admit that; they really have no argument with that. But what they do point out and they admit, as

well, is the average length of stay in the hospital is between four and five days, as the Minister said in his statement. However, what they do say is that a significant number of these pediatric patients - a significant number of them - have chronic problems, such as diabetes, asthma, and cancer - he will recall the letter no doubt - and they, therefore, require admission, albeit for four or five days at a time, many times throughout the year.

I just want to make the point the people here are making for the benefit of Members of the House and the public. They do say, 'Consequently, these patients could lose weeks, if not months, of school time.' They argue that the Department of Health has lots of information to substantiate their argument that these schools are very valuable.

They also point out that as a regional hospital they admit patients from all over central and southern Newfoundland, and many times these patients have to be admitted to hospital. Sometimes, I say to the Minister, the ones from outside the immediate central Grand Falls area, the south coast and so on, have been admitted for four to five weeks at a time. It is important - it is important - I say to the Minister, as these people say, that they keep their school work up to date during this hospitalization. And they also say, 'Transferring these children to the Janeway Hospital for school reasons is not a practical solution.'

They also have said it is not fair and equitable to close the schools outside St. John's, yet keep the school at the Janeway open - lay

off the four teachers outside and keep the thirteen teachers at the Janeway.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has lapsed.

Mr. Simms: If I could just finish that last point contained in the letter for the benefit of the Minister - for the benefit of the Members actually. They also say that part of the rationale the minister gave for closing the schools was because you were receiving requests from other hospitals around the Province for similiar services.

And they make a good point. They suggest, or ask, could you not establish criteria regarding which facilities should have pediatric schools? For example, the facility must be a regional hospital with at least an 18 or 20 bed pediatric unit. Presumably that is the process followed by Government Departments when they are determining program eligibility. That, I think, is a positive suggestion, it is a point that was not raised in debate in the past. And again, they make the point -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Okay. I hope the Minister will. Finally they make the point on closing the schools outside St. John's, as I said, and leaving the St. John's one, even though the three schools outside St. John's, and this is a key point, the three schools outside St. John's teach almost as many students on a yearly basis as the Janeway Hospital does. They think the decision to close the schools outside St. John's and keep the Janeway one open is really unfair

and inequitable.

I thank hon. Members for the additional minute or so they gave me, and look forward to the Minister's response.

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

Mr. K. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before the Minister responds, in a little while, I want to respond to the hon. the Opposition House Leader, Leader number two. He talks about education, he has talked about primary education. I want to talk about some of the initiatives just very briefly, about what has happened in our area because of the Minister of Education's initiatives he has brought forward. They are very real and very concrete. One of the things I was more than pleased to see was the increase in scholarship funding. I do not think people understand the significance of what we did, but for all those years, those small scholarships that were ongoing, those small \$500 and \$600 scholarships, they have not been touched in a long, long time. It goes back to my days in university, way back when in the mid-1970s, and that was a long time ago; but even back in that period they were \$500 or \$600, and before that they were \$500 or \$600, or \$200 or \$300 or \$400.

This Government increased the amount of dollars available to those scholarships from \$82,000 to \$282,000. That is a very sizeable increase which affects people; people who need the dollars, who are young, smart individuals who want the dollars and apply for them, now have much more access to scholarships. That is an



excellent initiative, something this Government did right off the bat. The Minister should be commended for it, and the Opposition should be saying, Way to go, Government! But I don't hear that.

That one move alone sends a signal to young people in this Province who are going into post-secondary education, that this Government supports them. And not only that, we are going to try to help them in a system. Student aid, for example, on the post-secondary side, we have increased that, a first time again, a major increase in student aid.

An Hon. Member: And upped tuition 15 per cent.

Mr. K. Aylward: Tuition? When they were in Government they increased it every year. I mean, it was nuts! If you go back and look at student aid increases when you were in Government - you've got to be kidding me! One of the reasons I ran in 1985 was to get rid of the Government, because of the increases every year. Student loans were going up; everything was going up. So, let us be credible. When you are going to give it to us that is fine, but be credible when you criticize, because it is very simple. You ignored scholarship funding for ten or fifteen years. This Government got in and in one year there was a 200 per cent increase in scholarship funding. So that is a good initiative. The funds for student aid were increased again, a very large amount, going into the fund to dish out to people, so that if a 5 per cent increase was put on them by the university or the Government, whatever, then the people who needed it most would be able to

deal with the increase.

Now, that is the way to go. We did that. We compensated for it that way, put extra dollars in so more people would get student aid and they will not have to retire from university and so on.

Mr. Chairman, going into primary education, in our Bay St. George region, the Port au Port R.C. School Board have been trying for five or six years to get a new primary school, the second largest primary school in the Province, with at least 500 students. They have had the request in for quite some time to the CEC, and two weeks ago, the same day the Minister was being asked questions about the commitment to primary education, I called the CEC office and the administration told me that approval had just been given for a new primary school for St. Stephen's Primary in Stephenville, Port au Port R.C. School Board, \$3 million to go ahead and construct a new primary school.

Now, you know, that is a real improvement. That is something real which affects primary students in Bay St. George and in Stephenville. That would not have happened as quickly as it did if the Minister of Education and this Government had not increased the school construction budget from \$20 million to \$27 million in their first year of Government. And in the second year of Government we kept it at \$27 million. That is a real, real increase. It is dollars into the system to construct new schools which are definitely needed around the Province, \$14 million extra dollars over a two-year period - well, just a little more than a year - and that it is going to have an affect is very evident

now. I know one thing, the students of St. Stephen's Primary and their parents will be thanking this Government for their commitment to education. So that is fine and dandy. That is just one effect of the increase in the school construction budget, which is very real, and again I do not hear any commendation of the Minister for that. Do they want us to put it up another \$10 million? We would love to. But we are trying to do the best we can, and that is a sizeable increase. It is very good.

The school tax equalization is another real issue which was addressed by this Government. It went from \$4.5 million to \$10 million in last year's Budget; in one year, more than 100 per cent.

An Hon. Member: And it stayed there.

Mr. K. Aylward: Stayed there! My jumpins! Stayed there, he said! I can't believe it! I don't know what you want. A 100 per cent increase in school tax equalization in one year, and we keep it at that level for another year, which is not bad. So, even if we did it last year and we increased it by 50 per cent last year, we can say we increased it by 50 per cent this year. I mean, we could say that. We could have done it politically, like that, if we wanted to, but we said, No, we are going to send a signal to the people out there that we are going to address primary and secondary education. We started that last year, and we are going to continue to do it.

Last year and the year before, '88-'89, the Port au Port R.C. School Board received \$144,000 in school tax equalization. The year

before, \$144,000. The year before, '88-'89, this Government took office. In less than one year, in the first Budget, over a 100 per cent increase, it went up to \$363,000 school tax equalization - in one year. And here we have the Opposition getting up and condemning us, and we have a few school boards out wondering, well, the Government is not committed to primary or secondary education! Well, if this Government had not gotten into power and doubled, 100 per cent, the school tax equalization, I don't know where they would be, Mr. Chairman. We know there have problems, but we are trying to address them.

The Minister has also stated that he is reviewing the per pupil grant system and the whole system for funding, because we know the pupil ratio is going down, we know that there is a declining enrollment. That is the real thing, but this Government is trying to deal with it, the Minister is attempting to deal with it. But he can't do it overnight. I think the Opposition should understand that. The people of the Province, though, they understand it. There is no doubt about that. I will tell you the people in Stephenville understand it very well, and when the Minister of Education goes to Stephenville, he will be thanked, very much so, because those are real positive changes which have affected education in the Stephenville District, and I am sure they have affected other areas of the Province. But I take it this way: if we hadn't been in power, for one year, and we hadn't increased the scholarships by over 200 per cent, we hadn't increased the school tax equalization by over 100 per cent, we hadn't

gotten the school construction Budget up by 35 or 38 per cent, where would we be now? That is the question mark. But I am not sure, with the way they were going with their increases, minute increases as a matter of fact, a few dollars here and there. And they have the gall to get up and say you are not doing enough for primary and post-secondary education. I mean, let's be credible folks, let's be credible!

Really, these are real changes. We have to concentrate this year. We are talking about education in the hospitals, and again the Minister is trying to deal with that for the young people in hospitals. But I will tell you that we have hospital beds opening up for the first time in years; we have expanded services in hospitals for the first time in years. So health care had a real shot in the arm this year by this Government. And it deserved one, just like education. Education and health care, two major priorities with this Government.

We are doing a good job as far as I am concerned, and we have a lot more to do. So I would say to the Opposition let's be credible with it, not because we aren't doing certain things, but give us credit for doing other things we are doing, and we are doing some good things which are having a real effect on the people out there. I wanted to point this out especially, that our region, not only my region but I am sure other regions, are benefitting very much so from these increases. But, again, we could only do so much in such a short period of time. And compared to what the previous Administration did, we are way ahead. They know it very much so, and it is time they realized it.

Now, when they get up and they want to be critical of us, tell us to make some changes, tell us how to do it and then tell us how to raise the money so that we can go and pay for it, because that is the other problem with which we are left, trying to develop the economy which they left in shambles.

Again, school tax is under review. Give us a break! We are looking at that system; we are trying to make it more equitable. Again the Minister is doing what he can with it, but I say that in one year the Minister of Education has done more for the kids of Newfoundland and Labrador in promoting their interests and in providing - I haven't even gone through the list; there are another three pages of initiatives we have here and I won't even get into those. But on those things alone, the effect, I know, in my area has been very good, very real and has been number one. I have talked with parents, and they feel the same way.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. K. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to wait for the hon. the House Leader to sit down. He was slow in doing it. I suppose it is because of his age, but we can all expect that. I have been with him here for the last four years, and he certainly is slowing down.

Mr. Chairman, before I go into the

gist of what I was going to say in the next few minutes, I would like to address a few sentences at least to the Minister of Education. I certainly would be the last person to say anything anti if there was something positive. I am not saying he is not doing some things which are positive, I am not saying he is not doing his best. I know we have restraints as far as the money is concerned, but we have to take into consideration that no matter - last year with the 4 per cent increase per pupil -

Dr. Warren: The one grant.

Mr. Parsons: The one grant - in one school board I know of, that would increase their revenue, I think, by \$182,000.

Dr. Warren: And they got school tax equalization on top of that.

Mr. Parsons: That is right, but not in this area I speak of, okay? That is mostly out in the rural areas, the rural Districts. The one I speak of is a local school board. They took in \$182,000 approximately, but with your colleague's payroll tax, they will lose \$87,000, this school board.

An Hon. Member: What are you talking about, my son?

Dr. Warren: The school boards are not losing one cent.

Mr. Winsor: (Inaudible) giving it back to them, Special Warrants, is it?

Mr. Parsons: He does not know.

An Hon. Member: He doesn't know, for God's sake. He has the Province fooled up.

Mr. A. Snow: What about the increase in (inaudible)? How are you going to give that back to them?

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Chairman, a lot of concern has been voiced, as well, about post-secondary education, and certainly post-secondary education is very important. Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Minister and I have talked on several occasions about a forgotten era of education, a forgotten age in education, and that is the primary and elementary schools. For too many years and too many dollars we have talked about and placed our money where we thought it was necessary, in post-secondary education. And it is necessary. But we forgot the ground rules.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: No, we did not. He was guilty perhaps, and I was too. What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we should place more emphasis on the primary schools. Let me say this to the Minister, when I was on the School Board for St. John's, we had schools which were bursting at the seams with pupils. We had them bursting, Mr. Chairman. We had to have a school in each community just to give the pupils in that community a chance to have an education. Right now, Mr. Chairman, we have three schools which do not have the school population to continue; right now we are looking for a school for the two communities. The two communities, Mr. Chairman, were viable entities only a very short period ago. That will show you how the pupil ratio has decreased. So when you are talking about putting extra money into schools, you have to take

into consideration that because of the lowering of the number of pupils, the dollars are just not going in as suggested by the Minister. There is a difference there. There has to be a difference. When the Minister gets up, I would like him to address that.

Again he talks about sharing. I agree with the Minister that there is certainly room in this Province for sharing of facilities, but I would like to point out to the Minister, as well, that this cannot be done in a uniform manner, because in many areas in Newfoundland there is no need for it. If 86 per cent of our schools do not need sharing, there is no need for it. There is no duplication. There is no need for it. So when the Minister speaks of sharing, religious-wise or any other way, he is only speaking about 16 per cent of our schools which need sharing. I would be the last one, Mr. Chairman, to say, where sharing is needed, that it should not happen. It should happen, because I do not think we can afford the luxury of not having this situation changed. I do not know what pressure Government can put on school boards or the educational committees, but it has to come in areas where it is needed. What I am saying to the Minister is, it cannot be done in a uniform manner. It cannot be done overall, it has to be done where the need is apparent, where people are saying we would like the school to be amalgamated, the facilities of the schools to be shared. In that sense, I think it is a step forward.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday we had a resolution presented here by the Member for LaPoile. Yesterday, I

complimented that Member for his presentation. I thought it was timely, and I thought it served a purpose. I was sorry the hon. Member did not think the amendment put forward by my colleague for Grand Bank was appropriate. I think he did that along party lines. I think that way down deep in his heart he felt, yes, this should be a program which should be shared by two Governments - the Provincial Government should be sharing with the Federal Government to fill up that slack, to fill up that vacuum. I said yesterday, and I say today, that program was focused in the right direction. It did not address the needs of the inshore fishery. But what I did not say yesterday was that when I spoke to one of our representatives in Ottawa, I told him, 'Well, the inshore fishery did not get justice. Justice was not given to the inshore fishermen, and everyone - plant workers, fishermen, what have you.' And he said, 'Look, we address the needs for the present, but,' he said, 'that program will be ongoing.' And yesterday evening on the way home - I am sure the Minister of Fisheries listened as well as I did - I heard the Fishermens Union President, Richard Cashin, and not every time do I agree with Richard, but what he said in essence yesterday evening was that -

Dr. Kitchen: You agreed with Peter though.

Mr. Parsons: You should know. The Minister of Finance should know, because the Minister of Finance agreed as well.

But yesterday I listened to him while going home. He spent two days in Ottawa on the concerns of

the inshore fishermen and plant workers, and what have you, and the dilemma some of those areas have been left in because of the scarcity of fish, and he sounded as if there might be something coming. In fact, he was enthusiastic in saying that by next weekend there might be a program in place to help that area which was not addressed in the aid program, namely, the south coast, southwest coast, and the west coast.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: No, that was Richard Cashin. He was interviewed on the Fishermen's Broadcast.

Anyway, the impression I got from it, and I think everyone else did, was of his two days of deliberations with the Minister and the Minister's staff, it seems that there is a strong possibility the people in those areas will be helped now.

He talked about a guaranteed annual income. Now, I am not sure if that is in the cards. I would really put some doubt in it. I do not think that is on the horizon as yet. What I am saying is, no matter what way it is done, and I suppose the Federal authorities have to be very careful in setting precedents and whatever, I feel the program will be forthcoming, and I believe, too, that the Federal Government will come to our assistance.

But I say to the Minister of Fisheries now, and the hon. Member for LaPoile and all other hon. Members of the House, if that program is not sufficient to meet the needs of those people, then I think this Government has a responsibility to come in with the

necessary money to put that program in its right perspective. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

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

Dr. Warren: I am delighted to follow my friend, Mr. Chairperson, and comment on a couple of things he said, and then comment on the hospital school situation. Mr. Chairman, I want to review some of the statistics again. Perhaps I am not a very good teacher. I always took pride in being able to be a good teacher, but perhaps I am not a very good teacher.

An Hon. Member: Oh, the poor students!

Dr. Warren: Oh, the poor students. Oh, I did not know. Because I have been pointing out one fact which is being misrepresented somehow, I want to reaffirm something I said the other day, that when you look at the increase in education this year, it is not nearly as much as we wanted; it is not as much as we need, but it is a substantial increase, and it is about 7 to 7.4 per cent in both primary, elementary, secondary, and post-secondary, the same increases in both.

Now I want to stress that, because I agree with my hon. friend's comments, that the early years are the critical years. If I were to pick where the priorities should be, it should be in the early years - and perhaps pre-school. Maybe this Government is really going to have to address the whole child care and pre-school thing. I am really convinced that a lot of the problems which occur in education start before students enter school. I was in a

community last week where I wish I had money to put into a pre-school program. In fact, the Minister of Social Services and myself - he is not here, but I have talked to him about it - he and I are thinking about trying to help a community with a pilot at the pre-school level and see what effect that is going to have over the next ten years.

So the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern is right on. The early years are the critical years. And this Government is going to try to do its best to help students in all areas of this Province, particularly in the early years. This year, the rate of increase is about the same in both, depending on what statistics you use. That is the first point.

The second one is that on tax equalization, I must say I am pleased with the increase of last year and we maintained it this year. We more than doubled the amount. The former Government started with \$2 million four or five years ago; \$2.5 million the next year, tax equalization; \$4.5 million the next year, the third year; \$4.5 million and \$2.5 million, that was substantial, but we gave to school boards last year \$5.5 million on top of that. We more than doubled it. And that is for maintenance and operation.

My hon. friend who was on the board, and I pay tribute to everybody who serves on a school board free, voluntarily; they serve this Province tremendously, but he knows that money is spent for maintenance and operation. He knows also that we have the grant on a per pupil basis. Last year 4 per cent was the increase - not enough, but it is a 4 per cent increase. Because enrollments are

going down, some boards got less, as he pointed out.

Now let me give you a statistic or so with respect to one board which does not get much in school tax equalization. Let us take the two St. John's Boards: they got the 4 per cent for grants, and you mentioned that figure was not a big figure. They do not get school tax equalization. But look what they get from school taxes, thanks to people like the hon. Member who worked with School Tax Authorities. Last year, the Avalon Consolidated School Board - perhaps it was 1989 - got \$3.7 million through school taxes. So they do not get tax equalization because they have all the wealth, they have the industries, they have the people who pay. The Avalon Consolidated School Board, to add to the 4 per cent we gave them last year, got \$3.7 million from school taxes, and the Roman Catholic School Board in St. John's got \$5.8 million. The average per pupil collection in St. John's, \$314 per pupil for Avalon; \$294 for Roman Catholic. For the whole Province on school taxes, it was only \$187.

They are getting much more from school taxes because they happen to be here, so we are giving more. The former Government started it, the school tax equalization. We just put more money into it. But I give the former Government credit, they started the school tax equalization to equalize St. John's and to bring the rest of the Province up to St. John's. That is the way it should be, but St. John's get 4 per cent. We have to level up, you should never level down. We did put a lot of money into school tax equalization last year. St. John's does not

get a lot, but St. John's gets a lot from school taxes because they happen to have all the wealth, all the industries, and everything else.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Warren: You forced them to?

My friend from Stephenville mentioned the increase in capital, \$27 million. I am delighted, hopefully, to be in the Member's riding in the next day or so. I have been asked to give three or four speeches, people are delighted. I am going to be with him in his riding in the next few days, meeting over on the west coast in Stephenville, in that area, Port au Port, in that whole area, so I am delighted.

Now, on hospital schools. Where is my friend on the hospital schools? Is he listening? He is listening because he needs to be taught, over, and over, and over. I thought I was a good teacher. Is it that he is a slow learner? I do not know. I heard he got a good mark in his courses at university. Is he a slow learner? Let me tell him about the hospital schools. We are sensitive to the needs of young people who are in hospital. We want to assure that they do not suffer as a result of our termination of three schools with four teachers. That is all. We have 8000 teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador. We cut the three schools outside St. John's. The one in St. John's is a provincial school and it serves all the Province, as people come from all over the Province. We cut the three outside St. John's - four teachers. Now, I would like to give more teachers to more hospitals. I would like to give

more teachers to students who stay home, who are sick at home, for a week, two weeks, or three weeks. Nobody helps them hardly, so I would like to have more money for them.

We decided to try another approach, and I want to tell the Member for Grand Falls that the school boards are going to be looking at this issue to see if we can find another way to help students who need help. I am very sympathetic to the letters. By the way, I appreciate the letters. I read every letter that comes, we answer those letters, and we are sensitive to the needs. I will talk with anybody about it. What we are trying to find now is another way of serving those students who are in for more than say, two or three days - and I think he made a good point - students who come back. I want to ask the school boards to be ready for September. I said it before and I repeat, we need a new approach to this, for students who are in hospitals for longer periods, or students who, as the hon. Member said, repeat. He raised a good point and I will take that into consideration in the next analysis. We want to make sure that we provide service for these students so they do not suffer. I will meet with anybody, anytime, about this because I personally, and the Government, is committed to ensure that students get the best education possible, and we are going to provide alternate programs for this.

Mr. Simms: Would the Minister be kind enough to send me a copy of his reply to that particular letter I talked about?

Dr. Warren: The hon. Member asked about getting a copy of the



reply. We have been waiting until we get a lot of them in and then we are going to develop a policy statement we can send to them all. I will send him a copy of the reply to that letter. I can assure him now, and the people in St. Anthony, where one teacher - by the way, he is right on, the length of stay is very short in many cases, but there are some who come back, in St. Anthony, Grand Falls and Corner Brook. I do not have the details on the stay in Corner Brook. It is a little longer than in Grand Falls and St. Anthony. They had two teachers there. We will respond to the letters, and more importantly than that, we are going to take some action to make sure that students who need help get it. I assure the parents in that area that I am going to ask the school boards to look at that between now and the fall.

On the student aid thing, I must say, Mr. Chairperson, I am really pleased with the reaction to this Government's initiative on student aid. It has been brought up by my hon. friends across the floor. This year we added \$1.7 million and the university students are delighted. The student council said, look fees are going up 5 per cent, five per cent on \$500 is only \$25. We are adding more than 10 per cent on the grant, which is \$1,000 a semester. So we are adding \$100 a semester when the fees are going up \$25. Use your mathematics, calculate, look at the statistics. Go back to the basics and calculate how much the amount is increased on student aid, because the Student Aid Grant is \$1,000. The fees are only \$500. So 10 per cent on \$1,000 is \$100, 15 per cent on \$500 is \$75, and we are going to give more than 10 per cent to single parents and

to people with dependents.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

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

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

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As is my usual wont for my hon. colleague directly opposite, I will give a little poem to start these remarks. It goes something like this. 'Dr. Kitchen had a Budget, you and I, you and I owe...but to Rick Seaward's interview, he wouldn't, wouldn't go. The Budget hit a lot of things, like tax hikes, and program cutbacks... but no matter what Dr. Kitchen sings, he wants nothing but your greenbacks.'

An Hon. Member: Is that the same (inaudible) wrote?

Mr. Hewlett: I did not write that one, Sir. As a matter of fact I would tell the Minister for Social Services that I absolutely despise cucumbers. I will not eat food that touches cucumbers.

An Hon. Member: How about Bev's Favourite Dip.

Mr. Hewlett: I would not try Bev's Favorite Dip for all the money on earth, Sir. I hate cucumbers.

Mr. Chairman, having worked in the Premier's Office for ten years I am relatively familiar with the estimates of the Executive Council Department. Many of the listings in the estimates are pretty

standard, the Lieutenant-Governor's establishment, the Premier's Office, the Cabinet Secretariat, Intergovernmental Affairs, Treasury Board, Native Policy, Women's Policy, and so on. There are two new headings, Mr. Chairman, that I think are worthy of comment. Constitutional Affairs is there as a new heading, and Newfoundland Information Services is there as a new heading.

The movement of NIS to the Executive Council Department, Mr. Chairman, shows that this Government is particularly preoccupied with its image.

There were a number of ads in the local paper a little while ago, Mr. Chairman, offering relatively high paying Public Information Officer jobs to be directly answerable to the Premier's Office. When the Premier was in Opposition, Ministers of the day would have press secretaries, Mr. Chairman, which position was paid considerably less even than the Minister's Executive Assistant. It was a crime, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister's to have Press Secretaries, but at the same time now it is okay for the Government to advertise for Press Officers paying in the \$40,000 or \$50,000 per year range. I am not saying it is wrong for the Government to do that per se, being elected they have the right to bring in whatever staff they wish, but they changed their tune considerably since when they were in Opposition.

So moving NIS to the Executive Council Department means only one thing to me, Mr. Chairman, that a civil service information dispensing organization is now becoming a part of the Government's propaganda effort,

and putting it in Executive Council shows that they are trying to consolidate the propaganda for this Government in the Executive Council which, of course, is a Department which is run directly by the Premier.

Mr. Simms: Herr Goebbels.

Mr. Hewlett: Yes, Herr Goebbels.

If you check the Budget Estimates you will find that the Presidency of the Executive Council has only nominal amounts in its subhead, Mr. Chairman, just nominal amounts. It is a titular role. The actual person in charge of the Executive Council Department is the Premier.

So as I said, Mr. Chairman, it is not illegal for them to move NIS up to Executive Council, but it does show a change in their attitude with regard to Government propaganda. A dangerous blurring, I might say, of the civil service and political staff roles.

I remember when I worked in the Premier's Office, many times Government Members would come and express frustration that they could not get out a press release on NIS because the staff down there, who worked in Public Works and Services, saw something in the release that they considered to be partisan or provocative, and they were straining out those kinds of releases. Now taking it out of public works and putting it in the Executive Council Department under the Premier's direct control shows that they are consolidating the propaganda effort in the Executive Council and under the Premier.

An Hon. Member: Did you write the pickle book?

Mr. Hewlett: No, Sir. I did not write the pickle book.

Mr. Speaker, another manifestation of their preoccupations with image is the business of cars for Ministers. I remember back in the days when the Opposition and some elements of the media basically hounded Brian Peckford out of Mount Scio House. I remember we gave up the Government plane and turned it into an air ambulance. It was a favorite political football for the Opposition of the day - the Government plane.

But I will bet you, Mr. Chairman, if you check the records of Government after the Government plane was put over to air ambulance only, that the cost of travel for Ministers probably went up because you had to rent planes and so on. But I guess people wanted their pound of flesh. They wanted to see that plane grounded, and that is what is going on here with the Ministers cars. I mean, they sold the business of the Ministers cars as a savings to the people, but there are going to be no savings. And the people out there are not amused with your change.

Again you have the right to make a change, you were elected. But I think it was the change you thought would improve your image and it is going to do nothing to improve your image because at least in the old days the crown would get the car back for a trade in, with the new policy the individual Ministers are going to end up owning the cars and the people on the open line shows are not pleased with that. So in a move to enhance your image, and pretend that you are saving money I think you just stepped in hot water. You stepped in hot water.

Constitutional Affairs is now a separate heading, and I guess this shows our Premier's preoccupation with this Meech Lake business. But I have said on a number of occasions on the free time political broadcast and in this House that the Government's preoccupation with Meech Lake is nothing more than a smoke screen. It is part of a smoke and mirrors game, the same as the cars were a part of the smoke and mirrors game, to pretend to the people that they are out to save the tax payers money when in actual fact there will be minimal if any savings there.

We waded wholeheartedly into Meech Lake in this Province and for a long time it took people's minds off the realities of what is going on out there, the fact that our fishery is in a severe crisis. Leave it to the Feds, they say. The Province takes a totally laissez-faire attitude with regard to the fishery and for a long time they were saying they were perfectly happy with the way the Feds were running the fishery. Lately though they started to change their tune a little bit because they are starting to get worried because reality is starting to hit home, Mr. Speaker. The smoke screen, the winds of reality, the winds of change, the real change, is driving the smoke screen away and people are starting to see.

Two budgets in a row they brought in measures that are going to drive power rates through the roof in this Province, Mr. Speaker, two budgets in a row. When they were Opposition they were absolutely deadly opposed to even inflationary increases in the cost of electrical power. Two budgets in a row now they have

deliberately gone out of their way to bring in budgetary measures which are going to drive up power rates. They phased out the PDD subsidy, they have a payroll tax and now we have guarantee fees.

The Hydro people have gone now for a three year increase of about 13.5 per cent. They say they are going to phase it in to the tax payers over a period of eight years, so we have five more years of increases up before the PU board yet to come, and the payroll tax will have to be factored into that as well. So, I mean, Mr. Speaker, they can talk about Meech Lake, but sooner or later that is going to be over and then they are going to have to start dealing with the reality of the economy of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in Question Period today I have fishplant workers in my District whose current UIC claims have run out. They have had some work this year, they probably have five or six stamps apiece. They do not anticipate getting work for weeks, maybe months again. So they are in a position where they cannot get a new UI claim going, so their choice is going to be visiting my friend with the pickle book over there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: Oh, the Minister of Finance is getting up to speak.

Mr. Hewlett: Well, they have a choice I suppose, they could leave, and be a part of the tribe going west instead of being a part of the tribe that the Premier said would be coming back east. Sooner or later these people, for all the nights of the arguments on the Meech Lake event, I mean reality is already starting to strike home for those people and they are soon

going to have to go up to Springdale and apply at the Welfare office for money to pay their car bills, pay their light bill, which is going up as I said, pay their mortgages, whatever. And these are people who have worked all their lives. And through no fault of their own right now, they will either stay in rural Newfoundland on welfare or leave.

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

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Hewlett: I will get back to it tonight, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Before I recognize the hon. Member I just want to read the questions for the Late Show: (1) I am not satisfied with the answer to my question to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations concerning the Employment Generation Program - the hon. the Member for Grand Bank. (2) I am not satisfied with the answer given to me by the Minister of Environment and Lands and would like to debate it on the late show - the hon. Member for St. John's East Extern. (3) I am not satisfied with the answer given today by the Minister of Fisheries in his response to my question on the commercial salmon fishery - the hon. Member for Fogo.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to slow this thing down a bit now, we are going at such a fast pace.

The Member for Green Bay, who was

giving such a lively and enlivened speech and dealt with a lot of topics, some of them I intend to get back to in the few hours we have left in this particular debate.

I would like to spend my limited time right now, Mr. Chairman, with regards to some questions that were asked about Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services. That company is a private company owned by three shareholders, the President of Treasury Board, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Work, Services and Transportation. They do business for government, computer business.

There have been a number of changes - the Opposition House Leader is absolutely right - there have been some changes. He is aware of some of them, and perhaps not aware of some others. So I will simply go over the changes.

As everybody knows, Mr. Harold Miller retired, and Mr. Kevin Murphy also retired. They both retired about the same time, and that left some vacancies. Mr. Hugh Grant was appointed President last September, and the position of Vice-President Systems Development has been filled by Mr. George Cole. Mr. Cole was formerly manager of Systems Development, and his position is currently vacant. There was an amalgamation of positions, the Opposition House Leader will be glad to notice. An amalgamation of positions done following Mr. Murphy's retirement: the position of Vice-President of Finance and Administration was amalgamated with the position of Vice-President Consulting and Client Services to create a single position. That single position is held by Mr. Alvin Drodge and he

is, in fact, carrying out the responsibilities of both previous positions. So we see here, Mr. Chairman, a consolidation of positions and an operation that is trimming itself down to become more efficient. There have been a number of other changes that may not have been so obvious. The data entry section has been downsized from 17 to 5. That is a significant downsizing.

Mr. Simms: Why was that?

Mr. Baker: The reason is the decreasing demand for data entry, and the beginning of that stage of their operation is becoming more sophisticated. The data entering that would ordinarily be required in a lot of the things they do, has all been done. Now its only the regular data entering going into the program. So the downsizing is from 17 to 5.

As a result of this downsizing the position of Supervisor of Data Entry, the Opposition House Leader will be glad to know, has been eliminated. And the associated duties and responsibilities of that downsized department has been amalgamated with the position of Supervisor of Production and Control. Also, as a result of some staff assignments to clients, to a client location, the duties and responsibilities of the position of supervisor, microsupport and co-ordination, that supervisory position; and the position of application package support have been combined to one supervisory position. So the former President of Treasury Board who himself was one of the three shareholders of that company, will be happy to know that there have been a lot of changes designed to make the company more efficient since we have taken over. We have

done a lot of work in that particular regard, a lot of changes in terms of streamlining and trimming the organization, and a lot of changes that will result in a more efficient organization to provide a better service at cheaper cost to Government.

Mr. Simms: Who are the other two shareholders besides yourself?

Mr. Baker: There is the President of Treasury Board, and there is the Minister of Health, who is a very active shareholder, and the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. So there are three shareholders. We have a very close association with that particular corporation. So, Mr. Chairman, that answers the questions posed about NLCS, in quite a bit of detail.

There are some comments made by the Member for Green Bay that I feel, in the couple of minutes I have left, I should in all fairness respond to.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: He talked about the money that we are not going to save by getting rid of the Government cars. He made specific mention of that. I would simply like to say, Mr. Chairman, that he is under the same illusion that the Opposition House Leader suffers from, suffers very seriously from, the same illusion or delusion, perhaps, is a better term - the same delusion that one of the editors of The Evening Telegram suffers from.

An Hon. Member: Who?

Mr. Baker: The same kind of a delusion.

Mr. Simms: You are going to attack everybody now, are you?

Mr. Baker: No, I am not trying to attack everybody, Mr. Chairman. I simply believe in telling the truth. It is as simple as that. And the implications have been that in addition to a car allowance, and in addition to being provided gas for the cars, Minister will now get their tires paid for, and the repairs to the cars paid for, and the insurance paid for, and all kinds of maintenance done, and will get the labour on the cars paid for by Government and so on. Mr. Chairman, I must say that that is entirely, totally, 100 per cent wrong.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker: Now the Opposition House Leader says, nobody said it.

An hon. Member: I never said insurance.

Mr. Baker: And that is a slippery way of getting around it, many times he has indicated to the press incorrectly that that, in fact, is the case. Many times he has indicated to the press people - they talk to me I know. Many times he has indicated to press people that, in fact, we are going to get all these things.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that simply is not right. If, in fact, there were any doubt, I could understand the Member raising the concerns, if, in fact, it were possible for this to be done I would expect Members to raise the concerns, I certainly would. And I would expect them to ask the question: Is it going to be possible to do all these things and to pay for all these things? I expect them

to ask the question. But when they get the answer, Mr. Chairman, a truthful answer, I expect them to believe it.

An Hon. Member: Exactly, right on!

Mr. Baker: And I think it is disgraceful and it is shameful, the deception they are going on with. And the Member for Green Bay was at it again today. He was at it again today, and the Member for Kilbride as well - total and absolute deception, what they are saying is simply not true.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker: Now, Mr. Chairman, what is going to happen is that in the very near future the whole Province is going to know the full story.

I find it disturbing - I spent four years in Opposition -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will deal with it later.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the detailed response to my question of a week ago, with respect to the operation of Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services. I remind him, of course, that it is not a company he referred to. He referred to it as a company, and it is not a company, it is a Crown corporation.

He gave quite a good, detailed response to one of the questions I asked last week. A lot of the information, of course, dealt with matters I am fairly familiar with, having served on the board and served as a shareholder of Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services on behalf of the Government, a couple of years ago.

So I thank him for that answer. Now, I only wish he could have responded to the other topic in as reasonable a fashion as he did on the question of Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services, but he got sidetracked on the Ministers' cars. Now, the Member for Green Bay hardly mentioned that in passing, but the President of Treasury Board wanted to raise it again. I don't know why he is raising it again; but in raising it, of course, he has again tried to take the approach to cover up what has been blatantly pointed out as a mistake in judgement. That is what he has done. That is all he has done. And he is going to embarrass his colleagues, now - the other Ministers sitting there. The Minister of Social Services is so bitten about this issue being raised again, he is going to be forced to get up now and lambaste me after I sit down, and attack me.

An Hon. Member: No, he would not do that.

Mr. Simms: Well, we will see what happens, but that is my guess. I may be misjudging the Minister and I may be totally wrong, but I am willing to bet he is going to take a crack at it. I am willing to bet that. Maybe he won't. Maybe he will answer my earlier question, which is of much more importance, I guess, the one about the youth correctional services.

With respect to the automobiles for Ministers -

Mr. Efford: What about the purchases of the former Premier?

Mr. Simms: Okay, talk about the purchases of the former Premier and all that stuff, but we are talking about this Government now. The President of Treasury Board said, first of all, that on this whole issue of automobiles for Ministers or car allowances for Ministers, that I, the Member for Grand Falls, was wrong, that I had said many times - well, Mr. Chairman, to begin with, I think I only spoke on the issue once, because I responded to his statement and I happened to get a scrum that evening with the press and I talked about it then, but I don't believe I have said another word about it, quite frankly. Personally, I do not think I have. I made my points then and whatever the points I made were, they were either accepted or not accepted. The public, the people, will judge. They are the ones who will make the final decision.

An Hon. Member: They have judged.

Mr. Simms: He said the Member for Green Bay was wrong, talking about car allowances and what he said about them. He said the Editor of the Evening Telegram was wrong; they are all wrong on their analysis of that particular issue. Everybody is wrong except the Minister, the spokesman for the Government, I suppose. Now I find that to be a bit of an unusual approach for the President of the Council to take. Having answered my questions on NLCS in a very reasonable fashion, he then turns around and attacks everybody on this side of the House, the Editor of the Evening Telegram,

everybody, for being wrong in their analysis of the car allowance issue for Ministers.

An Hon. Member: They were.

Mr. Simms: Well, this is the whole point, and the Premier has just emphasized it. The matter was initiated by the Opposition House Leader simply because I was the one who responded to his statement. He said I have said it many times, but that is not true. I have not talked about the issue before or since that time myself, as a matter of fact. What the President of the Council said today kind of reminded me of the old adage, he doth protest too much. He seems to be going on.

An Hon. Member: He is at it again.

An Hon. Member: Yes, and he will keep it up.

Mr. Simms: I am not at it again. I have not addressed the issue, other than the approach the Minister took today in trying to overcome the negative publicity they have received on this particular point by attacking us.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible) embarrassing.

Mr. Simms: I have not said anything about the issue, I have just said the President of the Council reminds me of the old adage, he doth protest too much. He may encourage his colleague, the Minister of Social Services, to get up now and attack us, and the former Administration and all that kind of stuff, which is all fine and dandy, we have no problem with that, but do not lose sight of the trees, the issue we were talking about.



Mr. Chairman, I also want to ask the President of Treasury Board, since he got up and answered one question for me on the issue of Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services, I also asked, and they are still outstanding, questions related to Newfoundland Information Services. He will recall I wanted to know why there was an increase in salaries? What did it cover? It was a large increase and obviously covers more than the percentage annual increase. It must be for positions. Why was there an increase in the transportation vote for Newfoundland Information Services? I was not aware that Newfoundland Information Services did much travelling at all, quite frankly. Then, particularly I asked why the Purchased Services vote in Newfoundland Information Services had been doubled, to \$120,000? What is that all about? - and some specifics? He did answer in a general way one day, but he promised to get me more information. He talked about brochures, I believe, or something or other. I asked what kind of brochures and what are they for? What are they planning to do? What are these brochures all about? For \$120,000 worth of brochures, I think we deserve a little more information.

I asked him to give me an update on the Government House Renovation Program which has been in place for a couple of years, and I have not gotten a response to that question. I asked why the President of Council's budget was doubled - this was under Purchased Services again - why it doubled to \$15,000 in addition to another \$3,700 he has under Purchased Services as President of Treasury Board? It doubled to \$15,000, the President of the Council alone.

Mr. Matthews: That is shocking.

Mr. Simms: I want to know what it is for. He said, I will have to check into that. Not quite sure off the top of my head, I think was his response. He has had a week to check into it. It is not a big item, so I would have thought he would have been able to provide that information. He also promised me more information on Professional Services for the Economic Research Division in the Executive Council, a \$216,000 expenditure. He also promised me more information on the transportation costs for the Classification Appeals Board increase. Why? Is the Board itself travelling all around the Province? While he is at it, he might tell me why the classification appeal for the Registered Nursing Assistants, which has been in the news the last couple of days, why that has been cancelled? The date was next Wednesday, I believe, and there was no alternate date set. I understand publicly there has been some concern expressed by the union, in fact more than concern. I also asked him why there was \$41,000 in Purchased Services for the offshore fund.

An Hon. Member: He answered that one.

Mr. Simms: No, not the last one about the RNAs. But I did ask about the transportation cost increase for the Classification Appeals Board, and maybe this will explain it. The \$41,000 in Purchased Services for the offshore fund, he was going to get me more information on that he may recall. He explained why Professional Services in the Organizational Management Division of Treasury Board was so high -

Organizational management,  
Professional Services.

Mr. Baker: I answered that one.

Mr. Simms: You answered in a vague way. But you said you would get me more information because I asked further - he talked about programs that were going to be reviewed - what programs specifically they intended to review. They must have some idea of what programs, because they have developed a Budget. I have notes made of everything, from Hansard and everything else, where he said he would get more information.

Also, in Human Resource Management, Professional Services in Human Resource Management in Treasury Board, there is an amount of \$545,000, a very significant amount for Professional Services. I was asking questions like, what professional consultants, or whatever, would be receiving monies from this \$545,00? Some of the contracts must already be developed or decided upon, or whatever, but more information on the \$545,000. He said he would get it.

In Intergovernmental Affairs there was \$96,000 for Professional Services again - Professional Services. I asked what that was. He was going to check, because Intergovernmental Affairs was the Premiers's bailiwick, and he did not have the answer to that question right away.

I also asked, he will recall, the cost of being involved with the Atlantic Premiers Council? What exactly is the Atlantic Premiers Council? Is it in existence now? Is there such an animal now? The President of Council said that he

was not aware.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: The Atlantic Premiers Council. You will remember I asked the question, what is the cost to be part of that? Is that, in fact, in place? Because I did not know there was any such animal. I knew there was a Maritime Premiers Council. But the Atlantic Provinces Premiers Council, is that a new entity now that has been established, formalized and all the rest of it, or is it just being referred to as the Atlantic Premiers Council?

Mr. Baker: (Inaudible.) answered that.

Mr. Simms: No, you did not. You said you were not aware exactly what the details were. I say to the Premier I wanted to know the cost of being involved in that Atlantic Premiers Council. What fee does the Province pay, or whatever? If there is any fee, what are the details?

I also asked what the details were for the Professional Services on the Hibernia Project - \$200,000 in the vote. What specifically is that \$200,000 allotment for?

Finally, on Regional Development Programs -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Simms: Okay. I will just conclude with, there were high increases in that Purchased Services vote as well, \$200,000, and I want to know who the contracts were for.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, IGA, Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Social Services was ready to answer some other questions.

Premier Wells: He can answer them after.

They were going to wire my jaw together so I would not have to answer these questions, but they would not do it.

Your question on the Atlantic Premiers Council: As you know, the Council of Maritime Premiers has been functioning for quite some time, and that is more than just periodic meetings of the three Maritime Premiers. They have -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: Competition out there.

They have other programs in place which cover a variety of other things, where the three Provinces are working together to a substantial degree, and I think their total budget is something like \$14 million a year. But we are not participating in any of that. If sometime in the future it may become advantageous for us to do so, we may well do so. But, for the moment, what we are doing is we have created a Conference of Atlantic Premiers, CAP - we have put on a cap. What it means is that four times a year the four Atlantic Premier's will get together. We are timing it at the same time the Council of Maritime Premiers meets, so that it would

cut down on cost and so on. The cost to the Province is negligible. We will be paying our fair share of whatever the additional cost is. And the additional cost is not very much of my attending the meetings wherever they are held, because we are not involved in all of the detail. But there is some small additional cost involved.

Mr. Simms: Was Corner Brook one of those such meetings?

Premier Wells: Corner Brook was one of those such meetings. At Corner Brook there was a meeting of the Council of Maritime Premiers, as well as the Conference of Atlantic Premiers.

Mr. Simms: So what did that one cost?

Premier Wells: I do not know, but I will get it the cost for you. That one may have been a little bit more than the others. Because of the fact that we hosted it in Corner Brook, there may have been some additional cost there.

Mr. Simms: No fees?

Premier Wells: No fees as such. But there is a certain amount of administrative work that will need to be done, a very miniscule amount, for the Conference of Atlantic Premiers, because the Maritime Premiers Council are meeting anyway. So we will have to pay our per capita share of that cost, and that is a proper basis.

I think what we will get out of it, by being able to work with the other Atlantic Premiers, will be a worthwhile investment. Then we can follow what they are doing in the Maritimes, and if some of what

they are doing will be or would be of value to Newfoundland, then we can go ahead and work with them and participate on a further basis. But I think it will be good for us to work more closely with the other three Atlantic Premiers, and I think we can get some benefit out of it.

I think that answers all your questions.

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

Mr. Simms: Perhaps I will relate to the Premier again specifically those questions I have asked involving Intergovernmental Affairs, I guess, for which he has responsibility. I asked these questions of the President of Treasury Board last week. I am a bit surprised he did not inform the Premier, and his Assistant did not inform him a bit better on what the questions were. Let me just see if I can identify them again.

There is a vote of \$96,000 for Professional Services in the IGA vote, the Intergovernmental Affairs vote. I asked what that was for specifically. I do not have the Head here; I gave it at the time I asked the question, so I just made a note of it. Perhaps the President of Treasury Board has a note of that.

Also in IGA there is, under the Regional Development Program Head - there are huge increases in most of the votes under that Head, Regional Development Programs, and I am sure there is an explanation for it. In addition to that, there is a \$200,000 vote in Purchased Services, which I believe is quite a considerable increase over what it was last

year, and I wanted to know what that \$200,000 was for and, specifically, what contracts have been entered into out of that \$200,000 vote up to this point in time.

Premier Wells: There are a half dozen items in Purchased Services there.

Mr. Simms: There is \$200,000 vote.

Premier Wells: \$200,000?

Mr. Simms: Yes. And I wanted to know if any contracts have been entered into out of that \$200,000 expenditure, and, if so, who are they for?

Finally, the other one which would be the responsibility of the Premier, I guess. The Hibernia project comes under Intergovernmental Affairs. There is also \$200,000 in Professional Services in that vote, and I wanted to know what that was for. How much had already been entered into in the way of contracts with professional consultants? Those were three specific questions. I guess he would want a bit of time to check them and maybe give the answer later on, tonight or whatever. Three specific areas of responsibility the Premier has, I guess.

The other questions I asked were questions of the President of the Council, under his responsibility as President of the Council, including a bunch of questions I just ran by again to remind the President of the Council that I am still waiting for the answers, which I am sure he will provide me tonight, I guess. We will conclude the debate on the Estimates of this particular vote at about twenty minutes to ten

tonight, so before that time, I would expect the President of Treasury Board, and President of the Council, to provide all the answers to these outstanding questions I just ran through the last time I was on my feet. Members all heard it. There are quite a few questions still outstanding. They are detailed questions I realize, and that is why we have not been pushing too hard. But we do expect to get the answers before twenty minutes or so to ten, or whatever it is tonight, Mr. Chairman.

The final thing I will say is by the time the Estimates conclude at twenty to ten, I guess, we then enter into a process where all the Estimates are called: the votes are called, the Heads are called, and that will take ten or fifteen minutes. And unless the Government House Leader wishes to introduce a new Item of Business at about five to ten or something, it is likely we will call it ten o'clock, I would expect. But the Government House Leader may have some other plan in mind for that last five minutes. Who knows what surprises await us?

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, since it is 4:30 and we have the Late Show, so I will adjourn the debate - well, I will not adjourn it, there is no such thing.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman (L. Snow): 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.

Mr. Speaker: It being 4:30 p.m. and the Late Show, I recognize the hon. the Member for Fogo.

#### Debate on the Adjournment [Late Show]

Mr. Winsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier this week, I asked the Minister of Fisheries about the Salmon Management Plan for 1990. From the onset, I know the Minister is quite aware that this is a responsibility of the Federal Government but, at the same time, the fishermen concerned are Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and are very much concerned about their livelihood.

Just last Thursday, in my particular District, officials from DFO came and moved the caution boards at the entrance to the rivers, or proposed to move them, some considerable distance in miles, about three to four miles, from where they were previously. I have since learned that my colleague from Terra Nova has the same concerns in his area, that there are proposals to move the caution boards some considerable distance.

For the fishermen in my District, it causes considerable hardship, since about half their total income for the year comes from the salmon fishery and they are

calling asking me to call on the Minister of Fisheries to show some leadership, to make some representation on their behalf to DFO at Ottawa. They have given the DFO officials some possible scenarios as to what can be done to alleviate a most difficult situation. With the failure of the inshore fishery, this source of income is of great concern to these fishermen.

In addition to that, while these fishermen can fish much further out the bay, the type of gear they have used for fishing, their nets, are much too short; most of the nets in this particular area are only twenty-five meshes deep, whereas the fishermen who fish further out the bay are using fifty mesh nets. So the nets these fishermen have are of no use to them at all. They spent all winter getting nets ready to prosecute the fishery this year and now, all of a sudden, it has been virtually pulled out from under their feet, because they are unable to fish. And what they are concerned about is that the Provincial Minister of Fisheries has not gotten involved in their plight. The Minister, in Gander, was heard to say on two or three occasions that he stands solidly behind the commercial fishermen of Newfoundland, and these fishermen are now calling on the Minister to come forth, make a statement, give them some direction and some leadership, and make representation to Ottawa so that these people will be allowed to take a meaningful part in this year's salmon fishery, recognizing at the same time, of course, that conservation of the stocks is important; but presently, they are just being left in limbo. I think the season should be opening around June 5, and we are not

hearing any announcements from either level of Government as to what should be done.

On this side of the House, we do not mind criticizing the Federal Government when they are doing something wrong, and it is wrong to delay the Salmon Management Plan so late in the season, when fishermen have to get ready for it. There has been considerable expense in getting ready, and the Minister should be making representations and loud noises to Ottawa on their behalf.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I guess I can only say that a great deal of concern is being expressed these days about the health of the salmon stocks, and I believe that something will have to be done to make sure that the stocks are given a chance to rebuild. In cases where there are enhancement programs, such as the Rocky River and the Exploits River, for example, it might very well be that some kind of protection will have to be put in place by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to protect the mouths of the rivers where the salmon would go to spawn.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a river up in St. Mary's Bay near Colinet, it is called the Rocky River, and that river was the subject of a \$2 or \$3 million enhancement program a few years ago and I am told that last year a few fishermen, I say a few, two or three maybe, saw fit to put their nets close to the mouth of that river, and where they would normally catch about 400 fish for

the year they succeeded in killing about 2,000.

An. hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I know what he is talking about but the problem exists in the Gander River, the Sop's Arm River, the Rocky River, the Exploits River and many other rivers. The Premier, by the way, said it I think, in reply to a question from the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes on May 10, when he said the Province supports protection for salmon enhancement as we must, and that where fishermen are precluded from fishing in such areas, the mouths of the rivers, that the proper course of action for the Federal Government to take is to buy the licences from the fishermen, and that is the position that the Province would push and lobby for, and we are. Mr. Speaker, we are having meetings not - I was going to say constantly, but that would not be true, but certainly on an ongoing basis we have met with fisheries officials and there are a number of options at which they are looking. I don't think time will allow me to outline all of them but there is one option at which they are looking, one which is being supported by the way, by the one which I think is called SPAWN and is the enhancement conservation group on the West Coast, that there will be a one year moratorium put on commercial and sports fishermen as well, but in the case of the sports fisherman it would be a hook and release program.

Now there is a pretty strong lobby being mounted for that kind of an approach. We have said to Ottawa that if you are going to adopt that approach then first of all

you must have the concurrence of the fisherman, you just can't take 3,700 Newfoundland fishermen and cast them adrift without giving them some form of compensation, so that's an option at which the Federal Government is looking and I think there might be problems with it because I would have to be guaranteed 100 per cent that if that kind of a moratorium were placed on the commercial salmon fishery for one year, after that year expired, the fishermen would be allowed to pick up their licences without any qualification at all and that they would be able to continue in the salmon fishery.

An Hon. Member: Are you saying this to Ottawa?

Mr. Carter: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ottawa is well aware of our position, and in fact there have been a number of meetings. I understand the season will be opened on June 5, but I am told there is no management plan announced yet. We know that Fisheries and Oceans are in the area of the hon. Member, and have talked to fishermen and have explained to them that it might well be that, because of the danger of preventing the escapement of salmon in the rivers concerned, that certain action will have to be taken. Now, I don't see how the Province can possibly object to that kind of action, providing there is adequate compensation for the fishermen concerned. Surely, we can't allow to happen to the salmon stocks what they allowed to happen to the cod fish and other ground fish.

In Gander I did say, Mr. Speaker, and I make no apology for it, and I say it again now, that the Province stands squarely behind

the commercial salmon fishery and fishermen, and any action taken by the Federal Government to enhance the salmon stocks, then we are saying that the commercial fishermen will have to be appropriately compensated by the Federal Government, and that if they talk about putting a moratorium on for one year as they are, then we believe that certainly fishermen will have to be duly compensated and that they be given the option at the end of the one year moratorium to go back into the salmon fishery. And before we would agree to any such action, I should add that we are going to have to be 100 per cent sure that at the end of the one year period that the fishermen affected will, in fact, be able to retrieve their licences.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want the hon. Member to know that while there is a problem developing in the salmon fishery, and I think the commercial salmon fishermen will tell you the same thing as will the the sports fishing fraternity, that some action will have to be taken. Otherwise we will end up, in a few years time, with the salmon stocks in our waters in the same kind of a depleted mess that other ground fish stocks are in today.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am dissatisfied this afternoon with the answers to my question to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations as it pertains to the Employment Generation Program of her Department. There were a number of reasons why I was dissatisfied with the answers of the Minister, or lack of answers from the

Minister, particularly when one looks at what has happened to the unemployment rate in the Province over the last twelve, thirteen, fourteen months.

I see that it is causing a bit of laughter from the other side. Maybe they find it a bit funny, but I do not. We see in eleven of the last twelve months there has been an increase in the unemployment rate in this Province. And last month, when you compare April of 1990 to April of 1989 we see an increase of approximately 1.4 per cent in the unemployment rate, and that is very alarming. And when you look at a Provincial unemployment rate of 18.6 per cent then that is very disturbing news for the people of the Province, and one of great concern when you represent an area of the Province where the unemployment rate has been steadily increasing. And the Minister, quite rightly so, said the different areas in the Province that her programs were going to be directed, were areas where the unemployment rate was greatest. And, of course, no one can knock that, if such is the case.

But why I was dissatisfied with the Minister's answer is that with this unemployment situation in the Province and with the very highly publicized program, such as your Employment Generation Program, that she was unable to inform the House of how many applications had been received from around the Province for that particular program. And you would think that for a Minister of Employment she would have been monitoring this particular program on a daily basis, and would have been able to update the House on any given day when asked to do so, on how many



applications were in, how many applications have been approved and so on.

Now, the Premier gives me a funny look meaning to say, when she gets up now she is going to give you that. And I hope she does, because that is the answer that I wanted this afternoon, because she was not able to do this before, and we have been on this issue now for a number of weeks. So I hope the Minister does give that particular information when she rises this afternoon.

But I would just like to say to her, Mr. Chairman, that under her Employment Generation Program, where she is spending \$2.9 million, she has created somewhere between four and five hundred jobs, I believe. Perhaps she will elaborate on that as well. But when you look at the program that was in place before, where there was \$ 7.5 million of Provincial funds put in, fifty-fifty cost shared with the private sector for about \$15 million, there was approximately 2800 jobs created under that private sector employment program as we knew it.

So, if you look at her expenditure as compared to what was spent before: 2.9 as compared to 7.5, and you look at approximate 2800 jobs created with the \$7.5 million - for three times the money you have created about seven times the jobs. So, what surprises me about it is that it is quite obvious that the take-up by the people of the Province on this particular program is not as great as I had expected it would be. Not as many people applied for funding under the program, and it is quite obvious that the number of jobs have been significantly lower than they should have been.

So I would just like for the Minister, when she rises, to react to some of these comments and criticisms of the program, because there is obviously something wrong, Mr. Chairman, because more people did not apply, the take-up was not as great as was anticipated. There is something obviously wrong. The perception out there about the program is wrong as compared to the previous program, even though the Minister says it is better. And she will have a chance to react to that. So I would just like to say to the Minister now when she rises, perhaps she could give us an update on the actual number of applications received, how many have been approved, and how she is going to address the very serious unemployment problem in the Province, which it seems on a daily basis is getting worse, and that is because of the downturn in the fishery. You see a lot of inshore plants are not reopening.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Well, whatever, but I mean it is, past whatever. That is fair enough. Past government, past fishery, the failed fishery, whatever, the four-eyed beetle, whatever the problem is out there, there is a problem. And only one group of people in this Province can address that problem, Mr. Speaker, and that is the Provincial Government. So I would be interested in hearing the Minister of Employment, particularly Employment, responsible for the Employment Services Division over there, inform the House of these concerns I have about her Employment Generation Program.

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

Relations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Cowan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I find the improved and escalated interest that this group of individuals has in the unemployment situation since they became Opposition, very interesting. I was reminded of it again when I examined some figures and found that the growth of the unemployment insurance recipients since 1979 in our Province has increased by 51 per cent, and that was during the term of the office of the past Government. And that is rather frightening to me. And when I look at some of the other things that happened during that seventeen years, or if we just want to look at the last ten years or whatever we can, it would be probably less embarrassing just to look at the last ten. But, anyway, I want to talk about what we, as a Government, have to contend with. Now education is a key factor in gaining employment. And education in this Province was left unaddressed in a shocking and shameful manner.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms Cowan: For example, now the Minister of Education tells me that it would take \$200 million to bring our education up to the level that young people and children are receiving in Mainland Canada. Now I do not know how we could do that, but it would be somewhat comforting if we thought, you know, you put so much in this year, and so much in next year, and finally reach that \$200 million. But the thing is that as each year passes those other

provinces are putting more and more money into it, so it grows from when I was President of the NTA from \$167 million until this year when it is \$200 million, in the space of a year, still we just keep falling farther and farther behind. So we have a potential work force there that is not educated. And that is why we find the Minister of Social Services now having to try to rehabilitate the worker because of all these years of Tory mismanagement. If they had done their job, Mr. Speaker, when they were in office, they would not have any questions to ask me; we would not have a Minister of Employment in fact, we would not need one, and that would be a wonderful thing for the Province of Newfoundland.

They are making such an issue out of this Employment Generation Program, and it is only one part of many programs we have had in this Government. It was so well received, and I am not going to tell him how many people applied until I have the exact information. I realize that is difficult for some people to say when they misinform people continually, and make a practice of it, and feel quite good about it, it would appear. But no, I am not going to fall guilty to that, but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the response to that program was extremely positive.

One of the things I found very interesting about the program in terms of cost, was that, in fact, there was very little difference in the cost of our program, the Employment Generation Program per person, and that program put in by the previous Government. But what we were able to do, or we hope we will be able to do, because again we do not know until the program

has run its course, is that we will have people in the work force for a longer period of time, at a similiar cost to what the private sector program was.

The best thing about our Employment Generation Program is that there was a commitment to the program by business. That was a significant difference. They have to pick up the total tab during the twenty-second week period, and they become part of the process, then, of rehabilitating the Newfoundland worker.

I was talking to a gentleman the other day, a man I admire very much in my District, an older gentleman who, I must say, suffered terribly under the Tory Government. He had a piece of land in Topsail the Government put a highway through and flooded his property. For seven years now, he has not been able to take any hay off that pasture because the land is flooded. He has made innumerable requests to the gentleman I defeated in the last election, and who apparently never even stopped by to observe the damage this had done. And it is creating a real burden for this gentleman. But he comes and visits me periodically, and he talks to me about the changing values in Newfoundland, and how disturbing it is. He is so proud, because he, himself, from a very young boy, has worked day and night to make a success of his farm. He is really disturbed because he sees what has happened to the majority of people in Newfoundland who fell into the trap, who fell into the net created by that crowd over there. They have become totally, Mr. Speaker, and sadly, dependent on welfare. And some of these individuals, he has drawn to my

attention do not have what we call the work ethic any more.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister's time is up.

Ms Cowan: My time is up?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Ms Cowan: Oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

I have recognized the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: I am delighted with the Premier, as well, because I was not sure when he was tapping on his desk over there, if it was for me or for the Minister. I assumed it was for me.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Parsons: Thank you again. I mean, the second time.

Before I get to my part of the debate, I know the the Minister of Fisheries is somewhere in the building, and I hope he is listening. In his debate with the hon. the Member for Fogo, he talked about the salmon. I would like to start off by saying in the District I come from, on the northeast coast, the headlands, if the opening date is delayed any longer, the Minister or no one else will have any problem with the salmon fishery, because it is over, all of the salmon are gone,

goodbye!

But that is not why I am here at this moment.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: Oh yes I am. I am interested in all aspects of the fishery, unlike the Member for Placentia, who knows very little. You could talk to him about doing the beat on New Gower Street and he would know something about that, when he and I were buddies. But apart from that, there is very little he knows about the fishery.

On May 14, I asked some questions to the Minister of Environment and Lands on an environmental issue as it pertains to the spawning grounds of our northern cod. I was alarmed really! When I asked the Minister if he made representation to his counterpart expressing his concerns over an environmental issue of great magnitude as it pertains to the spawning grounds, I was surprised when, in answer to my first question, the Minister said no, not specifically on that point, Mr. Speaker. So he did not address anything; he did not contact the Minister, he did nothing as it pertains to that particular issue.

In my second question I asked the Minister if he was aware there was a court case and Judge Dubé in his judgment said it was an important issue and it had to be dealt with by trial? And it was not a frivolous question, so it is a very, very serious question. And I again was surprised that this Government had not already made contact, representation to the Minister involved, Valcourt at this present time - not Valcourt. Who was the Minister?

An Hon. Member: Lucien Bouchard.

Mr. Parsons: Lucien Bouchard, right. Why haven't they said to him, Look, at least let us do something about it? Let us investigate it. Perhaps there is a problem out there. I mean, we do not know. We do not have the luxury today because of the state our fishery is in. The problem is the trawlers are out there during the spawning time, which is about from January until, oh, perhaps the last of April, sometimes until the 10th of May. What I am saying is very simple, that this Government should have made representation to the Minister to ask the Minister to assess the situation. The judge said there is a problem there. The only reason why NIFA, the people who introduced that court case did not win it, was because of the lateness of the season. They judge also emphasized the fact that because the spawning season was over, approximately the May 15, and because of the lateness of the court case, he could not see implementing a court injunction because of the lateness of the season.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: The old biologist is up.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are all suffering in this country from a lack of proper research with regards to the codfish. We have reams of research on other aspects of

fishing and so on, but we are suffering from a lack of accurate information on codfish, simply because of the nature of the animal. It was thought, for instance, until quite recently, that in the spawning process, which is what we are talking about, the female codfish simply released the eggs at a certain point in time, when the pressure built up, and that the males, for the same reason, released the sperm into the water purely at random - okay? So the spawning process was thought to have been a purely random process at one point in time. However, within the last year or so there has been some new research which indicates that there is an actual spawning process that the codfish go through, a ritual. This is fairly new information.

Now I am getting to the point. There is an actual spawning ritual. There has not been enough research yet to fully investigate that even, but the preliminary indication is that disturbances during that particular period, which extends about six weeks, that very specific period with the spawning ritual, that disturbances during that period actually interfere with the process. Now that is the preliminary indication, but we do not have enough research, just as we do not have enough research on the cod stock and everything else to do with codfish. We have to get it. So we are suffering from that particular condition in this country, and that really has to be corrected.

As to it being an environmental matter, I say to the hon. Member I believe it is more than an environmental matter. If it were simply an environmental matter

from the point of view of the waste from the trawlers, or from the point of view of the noise and so on, which is generally an environmental matter, if it were that kind of a matter, it would be a Federal environmental matter. Obviously, this is outside our jurisdiction. The spawning grounds, we all know where they are and it is not within our direct jurisdiction.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: I am getting to that now. I just want to set the stage about the research and the responsibility and that kind of thing.

The Minister's answer I thought was quite good. He said not specifically on that, indicating to me that that amongst other matters had been discussed at meetings and so on, and that he did not specifically dwell on that. One of the reasons perhaps is, as I have indicated, that it is peripherally an environmental matter, but it is more properly a concern of all of us: a concern of Government, a concern of the Federal and Provincial Governments to get the proper research to find out, in fact, how much of an impact that is having. I believe the dragging of the spawning grounds is devastating.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favor, 'aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: Those against, 'nay'.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: I ask hon. Members  
to join me this evening at 7:00  
p.m.



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 36(A)

---

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

***Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush***

Thursday (Evening)

[Preliminary Transcript]

17 May 1990

The House resumed at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Baker: Order 2.

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.

If the Minister of Social Services wants to speak, I do not mind.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Absolutely, go ahead.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: I recognized the hon. Opposition House Leader before the hon. Minister of Social Services had stood up.

Mr. Simms: You are right. Absolutely. I was just offering to relinquish my position if the Minister wanted to speak.

Mr. Efford: I will wait until you are finished.

Mr. Simms: I shall never be finished.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise some new topics again for discussion, as I have been trying to do over the last five or six days. In addition to referring to some previous topics that we have discussed briefly from time to time.

I have two new topics that I would have liked the Minister of Environment to address. One of them affects the Minister of Social Services and his constituencies. So perhaps, since the Minister of Environment is not here; when the Minister of Social Services gets up to answer my previous question on the Juvenile Corrections Centre, and that situation, I would like to hear somebody at least, give an update on the PCB situation at Makinsons. I think that is an important issue, a very serious matter, and one that perhaps the Minister -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, and the Minister of Social Services, after he gets up and attacks the Tories for not doing anything about it, perhaps then he can tell us exactly what is going on so that we all know what is happening.

The Minister of Environment is not here, and there is another topic I would like to ask somebody a question about. Perhaps the President of Treasury Board could respond to this question. I read with a great deal of interest the story in the news media last weekend, I guess it was, about a recycling program - I read it in the press - that had been proposed by the Department of Environment, which had to do with using all the paper, recycling all the paper used in the public service and so



on. There were other aspects of the recycling program as well that the Minister had been proposing to Cabinet, but apparently was not approved by Cabinet. This is according to a news report I read over the last weekend sometime, I am not sure where I read it, the Sunday Express, yes. There was quite a story about the Minister of Environment's proposal to do a recycling program and to use all the paper in the public service and anything else, and I would like the President of Treasury Board, perhaps, to give us an update. The Minister was quoted as saying, "It did not get approved in the budgetary process", and he was quite disappointed with that. Some of the Ministers look a bit surprised but that is the situation, so the Minister of Environment is not here, perhaps, the President of Treasury Board can give us an update. So that is a couple of new items that I would certainly like to hear more on, from the morons.

Also, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier took a note last week or a few days ago, I asked the question of the people appointed to the Provincial Heritage Foundation Board and there was one person in particular by the name of Judy Foote, Mount Pearl, and I wondered if that was the same Judy Foote in the Premier's office, and I thought if it was -

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Simms: - that perhaps it was a conflict of interest and it would not be very appropriate to have a public servant or senior political advisor to the Premier as a Member of the Heritage Foundation Board, and the Minister

undertook to find out for me if it was.

An Hon. Member: Which I did.

Mr. Simms: I now detect that it is, and I am wondering then if the President of Treasury Board can advise me whether or not they are considering making a change on that particular Board with that particular position because, I mean, it is a high conflict of interest to have a senior policy advisor in the Premier's political office on a Provincial Board, I mean, that is absolutely a conflict of interest, so maybe the President of Treasury Board could address that for me.

An Hon. Member: She is there to keep the Heritage crowd in line.

Mr. Simms: I did not receive the answer so, I wondered if somebody could -

An Hon. Member: She will do what the Premier told her to do.

Mr. Simms: I wondered if somebody could advise me on that particular item. That is an earlier item, not a new item.

There is another new item, perhaps the Minister of Development would be the appropriate person to stand and give us some information on it, I would like to hear a bit about it, as a matter of fact, the

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)  
Barbara Frum.

Mr. Simms: What did he say?

An Hon. Member: A modern-day  
Barbara Frum.

Mr. Simms: A modern-day Barbara

Frum? What is he talking about.

Perhaps the Minister of Finance might not be so jocular if I was to indicate or ask him if he received another letter from the owners of Kentucky Fried Chicken in the last day or so. Did he receive another letter from them by any chance? Where they chastised him and said that his apology was not good enough.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Simms: I wonder did the Minister receive a second letter, and perhaps, he could comment on that after he has had his big laugh.

Anyway, I was asking the Minister of Development if he would not mind giving us an update on the official opening of a new business development in the Province that the Premier officiated at a few days ago, I read in the paper with some interest. And that was the juice manufacturing plant out at Donovan's park. I read it with some interest, the Premier was there, I think, and officially cut the ribbon a little later, and I believe the idea itself was rather an intriguing idea, certainly a new idea. I believe the principal of the company is John Bursey, one John Bursey who used to work with VOVM from time to time on weekends doing reports from the Legislature, for Members who might recall him.

An Hon. Member: Blue Boy Foods.

Mr. Simms: He was with Blue Boy Foods.

An Hon. Member: Was, yes.

Mr. Simms: Anyway, the Minister of Development could, perhaps,

give us an update, I would appreciate it if he would give us an update because I think it is a good initiative, one he should be touting, by the way. I am not sure what the Government's involvement was, but the idea, the project itself, I think, sounds like a hell of an idea, and I wanted to hear -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes well, I wanted to hear somebody tell us something about it because it is a bit of positive news, for a change. So those are three or four new items, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to raise.

I also want to draw to the attention of the Minister of Social Services, I am sure he is already aware of it, but again when he speaks, I am providing him with lots of questions so he can respond to them as well as taking his darts at the Opposition and blaming everything on the previous Tory administration, which we fully expect him to do, and bring up Sprung and the pickle factories. I hope he will respond to the serious questions I have asked as well.

And one very serious matter that has come to light over the last day or so, has to do with the food banks, and the Minister would be aware, and I am sure, very concerned with the situation that exists. I only know from what I have seen on the public airways and in the media with the person who has been interviewed on the matter, and it appears that the cupboards are bare basically at the food banks. And the spokesperson interviewed on that particular matter I believe, made reference to the fact that today

we have more people out of work, than ever before. And that was one of the major reasons for it. He was interviewed on television the other night. Well, whoever it is caused by, I mean this is too serious a matter I think to be political about quite frankly. It is a serious problem. It is a serious matter. And I do hope that the Minister of Social Services will respond to it in a serious fashion and perhaps give his views on what we can do to help resolve that kind of a situation, because I am sure the food banks which I think have been in operation for decades, have been very, very helpful to a lot of those people who cannot afford

An Hon. Member: Thanks to the business community.

Mr. Simms: Well thanks to the business community for a large part, no question about that, and thanks to the efforts of the volunteers who are involved with food banks themselves.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. members time is up.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We will see what kind of responses we elicit from those few questions.

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I want to touch on a couple of points: first before I get into the issues of the questions I was asked by the hon. Member from Grand Falls about my own particular Department, it is not that I do not place serious emphasis on it, but I want to respond to a couple of things that

the Member from Green Bay spoke about this afternoon.

An Hon. Member: Is that the song?

Mr. Efford: The rhythm and the blues, the rhythm and the blues is it, he stood in his place. I had him accused but he denies emphatically that he wrote the lyrics in the pickle book. I am not surprised, I am not surprised at what he did not do, because from what came out of that office in the last ten years, there was very little done, so I am not surprised when he was not part of writing the pickle book. But what I am surprised at, but what I am surprised at, I do not mind one of the Members, the new Members, probably the Member from Grand Bank or the Member from Fogo to stand in his House and ask questions about the cars, the car allowance or ask questions about expenditures on this side of this House. So they should, they are in opposition. But when I hear it, when I have to sit here in my chair and listen to it from the Member of the House of Assembly from Green Bay, talking about \$8,000.00 for a car allowance when he just got a \$105,000.00 severance pay, \$110,000.00.

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Efford: Now that is the type of thing that comes out of his mouth in the rhythm way, a \$110,000.00 in severance pay, out of the taxpayers, out of the poor peoples mouths that this hon. Member of Grand Falls just mentioned about, empty food banks around, and then turns around and comes in this House and asks questions why a Minister of the Crown should receive a car allowance. And not only, not talk about it, but even distort it and

not tell the true facts about it. Try to give a totally different impression as to what it is actually about. Why did he not say when he stood up in his place that \$110,000.00 was received by one Member of the House of Assembly, one individual, not then an Member of the House of Assembly, an ex-employee of the Premier's office.

An Hon. Member: Was the money in a brown paper bag?

Mr. Efford: A \$110,000.00. Well I would suspect that if I got a \$110,000.00 I would not mind putting it in a paper bag. Whether brown or white.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: It would not bother me too much what it was into. Brown or white, I would not mind carrying it. But, I tell you, the poor people of this Province should be aware of it.

An Hon. Member: That's old news.

Mr. Efford: Now you sit there and you talk about it, talk about the money that this crowd is spending, at least we are going to decrease the cost of expenditures of operations. Lets talk about the ex-Premier, not the former Premier but the ex-ex-Premier. Premier number two. What was his expenses in one year, we talk about the poor people of the Province. What was the cost to keep the Premier in food, in rental accommodation -

An Hon. Member: You had better not bring that up, John.

Mr. Efford: \$220,000.00 a year, yes I will bring it up, \$227,000.00 a year that was budgeted for Premier Brian

Peckford, and nobody will stand up and argue that, \$227,000.00 in one year. How many cars did he have travelling around. Lets not talk about the cars he had here, the four or five cars he had here in the city, lets talk about when he travelled, and he got off the flight, and the stretched limousine was out there. \$1,250.00 a day limousines parked out by the airport, chauffeured to the hotel room and when he got out, now the most I ever tipped anyone is one of those loonies, you managed to tip somebody that, but when you stand up by a hotel door and get out and open the door and you put out a two hundred and fifty dollar tip from the airport to the hotel -

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Efford: It is the type of people that are standing here today criticizing this Government for trying to cut back and decrease on the 2 thousand cars in the pool out there, with trailer hitches on them. The hon. Minister of Finance, tell us about the trailer hitches.

An Hon. Member: There is only one with a trailer hitch.

Mr. Efford: I am driving one from the former Minister of Social Services and he told me himself that he beat the bottom of the car driving up to his cabin. The former Minister told me that in the House this week, he beat the bottom of the car driving up to his cabin. Because when I am driving over the Trans Canada going like that I am hanging on to the wheel.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: So we talk about the

cost. We will talk about the former expenditures.

Now I do not want to hear the shouts anymore about the wastefulness and about saving money. Two hundred and twenty-seven thousand dollars to operate a Premier's home. A hundred and ten thousand dollars for that monstrosity. A hundred and ten thousand dollars for severance pay, that is not possible.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: I stand to be corrected. I will let the MHA, when he stands up, correct me on that, but it cannot be correct.

Mr. Simms: Standard Deputy Minister.

Mr. Efford: Standard Deputy Minister, a hundred and ten thousand dollars severance.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) you gave the Deputies you fired.

Mr. Efford: I wonder how many food banks would you fill up with two hundred and twenty-seven to three hundred and thirty-seven thousand dollars. How many food banks would you fill up with that.

Now when a Government tries to do something positive and tries to cut back on some of the expenditures, you try to stand up in your place and criticize. I suggest to the official Opposition that if they are going to criticize, pick out something legitimate to criticize because you are not going to get very far making accusations like that when you have the history of expenditures in the past.

Let's talk about Makinsons. What happened? Let's talk about Makinsons for a while. The hon. Member for Grand Falls is the one who asked me a question about the PCBs in Makinsons. I remember how concerned -

Mr. Simms: Fifteen years ago (inaudible).

Mr. Efford: The then Government, this Opposition, just in 1988, when I had to take ten individuals from the little community of Makinsons to come in and embarrass and humiliate themselves and beg the Minister of Municipal Affairs, then, for a mere \$11 thousand to put some decent drinking water in their taps and what kind of a reaction did they get? No, we do not have \$11 thousand. And only through the determination of those eleven women, they occupied his office for a full week.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Efford: They would not have had their drinking water today, but they had the determination.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: You have not got to go to the present Minister's office because he recognizes the need. The most money given out in the last ten years was given out this year in water and sewage work.

Well let's see how quick the subject changes, eleven thousand dollars for the community of Makinsons for decent drinking water and what does the Members do, they ask what about the PCBs in Makinsons, yes what about the PCBs?

Mr. Simms: That is what I am asking you.

Mr. Efford: They were there. The PCBs were allowed to be stored there in 1970, and who was in power in 1970.

An Hon. Member: Joe Smallwood.

Mr. Efford: It was started at that time, and all up through the years, until 1986, the then Member of Port de Grave District -

An Hon. Member: That was the last time there was any work done.

Mr. Efford: - (Inaudible) on the Opposition found out the mess that was in Makinsons and what did we do? We created such a noise that we got the whole mess cleaned up in there, a whole surface mess of the PCBs cleaned off the ground, and it went on by the then Minister of Environment, nobody would even recognize it, but we did get it cleaned up.

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Efford: Now it is in the process of being cleaned further. Now the study is being done to see of there is really any PCBs in the ground and how much has been done. The people have met with the officials from Environment, the report is being given to the Minister, and the determination of how it needs to be cleaned up will be done.

That will be the report and the Minister will be making an official statement when the report is given to him by his officials. But, this Government is concerned and we are doing something about it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: The boys home down in Pleasantville: now you are asking

the right one now a question about the boys home down in Pleasantville because I am quite familiar with what has gone on in the boys' Home in Pleasantville, the Boys' Home in Torbay, and the Boys' Home in Whitbourne, and all the secured custody and the open custody centres right across the island of Newfoundland and Labrador. But especially, what has gone on down there for the last seven or eight years. I am sure that we can go back much, much further than that down in Pleasantville.

When I was on the Opposition, we had on an average of about 85 to 90 escapes every year. In that one particular facility alone. In the last year, since I became Minister of Social Services, we decreased the escapes in Torbay 95 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: Now, there is a decrease! There is a big improvement in the Boys' Home in Torbay alone.

What have we done with the education program in the Boy's Home in Torbay? We have completely turned the education program over, where it should have been years ago, to the Department of Education, so that the proper education and training programs can be put there for those young boys. Not men, not criminals, young boys.

Mr. Simms: I wanted to know what the problem was with the employees.

Mr. Efford: I am getting to what the problem is with the employees.

Thirdly, what kind of staff relationship was down there over

the past eight or ten years. There was very, very little relationship, any good relationship at all. You could not even recognize the relationship between the administrative department of the Boys' Home and the youth correction officers, the cleaning staff and the kitchen staff - the general staff down there as a whole.

It was always a real program there with communications and the policies were not put in place. There were absolutely no policies down there that the administration could direct the youth correction officers. In the last year, we have had to take a look at the whole policy on the youth correction side of the department, the secured custody side, and revise it.

I think it was eighteen years ago, eighteen years, since the policy manual was even read - even any amendments, any any changes put to it. So we have completely brought in a new policy manual. And what happens when you bring in a new policy manual? Naturally, some of the people who have been working there for the last ten, fifteen years, have been quite concerned about the policies. They have had their own way of doing things.

I will give you one instance, and if the hon. Member for Grand Falls was so interested in finding out, he would listen. He would listen to what is happening in the Boys' Home. One particular policy that was brought in by the administrator, was to tell them there was a no smoking policy down there.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thought that there was only one yesterdays man over in the Government, in the Cabinet. But I see now they have two yesterdays men. And his famous defense is to bring up about the pickle factory.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, you always mention the pickle factory. And if there is anyone in this House who knows more about being in the pickle, the one who knows most about being in the pickle, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister of Social Services. He has been in the pickle for the last year, and he is going to get himself further into the pickle if he is not careful.

An Hon. Member: Tell us about the boat.

Mr. Efford: Don't go threatening me now, you're making me scared.

Mr. Matthews: No, no, I don't threaten you. But I just had to say, in saying that about making you scared; it had nothing to do with the condition of the car that you were going like this when you were going out the highway. You have been so negligent in your duties that your nerves are gone. Your nerves are gone. When you are driving a car you are doing like this - you cannot keep it on the road.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Well, that is strong enough. That is as strong

as I mean it. It is the way I said it.

I would just like to say to the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Grand Falls brought up about the food bank, which was a very serious concern.

Mr. Efford: I was getting to that, but I was not given leave.

Mr. Matthews: You were too interested in talking about the pickle factory.

The people that go to the food bank looking for something to eat will be more than glad to have a few pickles sometimes.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: This poor man never spent \$327,000 in his life.

The situation is very serious at the food bank. I read, and I listened to what the gentleman on the television had to say the other night and I read after. He said it is the most serious situation that they have experienced at the food bank in this province in twenty years. This is 1990, twenty years ago was 1970. The hon. Minister asked who was in power in 1970. It was Mr. Smallwood. And who was in power in 1990?...twenty years after the worse time it has been in twenty years? Mr. Wells. Maybe he was there twenty years ago when it was as bad again.

It is a very serious situation. I am not saying that to take it lightly. There are a lot of hungry people out and about this city and this Province. More people unemployed than ever before. The gentleman who they

interviewed said; he could not believe the numbers of people that were coming in off the streets because they were out of work and had no income, and they were hungry. Now you cannot blame that on anyone else. It is not their fault and you get up and you make a joke about it. I thought, to be very honest with the Minister of Social Services, I thought that you took your responsibilities more serious than that, because I have been one of the few people on this side who consistently said that I thought you were sincere about what you do. Well you are causing me to change it. Because you are more concerned about pickles than you are about anything else.

An Hon. Member: Politics.

Mr. Matthews: Well if you feel like you should not than do not.

An Hon. Member: A big joke.

Mr. Matthews: It is not a joke at all. Yes, I am very serious about it. Hunger is nothing to be laughed at. People out of work is nothing to be laughed at, sluffed off on someone else, when you had the responsibility to feed them and to put them to work, and we have seen that the last two days, by the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, how she has laughed at the unemployed in this Province.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Matthews: Now listen the old awards theatre over there should be quiet. The old awards theatre. The reason that he is sitting in the Liberal benches today is because the Government of the day, when he was a bag man for the Conservatives in central



Newfoundland, would not bend the rules to give him the contract. That is why he is a Liberal today, if you want to know the truth. That we know why, we know why, we know why. We know why -

Mr. Chairman: Order please, order please

Mr. Matthews: - they would not put your equipment to work, they would not bend the rules for you. But now you are over there Minister responsible for awarding contracts, and tenders in the Province. So we know what that means.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Matthews: Yes it could be. Now I am going to tell you something. I would not want to tell you what some of the people think that you are when you are on television.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: And I had calls from Vancouver when you were on about Christina, and they said, what part of Newfoundland is he from Bill?..I never heard an accent like that down there before.

Some Hon. Members: (inaudible)

Mr. Chairman: Order please,

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, no I will not take it back, it is true because I did have the calls.

An Hon. Member: Your sister phoned

Mr. Matthews: No, I do not have a sister, I have four brothers.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Matthews: No they are all in

the Province, they do not live in Vancouver. They are fortunate enough to have jobs in Newfoundland and Labrador still. But they will not have them much longer, because some of them work at the Grand Bank fish plant.

An Hon. Member: Are they Tories?

Mr. Matthews: No they vote Liberal.

An Hon. Member: Thank God!

Mr. Matthews: Yes, they used to vote Liberal, but they are not now because you are shutting down their plant. Now the hon. Member up there, Mr. Chairman, has been slapped on the wrists a few times by the Premier over the last few days, and his latest is this afternoon for his belly ragging and so one in this House so he should be quiet, because he will be taken to the cleaners again by the Premier. Now we heard, and we saw, and we know, that some of your Members over there, tell stories to the Premier more than you use to tell the Premier on them.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Matthews: But, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a couple of minutes about education.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education over the last few days has been trying to defend his Education Budget. And there is not one educator in this Province that has made a public comment over the last few weeks that has had one positive thing to say about the Minister's Budget in education. Not one. Not one educator.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Matthews: Yes, I am telling you the facts.

An Hon. Member: Name one.

Mr. Matthews: You name me one. I am telling you the facts. You see bussing, allocations for bussing have been frozen.

Mr. Simms: The Prime Minister of distortion.

Mr. Matthews: I always tell the truth John, as much as it hurts you, I always tell the truth.

An Hon. Member: That is his middle name, John distortion Efford. Send us over your sensationalism -

Mr. Chairman: Order please, order please

Mr. Matthews: I want to go on to the Minister of Education: he has been sitting on the Crocker Report over there now on science and math, I do not know how long it has been over there, there is about two inches of dust on it now, that educators out and about the Province are waiting for the Minister to act on, and I see his good friend over there, the Minister of Finance, a former educator nodding in approval because he agrees as well, that it is collecting dust and something should be done about it, and I am sure if he was Minister of Education that something would be done about it.

An Hon. Member: He would burn it, he said.

Mr. Matthews: No, he would not burn it.

An Hon. Member: That is what he just said, he would burn it.

Mr. Matthews: No, no, he did not mean that. He said some things in the last few weeks, but he did not mean what he said then. He meant a lot of the other things.

An Hon. Member: What he said then was he was going to burn it.

Mr. Matthews: As well, the Minister today made comments about emphasis on secondary education, on elementary and high school and so on, and we agree with that. There has got to be greater emphasis in that area, and now he has got responsibility for all of the education in the Province.

Before the last election, the education of the Province was divided between two Departments, one, Career Development and Advanced Studies and the other Education, and, you know I believe that that should have continued, but for whatever reason that the Premier saw to make one Department of Education, and consequently now, the Minister of Education is responsible for elementary, high school and post-secondary education in the Province. It is a very big responsibility. But I would have to say to the Minister, a man who has had a lot of input in education in the Province through his work at the University, Royal Commissions, Task Forces, and papers and so on -

An Hon. Member: The Task Force on Educational Financing.

Mr. Matthews: There is a big disappointment out and about the Province from educators about the Department of Education's Budget. Not one educator, I would like to say to him, not one educator, and

you know what else, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Employment and Labor Relations was still President of the Newfoundland Teachers Association, she would be saying that the Budget was inadequate as well, and if the Member for Exploits was still President of the Newfoundland Teachers Association, he would be saying it was inadequate, as well. But educators out and about the Province have expressed concern about the Minister of Education's Budget, and the big reason they are concerned is that we see that bussing has been frozen, the allocation for bussing, and the amounts that have been given by the Minister is not keeping pace with the increase in inflation, electricity, it is going down, see?

An Hon. Member: Not one positive comment about it.

Mr. Matthews: Not one positive comment from an educator in the Province to the Minister's Budget, not one. Well, we do not know about that. If you had a telephone call, we do not know. We are talking public reaction, we are talking letters from school boards.

An Hon. Member: The Minister refused to meet them.

Mr. Matthews: And the group in Corner Brook are not very happy with him, because they are saying the reason their schools are closing is because the Minister has put the squeeze on the money to school boards, and they cannot keep them going.

An Hon. Member: Indecisive, he will not take a stand.

Mr. Matthews: And we see, oh,

yes, will not take a stand, and he has cut tuition fees to the University, 15 per cent in two years, 10 per cent last year, 5 per cent this year, a man who came out of Memorial University, a post-secondary institution, and what did he do when he became Minister of Education, the first thing he did was slap them with a 10 per cent increase in tuition fees.

Mr. Efford: He got the nerve to get up (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: And then he goes about the Province thinking that he is doing such a wonderful job for education.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, I would love to see them, I would love to read them, I would love to listen to them, because you see the only one that

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The only one who believes the Minister's list is himself, no one else believes it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. gentleman's time is up.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Torngat Mountains.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: I did not see the Hon. Member.

The Hon. Member for Bellevue.

An Hon. Member: That is right,

you cannot see around corners, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Barrett: It indeed gives me great pleasure again to rise in the House and the other night when I spoke, I indicated that I gave support for this Budget because of its initiative in rural Newfoundland.

I stand tonight as a person in support of the payroll tax, I fully endorse the payroll tax.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: The reason I do that hon. Members -

An Hon. Member: Private sector (inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Barrett: - is that in 1985, a headline in the Toronto Globe and Mail, said 'Billions spent yet programs fail adults in need', and the article goes on to say that training and adult education in Canada has turned into a multi-billion dollar business that is failing to serve many of those who are most in need of further education. And if you look at the money being spent in this country, you will find that the money is being spent on the people who are the best educated in this country. The same thing is happening in this Province, is that the best educated are the ones receiving the greatest amount of money.

I have a Master's in education and if tomorrow I decided to resign my seat in the House of Assembly and go on and do a Ph.D, I can get all kinds of funding, but if I am a person in Lamaline, on the Burin Peninsula and I have a grade six

education, there are very few areas for me to turn, and I say that example because I came across that example when I was involved in adult education.

I support the payroll tax because most of the industrialized countries in the world, particularly the European countries and Sweden and Norway, for years have had a payroll tax and it is called a training tax. And if you look at who benefits in society from training and from education, the individual benefits from education and training - and the Royal Commission on Unemployment and Employment said that people who have the highest level of education have the greatest chance of getting employment in this Province - so the individual profits from training and from education. Society benefits from an educated population, and in Canada today, in the Business Task Force on Literacy, said that approximately \$4 billion is lost annually because of lost productivity because of an untrained labor force, and society profits because of a well-trained labor force, and that same Task Force indicated that the loss to Canadian society in terms of dollars was \$10 million annually, because of an under-educated and untrained adult population in this country.

I was at a conference yesterday where the keynote speaker indicated that recently in Australia that Government brought in a 2 per cent payroll tax. A payroll tax that will be geared towards training within that country. Now if you do an analysis of the training that has been provided by business and by industry, you will find that the top echelon within the companies

themselves are the ones that receive the training, the people in management. Now there are big companies in Newfoundland and I would like to pay tribute to some of the companies in Newfoundland, particularly the Iron Ore Company in Labrador City, who have done a great job of training and training their workers, and business -

An Hon. Member: At their own expense.

Mr. Barrett: At their own expense, and so they should, because industry profits from a well-trained labor force. And why should governments subsidize and have to pay for a well-trained labor force. One of the roles of government is to assist, to coordinate and to develop a plan to have a well-trained labor force, but why should companies profit. And we know there are corporations in this country that do not pay one cent of corporate income tax, but benefit very heavily from the money that is spent on training and education in this country, so therefore, they should.

Also too, I would like to talk a little bit about centralization and decentralization of educational functions in this Province. For years in Newfoundland we had a centralized form of education, I think, before the Warren Royal Commission Report on Education in this Province, we had a centralized system of education in this Province, and we, after that Report, the Department of Education decided to put education under local control and give the mandate for education in this Province to school boards. And I think the system that was developed was an excellent one. But what happened

and what happened in a lot of cases is that we went decentralized,, but we kept the centralized function too much. In other words, the bureaucracy at the civil service level was still maintained and we built up bureaucracies at the local level.

It was interesting three or four years ago at a time in post-secondary education in this Province when we were going with a decentralized system of community colleges, a new Department was created, at some cost of \$8 to 9 million to create this Department, and at the same time we were decentralizing the system, I do not want hon. Members to be offensive about this, I think it was a mistake at that particular time to create a new Department. I am giving this as a person who is a professional and I am not playing politics with it at all, I am just making some comments in that we decentralized the system, we kept the centralized system, and we doubled the cost of administering education in this Province. Going decentralized, I agree with, because as an educator and an adult educator, I believe that the decision making processes with an education and an adult education should be as close to the local level as possible, because they are the ones to best ascertain the needs that are necessary in education and training in this Province.

And I hazard to assess, that yes, we have also done this sort of thing, not only in the field of education, we have also done it in the field of health. In this Province, at one time, we had a very centralized system of health care, when things were, and institutions were run directly by the Department of Health.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Barrett: By leave.

We went and set up hospital boards, and I think that was a great thing, I think it was a great initiative that we set up hospital boards and administered a health care system, but also too, we did not downsize the bureaucracy that existed in the public service, and it was unfortunate that we did not do it. I know that it is very difficult when you are talking about eliminating people's jobs, but I think we need to really assess - I made the comments many, many times that we went through a period within the public service when we had a lot of people who were in control who were graduates from business administration, and hon. Members opposite will probably know some of the people that I allude to that were in Treasury Board, good people. We got to the point where you could not have a Deputy Minister unless you had three or four Assistant Deputy Ministers. You could not have a Director unless you had two or three Assistant Directors. But I think, as Members of this House, and as people who are in charge of the public purse, we need to re-evaluate and really have a look at our system of Government and the bureaucracy that exists, because if we are going to be decentralized then there may not be a need to have all this centralized function. And I hazard a guess that there are probably a lot of people now - I used to refer to them as the people in charge of the flowcharts - and I would hazard a guess that today, in this building today,

that there are probably fifteen or twenty people drawing flowcharts.

An Hon. Member: You wouldn't be able to name them, would you?

Mr. Barrett: Well I probably could name a few. But I think we really need to assess some of these things, and I hope to get on my feet in a few minutes because I need to talk a little bit more about this subject. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The Hon. Member for Menihek.

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I rise and am pleased to have the opportunity to rise and speak on the Budget and I want to say right up front that I do not support the Budget. I find with a little bit of interest that the hon. Member for Bellevue supports, he is the only person yet I have heard in support other than the hon. Member for St. John's Centre, the Minister of Finance who supports the payroll tax. The arguments brought forward by the hon. Member for Bellevue, an argument in support for the payroll tax, being that he feels that these funds would be going to fight adult illiteracy, to support the training that is necessary for adult education.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. A. Snow: No, I am not against that.

It is interesting to note, of course, that the tax, the proper nomenclature, the proper name for that tax is the health and post-secondary education tax. Now the man is an educator, and he

should have recognized what that tax was, now yet, he is suggesting that this is going to go for adult education, and there is no guarantee that this particular revenue going into the coffers of this particular conservative Government is going to go directly into fighting adult illiteracy or, indeed, for adult training and education.

An Hon. Member: Conservative as opposed to Liberal?

Mr. A. Snow: Yes, it is very, very conservative. All you have to do is listen to what the hon. Member for Bellevue was talking about, how the companies and everything should be paying for the education and training and that they should, and that there is no role for Government. He is talking about people in Government, the public employee, not doing their jobs, he is suggesting that all they do is draw up flowsheets. That is what he is suggesting.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. A. Snow: Now that is a conservative, a very conservative philosophy, he would fit in very well with our friend south of the border, several years ago, by the name of Reagan. He would probably be associated with that particular type of philosophy and that particular type of Government.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. A. Snow: I would also like to make a few comments concerning the car allowance, that a lot of people have been discussing, the hon. Minister of Social Services, now I do not know of some of the abuses that have been alleged that occurred in previous

administrations about the car allowance, but I have listened to the debate about the car allowances and I just want to say what people are telling me.

An Hon. Member: Oh no!

Mr. A. Snow: The people do not resent making an allocation of funds, the taxpayers of this Province do not resent Ministers being given an allocation of funds to do their job. They recognize that hon. Ministers of the Crown need and should have the necessary tools to do their job. And in this particular case, we are talking about transportation methods, i.e., a car.

Mr. Efford: It is a long way down from a stretch limousine.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. A. Snow: And what they are all suggesting, at least when they are speaking to me, the hon. Member for Gander, the President of Treasury Board, suggested in a comment in a previous debate, he talked about one hon. Member on this side of the House at this particular time, possibly being able to go fifty times to his District and he brought up that amount and the expenditure of money. Now, in my case, taxpayers of this Province pay the airfare for me to travel to attend this House, and it costs seven hundred dollars, seven hundred and twenty-four dollars for me to travel from Labrador West to St. John's to attend sessions of this House.

Now if I were to travel, I am not taking it out of context, I use the hon. President of Treasury Board's example of fifty trips a year, that would be approximately

thirty-seven thousand dollars in travel expenses that the taxpayers would bear to send me to St. John's, and the people in Labrador recognize the high cost, and they recognize that I have to be here to represent them fully in this House.

Now to use the example the Cabinet Ministers have, they would not want to see me lease/purchase that plane, and after three years of paying \$130 or \$140 thousand in expenses, to own a plane. Now that is exactly what the taxpayers have been led to believe is occurring with the Cabinet Ministers.

And I am sure the hon. Minister of Environment and Lands; he does not want to buy a plane to travel back and forth to Goose Bay. But he would like to have the necessary tools of the job, and that is access to the Government vehicle and not necessarily have the taxpayers to buy him a vehicle.

In speaking about the budget and the Ministry of Environment and Lands, in our particular District, we had a Caribou Hunters Association dinner last week and the hon. Member for Eagle River attended and represented the Government and made an announcement that the Crown Lands Office would now have representation in Menihek. Again, the office would be reinstated and there would be a person there in the office as a lands technician. I commend the Government for reinstating that position in Western Labrador. It is an area which probably has the highest per capita cabin occupancy in this Province. So it is a necessary thing to have. Not only did I take credit for it, and the people of Western Labrador have earned it

of course, as the hon. Minister of Social Services knows, but the people of Labrador recognize that I did have a role to play in getting it located in Western Labrador, getting that office reopened. We are pleased, and I commend the Minister and the Cabinet for having that office opened. There is a definite void in Western Labrador with more presence under that particular Department and that is of course within the Department of Environment and Lands to have more presence for a better management of the service of wildlife enforcement.

We have two officers that patrol about twenty five thousand square miles. Now that represents probably about little over half of the area of the Island portion of the Province. And we only have two enforcement officers, so you recognize immediately, that it is necessary to have either a heck of a lot more people, enforcement officers, or a different mode of transportation for these people. I would suggest that maybe in conjunction with the Department of Works Services and Transportation that an allocation of helicopter time when being tendered in Labrador, it has to be done with the shared time of the chopper being located in Western Labrador and Eastern Labrador. You cannot properly utilize the resources that are over in Eastern Labrador, if the chopper is stationed in Goose Bay and part of the chopper time being stationed over in Western Labrador, you cannot properly utilize this resource because it takes two and one half hours flying time to fly from Happy Valley, Goose Bay to Western Labrador. It is a complete waste of taxpayers dollars. Two and a half hours to fly over a twenty



five or thirty minute patrol and two and a half hours to fly back.

It is also necessary to spend more money on caribou research and moose research, and caribou and moose counts in the Western portion of Labrador have to be done. There has not yet, ever been a moose count done in Western Labrador. We are talking about an area that is suffering quite a bit of poaching, because of the method of transportation that is being used in and out of Labrador and this particular case of being on the railroad. They travel approximately two hundred miles to a district on a railroad and anywhere on that district people are permitted to get off the train and hunt. So you can imagine the amount of access that people from our neighbouring province has, in getting in to poach these animals.

One of the things of course also in Western Labrador that we all recognize as a mining district. A lot of the people that reside in Western Labrador have families and friends still here on the Island and have come from the roots and are very, very concerned about the crisis that is occurring in our fishing industry. When albeit, we are not directly involved in the sense that we are very far removed from the fishing industry, as I suggested we do have a lot of family and friends involved in the fishing industry. One of the things that we also do, is that we have access to Quebec newspapers, and Quebec media, being very close to the boarder, as a matter of fact the daily newspaper that is commonly most widely read in Western Labrador is the Montreal Gazette. It is interesting to note, when the Quebec Government brought down their Provincial Budget, they made an allocation of

50 million dollars to help the fishing industry in that Province. That is a Provincial Budget that brought down 50 million dollars of money, of Provincial dollars in the Province of Quebec to aid the fishing industry. Whereas this Province has not seen fit to spend any money so far, to my understanding anyway, in aid to the fishing industry, so far this year. Whereas the Quebec Government has made an allocation of 50 million dollars. A large portion of this money is to be spent in giving the opportunity for business or fish plants to change their equipment and the fishermen to change their equipment to fish and process under-utilized species. Now, of course they have probably about one third of the manpower that this Province has in the fishing industry. Yet, they saw fit to spend 50 million dollars in the fishing industry.

I notice in the Budget estimates that there was a tremendous increase in the inter-Governmental Affairs vote, I believe it was. When I asked the hon. President of Treasury Board, he mentioned a part of this. I asked him a question, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy was not in the House at the time, and he indeed indicated that part of this money was going to - The Intergovernmental Affairs has a responsibility of negotiating agreements between both levels of Government, Federal and Provincial, and that some of this money would be allocated to negotiating an agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments with regard to mining. I raised that in the sense, that we in western Labrador are experiencing the opening of a new mine about 25 to 30 miles from

the town of Labrador City. And yet, it is in a different Province, it is in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: Read us a recipe, I want a recipe.

Mr. Efford: One recipe. I really did not want to.

Let me read you one. I would say after the speech he just gave, the Member for Menihek wrote it. This is the extent of what he could write. One Newfoundland cucumber, dish of salt, peel and cut cucumber in narrow bit size pieces and dip in salt. That is the recipe. Nice served with cocktails. That was the great addition to the recipe book of 1989.

Mr. Simms: Where did that come from?

Mr. Efford: Labrador. The Member for Labrador. Remember that.

Mr. Simms: Is he the originator of that one?

Mr. Efford: And, do you want to hear one from the Member for Torngat Mountains?

Mr. Simms: Yes.

Mr. Efford: Low calorie snack time. Gee Mom, this is good. Two or more slices of melba toast, cut cucumbers fine and lay over toast, salt and pepper to taste, add

grated cheddar and dressing if desired. Gee Mom, this is good!

This is what you have to sit here in your seat and listen to when they stand up over there, and they take credit for the Crown Lands office going into Happy Valley, Goose Bay. They take credit for it. They stand up as an Opposition and take credit. I have to sit there and read the like of that while he is taking credit.

I have to touch back briefly. I was finishing up on the group home, on the Boys' Home down in Torbay. I was getting into why we are having problems. I went back ten years, I could have went back twenty years. I went back as early as 1972-73 before the last policy manual was even revised in the youth correction facility. What we have done in the last year, we had to revise the youth corrections policy manual.

I want to get to the problem in the Boys' Home that the hon. Member for Grand Falls mentioned.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: And the which?

An Hon. Member: The crisis shelter.

Mr. Efford: I will in a few seconds, in a few minutes. I visited down there last week actually.

An Hon. Member: In Western Labrador?

Mr. Efford: Yes. And the policy manual had to be re-drafted and we had to make a lot of changes, and naturally, when you have an administration with a lot of

employees that have been there for such a long time, they are set in their ways, so naturally when you implement new policies, you are going to get some sort of a confrontation between the administration of the home and the employees, the youth correction officers, and all the other staff members. So, one of the simple things that caused the problem, and I said it was simple, but I suppose it is not, if you have been smoking for thirty-five years and all of a sudden there is a new policy implemented in the particular unit, there is no smoking, it is hard to break the habit. But nevertheless, if you are going to bring in new policies, either the administrative staff runs the home or the staff on the floor runs the home. So you have to find out what is right.

Now if we gave in and said no because the staff does not agree with it, there are not going to be any new policy changes and no smoking in a particular room, and then that means the staff is in control. So the administrator of the home discussed it and they implemented the policy. And as soon as the policy was implemented, confrontation.

And one of the employees had a letter put in his file because he smoked when he was on duty, and his supervisor put a letter in his file and reprimanded him for smoking while on duty. Now there is nothing really serious about that but they took it one step further, and because they were implementing new policies, they decided to have a walk out, and that is their right, to demonstrate, if they demonstrate and do not leave the home short of staff, but they went out on

strike, an illegal strike. And I mean, I sent a message down very quickly, you cannot have an illegal strike. We have to have that boys' home properly run, it is a secure custody facility. So, confrontation keeps building. But what we are doing, we are not going to be hard-nosed about it, we are not going to turn our backs and we are not going to drive the pegs in. We are going to sit down and we are going to talk to the staff and we are going to have a meeting where we will hear both sides of the story, and hopefully, both sides can come to a mutual agreement where they can work together. So the meeting is arranged for next Wednesday morning. So I want to inform the hon. Member for Grand Falls that we are not turning out back, we are not closing the doors, we are not saying you have to go in, and we are not going to be hard-nosed about it and drive pegs in and cause more problems, we are willing to listen. That is the good thing about this Administration, we listen to the concerns of people. We recognize that we are not always going to be right, they are not always going to be right, but we are, at least, willing to sit down, we are willing to talk, we are willing to hear both sides of the story, and hopefully, we can come to some sort of mutual agreement where we can work in a good environment and both sides can come to an agreement that is in the best interest.

Number one: The number one interest has to be the concern for the interest of the residents, the young boys and/or girls. In this particular case right now, there are twenty residents in the boys' home in Torbay, nineteen male and one female. Now they are the

interest. Whether the people can smoke and not smoke is a policy, or whether they can have a letter of reprimand on their file, then that is something that can be ironed out between the staff and the administration, but the main concern is the well being, the safety, the rehabilitation and the education and the environment for the residents of that particular home. And as Minister, it is my job and my responsibility to ensure that that is happening. And if I have to take a strong position at some particular time to deal with that situation, then I am prepared to do it, whether it will be with the administrative side of it, or whether it will be with the staff. And if the Opposition wants to question it, if they want to attack or they want to make accusations, that does not bother me one bit. I am willing to listen, but the best interest of the youth of that particular facility comes first.

Secondly, the Member for Grand Bank, my hon. colleague, Ben Matlock, spoke about the concern he had for the poor people. And there is nobody in this House of Assembly, and there is nobody in this Province has any more concern about the poor people in Newfoundland and Labrador, the less fortunate people, than I have. And I am not saying that in jest, I am saying that very seriously. But when I look at the past history of that Administration and the attitude that they had towards the poor people of the Province and the lack of policy and the lack of direction and the lack of education programs, and I am not talking about keeping people in school and having everyone be doctors and lawyers, but the lack of programs and the lack of just

the management within their own environment and the management within their own family system. There was absolutely no interest shown whatsoever.

There will never be enough money to give everybody in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador the money that they would like to have. Or probably the money that they should have. There is only one system that could bring that in, and that is the Federal system of a guaranteed income. There cannot be enough money in the Treasury to give the 20,000 clients that is now dependent on social assistance enough, at least to keep them level with the national income, the poverty level, which I think today is about \$17,000.

Right now, the average income of a family of four, on social assistance, including rent, receives about \$8,000 - \$9,000. Far, far below the need. And yes, there are going to be a lot of hungry people. Yes, there are going to be people trying to improvise, and trying to survive on not enough money, not enough food.

One of the things you have to look at and recognize is why. First of all, you have one, two, three generations of social assistance dependency. Why are they there? There are not there, in many cases, because of their own fault. They are there because the Governments in the past did not try to get them out of the system. We put them in the system. We allowed people to be on social assistance. We allowed the people to depend on hand outs.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

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

Mr. Chairman, I call a Quorum.

Quorum

There is a quorum present.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I listened with interest for awhile with the Minister of Social Services speaking, and a lot of his comments naturally, were not necessarily tied into the debate tonight. After I am finished with my ten minutes, I would think the Minister, maybe, will love to get up and make a few comments.

I would just like to say to the Minister, and I think the Minister is very serious, because in the estimates some time ago, when we were debating the social problems on the coast of Labrador, the Minister indicated that he was as concerned about the social problems on the coast of Labrador as I am, or anyone else is. And I compliment the Minister for showing concern and having his Assistant Deputy Minister travel the coast and meet with the social workers and also seeing first hand some of the problems. And, one thing the Minister said that I was really impressed with and really pleased, and I would hope that the

Minister after I am finished speaking now would probably be able to get up and answer without being too humorous. Be serious in responding to my serious request to him. Mr. Speaker, the Minister said in this House, that he believed that the time is coming, now the words may be a little bit, not exactly word for word what the Minister said, but he believed that the people on the Labrador coast should have the opportunity of being social workers or with working with the people up there and I believe the Minister was sincere. I believe, the Minister was sincere when he made that comment. Because, I think, in fact, like Mrs. Byrne that is in Davis Inlet, I think she is doing a good job with the Department of social Services. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman again, now is getting upset, and all I am saying to the Minister now, if that is the case, does the Minister agree with what I am saying?

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Warren: Ok, the Minister agrees with what I am saying, so I have to ask the Minister why, only three days ago, his Department decided to hire a person in his office in Nain, in the Department of Social Services office in Nain, from outside of Labrador, when there was a student that has spent two years in Memorial University, doing her MUN studies in social work, she applied for that particular position, and someone else outside of Labrador was given that particular position, and this young lady was hoping that at least she would have got some in the field experience in social work, but somebody else from the Island portion of the Province was hired on and this lady now at the

present time has no job. I find it interesting that the Minister, only a month ago said he would like to see Labrador people get more involved with the social work, and here this particular person had the application into the Minister's office and never got the opportunity to work in his office for the summer months, to naturally earn some income.

An Hon. Member: Is she working?

Mr. Warren: No not now, because she could not get the job with your Department. In fact I got a call from the family, and they were concerned that here she was, naturally out here doing University and promoting and wanting to work in social work, spent two years at university, and hoping to get in the field back in her own town to naturally be able to help her own people, and the Minister agreed with this a month ago.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Warren: I have no idea about the person that got hired, but that the person that got hired was from the West coast of the Province. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Minister, and I believe the Minister was sincere when he made the comments in the House some time ago, that he believed that the Labrador people should have every the opportunity possible to work in the fields, to help their own people. And, so Mr. Minister, I say to you in all honesty, check it out and see if there is somewhere else within your Labrador offices that this particular person can be employed during the summer months in the field that she is hoping to graduate in the next couple of

years.

Now Mr. Chairman, I know that two Ministers cannot get up at the same time but if the Minister of Fisheries would just listen for a minute, I have a very serious question for the Minister of Fisheries.

Now the Minister of Fisheries is not interested in the Labrador fishery because if he was, he would have answered in a positive manner the submission that was given to him by the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation. They requested that they should use one of the middle distance boats to collect fish for the two Government fish plants.

Now there are two major fish plants on the coast of Labrador that will need fish in order to employ people in the communities, and the Minister had the opportunity of a lifetime to give the LIDC the opportunity to use the middle distance boat with the same crew, and the same captain, to prosecute the fishery and bring the fish back to those two fish plants. I am glad the hon. House Leader is listening and looking very attentive because I think this was a good opportunity for this Government to show their concerns of employment to the Native people, this was a perfect opportunity for this Government to make sure there was employment in Makkovik, Hopedale and Nain by using one of those middle distance boats to collect the fish offshore, the same place, the same area, the same grounds that, last year, this Government caught the fish and brought it back to St. Anthony for processing, whereas it could have been taken to the two fish plants in Nain and Makkovik last year. But I was hoping this

year, knowing that it came from another group, not coming from me, that they would have responded more favorably to the Labrador Innu Development Corporation in a request to harvest a species for those two fish plants. But again, they have said no. On a second request, they have said no.

Now Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Development has called for a re-evaluation of the operation of the Government Stores on the coast of Labrador. I think, in the last ten years, this probably is the fourteenth or the fifteenth time that bureaucrats have said they want studies done on the operation of those stores, and Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. Minister of Development peeked his head in around the door because I am sure he is interested in what I am saying about this particular issue because it does concern his Department.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I say to my hon. colleague that, in fact, I am quite pleased that he came back because I am sure he was on the telephone then making a call to find out what happened to this position in Nain, and I am glad the Minister works so fast at these kinds of things because I would hope that he would advise me very shortly

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: No, I know how the Minister works and I am going to give the Minister credit that he is going to advise us very shortly that this particular lady in Nain will be hired on by his Department within the next three or four days. I think the Minister is going to do that because at least

one thing about the Minister, he does hold up to his obligations. And I want to give the Minister full credit for, at least, seriously looking at the particular issue that I have brought to his attention.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. gentleman, if he wants to, can try; but I am sure that I will be available to make some comment.

One other subject that I want to touch on before my time runs out, which is only about another five minutes, I thought that I would mention Sunday hunting. I understand that the successful applicants will be notified by next weekend. The successful applicant for big game licences will be notified by next weekend, if they are successful or not.

All of them - every single one of the successful applicants, want a very important question answered, and the very important question is; will the successful applicant be permitted to hunt on Sunday? I would hope that the hon. House Leader would be able to answer the question of whether Sunday hunting will be permitted this year, whenever the successful applicant is notified of his being successful, and the area that he will be permitted to hunt in.

Mr. Chairman, I want to continue.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the President of the Council.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

I thought I would get back to some of the questions that were asked and get back to the estimates, as dull and boring as they might be.

First of all, I would like to deal with one specific point outside the estimates that was raised. I suppose it is included in the estimates, in one sense. The question of Ms. Judy Foote holding a position on the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The history is simply this: first of all, it is a voluntary position, there is no money involved. She was appointed to the Heritage Foundation in 1984 by the then Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, the hon. Tom Rideout. She was reappointed again, in October 1987, for a three year term by the Cabinet at the time, or however these appointments were done at that time. Her term expires in October of this year.

She is serving on the foundation and working in two capacities really. She is chairman of the Public Relations Committee, and as such makes decisions in terms of the public relations effort of the Heritage Foundation. And she sits as a member of the Buildings Committee, and is not involved in the other aspects of that particular foundation.

I feel that there is no conflict of interest in this case. Our practice has been to have a look at all the boards and commissions as their term expires. We have not been in the habit of coming in and generally replacing all boards and commissions in the Province. In October of 1990, Ms. Foote will

be replaced on that particular foundation.

However, I might add, there are certain practices that are followed in terms of appointing people to this Heritage Foundation. The recommendations are sought from many areas. For instance, the Arts Council; and these people would make recommendations as to who they want to see on the boards and commissions. Generally, you would accept the recommendations that you get. We can not comment on who might be on that because we have not received the recommendations of the various groups and so on.

Very simply, that is the situation. I feel there is no conflict, and Ms. Foote will serve out her term, which expires in October, 1990 - as other people have been doing on the other boards and commissions. Some have been replaced and some have not. Ms. Foote has indicated right from the beginning, I understand, that she would be willing to get off all those things; but it was determined that - why do it? There really is no conflict here. That is one issue.

Mr. Chairman, as dull and boring as it might be, I will go back through some of the things that I have circled, and answer a few questions about some specific estimates headings in this booklet. If I can find them, it might take me a few seconds to find each one.

One item of note under Premier's Office - Administration Professional Services, there was a tremendous drop from last year to this year and the reason was that the purchasing of computers and so on that was coming under this



heading is pretty well over, so right now the only amount there is a \$10,000 contingency to cover any additions or terminals, printer software that might be needed. There was a \$100,000 spent last year. So this accounts for the drop there. In terms of the policy committees of Cabinet, the Cabinet secretaries, the policy committees, Members will notice that again there was a drop there under supplies 04, I still do not know why, the only explanation I can give is that this amount; one of the things it covers is the working lunches for the committees of Cabinet and our lunches have become less costly than before. We have been doing more work and less lunching, lets put it that way.

An Hon. Member: We are all on a diet.

Mr. Baker: Maybe many of us need to be on diets, Mr. Chairman. Another one that I have circled is, under the Cabinet Secretariat - Executive Support - 05, Professional Services, in this case instead of a drop there is a big jump. In one case from \$100,000 down to \$10,000, in this case from \$10,000 to \$131,000 and this is under a different heading, the purchase of microcomputers and associated software packages and development implemented computerized document control system. In terms of the Premier's office we computerized that and now we simply need contingency in case there are little extras needed. In this particular case, we have a project, we have decided to implement a document control system. A computerized document control system, as Members know, connected with Cabinet and with the various committees of Cabinet there is a veritable flood of

documents, and there are documents upon documents, and 9,500 copies of each document going all over the place and so on. And as some Members opposite can appreciate, the ones that were here last time, the documents in the system get lost and sometimes you wonder where is this proposal, where is the system and this kind of thing. And we feel that we can make the system more efficient if we computerize the document control system.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Baker: No I am not concerned about that any more, Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the Opposition House Leader that really does not bother me anymore. We will have this document control system and I believe it will make it more efficient for us as a Cabinet. There was professional services under Cabinet secretariat administration.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Baker: I do not believe there was a question on that, there is 32,000 in there for professional service and I think there was adequate explanation given for that, so I will leave that. Mr. Chairman, as I said, it may be dull and boring but I will answer questions now on the expenditures. There is another one I have noted here, but I believe that I have already answered that. It has to do with professional services under economic research and analysis, \$216,000. I believe we had a discussion on that, about the econometric model and the testing of the econometric model and so on. So, I believe that we answered that totally. Design,

development, estimation and updating of econometric model, on line computing, data storage charges for LCS Conference Board of Canada, consulting charges relating to computer programs, use of the Conference Board of Canada's ERIK computer system for design work and testing of the Provincial econometric model. And access to Conference Board's Provincial and national forecasting models. So it is a drop in funding from the previous year, as a matter of fact this is about a 50 per cent cut, but these are the things that the \$216,000 is required for. There are a lot of others here. I will get to them. A lot of questions, and the opposition is receiving an awful lot of answers.

The Classification Appeal Board was another question, I believe, I have a bracket circled here in the book, anyway. Transportation and communications gone up from \$10 thousand to \$45 thousand, I believe, and if I remember correctly, I did give an answer to this that this was travel and telephone related expenses. The Classifications Appeals Board does intend to travel, we do not intend to make everybody come in to St. John's. If there are some problems that need to be dealt with in Corner Brook, we go there, that is all.

Right now, there is a backlog, I believe, of about one hundred and fifty cases and it has become a problem from my perspective, and I have asked that the process be speeded up as quickly as possible. There should be some extra news in that regard in the next week, but we have to speed up that process. I believe there are one hundred and fifty or one hundred and sixty backlogged cases

that should not have accumulated.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: A lot of them are, yes, most of them are. So, there is a real problem there that has to be dealt with and it is really unfortunate that it has happened over the last year. One of those things that sometimes happens, I suppose, in any big system.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: No, during the last year, I said, not (inaudible) during this year. During this past year.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Baker: I am sorry.

An Hon. Member: He will get to you.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I want to react for a brief while to some of the statements made by the Member for Bellevue when he came out solidly in favor of the payroll tax because it was going to impact significantly on education. I think he cited specifically at the time, adult education, and I think my friend from Menihek reminded him that the tax was on health and post-secondary and not adult education. And the Minister of Education, every time he gets up to speak, makes great effort to emphasize how much he has done for post-secondary education in this Province

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Winsor: Post-secondary is down, he makes great strides in saying that we increased the aid to post-secondary, the grants by 10 per cent. You wait until I am finished and you will thump your desk. Today he went on to say, we have increased it by 10 per cent, and there is the Minister's calculations, student aid, 10 per cent on a thousand dollar grant gives the student a hundred bucks. Fifteen per cent on tuition, tuition fees are not five hundred dollars, as the Minister said.

An Hon. Member: That is five per cent on tuition fees.

Mr. Winsor: Five per cent and ten per cent, last year, because there was no increase last year. Seven hundred bucks times 15 per cent is one hundred and five dollars.

Tuition has gone up in excess of one hundred dollars since this Minister has been responsible for education, and he is getting up talking about the great strides made in post-secondary. The Minister did not even know that tuition is now seven hundred dollars a year and not five hundred as he said today.

Mr. Simms: He said it was five hundred.

Mr. Winsor: Five hundred the Minister said today.

Mr. Simms: Are you listening, you said it was five, it is not five it is seven.

Mr. Winsor: You said it was five, it's seven hundred.

Dr. Warren: It is not seven hundred.

Mr. Simms: It is.

Dr. Warren: It is not in Arts and Sciences, no.

Mr. Simms: Yes.

Mr. Winsor: One of the pages just came and told me that her fees for this year were seven hundred dollars and if we include health and student aid, it is in excess of eight hundred.

An Hon. Member: It is eight hundred dollars.

Mr. Winsor: In excess of eight hundred if we include that. That is what one of the pages here in the House of Assembly told me.

Mr. Simms: No, do not say who.

Mr. Winsor: I will not say who. And then the Minister out in Central Newfoundland, where my District is, there is a great concern about the location of the central college. We have waited because we have a of students out there. The Member for Twillingate nods too, because he has some students from his area who are quite interested in going to this degree granting institution that was going to be announced for central Newfoundland. We have waited, and waited and waited for the Minister to know the answer.

In fact we have all kinds of tradesmen out there who are waiting to start work on this new building, to create employment. Maybe the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations could get together with the Minister of Education.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Not a chance.

An Hon. Member: Who put the ice on the rink?

Mr. Winsor: The ice on the rink. When are you going to announce that? When are we going to get our stadium? Don't talk about ice.

And so the central college has gone out the window.

The Minister has two reports. The Crocker report; teachers are out there anxiously waiting for the Minister to work it out.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: The Minister told me that. Last October the Minister said; we are going to make great strides in science and math. Nothing has happened.

Then his own report; The Task Force on School Finances, I think it is called, the one that the Minister wrote, and now he is trying to skirt out in under it and say I resigned before they finished the final chapter.

The Minister was in on every recommendation, and now he does not have the intestinal fortitude to implement one of the recommendations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Winsor: On school tax and school tax equalization: The Minister gets up every day and gives the same speech; how he increased it from \$4.5 million to \$10 million. Now, the difference from \$10 million last year, to \$10 million this year, in my calculations is 0. Zero dollar increase.

The school boards out there are crying out for more money because

of declining enrollments, and the Minister could not find five cents for them. School boards have less now than last year.

One of the things that the Minister likes to do every time I ask him; I say, 'Phil, what are you going to do about the school tax?' And he says; 'where do you stand on it'? I will tell you where we stand on it, we did not go around this Province bamboozling and fooling the people by trying to tell them that we were going to eliminate school tax. Perhaps that is the reason the Minister is sitting where he is, because he fooled and deceived the people of Newfoundland into thinking that school tax was going to be abolished.

Under this Administration, the Budget for education is stagnated.

An Hon. Member: No one else in the Province will have anything to do with you, except each other.

Mr. Winsor: That is right.

The CBC program did the job on them last night. His image went last night. Yesterdays man. That is what was announced everywhere.

Student assistance: the Minister had the great program for student assistance, and I suspect we are going to need a lot more, because with the declining enrollments we have in our school systems, there are now having to help teachers in the classroom. And the Minister slashes the Budget, I think, from 3.7 down to to 2.5 last year.

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Winsor: Oh, yes, the Minister slashed the budget on that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Not true, the Minister says. Not true, I have to check.

School assistance: I am sorry - 3.4 to 2.5. And 2.5 for this year at a time when more are needed.

And furthermore, this Minister talks about his three E's: excellence, equality, and efficiency. Yes, some equal, some efficient, when we have more multigrade classrooms in this Province now than we had ten years ago.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Winsor: Why? Because of declining enrollments. The Minister is in a position to do something about it. That is nothing to laugh at. That we have declining enrollments.

An Hon. Member: He is laughing at teachers now, come on say it, you should not laugh at a teacher.

Mr. Winsor: There are all kinds of things the Minister can do. But, he does not have the intestinal fortitude to do anything because he can not get any cooperation from his Cabinet.

An Hon. Member: Name one. Tell us?

Mr. Winsor: I do not have to name one; because you will implement them next year and take credit for our ideas.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Winsor: Before I sit down, I just got to have one more shot at the Minister of Wildlife. It is too bad he is not here because,

like some of my colleagues on this side, and the Minister of Mines and Energy who is also a big game hunter, he spent fifteen trips out on the barrens last year, walked his legs off and had to get his buddy to get his moose for him. No he could not hunt on Sundays, that was his problem. The Minister of Mines and Energy, he will soon get up and I am sure that in Cabinet, he is going to be a passionate supporter of Sunday hunting because he spent so many -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Yes, no question about it, clearly on the side of Sunday hunting.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Winsor: And he has no problems getting up in the House and saying it.

Mr. Simms: Same as your colleagues from Lewisporte, St. George's (inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: And a good many Members on that side, and the Minister of Mines and Energy, he is going to get up.

An Hon. Member: Have you got any children?

Mr. Winsor: Yes, I have two children, I take them rabbit hunting on Sunday.

What was that?

An Hon. Member: How old are they?

Mr. Winsor: Eleven and seven.

An Hon. Member: They do not go to Sunday school?

Mr. Winsor: Yes, their mother

takes them.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: The hon. Minister should go to Sunday school.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Now for the on-going saga of the Estimates.

Under Cabinet Secretariat Offshore Fund Administration there was a heading, there was a question that had to do with the designing and printing of brochures. Last year there was an amount budgetted and none was spent. This is because there are certain things that have to be done if an agreement is reached and so on in terms of the offshore, with regards to the printing of brochures. That did not happen last year, as Members opposite know, so presumably the designing and printing of brochures is in the budget this year, in case there are further developments in the offshore that require that particular expenditure relating to the offshore, it has to do with the offshore fund and it has to do with negotiations between the Federal-Provincial Government and Mobil.

Mr. Simms: Brochures?

Mr. Baker: Yes, brochures.

Mr. Simms: What would the brochures do?

Mr. Baker: All I can say to the hon. Member is that if an agreement comes about then you will see them I guess.

Under Treasury Board Secretariat, the Treasury Board Committee of Cabinet, there is a transportation and communications amount that has been more than cut in half, and that is because we are trying to cut down on travel and that kind of thing, the charter of aircraft, that used to be done.

An hon. Member: I am sorry, which one?

Mr. Baker: Transportation and Communications under the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Treasury Board Committee of Cabinet. I said that the travel amount under transportation and communications was more than cut in half because we are cutting down travel. We do not envision that that particular committee would need to charter aircraft and do a great deal of travel this year.

There was a question asked about, at least I have it circled in the book here under Treasury Board Secretariat - Collective Bargaining, Professional Services, there is a tremendous jump from \$90 thousand of last year to \$200 thousand this coming year, and that relates to making sure that we have money provided to adequately handle the negotiations that are now on-going, and as Members opposite recognize, there are a lot of negotiations going on at the present time and, from time to time, we may need conciliation and arbitration board hearings or conciliation boards, conciliation officers, whatever, and we have allowed a certain amount of money in case the eventuality came. I would like to say to Members opposite that that amount is a fairly flexible amount in the sense that the Members know budgets or estimates, and if things go as smoothly as I hope,

and I expect that they will, we probably will not have to spend all that money.

An. hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Things have changed since last week. They have asked for a conciliation board. The request just came in, I am assuming that it will be granted, anyway, I mean, that is normal procedure. Sure it is.

Mr. Baker: Oh yes, but if the NTA feels at this point in time that they need it, then we will give it to them. We are easy to get along with. We are very -

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Baker: No, no not always, we have turned the request down in some circumstances. And suggested that perhaps the situation was such that a conciliation officer might better be able to handle the situation. But with the Newfoundland Teachers Association we have had that, we have gone through the conciliation officer stage. Under the Treasury Board Secretariat Pay Equity Review Implementation, a question was asked on the purchase services, it went from \$20,000 last year, more than doubled up to \$50,000. next year, and a question was asked, and I believe the answer I gave had to do with the production of a video. And there were some further questions on that video. I would like to inform Members opposite that the video that is referred to here is now done under the interim supply, and if Members opposite want, I could perhaps have a showing sometime next week, before the House opens. You may have seen segments of it.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Baker: Yes, but it is an interesting video and if Members opposite want to have a look at it, they can.

An Hon. Member: Has it been shown publicly yet?

Mr. Baker: No, as far as I know, it has not had wide distribution. I did not think that they had released it, although you may have seen a clip or two.

An Hon. Member: There is one on channel 9 that plays quite frequently, but that may be from the Union.

Mr. Baker: I have not seen the channel 9 one. So, if it is on pay equity it is probably that one, because all the unions are represented there and it is a joint effort.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Baker: That would be the one.

An Hon. Member: Quite complex.

Mr. Baker: I think it is very important that the posters and pamphlets get out to explain what the pay equity is all about. Because, once we finish this first stage we then have to start the expansion of pay equity. It is important that people understand exactly what it is. So, there is a 150 per cent jump in this current year.

Under Executive and Administrative Support, IGA professional services, hiring consultants, study various issues. I believe the question was asked, the answer I gave was to study various issues, and the question was asked, what are the various issues? And all I can tell you at

this -

Mr. Simms: And are there any contracts now out of that 96,000?

Mr. Baker: To the best of my understanding, these various issues, or issues that may - I believe what you are trying to get at is has this something to do with Meech Lake or something.

Mr. Simms: No. I just wondered who the professional services fees were paid to or contracted to at this point

Mr. Baker: They have not been paid to anybody, as far as I know.

Mr. Simms: No contracts?

Mr. Baker: No.

Mr. Simms: Out of the 96 no contracts?

Mr. Baker: Unless it has happened, very, very recently. See there are a number of issues that IGA deals with. And all I can say to hon. Members it that to the best of my knowledge, and I might be able to find out, that there has been nothing paid out to this point from the interim supply, and the issues have not necessarily been all identified. The grants and subsidies under the same heading -

Mr. Simms: Yes.

Mr. Baker: Yes, no that was explained, the Premier explained that this morning.

Mr. Simms: Not to my satisfaction, as I wanted more information.

Mr. Baker: There is a section in

the IGA having to do with regional development programs and there are some large amounts under a number of headings, and I have them circled here. Transportation and communications, professional services, purchase services, these are things that have been agreed to under the Federal/Provincial Agreements, and amounts have been put in under purchase services, \$200 thousand, there has been nothing spent on that yet, it is an amount that has been put in and is part of the agreement. That has to do with again, information brochures and newsletters.

Mr. Simms: Which one is this, I am sorry?

Mr. Baker: I am talking about now the IGA Regional Development programs and this -

Mr. Simms: Okay, nothing in the contract.

Mr. Baker: No.

Mr. Simms: I will check my sources further.

Mr. Baker: The one there is some concern expressed about is Professional Services under the Hibernia Project.

Mr. Simms: They were not concerns, they were just questions that is all.

Mr. Baker: Yes. What has to be realized here, and I do not think it has been pointed out, is that, in terms of the consulting about the royalty situation, with regards to the taxes, the fiscal conditions laid out in the Atlantic Accord, all that kind of stuff, the tax related issues, these are now coming to an end. So in reality what you are seeing



here, is an amount of money that would deal with just the first few months of the year. We hope that within a month or month and a half, two months on the outside, that all these issues will be dealt with, so that is an expenditure, an up front expenditure early in the year, and we envision after that, no further expenditure.

Mr. Simms: Who has the \$200 thousand been paid to and in what amounts, that is the question.

Mr. Baker: Yes, I do not have that information.

Mr. Simms: Will you get it before twenty to ten?

Mr. Baker: Somehow I doubt it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

An Hon. Member: By leave.

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

Mr. Rideout: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I want to briefly come back to a question that was answered earlier by the President of Treasury Board referring to the continued service of Ms, Miss or Mrs., I do not know, Judy Foote on the Heritage Foundation Board.

Mr. Chairman, as the President of Treasury Board said, I had the privilege to set up the first Heritage Foundation Board in this Province, I think the legislation was brought in by my colleague when he was Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, and the first Board was set up by me after I was moved into that Department when my colleague moved on to

Forestry, I believe it was at the time. And I approached, at the time, Dr. Leslie Harris, and asked him if he would consider to be the chairman of that Heritage Foundation Board, and I remember very specifically that Dr. Harris agreed, and was pleased to accept and did in fact accept, but recommended to me, as the Minister, that I also recommend the appointment of Judy Foote to the Board because he wanted Judy Foote who was a close associate of his, I understand, at the University, to work with him on the Board, I believe as Secretary, but anyway, for that to happen she had to be appointed to the Board. So I recommended to my Cabinet colleagues that Dr. Harris be appointed as chairman, and that Ms. Foote be appointed to the Board as well.

Now I must say here, Mr. Chairman, that with the exception of once or twice in the elevator, I do not believe, I have ever met Judy Foote in my life since she came to work in her current position in the Premier's office. I have run into her on occasion in the elevator. I have no personal gripe with the individual or with her service, but what I do have a gripe with is this, Mr. Chairman, and that is the continued presence on the Board of an employee of the Premier's office or a Minister's office for that matter. I think that it is fundamentally wrong. That Board dispenses funding, I do not know what it has now but we set them up with seed money, I think it was \$150 thousand a year, that would be dispensed at the discretion of that Board to maintain and enhance the heritage of older buildings all around Newfoundland and Labrador. And that person, as a member of the Board, is now in a political

position. I suppose one of the highest political positions in the Government, and I would have thought that the person would have been required, as a matter of course, so that there would not even be the perception of a conflict of interest, I would have thought that the person would have been required as a matter of course, if he or she were to accept a political appointment and was also on a Government board, I would have thought it would have been a matter of course that that person would have been advised to disassociate him or herself from the Government board.

Justice must not only be done, it must be seen to be done. This person is in a position, a political position in the day job, and in off hours, or some other point in time, in a position to influence the dispensing of public funds. I say that only in regard to the perception. I think it is fundamentally wrong for a -

Mr. Simms: The Premier himself has often said the perception of conflict -

Mr. Rideout: The Premier himself has often spoke on the perception of conflict of interest.

I think it is fundamentally wrong for a political employee of Government to continue to occupy a position on a board that, in this particular case, dispenses public funds. I believe that is wrong, Mr. Chairman. In saying that, it is nothing against the individual. As far as I know, she has served and I assume would continue to serve, while on that board. But I think it is wrong for her to continue to be on it, as long as she is a political employee of the Government.

If it were a civil servant; there are some boards where, I guess, by legislation it is mandatory to have civil servants on those boards. Like maybe, the Child Welfare Board, or something of that nature. That is a matter of statute. That is quite acceptable, because they are there for their professional expertise and so on.

But once a person makes the transition from the semi public sector or the private sector to the political arena, then I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that person should have been - I understand, that the President of Treasury Board said that she indicated she would disassociate herself from the Board. I think the problem here is that the Premier should have said, yes, that is the right thing to do. And I am surprised, quite frankly, that this particular Premier would counsel otherwise.

I think it is wrong, and I would not out of any malice toward the individual, because I do not know her, but I would think that it would be in her best interest and in the best interest of the integrity of the board, and in the best interest of the integrity of the Premiers office, to have an employee of the Premiers office on a board that dispenses public funding, I think, is something that nobody has paid much attention to, but something that I believe is fundamentally wrong and I cannot accept the sort of passing effort at a grade, that the President of Treasury Board is given in his explanation.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

Just a brief comment on what the Leader of the Opposition has had to say. I am impressed by the way he put his arguments. I guess at this point it is a matter of opinion. I listened to his arguments and he is entitled to have that particular opinion.

My understanding is that Ms. Foote is not involved in decisions taken with respect to the dispersing of public funds. Although, as he pointed out, maybe he indicated there might be a perception problem. She is doing primarily PR work for the particular foundation and sitting on one other committee; a member of the Buildings Committee. She is not taking an active part in the dispersing of funds.

The decision was made that it was all right for her to stay there until her term was up. We could argue as to whether that is right or wrong. I would make the case that there is no harm done. The Leader of the Opposition could make the case that there is a perception problem. Maybe at this point, we, as individuals, have to agree to disagree; and the Leader of the Opposition can do what he wants with it.

That is the situation at this point in time. The Leader of the Opposition has expressed his opinion and I have listened. I appreciate the way he put his case, actually.

Mr. Chairman, I am looking through to see what other items I have circled here. Yes, there was one that maybe I have overlooked - just came to mind, Newfoundland Information Services, I believe there have been a number of

questions asked about Newfoundland Information Services, and Mr. Chairman, I have-

Mr. Simms: Have you got the questions circled.

Mr. Baker: No I did find it, it just came to mind. Wait until I find it and I will give the amounts.

Mr. Simms: Never mind the political attack, there were questions that were asked too, specific, detailed questions.

Mr. Baker: No, I do not have that circled, as a matter of fact, I cannot find the specific heading in the briefing notes.

Mr. Simms: I would like to get the answers.

Mr. Baker: Yes go ahead.

Mr. Simms: I wanted to know the reasons for the increased salaries, and the increased transportation costs, because I did not know that NIS employees even travelled very much, and finally the purchase services vote has been doubled to \$120 thousand - I wanted to know why.

Mr. Baker: Yes, as I explained previously to the Members of the Opposition who were present, we see an expanded role for Newfoundland Information Services. We can see where it would have a useful role in terms of getting Departmental information out. We could not understand, for instance, why terminals were at the radio stations all over the Province and yet the weekly and twice weekly newspapers did not have terminals.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Well, the hon. Member might have provided it for one newspaper.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Well, as I say, they might have provided it or arranged to have it provided for one newspaper in his own home community.

Mr. Simms: Printing plants (inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Oh okay, well I am talking about the newspapers now. I know that the Gander Beacon, for a number of years, could not understand why the three radio stations in Gander each had one of them and the Gander Beacon could not get one, and was not allowed to avail of that service, and so on. So what we are saying is, in terms of that \$120 thousand, that the Member is referring to -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Well maybe you should have heard of it. We are going to expand the terminals, the outlets, to include the weekly newspapers, and in the case of the Grand Falls Advertiser, I believe, one more of the twice weekly newspapers, so it is an expansion of the terminals, that largely is.

Also, there are a couple of other services that we are envisioning tying in with Newfoundland Information Services from the point of view of individuals in the Province being able to get information. So that is something that is in the process of being developed and when we are ready, once it has been finalized, an announcement will be made with regards to that. So, what I am saying to the hon. Member is that

we are talking about an expanded role for NIS and we are going to tie that in with the ability to get out information about Government programs.

We have seen for some time a problem, and it has been recognized by other administrations as well, a problem with regards to information, and I am not talking now about the political stuff. There has been a problem people have had in the Province in getting knowledge, getting information and so on. And what we are trying to do is we are trying to use NIS plus some other parts of Government Departments, for instance the decentralization of New-Corp., and that kind of thing to try to get information readily available to individuals. And with NIS, we are going to try to make it available, not only for instance to the major centers of the Province, but to some of the smaller centers, and that is all I really want to say about this or can say about it at this present time. Members will know more specifically what I am talking about as the program gets developed over the next few months, so there is an expanded role for NIS, in spite of comments that may have been made a few years ago concerning the particular operations, that I have very readily admitted that I was a part of. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is all the circles I have got here. There are some general questions about employment equity, questions about the Hay plan, and the implementation of the Hay plan. I believe it was mentioned at one point.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Baker: Did I?

Mr. Simms: The regulations that currently exist, for the use of NIS.

Mr. Baker: Yes I will.

An Hon. Member: Any idea when?

Mr. Baker: I will try to get them tomorrow, if I cannot I will get them Monday.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Baker: I am not sure, there is one thing to talk about the rules of operation, procedures and other things to talk about the interpretation of these particular rules, and I would suggest to the Member for Green Bay that what is more important than the actual procedures is the interpretation of these procedures.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)  
career civil servant

Mr. Baker: That is right, that is right.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Baker: What I am saying to the Member for Green Bay is a general statement that could apply to any set of regulations for anybody. Now I do not know what he has on his mind there now, and if he will get up and state it, then I could respond to it. But what is more important than the regulations, is the interpretation of the regulations.

Mr. Simms: Who interprets the regulations under your regime now?

Mr. Baker: Well, I can not do a comparison with what happened before.

Mr. Simms: Who does it now?

Mr. Baker: I could provide you with that information, NIS interprets it.

Mr. Simms: Still NIS?

Mr. Baker: Yes.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I just read with some interest by the way, and I say this in passing while I have the floor, the Government House Leader will be very interested in this. Reading the Evening Telegram today, particularly Mr. Chairman, but also the Government House Leader, as well as the Opposition Leader, has to do with parliamentary procedure and rules and that, and I noticed in the House of Commons yesterday, the Speaker of the House of Commons, John Frazer, ruled that you cannot call somebody a wind bag, it is out of order, unparliamentary, because it is very similar to calling somebody a bag of wind. That was his reasoning for making such a ruling, and I thought I would pass that on to the Government House Leader and to Mr. Chairman. As from time to time that word may be used around here. I do not know, maybe it's my own paranoia, maybe I am expecting - oh I just threw away my notes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Government House Leader for the answers to some of those questions at least, according to my calculations he responded to three of the questions that I have had sitting for a response. Three more answers in addition to the three answers to the legitimate questions I asked over the last week or so, ten days or whatever

it has been, a year it seems like. The Government House Leader also responded to a number of other items in his estimates notes, that I did not ask him about at all, mostly because I understood what they were about, and I did not bother to ask him, but I had the impression almost as if he was trying to eat up some time or something, because he started throwing out all these kinds of information which had nothing to do with the questions that I have been waiting to get answers on. And then in addition to that of course, the next thing I noticed he was doing, he was answering questions that he had already answered for me last week, on the Hay pay plan and the pay equity, these kinds of things. So I do not know if he, I am not sure if he mixed up his notes, or maybe he got confused but I do not want to keep repeating the questions that I am waiting to get answers on. I have done it about five times now over the last few days, but he will remember all the ones that I wanted some more information on, the Government House renovation plan, I asked him that several times, and I do not know why it would take so long to get some kind of a detailed rundown or breakdown of the expenditures. I would like to ask more questions on the offshore fund. I asked him about that Purchase Services vote of \$41,000 for the offshore fund, and he vaguely refers to brochures, \$41,000 worth of brochures in the offshore fund. What are the brochures going to say? What kind of brochures, what are they for, what are they going to say? That is what I would like to find out. What exactly are you going to spend \$41,000 on brochures for? There has got to be a specific answer for that question.

An Hon. Member: It must be a household mailer.

Mr. Simms: That is what I am wondering. Is it something like a household mailer, or what? That is why I want to know.

I also asked the President of the Council for the umpteenth time now; why his own Purchase Services budget has doubled to \$15,000 from \$7,500 as President of the Council, particularly when you understand that he also has another \$3,700 under Purchase Services as President of the Treasury Board. I have asked him that, a half dozen times at least, and he has avoided answering. I do not know if there is a reason for it, but he has avoided answering.

The Professional Services expenditure in the O & M division. He has mentioned once in passing, that this is to review programs. I have asked him several times since, can he be a bit more explicit, a bit more specific, what programs are going to be reviewed?

An Hon. Member: It is a secret.

Mr. Simms: A secret, is it. Well, at least he could tell me that publicly. Stand at his place and say it and then we can deal with that later on.

I would like to know what programs the Government intends to review with the funds provided for under the Purchase Services vote in Organization and Management of Treasury Board. There have to be some plans. In order to budget the amount of money, there must be some plans in place to have a look at some programs.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: That is not good enough, Mr. Chairman. This is why the Opposition has such a difficult time. The Government should be a bit more forthcoming. It brags about being an open Government and forthcoming. I would have expected the Minister would say a little more than - oh in order to organize and manage Government programs better.

I am asking him specifically what programs do they intend to review. I would like him to give me that answer.

The Human Resource Management vote. The Professional Services - \$545,000. In excess of a half million dollars. What is this for? Has there been any contracts entered into with any professional consulting firms, and if so, what amounts? That is the kind of question that I have been asking the President of the Council.

And the same thing in the Purchase Services vote for the Hibernia project. The \$200,000 there. He said, I think, in an answer a moment ago, that this is really money that has already been spent basically, for this year, because there is only a couple of months left in this fiscal year. I think that is what he said, or words to that effect. And if he did not, then he can correct me.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, well, the first half. We have already gone April, May; two months are gone now.

Some of this money has been spent. What I wanted, what I would like him to table in the House, is a breakdown of the

funds, the expenses that have been taken from that vote. To whom, what amount? That is a very easy question. I would not expect him to get it now in the next half hour; but I would expect him to table it in the House. Or at least stand up and tell me when he responds, that he will table it in the House.

Mr. Chairman, before he leaves us, there is one other question I want to throw out. One more question I would like him to answer in the next twenty five minutes, because that is all we have remaining. All of these questions here have not yet been answered. And this one, I will repeat it for him, the Governments plan to implement the recycling program, I asked him about it when I stood up an hour ago.

An Hon. Member: I forgot that one.

Mr. Simms: Yes, I thought the Minister may have forgotten about it.

The understanding that I have is, that the Minister of Environment had put forth a proposal to Cabinet to implement a unique recycling program within Government particularly, but there are other aspects to it as well, and the aspect of Government which the Minister of Finance would have great interest in, I guess, is recycling all the paper that is used by public servants and so on through the normal run of the day stuff, thousands and thousands of pound, I suppose, of paper that could be recycled, and I understand that the Minister of Environment put forth an interesting project proposal to the Cabinet which I also understand has been rejected.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Not what?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: I am not asking what the story said, I am asking the Minister directly, is this the case? What I have just described now, is that accurate or is it inaccurate. Did the Government have a proposal presented to it, the Cabinet by the Minister of Environment to do, among other things, recycling public service paper that could be used, which would cut down on expenditures and all the rest of the things, and address an environmental problem, I guess, and if so, why was it rejected. It seemed to me to be a very interesting proposal, and I want to know why it was rejected, what was the cost of the project proposed by the Minister of Environment, and was it scrapped during the Budgetary process or was a decision made on it some other time, other than during the Budgetary process, and I would like him to address that question, because I think it is an interesting concept that the Minister of Environment proposed. There were other aspects to the proposal, I understand, that he put forth to his Cabinet colleagues, aside from recycling paper used by public servants in the Province, there were other aspects of it.

So I would like him to address it briefly, or as much as he can, considering the Minister himself is not here in his seat, and tell us why the proposal was rejected, and when was it rejected. Was it during the Budgetary process, or was it a separate proposal. If so, was it cost saving, because I understood that the project would

have accurately reflected some kind of cost saving, as well, to the Government. So if Government is looking for cost saving measures, it appears to me as if that might be an interesting one, this recycling of paper, I say to the Minister of Education. I am not sure he was here when I was asking the question earlier. So those few questions I hope the President of Council will respond to in the next twenty minutes before we conclude the debate on the Estimates.

I have to ask the question again that I have asked quite frequently. This whole process over the last couple of weeks, with night sittings, to go through the Estimates process, it seems to me that the Government is ramming things through and pushing quite hard to get things dealt with in a quick fashion. Now I do not understand why they do not let the normal process work, where estimates were dealt with in the House during a day period, and if the House runs until the end of June or if the House runs until the end of July, so be it.

An Hon. Member: Or August.

Mr. Simms: Or August. Well I will expect to hear some response from the President of Treasury Board, hopefully, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you

Did he recognize me?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Efford: Mr. Chairman, listening to the Member for Grand



Falls, you would not know but he was serious about the questions he was asking. You actually would not know but he was serious. He is almost convincing, almost convincing. To be standing up there and going on for ten minutes asking the President of Treasury Board all of these questions about saving, about money and about how much money was budgetted in purchase service, about how much money was in the Budget this year for the expenditures of the Minister's office and so on. You would not know but he was a new Member in the House, did not come from the old Administration and had absolutely no value on money whatsoever, absolutely no value.

Let's talk about the value they had on money. Let's talk about the furniture.

An Hon. Member: The furniture?

Mr. Efford: The furniture that the former Premier purchased, not your average run of the mill that any average Newfoundlander would purchase, a chesterfield, and a dining room set and so on, the Member for Green Bay is quite interested. The furniture he used in his house, in his luxurious apartment that was paid for by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. What happened to it?

An Hon. Member: He got it for a dollar didn't he?

Mr. Efford: What happened to it?

An Hon. Member: I do not know.

An Hon. Member: Who's furniture?

Mr. Efford: And what value was it? Was it sixty thousand.

An Hon. Member: Was it turned

back to the Government?

Mr. Efford: That is the question I would like to have answered. Was it turned back to the Government?

Mr. Simms: You are supposed to ask him the question, not the Opposition.

Mr. Efford: Where was it? But you see, we are talking about expenses on the Newfoundland people.

An Hon. Member: John thinks he is in Opposition.

Mr. Efford: We are talking about expenses that is incurred that the people today are wondering why we are \$5.5 billion in debt.

Ms Cowan: What about crystal and china?

Mr. Efford: Crystal and china.

An Hon. Member: Seven or eight thousand dollars.

Mr. Efford: This is the type of thing that you do not hear the Opposition House Leader up talking about, the type of dollars that is spent, but what have we talked about here tonight. We have talked about \$110,000-

Mr. Simms: When are you going to (inaudible).

Mr. Efford: - severance pay, we have talked about \$227,000 a year for the Premier's accommodations and food and lodgings, but never talks about his importing Havana cigars, we haven't got the cost of that yet. But on top of that we have to put the furniture on it. The furniture for the house that should have been left and should

have been sold and the money should have been returned to the general revenues, and the crystal and the china, what happened to all that? What happened to the taxpayers money that purchased that? Was that turned back to the poor people of the Province, was that turned over to some needy family who can use it? No, it was purchased for one dollar! Given to the former Premier for one dollar. That's the type of thing, that if you are going to stand up and ask serious questions, you should think about from where you came! I would like to have some of that money to give to the food bank down on Water Street. The Salvation Army down there cannot find a tin of wax beans.

An Hon. Member: They are looking for it.

Mr. Efford: Yes. Let's talk about the private dining room. How much money did we pay for the private dining room a year? How much did we pay for the chef's wages? Let me tell you one thing, I would like to have now, the food that was provided in the private dining room to put in those food banks. That is what I would like to have as Minister of Social Services. In the last eight years, since 1979 until the last election, when the hon. Premier, Brian Peckford, came - how much food went through the private dining room? I heard one Minister used to go in -

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

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible)

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

Mr. Efford: There is no question

about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

There has been a quorum call. I will ask the hon. Member to take his seat.

An Hon. Member: A quorum call! You don't even know what you are talking about.

Mr. Efford: We have lots of Members in this house.

An Hon. Member: They couldn't handle it!

Mr. Efford: They couldn't take it.

An Hon. Member: A quorum call boy, you didn't hear it.

Mr. Simms: The Government can't keep a quorum in the House, that's what is wrong! There are thirty-one Members (inaudible).

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is strange, I always maintained that if you can't take the heat get out of the kitchen, and that is exactly what happened there. You can't take the heat, get out of the kitchen! I want to clue up because we have other things to do. I'll tell you one thing, I would like to have the dishes, I would like to have the crystal dishes left in the private dining room or in the executive dining room, to serve some of the things which are in this book because it is absolutely fantastic. Let me

clue up, I only have one minute left. Let me clue up, let me talk about the type of Administration and their ability over the last seven or eight years. Let us talk about it. This is one of the last ones on page thirteen and it starts off with: Sweet/Sour Spice Cucumber Pickles. Understand what they are going to do now, they are going to bottle the pickles and I won't go down through the ingredients.

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

The hon. the Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: I just want to draw to the Chairman's attention that the Member is reading again from a document and he must table that document. He is a Cabinet Minister.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Mr. Simms: No, he is reading from a document.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Social Services on that point of order.

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker,-

Mr. Chairman: Are you on the Point of Order?

Mr. Efford: No, no, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Yes, he is on the Point of Order.

Mr. Chairman: A Cabinet Minister who cites or quotes a document, must table that document.

Mr. Efford: OK, Mr. Speaker, I have tabled the document.

Mr. Chairman: It has been tabled? Ok, Ok. Order please, order please. The hon, Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will table a document and I will read these last two paragraphs. Remove jars from boiling water and let cool on a rack. Touch the lids to ensure they are sealed. They will feel firm and will not bend inwards towards the touch. If an occasional one has not sealed, refrigerate and eat first. Now, this recipe is an adaptation from the Joy of Cooking. Now listen this is the last one. The addition of wine water serve to keep your pickle crisp. However, Mr. Speaker, I made mine without the ingredient and mine went soft. Shameful, I have got to bury this, I have to table this.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Efford: This is disgraceful, this is the former administration, this is the type of dollars that we could have given to the poor and this is how they seen fit to spent it. On your pickles when they are soft and when they are crisp. Make no wonder you dropped the tray.

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

Mr. Power: Mr. Speaker, I gather we only have a very few moments left to discuss the estimatess of this House of Assembly. When I listen to the Minister of Social Services, I have got to say, that this great change that we were about to have in 1989 during the election campaign, what a real farce it is. This is the change for the better. This great change we are going to have. This

Liberal Administration is going to change things from in the past. And he stands up and he talks about cucumbers, and the cucumber recipe, any idea, Mr. Minister of Social Services, what you could do with \$800 million a year. That is what all your Liberal buddies gave away in the Upper Churchill Agreement. We may have wasted -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Power: Hold on, hold on, you want to talk about history, you want to talk about mistakes, you want to talk about things we did wrong, well, we did a lot wrong in Newfoundland, yes we wasted \$22 million in cucumbers, \$22 million gone on cucumbers, wasted, the recipe book and all the rest of it was a farce I agree with it OK, now it is done, it was a mistake. It was a mistake that Conservatives, the Conservative Government paid a price for, but it is a short term price of \$22 million, which only puts so much money in the food banks. The biggest historical mistake that was made since Confederation in Newfoundland, has nothing to do with Conservatives, it had nothing to do with us and Sprung and cucumbers, it had to do with a fellow who happens to be Premier today, who is part of an administration, part of a bureaucracy, part of a party, that gave away the best resource we had. The best resource, a valuable resource, worth \$800 million a year, \$800 million year when the oil prices went up to \$25.00.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Power: So if you want to talk about mistakes, I mean, here is the problem, here is the problem. John Crosbie, look, Mr. Chairman -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Power: Mr. Chairman;

Mr. Chairman: Order please, order please.

Mr. Power: We only have a few minutes. My mother use to tell me as a child, that two wrongs do not make a right. Some how or another, you are trying to say, that what you are doing now, as a Government, sitting on your hands, with really no solutions to the fishery, no solution to the seven thousand people who have left Newfoundland, and left seven thousand mothers or seven thousand fathers to worry about their children who moved away. I do not hear anybody worried about that part of it. When are those persons coming back to Newfoundland? When are the other displaced Newfoundlanders who might have been displaced during Tory times, during rough economic times, during the recession of 82 or the rough times in 87. When are those persons coming back to Newfoundland to rejoin their families, to actually contribute to the development of Newfoundland? The reality is that there is not a Minister over there during this Budgetary process who has said anything at all of the \$2.5 or \$3 billion we are spending this year. None of you have said anything about bringing these people back to Newfoundland, of making a better future for the people we have in Newfoundland today. All I hear is the silliness of the Minister of Social Services saying; we are going to read cucumber recipes. Can you imagine paying \$90,000 to that Minister, to that Member. Paying you \$90,000 a year plus your \$8,000 for a car, to get up and read cucumber recipes. Do you

really think the Newfoundland people deserve that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Power: There is where you are wrong. There is where you do not understand your responsibilities yet. You are still acting like rookies. You still do not understand the Parliamentary process. You are now Ministers. You are now responsible for the direction of the Government.

An Hon. Member: You should know.

Mr. Power: And I do know. And I know both sides of it, Mr. Minister. And I know that you, as one Minister, are being frivolous and silly. You are not contributing. You are not solving the problems of the people of Newfoundland on social services, and the people that are going to go on social services in the next twelve months. And that is what you should be dealing with. Not to waste our time.

It is funny, it really is funny, to get you up and hear you read cucumber recipes. I suppose Valdmanis and his boys - I can go back and read - we have some editorials here - I will not even bother to read it because it talks about the Minister of Social Services, an editorial that talks about his conduct so far in his year being a Minister. Have you made a significant change in Newfoundland's history? Have you made a significant change in social services progress in this Province? The Minister has a lot to look at besides reading cucumber recipes, and I suggest to him that is what he should be doing.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: And I suggest to the rest of his colleagues, as Ministers -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: To work? So you are the only Minister that is working?

Mr. Efford: I did not say that.

Mr. Power: Are you saying that the rest of your Ministers are not working? The rest of your colleagues?

Mr. Efford: I said, why don't you come with me for a week.

Mr. Power: I will say to the Minister, that if he has time to read cucumber recipes, he has got a lot of extra time on his hands. He is not using his brain power. He is not using his mental attitude. He is not using any of his skills or attributes, whatever they are, however limited they might be, to develop this Province and make it better. He is trying to make a farce. He is trying to put blame on things that happened in the past. And that does not work.

All that I have seen of all the Ministers; in all of your estimates, in all of your defense of what you are doing; you have not done one thing different really, than what we were doing when we were in the Government. You have the same types of budgets, the same types of programs, except you keep saying, because you are Liberals, you can put a little bit more blame on the Progressive Conservative Government in Ottawa.

The Minister of Fisheries, when he wants to talk about fisheries problems, all he says is that it

is Federal mismanagement. It is Federal scientists. It is Federal abuse. When the Minister of Development wants to talk about tourism and development, all he says is we do not have a tourism agreement.

Mr. Efford: And is it not?

Mr. Power: All I am saying is that this Province has been part of the fisheries abuse. If you think it has not, you are crazy. This Province has been part of the fisheries abuse. Our dragger men, our plant workers, our companies that have made profit; we are the ones that have overfished. We are the ones that have worked, we are the ones that have made money from the fishery. So if the Fishery has been abused, a lot of the fish was abused in Newfoundland. And all I am saying is; if you are going to change, going to make the place better, then you have got to do something more than blame the poor old Tories that are over here, or the Tories that are in Ottawa. Now I am telling you, if you think that the two major fish companies in Newfoundland did not abuse our resource, then you do not know very much about our fishery.

Mr. Efford: You said the fishermen.

Mr. Power: I am saying the dragger men, who overfished, who are directed to cull by their employers, who threw fish away. Why do we have observers on vessels? Why have we got observers on vessels today? We have observers on vessels today to try and make the companies honest. To try and make sure they are not wasting fish. To try and make sure they are not throwing away 30 and 40 per cent of their

catch because it was too small.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: The Minister of Social Services, besides his frivolousness, his silly attitude about reading cucumber recipes, does not listen very well either. I said, that we, as Newfoundlanders, are part of the problem of overfishing a resource. Now if that is not accurate historically, and proven in any format, Mr. Minister, then I tell you, you have a poor logical process as well as your sense of humor in reading cucumber recipes.

I would like to, on some other occasion, discuss that comment, that if you reap the benefits you are not responsible. I suspect you are.

And all I say is that in discussing the Estimates of this Legislature, the \$3 billion that that Government is going to spend this year, you have to do something different with it. And I see you have been twelve months in the Government, thirteen or fourteen months, and you have not done anything different. The real change promised in the electoral process which might have been very necessary has not proved anything. All you are saying is that you made wrongs, as Tories, so we will make more wrongs as Liberals and it will all balance out, and that is not what the Newfoundland people deserve. We need to have some real solutions to our economic problems, we need some new social programs, we need some new directions, we definitely need, and if there is any Minister I sympathize with in that Government it is the Minister of Education, the Minister of

Education deserves every bit of sympathy of every person in this Legislature, and maybe in this Province.

If we, as a Government, as a Province, do not do something in education significantly different than what we are doing, then I am not sure we will not have our economic problems forever. But I do not see, in the Minister of Education's budget, the same as I did not see in the Minister of Fisheries' budget, I do not see any solutions to the Fisheries problems, I do not see any solutions in the Minister of Education's budget allocations to solve the educational problems that we have. And if this new Government, with new direction -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Power: Let me just conclude for a minute, Mr. Chairman, if you do not mind.

An Hon. Member: No, no leave.

Mr. Power: Just to say that just because the Minister of Social Services cannot handle logic, does not mean that this Government does not have a responsibility to do something different, and it is time for them to do it and stop being so silly and frivolous in reading his cucumber recipes and do something beneficial for the people in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. President of Council.

Mr. Baker: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

I must say that some aspects of the previous speaker's speech were rather interesting to listen to. I think he typifies himself as the conscience of the Tory Party and he gets up and makes a speech that is, in the latter stages non partisan, and tries to point out the ills of the Province and the difficulties that we have gotten ourselves into, and all I can say to the hon. gentleman is that it is too bad that he was not the conscience of the Tory Party two and a half years ago.

Mr. Efford: Hear, hear.

Mr. Power: And you were not the conscience of the Liberal Party twenty years ago.

An Hon. Member: I do not know if he was born then.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the hon. gentleman has had kind of a rebirth in the last while and perhaps, as we all can sometimes, look back upon our careers and see where roads diverged, examine our choices.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong that thought, but I am sure the gentleman knows what I am talking about.

We only have three minutes, I believe, three or four minutes, and we have now spent close to seventy-five hours examining the Estimates of the various Departments of Government. I think that at this point in time, especially because we are considering revised rules of the Legislature, that we should reflect on what we have done in the last seventy-five hours. We should think of the purpose of these seventy-five hours and, in two ways, there is perhaps a

political purpose and then there is another purpose and I think we should, all of us, think back on the purpose of this seventy-five hours.

I believe that a lot of that seventy-five hours could be better organized, better spent, and I think it is appropriate to think about that now because I believe in the next few weeks, we are going to be making decisions on changes in rules and procedures and so on, and we have to look at that seventy-five hours and ask ourselves, does that serve a useful function, does it not serve a useful function, and I would really like to see some changes over the next couple of years in the Estimates procedures as we know them and have known them for the last couple of years.

Mr. Parsons: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Say that again?

Mr. Parsons: Are those the same feelings you had when you were over here.

Mr. Baker: I believe it is compounded now. Compounded a bit simply because of the number of departments. That kind of compounded the problem. It was bad enough then, and we all participated in it. I think it is a little worse now because of the compressing of the number of departments. I just wanted to make that point because I think it is something that needs to be said.

I wanted to answer the question on recycling, because it is an important issue. If the question of recycling has been dealt with and rejected, it was probably done on the grounds that the mechanisms were not there to make it cost

efficient at this point in time. I say if, because, number one; the hon. Member knows that I cannot comment on whether an issue was brought before Cabinet or not, or what the discussion was in Cabinet. I cannot do that. Even in the budgetary process, which eventually ends up there.

All I can say is that we use a lot of paper. The possibility of recycling is a real one, and at the point in time where it becomes economically feasible, it is something that we should seriously look at.

The argument could be made, that it does not matter if it is economically feasible. The argument could be made that even if it is not economically feasible, or only marginally so, or almost economically feasible; maybe we should do it from a point of view of an environmental concern. Maybe that argument can be made. I say to hon. Members if in fact this was the case, and it was dealt with as they suggest, then the decision is made on that particular basis at this present time.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are into the last minute of our allotted time, so we should suggest that the Committee rise and report progress, then we will deal with these Estimates and there are a couple of other Headings that have to be brought up as well.

Mr. Chairman: The time has expired and I will ask the Clerk to read the Heads.

On motion, Heads 1.1.01 through 2.6.02, Executive Council, total carried.

On motion, Heads 2.1.02 and



2.1.06, Consolidated Fund Services, carried.

On motion, Heads 1.1.01 through 3.1.03, Legislature total carried.

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

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

Mr. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred, and has directed me to report that it has passed Estimates of expenditure for Executive Council, Consolidated Fund Services and Legislature without amendment and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to take one minute to explain to Members what the plans are, and what the process generally is beyond this point. We now have before us the main Budget motion. That will be debated in due course, under the normal rules of debate of the Budget motion. We have a number of pieces of legislation that we intend to deal with. We are going to start next with some pieces of legislation before we get back to the main Budget motion. I just wanted to explain that to hon. Members.

Mr. Speaker, it is not quite 10:00 p.m., but I would suggest by leave we declare it 10:00 p.m. and get a fresh start in the morning on the

pieces of legislation.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to say first of all, that I concur with the comments of the Government House Leader that he made in closing the Estimates debate. That indeed, the whole budgetary process needs some scrutinizing. There is no question about that, because for the first time ever I think we had twenty four to deal with the Executive Council and consolidate a revenue legislative votes. That is obviously just a bit too much. But, the other parts of the process are good I think. The hours for Departmental estimates scrutiny, maybe an additional hour for those things could be added or whatever. But I agree we should have a look at it. The Committee that is studying the rules, might very well do just that. The other point I want to make, and by the way I think we can agree to call at ten o'clock, I do not think there is too much interest in starting a new Bill now at this moment, but we should make the public aware, I guess, of what is planned to be debated tomorrow, and I want to ask the Government House Leader if he can confirm my understanding. I believe the items of business that he indicated to me that would be called tomorrow, would be Bills 16 and 17, those are budgetary resolutions, loan guarantees, and so on. And then following that, Bill 31 which is the Bill giving Hydro the approval to charge the one per cent.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible)

Mr. Simms: Yes, the guarantee

Bill, that is Bill 31, I understand from the Government House Leader, that is what is going to be called, and I just ask them to confirm that and it will be in that order, Bill 16, 17 and 31, is that his intention?

Mr. Baker: Bill 16 and 17 are the two Committees, 31 then, the Speaker is in the Chair, and it is dealt with in the House.

Mr. Simms: It will be in that order though.

Mr. Baker: Yes.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible) Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This House stands adjourn until tomorrow Friday, at nine a.m.