



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 27

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

The House met at 9:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):

Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise this hon. House about the level of tree production and employment at the Wooddale Forest Tree Nursery for 1990.

This year my Department will be producing 9 million seedlings consisting of 6 million container stock and 3 million bareroot seedlings. We will therefore be employing a total of 119 seasonal workers. Eighty-seven of these workers have already been recalled this week. Others will be recalled during the next week or so as the seedlings become ready for lifting from the nursery beds. The work force will be reduced to a lower level in mid summer, but will be restored, as is normal, back to full strength in the fall depending on the fall reforestation program.

Mr. Speaker, forty-five to sixty-five of these workers will receive approximately fourteen weeks of employment during the year and the remaining workers will be employed for approximately ten weeks. This level of employment is a slight reduction from last year's level of 139 seasonal workers. This is in response to various adjustments at the nursery, both in the number

and mix of seedlings produced. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I thank the Minister for sending over a copy of his statement. I would first of all want to express my disappointment that it has taken - I do not know what it is - six, seven or eight months to get this answer from the Minister. He will recall it was last year that I asked the questions with respect to employment - about seven or eight months ago. Now it has taken him that long to give the House this information. So I do not know what is wrong with the Minister or his Department that it would take this long to get this kind of information. But already we see, as we had predicted last fall, there will in fact be a cutback and a loss of twenty jobs at the Wooddale Nursery. That is what we know now. So there are twenty more jobs gone, out in the Central Newfoundland area. Obviously I want to scrutinize the statistics and the numbers of the production figures the Minister outlines in his statement. I want to consult with the union and with the workers out there to compare the production figures, and I may have more questions in the days ahead to put to the Minister. Finally I would just simply ask the Minister, since he makes reference in his last sentence that this is in response to various adjustments at the

nursery, would he provide the House with a statement in the next week to outline the adjustments which are going to take place at that facility? That is also a question I asked last year - seven or eight months ago. In fact I provided some information which the Minister never did respond to. But would he provide the House with a statement next week to outline the adjustments that will be taking place at Wooddale? That is all I will say for this time Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Good statement.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased today to announce that the Women's Policy Office has been awarded a Work and Well-Being Award by the Newfoundland Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association. The Women's Policy Office is a branch of Executive Council of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. It has a mandate to co-ordinate the development of programs and policies for the benefit of women in the province.

The Work and Well-Being Award was presented to the Women's Policy Office in recognition of their work to raise awareness about the need for Newfoundland workers to be assisted to balance their work and family responsibilities. The staff of the office co-ordinated the strategy for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador on

balancing work and family responsibilities, which was tabled at the 1989 First Ministers Conference on the Economy, which I believe was in November. The office also sponsored a seminar series "Balancing Work and Family: Employment Issues of the 90's". This seminar, developed primarily for employers but also opened to the general public was held in St. John's, Gander and Corner Brook in the Fall of 1989.

The Women's Policy Office in conjunction with the Departments of Education and Employment and Labour Relations sponsored a research project on employment policies in the province, related to work and family responsibilities. This research has recently been completed and the results will be used to plan future public awareness activities.

The Newfoundland Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association introduced the Provincial Work and Well-Being Awards this year. The objectives of the awards are to promote awareness and understanding of work related to mental health issues; to recognize organizations and individuals who have taken initiatives to promote work related to mental health; and to publicize these initiatives.

It has been recognized that if our province is to develop our human resources we must create an environment which supports and encourages successful integration of work and family responsibilities. Strategies to assist with the integration of work and family should be based on the premises that family and other social responsibilities should be shared by both men and women, and that both workers with dependents and workers without dependents

should have equality of opportunity and equality of treatment. The need to develop employment policies to harmonize work and family responsibilities is a prime example of the link between social and economies policies. The Women's Policy Office has been acting as a catalyst to raise awareness about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Newfoundland Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association for the promotion of health awareness and understanding in the workplace through the Work and Well-Being Awards. The successful implementation of strategies to help workers balance work and family responsibilities, depends on the co-operation and partnership between Government and the private and volunteer sectors. Other recipients of this years Work and Well-Being Awards are: Newfoundland Light and Power, the Community Services Council, Mr. Gary Dooley and the Newfoundland Nurses Union and its President Jeanette Andrews.

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador congratulates these recipients and commends the Canadian Mental Health Association for helping to publicize positive programs in the workplace and in the community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On behalf of the Official Opposition I join with the Minister and the Government in congratulating the Women's Policy Office of the Provincial Government and the other recipients of the Work and Well-Being Award presented by the Canadian Mental Health Association.

I would also like to praise the Provincial Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association for sponsoring this new award. We in the Opposition, value the role of the Women's Policy Office within the Executive Council, in co-ordinating the Provincial Government's development of policies and programs for women in our province. The policies and programs benefit women, but also men and children. We also recognize the worth of the Women's Policy Office efforts to promote a balance of paid work and family responsibilities. Many of us were Members of the previous Government which established the Women's Policy Office and which initiated their first work in this area of harmonizing paid work and family responsibilities.

There is an imbalance for women and men in co-ordinating paid work and family responsibilities. In the case of women generally, acknowledging individual exceptions, women are over-loaded with the combination, women are carrying most of the burden of child rearing and household management and women in ever greater numbers are also participating in the paid workforce. And the combination is straining many women, and I am sure that is why the Canadian Mental Health Association values the work of the Women's Policy Office of the Government in trying to promote a balance. In the case

of men, allowing for individual exceptions, there is also an imbalance, because most men are not doing very much around the house.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh! What? What?

MS VERGE:

Not the capital 'H' House of Assembly, but the small 'h' house, as in home.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MS VERGE:

I will have more to say later, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I was looking at my dishpan hands here this morning before I asked a question of the Minister of Fisheries. I wonder if he has any further information on the uncertainty surrounding the Burgeo plant situation? National Sea has already announced it will be cutting back on the duration of its operation this year in Burgeo, and, as well, have made public

statements in the past that if their quota is reduced, I believe they said if their groundfish allocation becomes less than 20,000 metric tons, they will seriously have to look at shutting down the Burgeo operation. Can the Minister inform the House if he has any further information on the Burgeo situation? Can he confirm that there is a deal in the works to sell the Burgeo plant with the Canso plant? Could he update us on that, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I can only tell the hon. Member what I told him a few days ago. We have written Mr. Henry Demone, the President and Chief Operating Officer of National Sea, asking him to respond to the rumours which are circulating in the Province. If I do not get a reply today, I will be talking to him in person. But the letter has gone off. It went May 1, actually.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I thank the Minister for his answer, Mr. Speaker, as weak as it is. I would like to say to the Minister that I have received information which tells me if the Burgeo plant is not sold, then National Sea Products has no intention of operating that plant beyond this year. I am wondering if the Minister would undertake, in his discussions with Mr. Demone, to try and determine that from the -

MR. SIMMS:

It is urgent.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes. He should leave the House right after Question Period and put a call in. It seems to me that if the plant is not sold there will be no future for the people of Burgeo in the fishing industry. Would the Minister undertake to immediately contact Mr. Demone to get answers to these very important questions on behalf of the people of Burgeo?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the unsubstantiated rumours which are circulating, I intend to have a meeting with Mr. Demone at the earliest date possible to discuss the future of the Burgeo plant. I am not aware of the suggestion the hon. Member has made, that maybe the plant will not be operating beyond this year. In fact, I have reason to believe the opposite is the case, but we will certainly be discussing that with him.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I hope the Minister is right. I hope that is what happens, as well, but I have been led to believe that just may be in the works for Burgeo, as I indicated. A couple of days ago, the Minister confirmed that the Cape Verde, a trawler which has been landing at the Southside plant, in St. John's, is being transferred to Nova Scotia. Is the Minister aware that as a result of this transfer we are going to see five or six maintenance jobs eliminated at the Southside plant?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I believe at the time I indicated that while they were deploying the Cape Verde to Nova Scotia, they were, in fact, adding the Cape Adair, I believe the name of it is, a factory freezer shrimp vessel, to the St. John's operation. I would assume that what we might lose by virtue of the Cape Verde being deployed elsewhere, we will make up by virtue of having the Cape Adair deployed to the St. John's operation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had a call yesterday from the Southside plant, and they informed me that as a result of this transfer there will, indeed, be five or six maintenance jobs eliminated at the Southside plant. I would like for the Minister to investigate that, as well, and report back as soon as possible?

A further supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say that all of us on this side were very delighted to hear the news of the Twillingate situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

I only hope that over the next number of weeks we will hear more and more good news from many other communities around the Province.

Let me ask the Minister, in light

of Conpak, the new Company which is going to operate at Twillingate, and listening to Dr. Blackwood this morning and his concerns about resource - of course, those resource concerns were echoed by former operators, Oceana in particular, Mr. Etchegary - is the Minister now concerned, or is he convinced that employment levels at the Twillingate plant will be maintained with the new operator?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, last night I meet with the people of Twillingate, at a rally. I think there were about 700 to 800 people there, probably more. I am very conservative when it comes to estimating numbers. The press, I believe, are probably saying about 1,000 people, but I would say probably 400 to 500 people turned up last night. I must say, they were quite pleased to get the news.

Dr. Blackwood is going to be operating the plant. He is confident he can, through his other contacts and buying stations, obtain sufficient raw material to keep the plant operating. But it is going to have to be operated, Mr. Speaker, on a businesslike basis. I think the people of Twillingate responded quite favorably last night, when I told them this might very well be the last chance the Twillingate plant will have. I asked them to co-operate with the new owner, and they have offered to do that.

I had meetings last night with the fishermen's committees and others, and I think there is a general feeling of co-operation in the

area. I am confident Dr. Blackwood's company will keep the plant operating, and I am hoping he will maintain the level of employment that was there in previous years.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. The Minister will be aware of the work stoppage at Terra Nova Fisheries, in Clarenville, and the problems associated with that strike. Workers with Terra Nova Fisheries are engaged in a legal strike, and they have the right to withdraw services now that they are unable to reach a first collective agreement. Has the Minister recently been made aware that CEIC are presently processing applications for workers to go out to Clarenville and take the place of the workers who are engaged in a legal walkout?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

No, I was not aware of that, Mr. Speaker. I certainly am interested in my Opposition critic bringing it to my attention.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Now

that the Minister has been made aware of that situation, will she immediately call CEIC officials, or the Federal Minister of Employment, and demand they cease this activity, and demand an explanation as to why they would become involved in what is essentially a strikebreaking activity?

MR. SIMMS:
Right on! Good question!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker. To my Opposition critic, I will investigate the matter. I certainly will not make any commitments as to how I will pursue it at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact the UFCW, the union representing the workers at Clarendville, have gone through the legal process and did have, initially, an agreement with the company which later fell apart, and in view of the fact the union has applied to the Labour Relations Board for implementation of the first agreement, and in view of the fact the Labour Relations Board have refused to hear the case, simply because they are backlogged, would the Minister go to her Labour Relations Board and see that this particular case is put on the top of the list, because these people are on the picket line out there, they want to get back to work, and they cannot seem to get the Labour

Relations Board moving on their case.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
Mr. Speaker, it would be totally inappropriate for me, as Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, to interfere with the work of the Labour Relations Board.

MS DUFF:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for St. John's East.

MS DUFF:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct this question to the Minister for Provincial and Municipal Affairs. Fire protection, as the Minister knows from his council experience, is a very important issue in St. John's East, because there is a very high incidence of wooden row housing, and schools, and hotels. I have been receiving a tremendous amount of representation from the people because of the uncertainty with relation to the East End Fire Station. In view of the fact that it may be some months before Government will be ready with its response to the recommendations contained in the Woods Gordon Report, can the Minister indicate what Government's intentions are in relation to the role of the East End Fire Station, pending final decisions on the Woods Gordon Report?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, the status of the East End Fire Station is similar to the status of all the other stations in this particular region, the Northeast Avalon, and it is being considered along with the Woods Gordon Report at this time. In concert with that, of course, we are dealing with the whole matter of fire fighting for the Northeast Avalon area, and the consideration of the placement of fire stations, and the eventual use of the East End Fire Station, in particular, is being dealt with at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

I think the St. John's East fire station is in a slightly different position from some of the others, because it was named in the Woods Gordon Report as one which might face closure if, in fact, a tremendous number of other recommendations to improve fire fighting services were put in place, and one of the concerns is that it may be closed without the improvements that would assure fire fighting services.

In view of the fact that there are persistent rumors that the Minister is under extreme pressure from the Mount Pearl Council, because of the station there which has not been opened, and the rumors are that the intention is to close the East End, even before the Woods Gordon Report is dealt with, and transfer the personnel to Mount Pearl, can the Minister categorically deny that this is not under consideration and, in fact, will not happen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, dealing in rumors is certainly not the way we operate and consider fire fighting services in this particular region. No question, we have been dealing with Mount Pearl about the Mount Pearl fire station, and they have been pressuring to have that station operative, under a separate Fire Department. My position has been all along that I was willing to man that fire station, have been offering to man it since early last year, and have continued to make those offers. But the disposition and the use of the East End Fire Station has absolutely no connection with the Mount Pearl situation. We cannot deal in isolation with one particular station; we are now considering fire fighting services for the entire region, and the placement of fire stations and equipment and so on will all be done in concert with that particular mandate.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

The Minister may not want to deal with rumours, but when the rumours are as persistent as they have been, and fire fighting service is as important as it is in this District, then, I think people need to have an assurance that they do not have to be concerned about this important issue.

I would like to ask the Minister if he could give an unequivocal assurance to the residents of St. John's East that the East End Station will not be closed unless

the comprehensive changes are made, as recommended in the Woods Gordon Report, to the whole fire fighting services, which will ensure an equal or improved level of fire fighting services to that District?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am just repeating myself, in the sense that I said we would look at the placement of fire stations in the entire region, making sure that fire fighting services were adequate, and equipment and stations were properly placed. That includes the East End Fire Station. We are not ready, at this time, to say whether that particular station will be operative and continue to operate as it is now, or whether it will be closed. But, certainly, any decisions made will be considered in the context of the entire region, making sure that response times are adequate and that stations are properly placed, along with the proper equipment.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Could the Minister give us some indication how long it is going to take Government to deal with the recommendations of the Woods Gordon Report, which has been in the hands of Government now for well over a year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, we have been dealing with the Woods Gordon Report on a constant basis, dealing with the whole question of fire fighting, as the Member knows, fire fighting in this particular region. Those discussions and considerations are ongoing, and have been ongoing for some time. We are hoping to have it resolved within the next few months. It is a very important matter, and the placement, just to repeat myself once again for, I think, the fourth time, the placement of fire stations and equipment and personnel is all being considered in concert with the transfer of fire fighting services over to the municipalities, which is the purpose for which we are carrying on negotiations and discussions at this particular time.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. As the Minister must appreciate, the Trans-Canada Highway, between Corner Brook and Steady Brook, urgently needs to be widened and upgraded, given the large and growing volume of traffic and the history of accidents. Last November, the Minister announced that Government would be calling tenders this winter, the winter past, for the planned four laning of that section of the Trans-Canada, and the Minister gave people the impression that the construction start would be early in the spring. Last week, people were upset to hear on the news that, in fact, the construction start will

not be until the fall. My question for the Minister is when will there be a start on the construction of the widened, four-laned Trans-Canada, between Corner Brook and Steady Brook? If not this spring, what is the reason for the delay?

MR. SIMMS:

A good question.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Well, as I told the Member for Humber East when I met with the joint councils back in the fall, when she asked the same question, her Government had been in for seventeen years and had not done anything about it, and right now, by virtue of the fact that they had sold the railway - it was the previous Government which sold the railway -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Gave it away.

MR. GILBERT:

You know, we are the only Province in Canada which had to sell our railway to get money to upgrade a highway that is badly needed. As I said, the contract will be called. It is called, and work will start this year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister did not answer my precise question. It is, when will there be a construction start?

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, tell the people.

MS VERGE:

Will it be in the spring, as the Minister indicated last November, or will it be in the Fall, as was reported on the news last week? If it is not going to be this spring, what is the reason for the delay?

MR. SIMMS:

A straightforward question.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Answer that now.

MR. GILBERT:

It is the same question, the same answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

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

MR. GILBERT:

The same question Mr. Speaker, the same answer: the highway is included in the 405 agreement, and it will be completed in due course, with the contract being called, and I am sure the Member will be happy when she sees the work being undertaken this year.

MR. SIMMS:

Why can you not be straightforward?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Why do you not just fly away?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple question.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Over there with the hands like he

is swimming.

MS VERGE:

It is on the minds of many people in the Humber Valley, Corner Brook area.

MR. SIMMS:

Be honest!

MS VERGE:

I will ask it one more time in the Chamber. When will there be a construction start on four laning the Trans-Canada Highway between Corner Brook and Steady Brook? When?

MR. SIMMS:

Will it be this spring?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

When. Yes, when?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

As I pointed out to the Member for Humber East several times and again this morning, the road has been there, it was recognized by the people in Corner Brook down through the years that there were serious problems with the road. Now that they have sold our birthright for a mess of pottage, as soon as we complete the deal, as soon as the contract is called, as soon as the contractor is ready

MR. RIDEOUT:

The contract is called, is it not?

MR. GILBERT:

- the work will go ahead. So, have no worries. Over the next years, the road will be done.

MR. RIDEOUT:

What is wrong with you? Your left

thruster is not on this morning, is it?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon.the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, with that kind of attitude on the part of the Minister responsible, people have reason to be worried.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The people of Petit Forte have reason, too,

MS VERGE:

Will the Minister tell the House exactly where this project stands?

MR. SIMMS:

Wake up!

MS VERGE:

Have tenders been called? Has the contract been awarded? Why will he not tell us when work will start?

MR. SIMMS:

He probably does not know.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He does not have the information.

MR. SIMMS:

It is too early.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

The people of Corner Brook need not worry - maybe the Member can - the work will be done.

MR. RIDEOUT:

What a brilliant answer.

MR. WINSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:
He is right proud of himself.

MR. WINSOR:
My question is to the Minister responsible for Municipal and Provincial Affairs. In a Ministerial Statement several weeks ago in this House, the Minister indicated that he was going to announce a Regional Capital Grants Program, money which was left from last year, Mr. Speaker, not money from this year's Budget.

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is right.

MR. WINSOR:
In his Estimates, the Minister said letters were now being sent to the communities which had been successful. Is the Minister now ready to table the list, or is he waiting until summer recess, as he did last year, when we saw the most blatant political pork-barrelling ever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. FUREY:
Tell him about our pork-barreling.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, yes, indeed, a few

weeks ago I did announce that the Recreation Capital Grants Program for this year would be announced and would be confirmed with the various communities involved.

We, in fact, had some \$350,000 of funds which were available in last year's budget, and those funds have been allocated to the various communities based on priorities established within the Department, and those communities have now been advised of the Recreation Capital Grants that have been confirmed for their particular communities.

MR. SIMMS:
Pure, bald patronage.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The question was, will the Minister now table the list for the House? He has indicated that it is ready. Will he table it?

MR. WINSOR:
In the same statement, on regional recreational facilities, the Minister also left some confusion with municipalities and recreation commissions as to the announcement of the two such facilities which would be constructed this year. Is it the Minister's intention to select two from the nine which had feasibility studies completed, or is it now again open to all municipalities?

MR. SIMMS:
Pork-barrelling.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, on the first question, I have no hesitation in tabling the list of those communities which have been confirmed now for Recreation Capital Grants.

On the second question, on regional facilities, we have now advised, or I have written, all the recreation commissions and groups which had previously applied for recreation facilities on a regional basis, and asked them to look at their applications, and if they want to revise and make any changes, to do so. Because some time has gone by, they may indeed want to make changes, and, in some cases perhaps, may even want to change their priority from a skating rink, for example, to a swimming pool.

Indeed, we have two stages of applications. One stage would be the group which had already had applications in and applied for regional facilities; there is a second group, and to those will be added those who wish to apply for a first time.

MR. SIMMS:

More fairness and balance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair is very interested in hearing the answer to this question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, the Speaker wants a straightforward answer.

MR. GULLAGE:

The group of regional committees,

and communities, which are in the second stage, of course, will take some time to have feasibility studies done and make application. In that particular group, of course, it may be difficult to have any of that group approved for this current year, but certainly for the group in the first stage, which have gone through the feasibility process and are just simply updating their applications, within the next few months, certainly, I will be announcing the successful groups of communities for the first two regional recreation facilities.

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, had I known you were so interested in the question, I certainly would have had a longer preamble, and I give notice that I will put it on the Late Show for your benefit.

In the Estimates Committee, the Minister indicated that the new applicants, the stage one applicants for the Regional Recreational Facilities Program, would have to bear the total cost of feasibility studies themselves instead of having it cost-shared, as was the policy of the previous Administration. Will the Minister now reconsider this policy and reinstate the policy of the previous Administration, cost-sharing on an eighty/twenty basis?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, we will be cost-sharing on an eighty/twenty basis with those applicants who are successful. The way the criteria reads is that any cost of feasibility studies will be taken up in the eventual cost of the project, and we will pay for the feasibility studies at that time. The previous Administration, in fact, did pay for some feasibility studies, and others they did not, so we are having a look at that, as well. Indeed, we will cost-in the cost of the feasibility study with the successful applicants, when they are approved.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for my good friend, the Minister of Education. A few days ago, the Minister clearly explained, in response to a question from the Member for Carbonear, the rationale for eliminating Carbonear as the headquarters for the Avalon Community College system. I wonder if he would explain to the House the rationale for eliminating Burin as the headquarters for the Eastern Community College system?

MR. RIDEOUT:

A very short question; a very short answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I really answered

that question last time. I think the first decision the Government made was to restructure the boundaries of colleges. Eastern was a relatively small college, and did not have sufficient numbers to justify the use of the broad services that are needed; there are certain numbers and certain numbers of campuses required. When we decided to extend the boundaries, we merged Eastern with two campuses from Avalon, and these two were Carbonear and Placentia. After we did that, the choice was to leave the headquarters in Burin, because Burin was the original headquarters of Eastern, or to close Burin and put it in Carbonear, which was the headquarters originally of Avalon. So you had two headquarters in the new college. What we did, of course, was examine the whole question, and our conclusion was that educationally, economically, and in every way possible, creating the new headquarters in Clarendville was the right decision to make. Therefore, we closed both over a period of time, and located in the center of the new college boundary. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is now officially on record. I go back to the Minister's answer a few days ago in relation to the move of the headquarters from Carbonear, when he said, 'Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, the decision was not made easily. It was a very difficult decision.' We have just been told now that

the headquarters in Burin and Carbonear will be closed over a period of time, for what might be the right or wrong reasons. But what the Minister has said on both occasions is that the decision has already been made, and I ask the Minister why he bothered to put out a White Paper and waste the time of people in responding, when it is not a White Paper at all, it is a fait accompli, a decision that has already been made, and it is a whitewash of the educational system by this Government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

I wish, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member read the rest of my answer last day. He was very selective in what he read. What I said last day was that these are proposals to close these two and to relocate in Clarenville. I think I had here on my desk last day, a whole series of briefs. I indicated to the House that we were going to consider all these presentations and then we would finalize the decision and announce in due course, in the House hopefully, what would happen. Last week I did indicate that we were considering every presentation that was made to us, and we would, at the end of the process, announce our final decision.

MR. HEWLETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had a telephone call from the Mayor of Little Bay Islands. The entire community there is in a state of confusion as to the future prospects for their fish plant, S. T. Jones and Sons. I wonder if the Minister of Fisheries could bring us up to date as to the prospects for that plant operating this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot be sure what is going to happen to the fish plant. I do not want to go into any financial information, it is a private company, so I am not going to discuss the finances of the company in this Chamber. I would be happy to meet with the hon. gentleman after Question Period and have a chat with him about that company.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister, I suppose in general terms, is it possible that this plant is one of the hundred or so small to medium-sized plants mentioned in the newspaper some time ago as being required to go out of the system?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the preamble to the question is incorrect. There is certainly no plan to phase out fish plants, or that a certain fish plant would go out of business. I have said before that in cases where fish plants have a

chance of success, this Government will support them. Again, I do not want to go into any details about the financing of that company, but I would be happy to meet with him after Question Period and talk about it.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, I realize we do not have much time, so I will have just have a very brief, quick question to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. Following along with the line of questioning from my colleague from St. John's East dealing with fire services in this region, let me ask him specifically, as it relates to the Mount Pearl fire department, when is the Minister going to make a decision on that, in view of the fact he has been procrastinating now for a year, and that he, as I have said in this House several times, will be held personally responsible should a tragedy occur because that fire department has not been reactivated? Let me ask him, when will he make a decision? Let me ask him specifically, as well, Mr. Speaker, has the Minister threatened the Mount Pearl Council that if they go ahead on their own, he will introduce into this House of Assembly legislation which, in fact, takes away from the City of Mount Pearl Act, their right to own and operate a fire department, as does every other municipality in this Province? And, will he assure this House that he indeed will not do that, if it is not true?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, we are having excellent ongoing discussions about the Mount Pearl fire station. In fact, we are now having discussions with the union, as well; we are in union discussions about their agreement, and, particularly, discussions with the Mount Pearl Council, the St. John's Council, and others, concerning the transfer of fire fighting services over to the municipalities. Within the next few months I hope we will see that transfer take place, and I hope the union will be well served and will look after all the stations in this particular region.

Incidentally, the Fire Commissioner and the Fire Chief assure me that the response times to Mount Pearl are adequate. To alarm the people, as you have done on other occasions, is unconscionable, because the response times are adequate. In any case, as everybody knows, I offered to man that station as early as last May. To make alarmist statements in the House is totally incorrect and unconscionable. The Member will know that response times are adequate. We are having ongoing discussions now to facilitate a transfer of the fire fighting services over to the municipalities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Question Period has expired.

Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, we would like to

welcome some visitors to our gallery. On behalf of hon. Members, I would like to welcome to the public galleries today thirty-two Grade VII students from the Mount Pearl Junior High School, with their teachers, Mr. Mike Benson and Mr. Gordon Hicks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Also, I would like to welcome twenty post-secondary students from the Lawrence Collegiate School, here in St. John's, accompanied by their instructor, Kathryn Avis.

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Order 3, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 3, the Concurrence Motion.

We are on Order 3, the Concurrence Motion on the Resource Estimates.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Hearn.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, when we look at what is happening in the resource sectors in the Province, it is not much trouble to spend a few moments discussing some of the problems and the concerns. One of the most important ones, of course, that will concern people in many parts of the Province would be the state of the fishery.

We have two major problems: one over which we have very little control, and one over which, as a Province, we have a fair amount of control. Both, combined, are leading to a disastrous year for a number of people throughout the Province. The major concern, of course, is the lack or the perceived lack of resource, and based upon the best scientific information we have, a number of stocks. Sometimes, we just put our emphasis on the Northern cod stock, which has drawn more attention than anything else, because more and more people are involved in the harvesting and the processing of that than, perhaps, any other species, and that has highlighted the concerns of fishermen throughout the Province.

But there are also concerns about many other things which are going on in the fishery. We have concerns over the caplin stocks, despite the fact that many say, Oh, we have a tremendous amount of caplin. That is not a problem. A lot of the older fishermen and older people around the Province will ask you, How come, then, the caplin are not rolling in on the beaches like they used to? How come, in many parts of the Province, the areas where you could always get caplin during the month of June and early July, they are not seen any more? Is it because they are being cleaned up before they hit the beaches, before they get a chance to spawn, and is that having a disastrous effect on the stocks?

The price of lump roe, this year, is a real concern to a number of fishermen. In most parts of the Province they have refused to put out their nets to bother the fish at all. That certainly was a subsidy in relation to the losses

they experienced in the cod fishery the last few years, and it helped them tremendously. People who are taking part in the lobster fishery find that this year there is a real concern in the market because of the decision in the United States not to buy smaller lobster, and the price paid generally is extremely low.

So it seem that whichever way we turn, the fishermen or fisherpersons, or I understand the latest operable word is fishers, are being hurt tremendously. One of the latest concerns, and the Minister is not in his seat but I presume he is listening, one of the latest concerns is the decision by DFO to close large areas near the mouths of various salmon rivers, especially rivers where there are some enhancement programs taking place. We know full well that unless the salmon go up the rivers to spawn that the salmon stocks will be destroyed. But we also know that somewhere in between there is a happy medium where people can continue to fish as they always have done, to make a few extra dollars as they pursue a livelihood in the fishery.

Certain areas are being closed off, large areas in fact, which involved not only salmon nets but also cod traps and other fixed gear. This is a major concern. Perhaps before final decisions are made and proper discussions take place then the harsh decisions that have been announced will be moderated somewhat. But all of these things add to the confusion that presently exists in the fishery. The main concern however is the number of fish plants, mainly cod processing plants, that are closing around the Province.

We not only have the major plants,

the ones announced by the deep sea companies in Trepassey and Grand Bank and Gaultois, and in St. John's by National Sea, we now hear rumors of concern about Burgeo and what the future of that will be. We see the Universal operation completely shut down with very little encouragement to date about the re-opening of the plants involved there. We have a number of smaller plants throughout the Province that are on the brink of disaster, Jerseyside being one. Other plants such as Branch where the future is uncertain, and we can go on and on.

These might seem very small to those who are not aware of the areas, but a fish plant employing 100 people, buying fish from the residents of the area who fish, is the sole base of livelihood for these areas. And a small fish plant in a place like Jerseyside in Placentia Bay or in River Head, St. Mary's, means just as much as a Come by Chance or a Hibernia would mean to St. John's, because it is the sole source of livelihood, as I mentioned.

The Universal situation, which has been before us for quite some time is a sad story because you had there one of the few operations in this Province which was not affected by a lack of resource. Many of the other plants, at Trepassey, at Gaultois and Grand Bank, and National Sea plants, have been put on the block because of resource problems. The Universal operation, a large operation employing 2400 people, did not have resource problems. These plants operated - some of them seasonally - the one in Fermeuse practically year round.

The company had built up a solid

supply of product by aggressively going out looking for boats, looking for product, identifying different species into which they were getting, lining up good equipment for their plants, lining up good efficient markets. They had markets in areas where other people had none. What is it? Fools rush in where angels fear to tread. But sometimes fools have to break the way, and they did break the way into good market areas. The one thing the company failed to do as it grew and grew rapidly, and perhaps that is what happened, because nobody stayed home really to mind the shop as others went out and aggressively went after markets and product. But the mechanism was there to create a very solid inshore fishing company with a fair amount of resource, with good plants, and with good work forces. There is one thing that that company did that very few have done over the last few years, they bought all the product landed in the local areas and they provided a tremendous number of jobs. To the people, the workers, and the fisherpeople in the area, the Universal Company was top notch. To those who were involved with them on a financial basis the company was perhaps not a top-notch one. But that only meant that a change in how they were managed, a change in how they handled themselves financially, could have solved their problem. The company itself was quite willing to put some extra funds into it, showing they had faith in investment in the Province, because most of the money was outside investment and that they were looking ahead to the future. It is unfortunate that the Government did not take advantage of the situation, not just to throw away money, but to invest

wisely and control the investment.

The Member for Port de Grave yesterday evening in responding to some comments I had made asked why it had not been done before now? Why the panic? Simply because the company did not start operations in the Province until 1985 and then started very small by moving into Riverhead, St. Mary's, and St. Mary's itself, starting a very solid operation. They were in an area where for three or four years fishermen has not been able to sell their fish, where the workers had no work, and they got those two little plants on a solid footing, then moved into Fermeuse, which was a big deep-sea plant for a number of years, an old plant, heavy overhead, and in order to operate efficiently they would need a lot of product.

They aggressively went out and got that product, but in order to get it they had to make heavy commitments to operators of a number of larger boats to encourage them, number one, to get into the larger boat fishery, which the Government has been doing for years, the Minister of Fisheries over the years has been encouraging people to get into larger boats.

If the fish does not come to us, go after the fish - which they did. Certainly the fishery, mainly concentrated on the Virgin Rocks and other areas by inshore boats under sixty-five feet, has been extremely successful and has provided a lot of resource to a number of plants. The unfortunate thing about it the investment in these boats would take a long time to get back, and when we talk about the millions of dollars that the company had lost, that is not really factual, because if you

look at the investment in the plants and in the boats and the long-term return on product that would be landed and the jobs created, financially, in relation to revenues coming into the coffers of the Province, we would have been a lot better off financially if we had found a mechanism to assist that company.

Right now, unless somebody pulls a rabbit out of the hat very quickly, these plants are in very, very serious shape for this year. There is certainly not much encouragement. Hopefully somebody will lease the operations, and provide some jobs and buy some product. But the whole operation has become fragmented, because a lot of the boats which landed in the area have now gone elsewhere. Even before I came in this morning I had calls from fishermen who said they have already committed themselves to other buyers because they cannot wait any longer for decisions. And when that starts happening, of course, the product that is so badly needed to operate these plants has now been lessened and therefore the amount of work that is going to be available in the overall viability of the operations also has been lessened with it.

So sometimes a stitch in time saves nine, and if the Government had taken a more solid look and, perhaps, if they had understood the overall operation better, we might have salvaged something for a very few dollars. We spent three or four times as much as they were requested in the form of a loan, just to keep the deep-sea plants alive for a few weeks, whereby the total number of employees who might be affected will be no greater than what Universal had, and if the TAC is

cut again this year they may not be able to take you up on your offer of assistance anyway.

So sometimes it seems the concentration goes to the big companies mainly because the owners and the operators are the ones who mix around in the board rooms and in the cocktail circuits, and the smaller companies are forgotten. Maybe it is time we started looking at the people who built up Newfoundland originally, who provided the original jobs in the fishery, the small operators, and not spend so much time paying attention to - and I am not just talking about the Provincial Government here, the Federal Government is much more at fault. So much time is paid to the larger companies. It seems as if the only thing that matters is, you know, the national company, and when we talk about assistance to plants everything seems to be geared to the FPIs and the National Seas.

I heard the Minister last night announce a successful operator for his plant down in Twillingate. Certainly, Dr. Blackwood is one of the best operators in the Province, and hopefully he will make a success of that plant. We do have people who have confidence in the fishery. We have outside investors who have confidence in the fishery, but we have to show ourselves that we also have confidence.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. HEARN:
Okay, Mr. Speaker, we will get back to it later. I just think that if we collectively show that

we have faith in the fishery, that it is not dead, and that it can be rebuilt, then perhaps we can encourage others to invest so that our plants will not be closing, and we will continue to provide markets and jobs.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I welcome this opportunity to speak in this particular debate. I want to do so for a couple of reasons, but particularly to make acknowledgement to the Fishery and the Department of Development as it relates to my District. I want to illustrate some of the ways these two Departments, in particular, over the last year, have really turned things around for my District, and I wanted to pay particular acknowledgement to the Ministers on these initiatives.

The first one, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge is, as everybody knows for the last three consecutive years in the Labrador Straits there has been a downturn in the cod fishery. For the last number of years there has been a very bad situation when it came to trying to get some employment for plant workers in the Labrador Straits. As everybody knows a lot of fish is being caught and taken away from our Coast, particularly in the Black Tickle - Domino area.

Over the last number of years there is probably around 120 million pounds, around 40 million pounds a year taken away from the Coast. Last year it was really bad. Five of the plants in the Labrador Straits only worked for three weeks of last summer and

last fall we were faced with a situation where we had 195 people who could not even qualify for the Emergency Response Program. They did not even have six insurable weeks in the last fifty-two.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this Government was faced with the onerous task of trying to address that problem, and I want to pay particular acknowledgement to the Minister of Fisheries, and this Government generally for approving \$300,000 as a transportation initiative, to see that the fish is collected and transported along the Coast. The plant workers in the Labrador Straits, I think, can now be assured that for the coming summer they will have a number of insurable weeks there, and that the plants will be in a much more competitive position because of that resource.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in my District there has been a number of problems with infrastructure and certainly plants cannot make money, and they cannot operate, if they do not have the latest equipment, or indeed the fishermen cannot make a go of it if they do not have facilities to put their fish in. This has been particularly bad in the Southeastern part of my riding, in Black Tickle and the other small communities around that area. It is certainly good news for the people of Black Tickle this year, Mr. Speaker, to see that a new community stage will be built there and that will be to incorporate fifteen fishing families.

Black Tickle, as everybody knows, has been a place of abundance in the cod fishery. In many years they have been having to go on quotas themselves. There are only

fifteen or twenty families there that fish, but these people have been taking second place, I suppose, to people from outside, or even putting themselves on an even footing with the people from outside. They used to have to accept quotas of 600 or 700 pounds a day in order for somebody from outside to sell something to that plant. They were being very, very reasonable, and I think we should all acknowledge that. Rather than have them dump their fish they could salt it if there was a facility there. This Government has turned a very sensitive eye to that situation by approving \$130,000 for a community stage. It will really make their livelihood a lot more secure and, certainly, their coming season a lot more promising.

Another community that has been struggling to try to make its operation work, is Williams Harbour. Williams Harbour is another small community on the coast of Labrador that has probably twenty-three or twenty-four families there, and they have to try to make the operation work with little space and, certainly, some bad plumbing and a good water supply.

The people there were very happy, again, this year, Mr. Speaker, when the Department of Fisheries made sure that the Estimates supplied funding for a new fish plant in Williams Harbour. The first phase of this will be going ahead this year, and the final part of the fish plant will be finished next year.

Mr. Speaker, while these are very encouraging things for the coast of Labrador and for the fishery in Eagle River, I would like to take this opportunity, now, to apprise

hon. Members of a situation in Labrador generally, as it relates to the unemployment insurance system. We have heard different statements on unemployment insurance, most recently by the Federal Minister of Fisheries, saying that fishermen only wanted to go out and get ten weeks, and then sit back for forty-two. That is very disappointing, coming from the Federal Minister of Fisheries, for two reasons, one, that is certainly not the case with the fishermen in Labrador, and the other more disturbing thing, Mr. Speaker, is that it is just not true. All fishermen, as far as I know, in Labrador - I do not know exactly what it is like in other places on the Island - but, all fishermen in Labrador are only allowed to apply for unemployment insurance as of November 15th of every year, and they can only draw these benefits until the following May 15th. So, you know, the maximum unemployment insurance benefits that the fishermen on the coast of Labrador can get, is six months.

So, there is absolutely no flexibility with that system. And, Mr. Speaker, again this year we are coming to a situation where it is going to be one of the latest years ever for the ice breaking up on the coast of Labrador. We are going to be well into the middle of June, at least, and, in many cases down towards Cartwright and Rigolet and Nain, in Northern Labrador, it will be the 1st of July, Mr. Speaker, before they get a cent of income from the Fishery. And this is the worst time of year.

People there do not have any idea if there is going to be any fish out there, to begin with; they also do not have any money to put

into getting their fishery going in the coming year. It is one of the most disappointing things that has been put in place for the people of Labrador. We have tried for years to get some people conscious of the fact, but it seems to certainly have fallen on deaf ears. I would like to elicit the support of my hon. colleagues to see if we cannot get this situation at least a little more sensitized to the area.

I would like to enlist your support in getting the unemployment insurance benefits extended, even if it were just for one month. I mean, there is absolutely no fish there, there is absolutely no water there; so, you know, there is absolutely no security for the families in this situation. Ninety per cent of them, Mr. Speaker, from Mary's Harbour to Cartwright, in particular, have to move outside every year. People probably do not comprehend this, but the people on the coast of Labrador fish twenty, thirty and forty miles from their winter home. They all have to go, in the spring, to the small fishing stations.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Okay, Mr. Speaker, I certainly welcomed the opportunity to apprise hon. Members of this situation and hope that we can work towards it's resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, as I rise I would like to thank the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy and the Premier for inviting me to join them in their common room to meet with the students from Mount Pearl who are going in there. They had no idea I was about to get up and speak and, therefore, cannot join them. So I would ask them to pass along my regards to the students in the common room. Again, I appreciate the invitation to join them. Perhaps, I will get a moment afterwards to talk to them.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity just to take ten minutes to -

PREMIER WELLS:

I will not undermine the hon. Member.

MR. WINDSOR:

I assure the hon. Premier there is no way he could, but I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address generally the initiatives of this Government as it relates to economic development in the Province.

Years ago when they were in Opposition the cry at that time was, you have to get out and develop small business. The Government of the day, the Government of which I was a part, were putting too much emphasis on the megaprojects, on Churchill Falls and on Hibernia. How many times did they cry from this side of the House, 'All you think about is Hibernia. You have all your apples in the one barrel'. So their initiative in their first Throne Speech, as I recall, was to diversify the economy, to develop

small business in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, the so-called little cottage industry. That is all well and good, Mr. Speaker, but this Government, as we said at that point in time, will soon realize that the megaprojects are where the quick turnaround in the economy of Newfoundland lies.

Indeed, in this year's Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, there was a complete reversal. So the one thing that they have accomplished in one year is realize that without the larger projects the smaller projects do not survive. You have to have that level of economic activity in this Province to support the economy generally, which therefore has enough money in the economy to support the smaller initiatives. So Government now is very much actively involved and putting a lot of emphasis on trying to negotiate the Lower Churchill Development and the Hibernia Development. We sincerely hope they are successful, Mr. Speaker. I think a couple of days ago I expressed my concerns on both these projects as a result of the position this Government has taken nationally, particularly on the Meech Lake Accord. I believe that this Government's position on Meech Lake will very directly and very negatively impact on our ability to negotiate a deal on the Lower Churchill.

I dealt with the Government of Quebec and the people who were negotiating potential projects for Quebec. I know how they think and how they work. I know the Government of Quebec has to be saying to itself today, 'Why should we negotiate in good faith with a Government who is doing so much to make it impossible for us

to become part of the Constitution of Canada.' So, I think we must be very concerned about that project. The Minister of Mines and Energy seems to indicate that they are making some progress, and I hope he is right. I sincerely hope that he is right. And I sincerely hope that we can move ahead with that project because it is so critical. Critical in the short-term because of the amount of capital investment it brings into the Province, critical because of the short-term employment it generates in the Province. It would have a tremendous impact not only on Labrador but the whole Province, as we saw in the development of the Upper Churchill, when thousands of people from the Island of Newfoundland went to Labrador and many of them stayed there.

Many of them found just how much that great land has to offer and soon found that it was a great place to live believe it or not. If the hon. Members Opposite have not been up there, they have an opportunity to travel with Government, I encourage every one of them to spend some time in Labrador. It is a tremendous part of our Province and has a tremendous amount to offer, particularly to those interested in the outdoors, but I think it has a tremendous amount to offer young families. The facilities are there, provided by the larger companies that are doing business there.

Mr. Speaker, that project is also very important to the Island of Newfoundland and Labrador, and to the economic development of Newfoundland and Labrador, because in the world situation today energy is the key to development.

I should include as well the Hibernia development. And I shall speak to that perhaps if I have time but the Hibernia development and Lower Churchill are two major energy initiatives, two probably of the largest energy initiatives that Canada will see in the next decade or two. And, as I have said, energy is the key to development in the world today.

Those countries or nations that have energy resources are the nations that are developing. They are the ones that are seeing the rapid growth of economic activity, they are the ones who are enjoying the prosperity that inherently results from that scale of economic activity. So we must move ahead with that Churchill Falls development. It will give us on the Island sufficient hydroelectric energy to displace the thermally generated energy at Holyrood, which is very expensive, and it puts us at the whim and will of energy prices of oil prices in the world, which is controlled from outside. And it is incredible that a Province such as ours, that is so rich in hydroelectric potential, should indeed be burning one gallon of oil or gas or coal or any other source other than wood fired, we encourage that because that is utilizing basically surplus materials from a resource development.

So that is good economic activity; it is also good environmentally; good effective use of our natural resources.

But we do need energy on the Island, we need the opportunity to attract more energy intensive industries to the Island or to Labrador, as the case may be, and we need the opportunity to export

because hydroelectric energy from Newfoundland's point of view is a renewable natural resource. We always talk about renewable resources in Newfoundland as our fishing industry, and our forest industry, to a lesser degree our agricultural industry, the mining industry, of course, being a non-renewable resource. But energy is a renewable resource for Newfoundland and Labrador. Hydroelectric energy. Not petroleum energy, but hydroelectric energy is a renewable resource, and it is something that we will have to market for many, many years to come, if we properly develop and properly manage that resource. So I encourage the Government to move ahead with that.

But I do not for a moment suggest they should move away from diversifying the economy of rural Newfoundland and Labrador. The economy of rural Newfoundland and Labrador is inherently tied to our fishing industry. This has been the mainstay of the economy and it is the single industry which has the greatest social impact on our Province. And we will always hopefully have a vibrant and thriving fishing industry, and we are faced now today with a resource problem, a resource crisis in the fishing industry, but I believe that can be dealt with, if you give proper management of our resource. I think we are all onside when we say the Government of Canada has to play a greater role in protecting, internationally, that resource from overfishing and unauthorized fishing off our shores. We have to take a more pro-active role in that regard and I think we all encourage the Government of Canada to play that role on our behalf, and on behalf

of other provinces of Canada that are involved in the fishing industry.

So I believe that we will indeed always have a very thriving and vibrant fishing industry. There has to be some rationalization of our catching methodology and catching technology, I believe in that. I do not say that we have to totally ban the inshore fishing industry. I think there will always be an inshore fishing industry. But I think to a lesser degree we have to realize that new technology, if we are going to compete in a world marketplace with the fishing industry, is indeed selling in a world marketplace, and we have to take advantage of the latest technology if we are going to be competitive in that world marketplace.

Traditional methods may be socially more acceptable. We may like to retain them, but I think we are going to have to realize that we may lose some of that over a period of time, so that we can continue to be competitive in the world marketplace, both in price and in quality. Quality is critically important in the fishing industry, and it is only in the last number of years, that I think we are starting to put the correct amount of emphasis on quality in the fishing industry, to upgrade our product, because other nations had a better reputation for quality in the marketplace. We saw ourselves suffering about ten years ago when the United States marketplace, particularly, went to countries like Iceland, who had a tremendous reputation for putting a first grade quality product into the marketplace. But I think we have captured now a similar reputation, at least we are well along the

road of capturing a reputation for good quality product in the market place. And you hear that as you travel the United States and talk to some of the bigger purchasers, the bigger buyers of seafood products in the United States.

The second thing we are starting to do, and we had tremendous success in this regard, is in secondary processing of seafood products, producing the consumer product because that is where the employment is generated. That is where the future is in the fishing industry. The resource is a finite resource. Our scientists someday will establish technology which will tell us, because right now it seems to be hit and miss. One year they are saying it should be here, the next year they are saying it should be there, and it is going back and forth. Some day we will develop technology which will help us define better the allowable catch that we have offshore. We have to then manage our resource to catch that total allowable catch. And I have said all of it. All of the underutilized species should be caught and should be utilized. But where the expansion in the fishing industry is possible, it is not in catching more fish -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:

It is in utilizing that seafood product better.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR. RAMSAY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, here this morning reading the Globe and Mail, and I understand in Question Period went on to refer to the written word. But looking at the editorial in the Globe and Mail this morning, it is certainly obvious that this national newspaper is very, very much a central Canadian mind set, as far as its editorial board goes anyway. The editorial that has brought me to my feet is called The Waiting Game in Atlantic Canada. The waiting game in Atlantic Canada seems to be, as far as they are debating it, one of whether or not the Atlantic Provinces should receive any kind of compensation whatsoever in the nature of social welfare, the unemployment insurance system that we have with social welfare, which understandably from that viewpoint is the way they would see it. They even go so far as to say that it is the Government's role to make sure they do not starve, 'they', meaning us. They then say, 'but that brings us back to social welfare, which is a dirty word among people who have grown used to loto 1042, ten weeks working, forty-two weeks collecting U.I. benefits.'

It is obvious in speaking about 10 - 42 that they do not realize that the majority of people in the fishing industry cannot avail of the supposed 10 - 42 as was mentioned earlier by the hon. Member for Eagle River. The aid package for Atlantic Canada is one which should in effect support the

fishery where we are now in a fisheries crisis. And some of the workers employed in the fishing industry, namely fish plant workers of course, would be those that could qualify after ten weeks of work, or currently fourteen, because of the non-passing of the variable entry requirement by the hon. Barbra McDougall.

It also notes that the Government has been kicking in \$3 billion a year to a fund it would prefer to see financed solely by employers and employees. It has had trouble breaking loose from it because too many people, including many senators, who have stalled the Government's U.I. reform Bill, see it as an entitlement like health care or, yes, welfare.

To look at this central Canada mentality we see their version of supporting the Atlantic Canadian Provinces as a burden, not as entitling us to our fair share. As far as the Federal Government goes, a policy to enshrine good quality, economic development that would allow us to send money to central Canada and goods to central Canada, as opposed to them sending goods down here that we send money back up there for. Every penny in economic development money that comes to Atlantic Canada, in general, returns to central Canada anyway. So there is a non-support in the industrial policy and the overall business and economic policy in Canada today. What are we entitled to? I feel we are entitled to, in resource sectors, in the various different sectors of the economy, our fair share of regional development, either through funding or development, not unlike the situation where the pro Meech P.E.I. has just recently recieved the GST centre. Does

this imply that possibly PEI is being patted on the back for being onside. That is possibly the case. It is the first view of a lot of people who would look at it from the outside. Why would Summerside receive 400 jobs in losing twelve hundred, or so, Federal Government jobs? That is one suggestion.

Another thing that is mentioned in this condescending editorial is one of, the world is unfair. They put some wonderful patches of ground in places where industries have trouble surviving, and natural resources are subject to depletion. Why are the natural resources subject to depletion if it not for the central mentality of the Canadian Government's policy? That is why, in my estimation, we have the situation we currently have. So, to assume, based on the fact that our natural resources are subject to depletion because of the situation of where we are: They are down there in Atlantic Canada, they are looking for more, they are looking for federal aid. I feel it is really, really, unfair, as they say the world is unfair, well, the system of Government, the national institutions that we allow to exist as they currently are, with very little opposition from the larger provinces, is a case that is in need of change.

I might also note that the Globe and Mail has sided with the hon. Minister of Fisheries, Bernard Valcourt, and they say the following, 'The question is whether the people lucky enough to have grown up in such places' referring to Atlantic Canada, 'should be encouraged, at great public expense, to stay there in the absence of work or given incentives to make a living

somewhere, or somehow else? Many people have answered that question the right way, the most recent being Fisheries Minister Bernard Valcourt. There is a generation of parents' the New Brunswick MP observed, 'whose only legacy to society will have been enough patience to qualify for unemployment insurance. What kind of work ethic are we giving to our kids?' Now, for a man to say that, representing the Government of Canada, who, as an entity, is responsible for the situation we now find ourselves in.

The people who live in the smaller communities of our Province, and in Atlantic Canada in general, the implication of this editorial, and the implication of the average Central Canadian mind-set, is that we are to blame for our own destiny, and that is not the case. I implore anyone to argue that case with any Newfoundlander, Nova Scotian, New Brunswicker, or Prince Edward Islander, that has any sense of the political situation with regards to our national institutions and come out on the winning side. I doubt very much that anyone arguing that case, including the editorial board of the Globe and Mail, would be able to argue and win such an argument, even to an audience of Central Canadian people. Now, oftentimes the written word is seen as being the case. This is the truth, this is the case, and to look at it from the way the general public would see it in light of their understanding of the political situation, and the balance of power, so to speak, as far as the Members of the Opposition would like to say it, how would we get an elected Senate without giving up some power? Who would give up the power?

Well, if you change the structure you do not necessarily give up power. You redistribute it but the power is still there. Some goes into other areas. I might say also, it says here, 'The sad truth is that community after community has ended up on welfare under the assumed name of UI, because' and their reason is 'as the fishery runs into problems and jobs dry up, too many people are unwilling to move elsewhere to seek a job or to spend the time necessary to be retrained for other work.' Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. RAMSAY:
Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will continue with that argument later.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for St. John's East.

MS DUFF:
Mr. Speaker, I know the time is very limited and I would just like to ask before I speak how many minutes are left in this set of Concurrence Debate?

MR. SPEAKER:
Four minutes.

MS DUFF:
Four minutes. Alright. In that length of time what I would simply like to do is pick up where I left off yesterday, which was zeroing in, basically, on the Tourism Estimates and the issue of our preparedness or lack of preparedness for the Cabot Cinquecentennial. In the meantime, the Minister of

Municipal and Provincial Affairs did table a Ministerial Statement indicating that, from my statements earlier, that we were spinning our wheels. We are not correct. Because, in fact, he had spent the last year doing all kinds of things on this and that there was a committee appointed.

I think the facts will bear out my statements that the committee, which is not yet appointed, the Chairman of that Committee, a civil servant who was only appointed last week, and that in fact, we have done nothing in the past year to continue the momentum which was started by the previous Government on this very important event. It is important. It is no more important thematically, if you like, than some of the other special anniversaries and celebrations that we are dealing with. Certainly, not like Beaumont Hamel in its significance to us. But it is important because it is probably the only one of the special anniversaries that have been identified that has the potential to be developed into a very major international and national event with tremendous potential spin-off, job creation, and tourist development for this Province. I think we seem to have a problem. It is not new to this Government, but I would say the same thing of the previous Government in celebrating the Gilbert anniversary. But the Gilbert anniversary did not have nearly the significance that this does. That we did so little so late, that we ended spending almost as much money as we would have, without any of the bang for the bucks that we would have received had we done it a little earlier, and with a little more imagination. We were scrambling

and I know that as a fact because I served on the Special Anniversaries and Celebrations Committee. There were no commitments coming forth from Government to allow for the kind of planning and marketing and event development that would have been necessary to really make that a major significant event.

I hope that we do not miss the boat again this time. We are already late. We know the Matthew is going to sail out of Bristol. I think the only thing our Government has done so far actually is make a \$5,000 donation to the good burghers of Bristol to help them with the development of the re-creation of the Matthew and its sail. I hope it does not end up in Cape Breton. Because I can tell you that the people of Cape Breton would dearly love to have it go there as the landing point of Cabot and we will end up again missing the boat.

But if you just simply look at what is involved in the planning and development of a major national and international festival it does not just happen. By this time, we should have had a strategic plan in place. We should have been beginning to develop our marketing plans. The City of Vancouver, when they had the World's Fair - a good four years before the event had all of their brochures, all of their public relations effort in place. We have not even begun. All we have done is appoint a civil servant, who has not even got a committee, for a very low-key effort. There is not one cent in the Budget estimates for either Municipal or Provincial Affairs or Tourism to indicate that there is any creativity, any long-sightedness, any imagination,

any expanded sense of the possible in this Government for -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for this debate has ended. The time set aside is ended.

Is it the pleasure of the House that we concur with the Report of the Resource Estimates Committee.

All in favor 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:
Against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:
Carried.

MR. BAKER:
Order 3, Mr. Speaker, Government Services Committee.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order 3, Government Services Committee.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I get into my remarks I have to - you know it is so difficult to concentrate when you are giving your remarks and you have these comments coming from the other side. These little gibes they throw at you, Mr. Speaker, especially the hon. House

Leader of the Opposition. I mean he is constantly at it, Mr. Speaker. I just wish he would not berate me so much so I could get on with my comments. He really disturbs me so much, but I try my best and I will continue to do so. And I will try to keep my concentration on my report, though it will be definitely very difficult to do.

Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to chair the Committee for Government Services. I would like to thank the Members of the Committee, and the Vice-Chairperson, the MHA of Port au Port; the Member for Fogo, also on the Committee; the Member for Placentia; and the Member for Harbour Grace. Now all these individuals served the Committee very well and they did a good job. We had very good discussions on each of the Estimates of each of the Departments. A number of issues arose within each of the Departments in the Estimates and they were discussed in a level manner, in a manner of professionalism and in good debate, except well the last session which I was not able to attend and be the chairperson for, I believe was a little bit extended. But again a number of the issues were discussed and were able to be expressed.

I would also like to thank Ms Elizabeth Murphy, the Clerk of our Committee for her work on the Committee, again she did an excellent job as usual, and helped us get through the process; and this chairperson to get through the process of the Estimates.

In the Department of Finance, the Minister dealt with a number of issues that were presented to him, related to the finances of the Province, tax measures and so on.

In the Department of Works, Services and Transportation, again a wide variety of issues were discussed from road work to the public service, to employment in the Public Service Commission. That was also discussed, and a number of other issues related to transportation and to public works again went through.

Employment and Labour Relations: again the Minister was called upon to answer a number of questions pertaining to employment programs, pertaining to occupational health and safety, and labour relations. She was asked about the legislation that may be coming forward and handled herself very well.

The Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, again a wide variety of issues were discussed there, from recreation grants to municipal funding to the arts. And I believe that session was fairly lengthy, but again it is a fairly large Department, but I believe the Minister was able to handle himself and answer the questions and I think it was a good session.

All the sessions were very good. I must say I found the session very good. I found the Opposition critics to be very constructive in their criticism to the Ministers. Again I am being so nice, I cannot help it, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are being too nice.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

- but some people on my side say I am too nice, but again I just have to -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Boiling over with niceness.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I am boiling over with niceness, but I am just trying to be fair. But now mind you there are some Opposition critics who are not exactly like that. But then again I have to give credit to the ones who are. Most of the ones, I must say, with our Estimates did a good job and asked questions which were fair. Again it does not go for all, so I will let off with that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How did Sam, do?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I must say the MHA for Fogo was superb. Number one. Just a good job, you know, constructive and so on. In fact, he would make a good Member over here, but that is up to him.

So, Mr. Speaker, in reporting to the House I would like to indicate we appreciate the co-operation of all the Members and the Committees, the staff, and also the co-operation of the press, some of the press who were there at the Committee hearings. We would have liked to see more there, but we did have some press people there to cover the issues, I believe the process is very worthwhile. Again it is part of our good democracy that we have. Again this side believes in that. So we feel very good about the process.

I would like now to let the debate begin on these Estimates, thank you.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is it?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

That is it. I only needed five or ten.

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to take part in the Concurrence Debates on Government Services.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) over there?

MR. SIMMS:

Stop interrupting!

MR. WINSOR:

I tell you what I will tell you about, the Member for LaPoile.

MS VERGE:

Excellent point of order over there.

MR. WINSOR:

The last Estimates, we had a delayed one. We had it here in the House, and Mr. Hodder was the Acting Chairman for the night, because Mr. Aylward was away. The Member for LaPoile came in and begged and begged and begged to sit down at the table as Vice-Chairman, and, on a point of order, one of my colleagues I think, asked if the Member should be there. He had documents and he pulled them out of his pocket, because he wanted to be sitting at the table so badly. He begged the Member for Port au Port to get up and leave the table so he could sit down and chair the activities, he wanted to be the Chairman so badly. I say to the President of Treasury Board, when you are appointing chairmen next time, for God's sake give the Member a

little task at the table, because he is going to go nuts if you do not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:

Anyway, the Member for Stephenville did an outstanding job in the Chair. We looked at four Departments, Finance, Works, Services and Transportation, Municipal and Provincial Affairs and Labour. And, I guess the one we looked at first was Finance. The Minister of Finance had all the answers to the payroll tax.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He did?

MR. WINSOR:

Oh, yes, he knew that hospitals and school boards and everyone else might be included - 'You wait for another couple of weeks and we will have the announcement.' I think about three weeks after the Estimates he announced it, and all through the course of the Estimates the Minister was making it perfectly clear the aim of this payroll tax is to get at Uncle Ottawa, that Federal Government, that mean old Government who took all this money away from Education and Health - 'That is why we implemented this tax.' Then, when we look at his calculations in the paper, we find the Minister of Finance could only find \$6 million out of a total of \$25 million from Ottawa, and the rest is going to come from the poor old taxpayers of Newfoundland. The Minister shakes his head and says it is not true.

The Minister, at that time, was awaiting the study which was done on pensions in the Province. The study, we are told now, is in the

Minister's hands and we are going to be anxiously waiting to see how the Minister deals with it, especially in light of the round of negotiations coming up now with the teachers' union and NAPE, and see how their pensions are going to be affected by it. We will have to wait on that one.

DR. KITCHEN:

Everybody will be pleased.

MR. WINSOR:

Everyone will be pleased, that is the Minister's stock line. Then, of course, there was the Minister's infamous Budget with taxes on liquor that were not there, but he turned around to the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation and said, 'You go out and raise a couple of million dollars more next year,' and they whopped eighty cents on a poor man's stuff. Then, of course, there is the matter of fees - there was no increase in fees. We pressed the Minister, you know, we pressed him: 'Come on, name what the fees are.' I think in the Registry of Deeds it increases by some \$5 million. I cannot remember the amounts now, but it has gone up an enormous amount.

MR. GILBERT:

We put that money into the Fogo ferry.

MR. WINSOR:

Did you? We will get to that with the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation - that is for the \$4 million for the study for the Fogo ferry.

MR. EFFORD:

I tell you what he needed it for, to pay off the pickle debt!

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, is it possible that

you can take this picture from the Minister of Social Services, table it, or do something with it, so we can all get one, because every time the Minister sits in his seat

MR. GILBERT:

(Inaudible) Newfoundland \$20,000 (inaudible).

MR. WINSOR:

Twenty thousand? That is not too bad.

MS DUFF:

Well, think of how many pickles have been made since in little households around the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I have a bit of silence so I can continue? These Ministers are being very beligerent and noisy there. I will have to ask for the protection of the Speaker on this!

MS DUFF:

The Premier is out of the House.

MR. WINSOR:

The Premier is out of the House. It is Friday. It seems Friday is the day they all let loose on the other side. The Premier disappears, and anything at all goes.

Anyway, I will not spend much more time with the Minister of Finance, because my time is going by and we have three other Departments to look at. We looked at Works, Services and Transportation. The Minister's responses to our questions on Works, Services and Transportation were about the same as the answers he gave the Member for Humber East today; he said,

'yes', 'no', and sat down. Thank God he had some officials there who were able to fill us in on what was going on in his Department. His stock response, of course, is that all problems with transportation in Newfoundland are the responsibility of the Federal Government, that bad, old deal we got on the railway. That is the only bit of money that is in road construction in the Province. I think he found \$25 million to put in, and \$100 million comes from Ottawa. He takes great delight in announcing his program for roads. I think the Member for Lewisporte spent some considerable time boasting about the wonderful Roads Agreement, \$125 million, of which over \$100 million is coming from Ottawa, that bad, old Government.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What did the Minister say about the year-round service to Argentinia? Do you recall that?

MR. WINSOR:

Oh, he skated. But they will soon fall through the cracks on that one. They year-round service to Argentinia, he did not want to touch that one.

MS VERGE:

Not even the Premier wanted to touch that one.

MR. WINSOR:

Not even the Premier. That is a very touchy issue. I am going to leave the Minister of Labour to the critic. I think he probably roasted her quite well that night. I will let him have another ten minutes at her, following my few remarks.

Then we got to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. It is too bad he is not in his

seat. That is the night the Member for LaPoile was so adamant that he wanted to be the Chairman for the occasion. I think he was Chairman of Resource last year. He did not get the job back this year, and I have to tell you he is pretty disappointed. Anyway, he held up proceedings occasionally with some silly, flippant questions with no relevance at all, but he wanted to get on the record, I guess.

In Municipal and Provincial Affairs we looked at the municipalities and the breakdown of water and sewer. My friend for Burin - Placentia West was very upset that the Minister has deliberately shut out his district from water and sewer action, I suppose because the Member is his critic.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How did your district make out?

MR. WINSOR:

My district got about half what Cabinet Ministers got.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What did you get in the last twelve months?

MR. WINSOR:

In the last twelve months, \$1 million.

We also questioned the Minister on the local service districts, and the breakdown of funds.

MR. WALSH:

(Inaudible) got more in two years than I did in ten.

MR. WINSOR:

The Member for Mount Scio lost his job as Chairman. I do not suppose he is now trying to get back as Chairman of the Caucus, is he?

Anyway, in Municipal and Provincial Affairs, the Minister tried to defend unfair capital works budgets for water and sewer. We also discovered how the Minister was going to man the Mount Pearl fire station. He does not call it fire department, it is the Mount Pearl fire station. Do you know how the Minister was going to do it? He was going to take people from the St. John's Fire Department and put them in the Mount Pearl fire station. All those new people he was going to hire, it was going to be downgrading fire protection for the city of St. John's.

MR. WALSH:

(Inaudible).

MR. WINSOR:

That is what the Minister said. The Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island should stay quite. It is better for the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island to be out in the woods looking for that moose as a companion for the one on Bell Island, if all he is going to do is blare and bawl from the other side, similar to a moose call. I will take you with me next year.

MR. WALSH:

If I took you in the woods, I would not be long catching one, I would say.

MR. WINSOR:

I will let the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island know that I would not dare be caught in the woods with him.

We also questioned the Minister on Historic and Cultural Affairs. That division of his Department has been sadly neglected. The Minister had no answers. He knew nothing about the Department. We asked all kinds of questions.

Thank God Mr. Frost was there to fill the Minister in on what was going on, because he obviously showed a complete lack of knowledge of what was going on in his Department. Historic and Cultural Affairs is falling down around his ears and he does not even know it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, do I have to tolerate this?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I ask the hon. Member to continue on with his report.

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps in all the years there has been a Department of Recreation, this has been the first time recreation got no new monies, not five cents, and the Minister is unable to explain why. He has tried on several occasions to explain why there is not funding this year for capital works in recreation. The Minister's response on one occasion was that the major projects in this Province are substantially complete and there was no need for any extra funding this year; \$2.7 million taken from Bonavista and little communities around the Province of Newfoundland, little small, tiny municipalities which have very little access to local funding, and this was always a welcomed announcement: \$5,000; \$10,000; \$20,000 over three years to construct a softball pitch or whatever. The Minister just took it, pulled the rug out from under our feet, took it away and left us nothing.

The Minister is also on record as saying that when we announced our new Regional Recreation Facilities Program, boy, it is going to be better; it is going to be more; we are going to be in a position to announce many, many more. Many, many times he said it. The previous Administration had issued the cheques for three.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The cheques were written but you did not deliver them.

MR. WINSOR:

Did not deliver them? No, the Premier would not allow you to mail them. This Administration is now saying that they are going to approve two. Now, even the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture would know that three is more than two. We had approved three programs. The Minister will announce two. Now simple mathematics tells you that three is more than two. Now, how is that going to be many, many more programs? Besides that, the Minister is also putting the stipulation that it can only be \$1.5 million. Mr. Speaker is not in the Chair now, but if the Speaker was here he might know that his application from Bonavista North, I think, might have been in the range of something in excess of \$2 million. That is why the Speaker was hoping I would ask the question for him this morning; he had to beg the Government to be silent so he could hear the Minister's answers. Probably the Speaker has not been told the details of the program.

My good friend for Pleasantville was on the elevator this morning and he asked me, what is the Minister going to do with recreation announcements? Put an

ear in. I cannot get any information from him. He comes to me about twice a week to find out what is going on with recreation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Member for where?

MR. WINSOR:

Pleasantville - he is looking for a stadium too, and I have more information than the Minister does, apparently, much like my colleague for Grand Bank seems to know more about what is going on in the fishery than the Minister.

MR. HODDER:

They are probably punishing the Member for Pleasantville for his stand on the Economic Recovery Commission.

MR. WINSOR:

That could very well be. Anyway, the Minister is not very forthcoming in his answers.

I think the last Department we looked at with the Minister was Housing. My colleague for Burin - Placentia West grilled the Minister, but he could not come up with very definitive answers of what was going on with housing. Do you know what his response was? Have a guess what he blamed it on?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

The Federal Government.

MR. WINSOR:

The Federal Government. 'Any cutbacks in Newfoundland and Labrador Housing is a result of cutbacks by the Federal Government.'

That will conclude my few brief remarks, and my colleague, the Member for Harbour Main, will, I am sure, continue. I left Labour

exclusively for him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Placentia.

MR. HOGAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am amazed, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was at the same Estimates Committee Meeting as the hon. Member, but I did not hear the same thing. As a matter of fact, he makes as much sense now as he did during the Estimates, no sense at all. I must say, though, he did, from time to time, ask some sensible questions, some concrete questions which were constructive, but only every now and then, and it was seldom.

MR. SIMMS:

Does he question him on the year-round service?

MR. HOGAN:

Yes.

MR. SIMMS:

He was right. And the Minister skated around it.

MR. HOGAN:

Again, as I said, most of his remarks were stupid, anyway.

Mr. Speaker, we examined, as others have already said, the Department of Finance, Employment and Labour Relations, Municipal Affairs, and Transportation. I am going to address the subject of Transportation, probably better and more at length sometime next week when I speak in the Budget Debate.

However, in dealing with the subjects examined, I must say,

most Members, most of the time, our Members, acted sensibly and asked the right questions, and the Ministers excelled in giving their answers, and put on a good question/answer period.

Mr. Speaker, I must add, in the last session, where we dealt with Municipal and Provincial Affairs, the hon. the Member for Port au Port did an excellent job of chairing a very difficult meeting. We had the hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West - I am sorry he is not in his seat today - excel in all disruptions, all other interference, all other rhetoric that he ever put on in this House of Assembly; he outdid himself that night, so much so that I thought he was going to pass out on us. Unfortunately, he was not feeling well that evening anyway, and because of this concern, I had to speak to him on several occasions to try to cool him down. There is something wrong with the man, at least, that evening there was, and I suggest the next time he comes to something on Municipal Affairs, he take a tranquillizer or something, and an injection of common sense. Because he was on subjects which had nothing at all to do with the Budget, had nothing to do with the Estimates that were in front of him, nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not true! Not true!

MR. FUREY:

Yes, it is true. Very true.

MR. HOGAN:

They were talking about hypothetical situations, philosophical situations which did not even apply to the Budget.

Getting back to the Estimates, the

first group we heard from was the Minister of Finance and his colleagues. The Minister of Finance, as he did on Budget day, Mr. Speaker, answered all questions that were put to him in a forthright manner, truthfully and with a great deal of knowledge, supported by his colleagues. And, as on Budget day, they were amazed that the Minister of Finance could deliver such a Budget under the circumstances.

Under Manpower and Employment -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Employment and Labour Relations.

MR. HOGAN:

Employment and Labour Relations, my prompter here tells me. I have to say about this Minister, Mr. Speaker, in all my long years of association with Occupational Health and Safety, and I have heard this from people who are in the profession, this is the best Minister for Occupational Health and Safety who has ever held that office, with no disrespect for my hon. friend from Harbour Main, who tried, but knowing so little about the subject, he never even took the interest.

MR. DOYLE:

I was only in the Department one month.

MR. HOGAN:

That was a month too long. You did more damage in a month than all of your predecessors did in seventeen years.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I have heard from people who are in the profession, the employers and, indeed, from Labour, that the Minister has demonstrated her interest. As a matter of fact,

she was the only Minister to ever attend the Advisory Board's meetings, and she has been at three of them already, I think. It was never before heard of, that a Minister attended any of these meetings, and it is the Minister's Committee, an Advisory Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The previous Minister did not go to any meetings.

MR. HOGAN:

He did not even know where the meetings were held; he did not know who was on his Advisory Board.

Mr. Speaker, together with that, the Minister, as was indicated in our discussions, has undertaken reorganization of that particular department. The plans I have heard discussed are pretty preliminary at the moment, but are looking very good for the Occupational Health and Safety field.

I would also mention that I hear my hon. friend for Harbour Main jump to his feet every now and then and berate the Minister about the terrible labour situation, the strife in labour in the Province. It was never so quiet before. It has not been this quiet in ten or fifteen years.

Municipal Affairs: The Minister of Municipal Affairs came to a meeting with quite a number of his officials. He has a large department. And I have to say this, that even I was surprised at the knowledge, and the indepth answers the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs could give to questions which were put to him.

MR. RAMSAY:

Without any help.

MR. HOGAN:

Without any help, despite what our friend over there is saying. As a matter of fact, he knew some things about Municipal Affairs that I did not even know, and I thought I had researched the subjects I questioned him on pretty good.

At this time, I would also like to advise the House that as a result of representations from myself and the Mayors in the Placentia inter-town area, the area known as the north side of Argentia industrial park is going to be included in the amalgamation hearings which will be held next week, and that augers well for the Placentia inter-town area. I would suspect that before the end of the year we will see a movement towards amalgamation in the Placentia inter-town area. I would like to thank the Minister publicly for listening to the sound advice put forth by this hon. Member, and the sound advice of the Mayors in the inter-town area.

There is one part of the Estimates this year I must say I was some what disappointed in. On behalf of Members opposite, particularly my good friend from Labrador West, I have made suggestions and representation in support of continuing the air support subsidy to that particular region. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, hon. Members across do not even realize that I was one of the architects of that program.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) with the Federation.

MR. HOGAN:

No, before that. Back in 1966-67, when it was first introduced. When it was introduced, it was

introduced with a philosophy that would address the concerns of travelling athletes, I guess you would call them, and sports organizations to and from Labrador. I think it was in the early 1970's that the Administration of that particular day - where you in office then?

MR. SIMMS:
The Tories, yes.

MR. HOGAN:
The Tories were in office then. I figured that. They started to whittle away at it, until, the last couple of years, it was almost destroyed altogether. The cost of the -

MR. SIMMS:
I increased it when I was Minister.

MR. HOGAN:
You tried to do away with it, until the Sports Federation got on your case. You tried to pull it out, and there was a big fuss in the press.

MR. SIMMS:
I was the one who increased it.

MR. HOGAN:
Well, it was either you or leader number one, when he was there.

MR. SIMMS:
I increased it by \$50,000.

AN HON. MEMBER:
It must have been leader number one.

MR. HOGAN:
Leader number one, was it? Well, I do not know who succeeded whom. Who succeeded whom?

The hon. Leader number one, or the hon. Leader number two was Minister of that particular

Department at the time. Anyway, they did away with it, and it was pressure from the Sports Federation at the time, of which I was happened to be a Member of the Executive, which argued the case very well and it was reinstated. But even after that, Mr. Speaker, it was whittled away.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
(Inaudible) sensible question -

MR. HOGAN:
Okay. I will have to withdraw, Mr. Speaker, because I think it was after the Minister's term of office in recreation.

MR. SIMMS:
I increased it.

MR. HOGAN:
Yes, and the year after that it was wiped out. So, he was quite easily able to increase it.

MR. SIMMS:
We wiped it out?

MR. HOGAN:
Yes.

MR. SIMMS:
You wiped it out this year.

MR. HOGAN:
No, it is not. It is still on the books.

MR. SIMMS:
What is?

MR. HOGAN:
The travel subsidy.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

MR. HOGAN:
By leave?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, we questioned the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations on a number of different occasions in this House with respect to her plans for employment generation in the Province, and we questioned the Minister in the examination of her Estimates as well, about her plans in a whole range of areas as it pertained to her Department.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, and I am trying to be kind to the Minister, that I was extremely disappointed with the Minister's performance in the examination of her Estimates. We thought we would get some good, meaningful comeback, some good, meaningful answers from the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations as to what her plans were for employment generation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I heard she did a great job.

MR. DOYLE:

No, she did not do a great job. I am trying to be kind to the Minister. She did a very, very poor job this year in defending her Estimates. We questioned the Minister, as I have said, in a whole range of areas as it pertains to employment generation in the Province, but we did not get too many satisfactory answers from the Minister; we did not get any answers as to what her plans were to try to address the growing unemployment rate in Newfoundland which, in some communities, especially in my own District and in the Minister's own District, and certainly parts of Newfoundland where we have an unemployment rate of somewhere up

around 70 per cent. We asked the Minister what her plans were to address these problems in light of the fact that the unemployment rate in Newfoundland is going to get worse and worse as time goes on, and it is going to get worse as time goes on because we now have a downturn in the fishery occurring and you are going to have many, many more fish plants in Newfoundland closed up. We asked the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations what her plans were to address that very, very serious situation that is going to be occurring, but we did not get any concrete plans from the Minister as to what she intended to do. That is very, very disappointing, Mr. Speaker.

We questioned the Minister, as well, on occupational health and safety; we questioned her on Labour legislation, especially as it pertains to Bill 59, pay equity and double-breasting. Again, we did not get any concrete plans from the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations as to what she intends to do to address those particular concerns of the Labour movement out there.

Before we get along to Labour legislation, let us talk about the Minister's employment generation program and what the Government has done with respect to employment generation in the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the former Government, and I hate to keep talking about former Governments and what their employment efforts were about, but I cannot let the opportunity pass to point out to the Minister once again that when the new Administration took office, the people in Newfoundland and Labrador were expecting the

Administration to focus in, if you will, on employment generation. We have a new Department created. It was not to be known as the Department of Labour alone. Now it had a new focus. It was to be called the Department of Employment and Labour Relations, so we are all led to believe that the focus of that particular Department's efforts would be employment generation. I do not believe anybody in the Province really blames the Government for cutting out the previous employment program. I do not believe anybody at the time really blamed the Government for doing that. Why? Because they were a new Administration and everyone was expecting the new Government to want to put its own particular seal of approval on its own employment generation program. So it was of no great surprise to anyone when that particular program was cut out.

But what we were expecting, Mr. Speaker, what the people of the Province were expecting, was a big bang from the new Administration, a big bang with respect to what they would come in with to address the unemployment problems in the Province; they would be coming back with a program much better than the program they were cutting out. Now, the program the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations axed when she came into that Department was worth in the neighbourhood of approximately \$7 to \$8 million.

The Minister can deny it all she wants, but that program created in the neighbourhood of 2,700 to 3,000 jobs per year. We were expecting the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations to come back with her own employment program which would not only be

equal to, but which would be much better than the previous Government's employment program.

But, what did we see, Mr. Speaker? We saw the Minister come back with an employment program not worth \$7 or \$8 million, which everyone expected, not worth \$6, \$5, or \$4 million, or even \$3 million, we saw the Minister come back with a program, announced sometime in January I believe, which was worth \$2.9 million. What has that program done to date, Mr. Speaker? We are told it created anywhere between 600 and 800 jobs. That was the great program that replaced the former Government's employment generation program which was worth \$7 million, and created from 2,700 to 3,000 jobs per year. Mr. Speaker, the Government's efforts, and the Minister's efforts in creating employment in Newfoundland has reached an all-time low, and the Government should be ashamed. The Government should be ashamed that they would come in with an employment program worth \$2.9 million, after cutting out a program which was worth \$7 million and created 3,000 jobs a year. The Minister should be ashamed to travel around the Province to talk to the unemployed people in Newfoundland, when she axed a program which was creating the number of jobs it created, and then come in and create a program that comes up with 500 or 600 jobs a year. She should be ashamed to do it. That has been the sum total of the Government's efforts so far over the last year. We have a report card being presented today on the Government's great initiatives over the last twelve month period.

Certainly, one of the most important areas of concern in

Newfoundland has to be employment. When you have an unemployment rate as serious as it is in this Province, then the focus of Government's attention has to be on the creation of employment opportunities for people.

As I said to the Minister in the examination of her Estimates, the unemployment rate in Newfoundland is going to get much worse than it is today. I think we can all be in general agreement on that. It is going to get much worse.

DR. KITCHEN:

Do you know why?

MR. DOYLE:

Why? The Minister of Finance wants to know why the unemployment rate in Newfoundland is going to get worse than it is. I do not know where the Minister of Finance has been over the last year. We have fish plants closing down all over the Province, and that is going to continue to happen. I was surprised the other day, Mr. Speaker, when I was driving in from Avondale, at 9 o'clock - I believe it was on Monday morning. Somebody called into an Open Line program - I wish the Member for Bonavista South was here, because somebody called into the Open Line program, from Bonavista, and I could not believe what he said. He was talking about employment opportunities in Newfoundland. He said, since December, four months ago, 300 people have moved from the Bonavista area. Now that is hard to believe, I know. I do not know if he said the District of Bonavista South or the District of Bonavista North, but he said 300 people had moved in that four month period.

That is a little bit difficult to

believe, but the fact of the matter is it was said, and I would imagine the same thing can be said for a whole lot of areas in Newfoundland the people are moving out, looking for employment. So that is why it is disappointing to see that the focus of the Government's attention has not been to date on the creation of employment opportunities in Newfoundland and Labrador. That is really, really disappointing. So we are hoping, and lo and behold a couple of days ago we saw the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations drop a real bombshell here in the House a couple of days ago, I did not pursue it, not all that much, but it was a real bombshell that the Minister of Employment landed in the House the other day.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No new money.

MR. DOYLE:

Under questioning she stood up and she told the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that there will be no new money for employment generation this year.

AN HON. MEMBER:

All spent.

MR. DOYLE:

All spent. The \$2.9 million is gone and there will be no new monies for employment generation this year. That is absolutely unbelievable.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

The hon. the Member for Placentia.

MR. HOGAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to finish off the few remarks that I started on and I was speaking of recreation, my hon. friend for Fogo was so quick to complain about the program that was introduced by the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. I think my association with recreation and municipal projects over the years was probably the best capital philosophical approach to recreation since, in my memory anyway - and that is a long term program instituted by the municipalities themselves, who should be the standard bearers when it comes to recreation and development. And the program, Mr. Speaker, allows the municipalities long term financing with the greater portion of it borne by the Province. And it is in conjunction with and co-operates with and is compatible to the programs that municipalities already participate in.

So I look forward to a lot of the regions in the Province, who are now without regional facilities and without major recreational facilities, to be able to participate in this program, and I hope that it works so well that the Government can see fit to expand it where many more projects can be introduced over the years. I would reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that it is probably the best capital works philosophy that has ever been taken when it comes to the development of recreation facilities.

I would just like to make a brief reference to what my hon. friend for Harbour Main was saying on the Employment Program: if one were to sit down and take note of it that it triples in net value the amount of money that is inserted by the Government of Newfoundland as

opposed to the program that they had in - it was only doubled and open to abuse, and indeed was abused.

On transportation, Mr. Speaker, and I will not pay too much attention to the subject of the Argenticia ferry this morning, I will leave that for some day next week when I get an opportunity to speak in the Budget debate. But I would say this, that for those over there, those opponents, and there are only half of them over there, not half of them who are opposed to the Argenticia year round service.

AN HON. MEMBER:
The Premier is.

MR. HOGAN:
I am talking about you over there. This crowd over here are all right. I am looking after them.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What about your colleague?

MR. HOGAN:
My colleague is not against the Argenticia ferry service, Mr. Speaker. But I did have the opportunity to appear on Cross Talk the other morning and I must say I was very gratified to hear the Mayor of the City of St. John's supporting the Argenticia year round service, and the one call, in particular, that came in came in from a truck driver who really got at the nuts and bolts of providing year round service into Argenticia. And it is a matter of record the approach the man took, highway safety, risk not only to the truck drivers, but to the travelling public in other ways and the speedy delivery of goods to the Province that would not be to the detriment, and he

explained it quite adequately, he being experienced in the business, how Port aux Basques would not be hurt. And the opponents of the Argentinia year round service, Mr. Speaker, do not talk with substance, they talk with emotion about the loss of jobs. The study that was done on that particular project by the Federal Government in the Minister's own report, indicates that there is no serious loss of jobs, indeed there is no serious loss of jobs in St. John's. If there is any loss, it is marginal. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do want to get into that argument. My time is limited, and I just want to briefly refer to the other Department that we dealt with and that was the Department of Works, Services and Transportation.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. HOGAN:
I do not have time for cracks. My hon. colleague wants me to crack, but I cannot crack, I will have to leave it until next week. He wants me to start talking about Bev's Dip, I do not have the time this morning to talk about Bev's Dip.

In the Estimates provided by the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, we covered such subjects as highway construction and maintenance, and I might also add that the \$104 million that has been spent by this Government this year in capital works, that has been already announced - and a good deal of it is going to be underway on time this summer, rather than waiting for the fall, as was usually done, when half the jobs did not get finished - is probably the greatest amount that has been spent, in memory.

The ferry service operations throughout the Province that has been so admirably addressed by the Budget this year, and assistance to the users and participants of that, and the new program introduced, dealing with motor registration, whereby there is greater convenience for members of the public and licence holders being able to pay their fees other than coming into Mount Pearl.

MR. EFFORD:
Tell them about the building hidden away in Mount Pearl that is accessible to the people.

MR. HOGAN:
Well, we had to introduce it because they could not find it, where it was hidden away in Mount Pearl; that is why we have to be able to pay it at banks. It is taken off the main thoroughfare.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:
The Motor Registration Building.

AN HON. MEMBER:
But where it is located.

AN HON. MEMBER:
A perfect location.

MR. HOGAN:
Mr. Speaker, there are many other improvements that were addressed in the Estimates, improvements to leasing services, the downsizing of the fleet, which is an economic drag and a financial drag on our resources, that was quite adequately addressed. And, I must say, the Minister covered a lot of subjects, the airstrip operations, the air ambulance, the coastal service, vehicle fleet management, the new signs to be introduced for highway information along the

highways of our Province, which will be a great asset to the travelling public and tourists alike, Mr. Speaker. All in all, Mr. Speaker, the hearings I participated in, except for the one instance where my good friend from Burin - Placentia West lost his cool -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Was that the Tory friend?

MR. HOGAN:

Oh, yes. Well, I had to help him out. In Transportation, too, the Minister was able to rise, and seeing I had so much input in it, and encouragement, was able to put that road into Petit Forte. I was glad to be of assistance to my friend from Burin - Placentia West. Although he is on the other side of the House and he is misled into believing Tory philosophy and having to practice it, we, in the Placentia Bay area have to stick together, Mr. Speaker, and look after the people out there, and I was glad to be of assistance to him in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, the sessions were very informative, very worthwhile exercises and I guess, except for the few moments of - I do not know how best to describe it.

Oh, yes, but they are so incapable of looking after themselves that every now and then, we have to step in and help them out.

MR. EFFORD:

Like the old fellow in Port de Grave said, 'I voted Tory once in my lifetime. I hope God will forgive me!'

MR. HOGAN:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, that concludes my remarks on the Budget Estimates I participated in.

I would like to thank hon. Members who served, even though Members on the other side of the House, and one fellow was out of hand once in a while. The questioning went well, it was constructive, and I would like to thank the Members for their co-operation with this speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, just before I sat down, we were talking about the Employment Generation Program and the Government's plans for the creation of employment over the next number of months in Newfoundland. As I said the Minister walked into the House last week with a real bombshell when she announced to the people in Newfoundland and Labrador that there would be no new monies put into the Employment Generation Program to address the very serious problem of unemployment that we have.

I do not know what the Minister intends to do, and hopefully if she stands in her place today to speak, she will lay out some kind of a plan as to what Government is going to do. With all that money now used up, and the unemployment rate continuing to rise in the Province, and going to get worse with the downturn in the fishery, hopefully she will be able to announce to us today, or next week sometime, what her plans are to address that very serious problem. I cannot believe that the \$2.9 million, which is already used up, that there is not going to be any further funding put into Employment Generation Programs. That is hard to believe considering the fact, as I said,

that we had an employment program worth about \$7 million.

I do not know if the Minister is going to buy tickets for the people of the Province to ship them off to the Mainland, but I would call upon the Minister to go to her Cabinet colleagues and to make them aware, if they are not already aware, they should be aware, go to her Cabinet colleagues and beg, if need be, to have some further funding put into that program, so that we can create a few more jobs and keep a few more people here in the Province. We are losing people by the plane load, every single day heading off to the Mainland looking for the chance to go to work. Cutting the Employment Generation Program is certainly not consistent with the Government's election promises, where we would be bringing people home from the Mainland to go to work. Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Minister to go to her Cabinet colleagues and see what she can do to get some further funding put into that program, some badly needed funding.

We questioned the Minister on a whole range of areas in her estimates. Occupational Health and Safety was brought up a few minutes ago by the Member for Placentia and I believe the remark he made was that the current Minister of Employment and Labour Relations has to be the very best Minister that the Province has ever had with respect to occupational health and safety. Well, I would love to support that. I would really like to be able to support that. I do not know if the Member for Placentia was in the House last week, but if he was he would not make the type of statement that he made.

Last Friday morning we had the Minister of Health walk into the House with a statement on behalf of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations proclaiming Health and Safety Week, or something coming up, which was Monday past, I believe, Health and Safety Day.

AN HON. MEMBER:

When is that?

MR. DOYLE:

In June. That was proclaimed for June.

At the same time the Minister of Health was making that statement on behalf of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, the Minister of Employment was out at a convention in Gander talking to 400 delegates telling them that she had taken \$40,000, I do not know if she told them there at the convention, but certainly they learned, of the Government taking \$40,000 from the Occupational Health and Safety Budget. The future of Health and Safety Boards jeopardized by cuts of \$40,000.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is wrong.

MR. DOYLE:

That is wrong, is it? Well, maybe when the Member gets up to speak he can tell us where that is wrong. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, he will have a chance. So, while the Minister of Health was making that statement on behalf of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, the Minister of Labour was out talking to 400 delegates in Gander trying to explain why she cut \$40,000 from the budget of Occupational Health and Safety.

MR. DOYLE:

So that was the sum total, Mr. Speaker, of the Government's commitment to occupational health and safety in the Province this year, one that was supported loudly a couple of minutes ago by the Member for Placentia.

So, Mr. Speaker, we questioned the Minister in a whole range of areas. Bill 59 was one area that we got into as well. I found it a little bit unbelievable the statements the Minister made with respect to Bill 59 that evening, and I suspect it was probably a mistake that the Minister had made. When we questioned her as to when that legislation might be brought in, the Minister told us that it could be a three or even a four year period before - no that was not Bill 59, I think that was pay equity, we questioned the Minister on that night.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. DOYLE:
But legislation with respect to pay equity is what we questioned the Minister of Employment on that night.

MS VERGE:
What did they promise during the campaign?

MR. DOYLE:
That is a very good point. The Member for Humber East says 'What did they promise during the campaign?' Well that is there for everyone to see, Mr. Speaker, what the Government promised during the election campaign with respect to labour legislation, especially as it pertains to pay equity. And the Government has certainly fallen far-short of keeping their promises on pay equity, on Bill 59, and a whole range of areas.

The Government has fallen far-short of fulfilling their election promises this term.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. DOYLE:
Now this was called the Liberal plan to make a real change.

MS VERGE:
A glossy, full cover brochure.

MR. DOYLE:
Yes, it was that. It was a very expensive brochure. And the Government -

MR. SIMMS:
Money well spent obviously.

MR. DOYLE:
The Government singled out labour as being one area that they were very, very anxious to address.

MS VERGE:
Was Meech Lake there, by the way?

MR. DOYLE:
And what did they say, Mr. Speaker, a Liberal Government will create an atmosphere of rational co-operation in developing labour legislation and in dealing with public service unions.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Precisely what is being done.

MR. SIMMS:
Develop progressive and fair legislation to deal with double-breasting, industrial standards, minimum wage and pay equity.

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is what we are doing.

MR. DOYLE:
Now, Mr. Speaker, when we

questioned the Minister on pay equity during her Estimates, she told us that quite possibly we may not see any legislation on pay equity for maybe three, I think, the term she used was 'three or four years.' 'For three or four years we may not see any legislation on pay equity.'

And only a couple of days ago, we addressed a question to the Minister on that, and the President of Treasury Board answered it, but really did not answer it to the satisfaction of the labour movement out there who are wondering if there will be legislation on pay equity. The Minister stood and he danced around it quite effectively saying well, we are still in the consultative mode, we are still talking to the unions. And on a supplementary we questioned the Minister again as to whether or not there would be legislation on pay equity? And the Minister still danced around it, and said essentially nothing. He said essentially nothing. He would not give a commitment as to whether or not there would be a bill -

MR. SIMMS:
Wishy-washy!

MR. DOYLE:
- giving effect to pay equity.

So I would suspect now that what the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations told us in the examination of her estimates was a little bit closer to being accurate than what we thought at the time. We thought that maybe the Minister had made a mistake. That it was only a slip of the tongue, if you will, that she really did not know what she was talking about on that one, but I suspect the Minister knew quite

well what she was talking about, that there could be three or four years before the Government gets around to introducing legislation on pay equity. I hope I am wrong, and I will be very, very please to say that I am wrong if I am. Quite possibly the Minister blurted something out that night that was closer to being accurate than anyone realized at the time.

MR. SIMMS:
Did the Premier rap her knuckles when she said she had no money for job creation?

MR. DOYLE:
I think the Premier was visibly disturbed at the time, that the Minister would say there was going to be no new money going into employment generation. Again, I believe the main problem with this Minister of Employment and Labour Relations is probably she is too forthright and she tells the truth when she gets up to the best of her ability. The other day she told it again. She got up and she said, there will be no new monies, instead of saying, well, I will be approaching the Government to find out if we can put any additional money into employment generation.

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

MR. DOYLE:
She got up and she told it as it was, that there would be no new money for employment generation.

MR. SPEAKER:
Before I recognize the hon. Minister of Employment and Labour Relations I would like to welcome on behalf of hon. Members twenty-seven level one students from the T. A. Lynch High School in Catalina, Port Union, accompanied by their teachers

Wayne Fry and Isaac Norman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am very pleased to be able to rise today to respond to some of the comments made by my critic, and by other hon. Members of the Opposition. I find the comments so interesting on the Industrial Association for Occupational Health and Safety that was held in Gander a little while ago, and how I have taken away this \$40,000 from the poor things. I want to tell you that I never had a better reception anyway than when I went to that convention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

They know how that \$40,000 was spent in the past, and they know that their association is going to be strengthened by this particular move of Government, because it is now going to involve, hopefully, a response that comes from the pocketbook of the industries that are involved, and perhaps from the unions that are involved as well, and Government will play its part as we should, the three parties together, Government, employers, and labour. We will still be putting our bit into it, and providing consultation and so on: I was surprised when I sat there and was introduced by the President of the group. He said I was the first Minister to have been there in eight years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

Now, I thought to myself, that cannot be possible, because I am sure I heard of a Minister going out to that group before. Well, apparently a few of them use to drop in to the hospitality suite, and I understand a considerable amount of that \$40,000 went into hospitality suites. We need occupational health and safety inspectors in this Province. But that is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that the past Government was very, very good at, and that is hospitality. I appreciated it myself on several occasions when I was President of the Newfoundland Teachers Association. I appreciated the hospitality, I must say, of that particular Government.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to take any credit myself for the highlighting of occupational health and safety, because I do this with the complete support of everyone on this side of the House. People certainly were not aware, and as Minister it was my role to point out to them, the inadequacies in that particular division, but once I did they certainly gave me their complete support. That particular division is now being evaluated and we hope to be able, over the next year or so, to start delivering an adequate occupational health and safety program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

I was absolutely and totally amazed that I came into this House day, after day, after day and

nobody, not one single Member on that side of the House, and from an area of the Province that is represented by Progressive Conservatives, nobody has ever asked me a question about safety at St. Lawrence mines.

When I came into the office of this particular Ministry the Minister of Energy and I decided that we would start visiting some of the mines in the Province because mines are an area where there is a lot of problems with safety. It just is part and parcel of the underground mining business. So, where did we go first? We went to St. Lawrence. I met with everybody I could down there who was associated with the mine along with the Minister of Mines and Energy. Do you know that one of the workers said to me, he had tears in his eyes, he could not believe that two Cabinet Ministers, two, would come to St. Lawrence when they had never seen one in his lifetime before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:
That is what I was told.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) signed an agreement and kept St. Lawrence alive.

MS COWAN:
I do not know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
(Inaudible).

MS COWAN:
I am only quoting what I heard. I did not check it out when I came back as I did regarding the Gander business.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You do not know what you are talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is right.

MS COWAN:
That very same individual I met at the industrial conference out in Gander last week said that he could not believe the change in attitude of that company towards occupational health and safety.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:
And as an aside I might also add, just in praise of my own Government, that he could not believe what the Liberal Government has done for the town of St. Lawrence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:
Now, let me just make a few comments about - I do not know, my critic over there, the hon. Member for Harbour Main gave me so much to respond to I may have to get up several times before this is over. But anyway, I am going to comment for just a minute on Labour relations.

Now I talk to heads of unions. That may come as a surprise to people across the way, but we converse and we chat. And I was introduced recently at a conference by the President of the Federation of Labour and in his introducing of me commented on the former Government and said they were the most arrogant employer that this Province had ever known. And yet, I had to sit there that night at the Estimates Committee and listen to these

sanctimonious sort of questions coming from the hon. the Member for Harbour Main as if they had had every answer to Labour Relations. And I know because I talked to those leaders. What they have said to him when he has called up and said, 'You know, is there anything you would like me to bring up in the House about Labour Relations.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

In fact the hon. Member for Harbour Main is so concerned, not only about his role as a critic, but about his re-election in his own District. I noticed the other day driving to Seal Cove he has left up a sign from the last election just so the people will kind of see his face and, you know, keep him in mind when the next time comes around and hopefully vote for him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Way to go Pat.

MS COWAN:

It is a problem. Labour Relations is a problem in this Province, and I am sorry that I do not have the answers to every problem in one year. It would be nice. And I certainly am working on it with the help of my colleagues, and with the help of the people in the Province. All the groups that are affected, the union companies, the non-unionized companies, the unions, the people who are not members of unions, the public at large, all these groups have to be considered and consulted. You do not just go in and wave a magic wand and come up with wonderful

solutions, if I could do that I would be making lots of bucks in labour relations somewhere. We have to work towards these things steadily and in a considered fashion.

How much time do I have left?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MS COWAN:

Now I want to make reference to, Mr. Speaker, the Employment Program. How obsessed these people are with statistics? How many jobs did you create? I would like to know how many of the people they put into jobs are still there today?

AN HON. MEMBER:

None! None!

MS COWAN:

The fact is it is much better to get 500 people into the workplace and have them stay there than it is to get 7,000 or 8,000 in for ten or fourteen weeks or whatever, and have them all out again.

Now I find it interesting that they knew for one month, they actually knew for one month that there was no new money going into the Employment Generation Program, and they waited a month before they brought it up in the House. Now is that concern? They knew about it for one month before I was asked a question about it in the House? Now I am sorry that we did not have more money to put into that particular Employment Generation Program, everybody over here is sorry. But as has been said many, many times our Government has its priorities. We know where we are going. We know what we are doing. We have vision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

We were all very, very disappointed. This program appears to be working well, and I am sure if the money is available down the road it will be put back into the program or into something similar that will serve the needs of the people of this Province.

I often wonder how their Cabinet worked, you know?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MS COWAN:

By the comments that are made about she, she, she, she, as if it belonged to me, the Employment and Labour Relations was mine, that it did not have anything to do with anybody else. You know, when we go into Cabinet, we are not bullies or we do not make deals with each other. We try to do what is the best thing for the people in this Province.

We did the best we could. An excellent Budget, well received by everybody everywhere. I am proud of my budget in Employment and Labour Relations; I am proud of what the Government decided would go into my particular Department, and I know the Cabinet is ready to listen to anything I should bring in the future. I do not have to beg to be heard in Cabinet. We are all respected individuals. We are listened to. Nobody in our Cabinet begs to be heard.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

AN HON. MEMBER:

The old anti-confederate.

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not even going to touch on that today, the anti-confederate aspect of it, but when I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, how pleased I am I lived in the era of 1934 to 1949, when we had Commission of Government, how pleased I am today to be able to get up and speak to the Commission of Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

That is what it is. I hear the Minister talking about what goes on in Cabinet. What goes on in Cabinet has no bearing on what transpires within the Province, it is dictated to by Dr. House. You are only victims. You have no say in Cabinet. You talked about what went on behind the scenes in the last Cabinet. I was only there for a couple of months, but let me tell you something, let me tell the hon. Minister that it was democracy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

No, it was not. There were twenty-odd, and rightly so, Cabinet Ministers who stood on their own two feet, who were elected by the people to represent them, not some doctor brought in to run the Government. Overall, all you people have to adhere to

the doctor's rulings or the doctor's law and regulations. Dr. House - this is Commission of Government. So, since you sort of riled me up by talking about me being an anti-confederate, which I am very proud of - I am not today. I was an anti-Confederate.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What? You were proud of it?

MR. PARSONS:

Yes. Yes. That is the kind of liberty we had. We were never downtrodden, we were never pushed down by some doctor up there in an office. Unlike today, we were free people. Our Freedom is being lost by that side of the House, when duly elected Members of the House of Assembly do not make the rules, do not bring in the legislation. They are being dictated to. They are told what to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have to get on to another little bit of our Confederation bit. It is a wonder the Minister did not get up this morning and say blame it on Ottawa. Blame it on Ottawa. That is their theme over there. I was surprised the other day when I heard the Premier stand on his feet and lambaste, kick the hon. John Crosbie in the rear. Glory be, Mr. Speaker, a better man never went anywhere to represent Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

I was listening to the Open Line Program yesterday morning and the question was asked, Is he getting on the nerves of most Canadians, because in every meeting held in Cabinet he is so strong for Newfoundland and Labrador that

other constituents cannot get a word in edgewise? Is that the same person about whom the Premier gets on his feet and says, old Crosbie! he is doing nothing. He never did anything. Ah, he never did anything. Look at what he is doing for the Bell Island people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. PARSONS:

Oh, I know when I am touching a sore spots. Sure I do. Imagine the nerve, the audacity of the Premier to stand in his place and rake down one of the most prominent Newfoundlanders, one of our best individuals, one of our best representatives. It is a shame, a shame, a shame! He should come in and apologize, the same as he should have apologized yesterday.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A despicable performance.

MR. PARSONS:

A despicable performance, if there ever was one.

Mr. Speaker, all Newfoundlanders are waiting in anticipation of Monday's announcement by the hon. John Crosbie and Ross Reid, who is not as well known, but is just as good in the Federal scheme of things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. PARSONS:

Yes. And the Provincial Government are really worked up. They are all amazed that the Federal Government did not come down and tell them what they are going to do. They are kicking the Federal Government in every way they can, and they expect them to

come down then with a platitude and say, 'Oh, my, we do not mind what you are doing and saying. Here is the money. You spend it at will.' But they are not going to do that. I mean, the hon. John Crosbie and Ross Reid and the rest of the representatives we have in that Federal Government, they would not do that. They could not do that, Mr. Speaker. How could they?

Mr. Speaker, I am now going to have to touch on something which is nearer to home, amalgamation. Where is the amalgamator? Eric the amalgamator, come in 'til I have a word with you. He tried amalgamation. Look, he and the Minister of Finance are in cahoots. The Minister of amalgamation, the old amalgamator, wanted everyone to amalgamate so he could bring enough communities together for the old Minister of Finance to tax them with his payroll tax. Then the Minister said, we have no money for Flatrock, we have no money for Pouch Cove, we have no money for Torbay, Outer Cove, Middle Cove, and Logy Bay. Wedgewood Park did not want anything, they are self-sufficient.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Pouch Cove and Shoe Cove.

MR. PARSONS:

No, it is not Pouch Cove and Shoe Cove. You are wrong. They amalgamated and they are one name now, Pouch Cove.

MR. WALSH:

They amalgamated, did they?

MR. PARSONS:

Oh, yes. It was not forced down their throat by the last Government, they did it on their own. Democratically, they

amalgamated. Now, let me say what the Minister did, the Minister of Amalgamation, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, let me say what he has done. When he was first elected he came into the House and wanted to create a great big city, a city as big as Toronto, but, like the Minister of Finance, he did not realize what he was trying to create the big city from. There are only 560,000 of us, so we could not create the big city. We were spread over too great an area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. PARSONS:

I told you about the freedom part of it. All Newfoundland would have to be brought into the super city, so what did we talk about?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is too much disorder from Members on my left.

MR. PARSONS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I do not mind an hon. Member, but when it gets down to six or seven, seven or eight, that becomes all too disorderly.

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I really appreciate you being in the Chair, Mr. Speaker. You always come to my defence and protects me from this crowd across

the way. There is only one thing I have to say to most of those young fellows across the way this morning. When you have harrowed what I have plowed, then I will certainly sit down and let you stand in your place. Until that day arrives, then be seated and be quiet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Let us get back to the Minister of Amalgamation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Get to the substance of your speech, now.

MR. PARSONS:

I will tell you the substance of my speech. He then, or the people in his office, tried to blackmail the people of Flatrock. He said, we will give out \$55 million with no restrictions, but if you want to have capital funding, then you must do what I say, you have to bring in a mil rate of thirteen mils.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not true.

MR. PARSONS:

The Minister knows what I am saying is true. If that is not hypocrisy, if that is not, Mr. Speaker, tell me what is. But the Flatrock Town Council said, Glory be! in this day in age, are we to be subjected to this? and they refused. They said, no. And thank God for their deliverance. They could not accept that, because the people just could not afford it. It is as simple as that. They could not afford that mil rate. If they had, would it not be great for the Minister to be able to get up next year and

say, you must do it, Port de Grave, you must do it. They would have set a precedent that was going to be the tax rate for all Newfoundland, all the rural areas. All you fellows over there should be on your knees thanking the Council of Flatrock for not being hoodwinked by this Minister.

MR. WARREN:

How about sharing your (inaudible)?

MR. PARSONS:

Since the hon. the Minister of Education brought it up, yes, I have to address that as well. You know, I am glad you hon. Members over there remind me of some of the things -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

No, I would not mind addressing it. I am solidly behind the school system we have, the denominational education system, so there is no need of ever asking me again. I am solidly behind that - Am! Am! Am! There is one school which does not need sharing, but we have between 16 per cent and 20 per cent in areas which do need sharing, sharing the facilities within a school, no matter what religion.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you support that?

MR. PARSONS:

Yes. On that 16 per cent or 20 per cent I will support that. Remember, that is not taking God from the schools.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

That has no bearing on it. I am

saying, and I said it before, Mr. Speaker, and I will say it again, that where the need arises, I will certainly say yes. There are areas where the school facilities should be shared, but remembering 86 per cent do not need it. That is ongoing, and it should be done.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Your time is up.

MR. PARSONS:

That is an ongoing Tory policy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is a Tory policy?

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, I know I only have a couple of minutes left, but when I see the hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, the old anti-St. John's Member, the old anti-St. John's Minister, down the drain with you if you come from St. John's, I cannot understand, when I look over there at all the St. John's Ministers, how they are letting him get away with it. He does not only portray it, he brings it out every day he can in the House: 'I am anti St. John's.' You hate St. John's, you have a hatred for it.

MR. TOBIN:

He hates Petit Forte.

MR. PARSONS:

Petit Forte! Only for John Crosbie forced you into that you would not have done anything with their road down there, either. But let me say that to you.

MR. GILBERT:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, John Crosbie forced you. The hon. John Crosbie told you. Now

let me say something to you about the Outer Ring Road. I cannot understand for the life of me how those Cabinet Ministers and Members from St. John's can sit in their places and let this Minister get away with it. Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before adjourning the House I would like to wish my colleagues on the other side of the House a very good weekend. I understand they are having their executive meeting in Marystown, so I would wish them every success in their deliberations this weekend, and assure them, Mr. Speaker, that in the democratic process, they serve a valuable function. That is why I wish them success in their meetings this weekend.

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Before I second the motion -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will not respond to his patronizing remarks. I know he is trying to get a little dig in there somehow or another. He is obviously trying to get some kind of a little dig in there.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, our Executive Council meeting will be held in two Districts, in Grand Bank District and in Burin - Placentia West. Nevertheless, forgetting all that it is a political matter, may I ask the Government House Leader what the plans are for, say, Monday and Tuesday of next week so we can have some idea and be able to prepare and plan, as we frequently do?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If we could stop the clock for a couple of minutes.

MR. SIMMS:

Agreed.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that my comments were meant in all sincerity, and I hope the Opposition House Leader does not try to find something that was patronizing or anything else. I did not mean it in that light.

Mr. Speaker on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, and the next Monday and Tuesday and so on, after we finish the hour and a half we have left of this particular Committee, we will be dealing with the Committee of

Supply in terms of the Executive Council Estimates. That is my intention for the next order of business.

MR. SIMMS:

So you will not be calling the Budget Debate for quite some time, then?

MR. BAKER:

Well, we will see how that goes, because we have to get through that.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, May 7, 1990, at 2:00 p.m.