



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 72

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Wednesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

7 November 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Oral Questions

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

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had a series of questions for the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, but in his absence I will put the questions to the Premier. The Premier might recall that on November 1, in response to a question from the Member for Kilbride with respect to snow clearing by the Department of Works, Services and Transportation, the Minister excused the feeble efforts of his Department just a few days before that, on the Northern Peninsula, by saying that it was the first snowfall and in essence they were not ready, and that is normal during the first snowfall.

Mr. Speaker, there was a second snowfall on October 29 and the same thing happened. There was a third snowfall on November 1 and they still were not ready. I want to ask the Premier if he can tell the House when the Minister and the Department are going to get their act together and be ready? Why are they still unprepared, when there have been three or four snowfalls in that part of the Province since the question was first posed in the House, and do we have to wait for serious accidents before the Government gets prepared for winter in Northern Newfoundland and Labrador?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I know we are a very powerful and capable group on this side but we really cannot control weather. The consequences of sudden weather change can cause driving conditions that can neither be predicted nor immediately dealt with in many circumstances. It is not unusual, it is characteristic of this part of the world. As a matter of fact, since last Thursday, which was, I believe, November 1, there have been 160 hours of overtime just in the Northern Peninsula division. I had it checked. The Minister who is the member for the district caused it to be checked, and he has confirmed the number for me. He told me about it last night, as a matter of fact. He gave me the figures last night, that there were 160 hours of overtime in that particular division.

Essentially, the system is not any different than the hon. members had in place. The superintendents have the authority to call out the equipment when the weather conditions require it. There is no intervention by the Government, or no restraint by the Government caused it. There has been no change. It is the peculiarity of a sudden change in temperature in those particular circumstances. At this particular time of the year it is not an unusual happening, and I do not see how the Opposition can make very much of it.

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is making nothing of it. It is the people who are living in those areas who are calling us and complaining. That is where the word is coming from.

Let me ask the Premier this, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that there were three significant snowfalls in that area of the Province three days in a row, why would it have been that on the third day, November 1, that at 11:30 in the morning the Northern Peninsula Highway still was not plowed and school buses could not take children to school? Why would that have been the case if the Department was prepared? And that was not a sudden change, that was three days in a row, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the detail to that question. But I am not the one-man show or the dictator that you want to say because I do not know this. Now, you have to make up your mind. You can have it one way or the other but not both, at least not at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, I will seek to obtain details as to exactly what happened in the last five or six days on the Great Northern Peninsula. But last night the Minister of Development told me that the problem was related to the peculiar weather circumstances at the time, and that in fact in that period 160 hours of overtime had been worked.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: How can ever that be?

Premier Wells: That is in addition to the regular time, do not forget. And they have full authority to call out as needed. There is no limitation by the Government.

Mr. Rideout: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, I would have asked the questions to the Minister, but I am sure for good reason he is not here. So I have no choice but pose the questions to the Leader of the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there were significant snowfalls on the Baie Verte Peninsula on Sunday and Monday of this week and there was no snow clearing until after midday each day, and do not ask me, I was there, Mr. Speaker, I drove those roads and went through it, in view of the fact that school buses did not get out on Monday morning, in view of the fact that there was no snow clearing from Avondale through to St. John's until 12:30 today, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier undertake to review what is happening to snow clearing all around the Province now, where we are starting to have difficulty with snow clearing and ice control, and stop the cutbacks and get on with providing services to the people of this Province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to have the hon. member's words misinterpreted by the people of this Province or have attributed to him in a day or two a misrepresentation. There are no cutbacks affecting snow clearing. None at all. So let me say at the outset that that is an irresponsible reference for the Leader of the Opposition to make.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are very simple and straightforward. There is no change in the management of snow clearing since this Government took office. Whatever the procedures are, they have been there for quite some time.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the individuals who manage the highway maintenance operation have full authority to call out such snow clearing equipment as is necessary. Every year at the beginning, at the onset of winter, you will frequently find such difficulties as have been encountered this year. This is not at all unusual. I am sure we can go back every prior year and discover exactly the same thing. So I am not going to take any unusual efforts to do anything, because there are no unusual circumstances that would justify it.

Mr. Rideout: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, how can the Premier justify that statement he just made, that there has been no change in the policy, with the announcement made by the Minister in this House just a week or so ago, that management personnel had been taken off overtime, and with the fact that supervisors in this Province have told us they were ordered not to order their operators out on overtime? How does the Premier justify those remarks in light of the reality of what is happening out there, Mr. Speaker? What is the truth?

Mr. Simms: They are told not to bring them in.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The question has been asked.

The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Rideout: All those people are wrong. Everybody is wrong.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I am told that superintendents have not been taken off overtime.

Mr. Rideout: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Well, I am not sure where the hon. member is getting his information, but I will have it checked out. To the best of my knowledge, there is no basis for these suggestions of the Leader of the Opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, I will have it checked out and either the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, when he recovers from his illness, will deliver the answer or I will deliver the answer.

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

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Premier. The Premier will be aware that the organization known as The Hub offers a very -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: Hub, H-U-B - offers a very important service to the handicapped here in the St. John's area. They carry out the very important and vital service of providing transportation to the handicapped people who work within the public service.

Now this organization presently

receives a grant from the Provincial Government to carry out that job. I am informed today by employees of that organization that they have been officially notified by the Department of Transportation that as of November 28, that grant will be cancelled and The Hub will have to offer these services themselves. Could the Premier confirm if that is true? And if so, why is this happening?

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

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, I am meeting with the representation of The Hub this afternoon and I can assure the hon. Member that what he has presented is not quite accurate. I will not say much more about it now, because we are checking into that point. I am sure that is not what has happened. I understand that the representatives have met with City Hall. It is basically something having to do with City Hall, which we also help out with as well. What basically has happened, as I understand it, is that they have exceeded their budget and they are looking for additional funds.

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

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that is the case or not. I can only tell the Minister of Finance that I was contacted today by employees of that organization who said that they have a letter in their possession and that as of November 28, their grant will be cancelled and they will have to provide that service themselves.

Now, I would say to the Minister of Finance, if he finds out that this particular piece of

information I am giving him today is correct, that they have been notified by the Transportation Department that the grant has been cancelled, will the Minister and the Government take steps to reverse that decision and reinstate that grant to the handicapped?

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

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, we will deal with this matter appropriately at the appropriate time.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Premier. Early in the administration of this Government the Premier made much ado about taking Government cars away from Ministers and political staff. I would like to ask the Premier, is it still the policy that Government-owned or leased vehicles are not available for personal use of Ministers and/or political staff?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker. Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition, who for this purpose is treated as a Minister, and Your Honour, are provided with an automobile allowance and they provide their own. The annual automobile allowance is provided, each provides his or her own car and insurance and so on, and they are also provided with gasoline.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the policy of the Government. Nobody else has automobiles for personal use that I am aware of.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that we have had trouble getting control of the automobiles, wresting and getting control, so we have gone to another step. And what we have said now to all departments, all agencies involved is, next year plan your budget with zero dollars for automobile use - zero dollars for automobile use - unless you justify to the committee beforehand that the automobile is needed, otherwise all automobiles whose justifications are not clearly established to our satisfaction have to be turned in, now, hopefully, we will get a handle on it by that means, but it has taken pretty well the best part of a year to get control of it.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can understand, with the big public service and a number of departments that there would be difficulty in getting full control, but some time ago the Premier was told that his parliamentary assistant was driving a Government vehicle, and he said at that time he would put an immediate stop to that.

Maybe, the Premier could explain to the House then, why his assistant still regularly uses a chevy blazer. I have had a number of calls on that as it has been seen regularly driven by the assistant around the town and so on, owned by the Government as I understand it, and I believe either registered to the Premier's office or the Executive Council, I am wondering, can the Premier explain that, because that is certainly something that should be under control.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: The former Premier, not the now present Leader of the Opposition, the Premier before that, Mr. Peckford, had a chauffeur driven limousine automobile, full time, chauffeur driven.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: That is not so. He had a chauffeur driven limousine permanently, drove him wherever he went and went home with him and everything. In addition, either he or his wife used this particular four wheel drive vehicle. Now, that was there when -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Okay, I am explaining where and what the vehicle is. That was there when we -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: That was there when we came into office. We turned in the vehicle, I did not use it. I turned in the vehicle and it is now used by the Executive Council and the staff in the Premier's office for whatever is needed, whatever official needs to use it, it is a staff car that is available, and to the best of my knowledge it is the only one.

Now that automobile is not to be used ever for personal use, that is the rule with respect to that automobile. It is not to be used for personal use. Now the hon. Members opposite may choke on their laughs if they wish, if they cannot do anything more.

intelligent than that, we will have to accept that as their best efforts. But that automobile is to be used for staff purposes and no other purposes, Mr. Speaker, and if it is being used for any other purposes, we will stop that, too.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. No, I do not find it very funny either to be very honest with you. My sources tell me the vehicle is used for purposes other than Government business. I could get more specific if I so desired, but I do not want to do that for obvious reasons, but I am wondering as well, the Premier has referred to the former Premier, of course we all know that Premier Smallwood was chauffeur driven back and forth Roaches Line, but that is then and we are talking about now.

I am just wondering as well, the Premier, when he first came to office or shortly after used to drive a grey oldsmobile, I am wondering if the Premier as well could check because, again, I have been informed that that particular vehicle that I suppose is still attached to the Premier's office or the Executive Council, one of them, there is not a lot of difference, has been seen on several occasions parked in front of the residence on weekends, in front of one of his executive assistants residences, again, I could be specific and tell the Premier what the address is, but I will not do that, and I wonder if the Premier could explain that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

That grey oldsmobile is an official car that the Government uses for transporting ambassadors and other people, and when -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Members will listen now they will get the full story. It is part of Works, Services and Transportation motor vehicle pool and it is used and directed for that kind of use. And occasionally when I have to go anywhere on an official basis and have to be driven they will use that car to drive me frequently. Otherwise I use my own car all of the time and I drive myself.

But occasionally, if I have to go somewhere, particularly if I have to go somewhere where I am likely, because of the circumstances to consume alcohol, I will not drive, so somebody drives that car because I think that is the right thing to do. So, I do not drive personally in those circumstances and occasionally when I have to go somewhere officially or where I have to go somewhere where there is no ready parking and I have to get out, somebody has to drive the automobile. So, it is used by me on that basis.

Frequently, Mr. Speaker, in order to avoid overtime expense, when I will have to do something, some official duty on the weekend or something, my executive assistant will use the car and drive me instead of calling in the chauffeur who was permanently employed by the former Premier. In order to save money my executive assistant on his own time - no overtime, no nothing - will use the car and drive me or

carry out some official duty. I think it is entirely proper and appropriate. Wise use of the Government vehicle I would think.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Matthews: Another supplementary -

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: What is the matter with the Member for St. John's South, talking about gall over there now, Mr. Speaker? What is his problem now?

Mr. Tobin: You are embarrassed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Matthews: Cutting a little close to the bone again, I guess, Mr. Speaker. Getting a little bit close to the bone, I guess.

Mr. Speaker, another supplementary to the Premier. He has partially answered, really, my next supplementary because again I have had several calls, and I say to the hon. gentleman, I have had several calls that have informed me that quite often the Premier is chauffeur driven around the City. I was going to ask the Premier, and he partially answered that, who owns the chauffeur driven car and who is the chauffeur.

Now, I can only say to the Premier that on one occasion I saw the Premier being picked up. I do not think it was one of his assistants because the chauffeur was wearing a cap and so on, properly attired I suppose you would call it. So I am just wondering if the Premier could elaborate on that, who owns

the chauffeur driven car, who is the chauffeur -

An Hon. Member: Who owns the cap?

Mr. Matthews: Who owns the cap? I am not worried about who owns the cap. I guess the taxpayers own the cap, Mr. Speaker, the same as they own the car.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Matthews: Now the hon. gentleman might think it is funny, Mr. Speaker, but I am telling you that the people who are calling our offices, of course, are those who are in danger of losing work in the health care system and the teaching profession and so on, that is why the calls are coming in. And we have the right as an Opposition to ask him if he would inform us. So, could the Premier explain that. And in light of the chevy blazer and the grey oldsmobile and the other chauffeur driven car, that if the Premier is taking the \$8000 car allowance how can he justify it to the taxpayers of this Province?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, when we came into office there were two individuals in Works, Services and Transportation who drove official automobiles on behalf of the Government. One man's name is Wally and the other man's name is David, I believe, and they are still employed in Works, Services and Transportation. They pick up ambassadors and officials and so on when they visit, and drive officials, and that is primarily what they used to do. In addition

the Premier of the day had an \$80,000 a year bodyguard and chauffeur that drove him wherever he went, back and forth to his house, or wherever he went, in another automobile. Then, Mr. Speaker, when the new Government took office we cut out that chauffeur and the automobile that the former Premier used, the big limousine, went back to -

Mr. Tobin: It is still there.

Premier Wells: No, it is not - it went back to the Department of Works, Services and Transportation.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: No, no. It went back to Works, Services and Transportation. And it was used by those two individuals who were employed in Works, Services and Transportation. So we eliminated the chauffeur right away, step number one, we eliminated the chauffeur bodyguard. Then, Mr. Speaker, any time that I had to be driven anywhere officially, and frequently I would have to go to places where I could not park within a quarter of a mile of where I had to go, so I had to have somebody else to drive me, and that is done.

One of these people in the Department of Works, Services and Transportation would do it. So we have already saved the cost of this expensive chauffeur bodyguard. One of the individuals was driving to the airport one time in this big limousine and had an accident out at the intersection of Newfoundland Drive and Torbay Road and that car was demolished, that big official limousine is no longer in use. So that is gone out of the system.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, the grey oldsmobile and this other one is still driven by those same two individuals, and occasionally it picks me up and drives me somewhere where I may have to go officially. But primarily -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have a chauffeur. Now the hon. members want that. And I do not have a chef. I don't have a chef either.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I just want to remind the Premier that he is getting rather lengthy with his answer. I will ask the Premier to clue up in ten or fifteen seconds, unless he is already clued up.

Premier Wells: I believe the balance of the question can be fully answered by saying, Mr. Speaker, that the only time the automobile is ever driven is in circumstances like this. Otherwise, I drive my own automobile. And let me correct one mistake in the hon. member's statement, I do not take the full \$8,000, I take half of it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: For just that reason.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Tobin: What about the \$20,000 (inaudible)?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: I want to get order before I recognize the hon. member.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Education. I am not going to ask him if he has a chauffeur or a chef or a barber or whatever. I will just ask the Minister if he has been told by school boards, by teachers, or by his own staff that his cutback of 10,000 substitute days has crippled professional development activities in the Province.

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

Dr. Warren: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not been told that.

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

Mr. Hearn: I ask the Minister if he is aware that teachers have resigned from certain professional development committees because they feel they can no longer do justice to committees because of the cutbacks imposed by the Minister?

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

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the House that some teachers have resigned from these committees, but I have been told that the reason is they have been advised by the president of the Newfoundland Teachers Association to do so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member

for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister what advice would he have then for a former president of the Newfoundland Teachers Association, the Member for Exploits, who is reported to have told teachers that if they want to attend professional development, because their days have now been taken away by the Minister, that they should book in sick?

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

Dr. Warren: No, Mr. Speaker, (inaudible).

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Finance. This past Monday the Premier said the Minister of Finance had given the House full details of how the \$10 million Budget surplus predicted in March had become a \$120 million deficit in September, a difference of \$130 million. I missed it, everybody on this side missed it, all the media or whatever missed it, so I apologize for asking the Minister to tell us again. My question is, will he confirm that the shortfall in Federal transfer accounts for approximately \$40 to \$50 million of the \$130 million in his Budget projections, and the balance of approximately \$80 million, results from lower than expected revenues from provincial sources and higher than expected expenditures?

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

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the points the hon.

member raised. The difference is not, as he suggested, \$40 million due to differences in what we were anticipating from the Federal Government, but closer to \$70 million. The balance is about evenly distributed between decreased revenues by about \$30 million and the remainder increased expenditures.

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

Mr. Parsons: In view of what the Minister has told the House, how much of the deficit is due to lower than expected revenues from provincial sources?

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

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with projections as to what could happen at the end of the year, by next March. The latest figures we have indicated that our revenues are down by about \$30 million or a bit less than that.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. How much of the deficit is due to higher than expected Government expenditures, and where have those major increases in expenditures occurred?

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

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, these details will be coming out over the next little while.

An Hon. Member: You do not know.

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

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, we have been advised of various cutbacks in the Departments throughout Government. I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if councils throughout this Province will be affected by actions of cutbacks within his Department, and can he now confirm that there will indeed be drastic changes made to the grant system?

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

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, we are presently reviewing various recommendations made by the councils throughout the Island as far as capital works are concerned. And a recommendation will be forthcoming to Government on a recommended capital works program for next year. So that is not yet finalized.

As far as the grants program is concerned, yes, the grants program is under review. Very soon now I hope to have a grants program approved by the Government, which will be announced at that time, and the municipalities will be briefed and informed, hopefully in time for next year's budget. That is the way we are targeting right now.

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

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister confirm that the decision has already been made to eliminate the social services component?

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

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, it was announced last year and the social

services component was eliminated last year. It is not in effect at all.

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

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, it has been paid to councils in the previous year, let me assure the Minister of that. It was just recently that they have been given the information to that effect.

Let me ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs, will he tell the House today and confirm that the capital works for water and sewer will be at least what it was last year?

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

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, the process is such that we receive recommendations from the communities throughout the Island. All communities, of course, without exception, I believe, have requests for capital works, water and sewer and roads. Those are funneled through the regional offices and eventually those recommendations come into head office, if you like, and subsequently the Minister makes a recommendation to Government.

As to the amount of capital works that might be approved, Mr. Speaker, it is too early to say. I can only say that the process is ongoing and I will be making a recommendation to Government, and subsequent from there it will be announced what the capital works program is and the dollars that are involved.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

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

Mr. Flight: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table the financial statements of Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation for April 1, 1989.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was reminded that I had not provided an answer to a question that I thought I had undertaken to get. When I checked Hansard, I find that the question was, how many automobiles have been leased by the Economic Recovery Commission? Or to meet the allegations, 'the Economic Recovery Commission, I understand, have leased a number of large new cars.' This was by both the Leader of the Opposition and the Government House Leader on October 23. I indicated at the time that I thought there had been none; or I was informed that there had been none - somebody contacted the chairman right away. I confirm again, Mr. Speaker, that there have been none.

Yesterday, the Opposition House Leader said he did not want the Premier hanging on technicalities, he hoped he was going to check out Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador, or Newcorp, whatever it was called, to determine whether or not they had leased a number of large new cars.

Mr. Speaker, I have had it checked and the situation is simply this. Under the former Governmental structure, Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation had seven automobiles they used, and the Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development portion of the Department of Development leased twenty-three, for a total of thirty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador incorporates those two as a single unit. The new Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador at the moment has been assigned twenty-nine vehicles, one less than the total under the previous two, and that is not an acceptable reduction, I might hasten to add, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Grand Bank also asked two very specific questions. He asked about a Chrysler Dynasty, and he gave the licence number AOG 150, and a Chevrolet pickup in Labrador. The 1990 black Chrysler Dynasty is assigned to the Central Region Vice-President and he named him, Mr. Fraser Lush. It was leased in June, 1990 by Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador. The choice was to lease a vehicle or have the Vice-President use rentals or claim mileage when travelling on business. The financial analysis showed the Lease arrangement to be much more economical, and so the car was leased.

Now that justifies having the lease, but what it does not justify is getting a new lease when there should have been surplus vehicles available. Now, I have admitted to the House that we have been having troubles wresting these vehicles from the

individuals who are using them, but sooner or later we are going to achieve it. That is one that got away from us.

The hon. members opposite may have been misled by seeing an advertisement in one of the newspapers, I believe The Evening Telegram about six weeks or so ago, or a few weeks ago, but we saw it, too, and we headed it off and pulled it, and not one vehicle was bought under that invitation to tender. We have stopped this kind of thing. There are some that have gotten away from us. We do not admit to being perfect, Mr. Speaker, and that is one that got away.

The second item he asked about was a grey Chevy pickup. That grey Chevy pickup, assigned to the Labrador region Vice-President, was purchased in December of 1989. It is a 1990 pickup, it was purchased in December of 1989, under a Memorandum of Understanding between the Federal and Provincial Governments, where the cost is shared and the usage is shared. That Memorandum of Understanding was entered into by the former Government.

Mr. Simms: We know where the vehicle came from. That was not the point. Are you giving your Vice-Presidents cars?

Premier Wells: No. This was the carrying out of the terms of an agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments, entered into by the former Government and honoured by this Government where the cost of it is shared, Mr. Speaker. That is the explanation of the two. Where cars are needed, cars will be provided.

Petitions

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

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition signed by twenty-seven residents of Green Bay: from Springdale, Rattling Brook and South Brook. The prayer of the petition is as follows: Because an expenditure in the health care system will mean layoffs and bed closures we, the undersigned residents of Green Bay district, petition the hon. House of Assembly not to approve such a freeze.

Now the health care system in Green Bay is a very valuable public service to the people of the area. The system itself is somewhat of a model throughout Eastern Canada, the one they have in Springdale, and many people have come from far away to view it. It is really sad to see a possible freeze coming and severe cutbacks in the workings of that particular health care system. It is a tremendous public service to the local area, and I do not mind saying, as well, that health care, certainly in the town of Springdale, is also a valuable asset to the local economy. In the Springdale area, we have not opened a mine in years; the forestry is in decline, we have run out of trees; the fishery has always been marginal, and we have a large fish plant which depends almost exclusively on offshore Northern cod and it is in danger of closing if the quotas are cut back any more. Therefore, Green Bay needs the public services of its health care system, and also it needs the boost to the economy.

The administration of the health

care system in Green Bay provided the Government, as requested, an impact statement as to what would be the fallout from a freeze in their particular system. The cost of their system is in the range of \$600,000 to \$700,000, and it would involve approximately twenty layoffs; it would involve the closure of twenty-four beds at the senior citizens complex, and the closure of the only two children's beds left at the Springdale hospital.

In the hon. Minister of Finance's previous Budget fifteen of the beds of the hospital were closed, and with this latest freeze the administration proposes another two, the only two children's beds would close. So there we have it, Mr. Speaker. We have a Government in power who, when running for office, stressed time and time again that their main concern was health and education, and that their main objective would be to open beds in hospitals and nursing homes, wherever the demand existed.

Now, here we are, they have not been in power for two years and the model system in Springdale, which serves the entire Green Bay area, and, as I said, is a model for most of Eastern Canada, stands to lose all these beds and have all these people laid off; and the town of Springdale stands to have \$600,000 or \$700,000 taken out of the local economy. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition and I ask that it be tabled and given to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly support the petition presented so well by my

colleague, the Member for Green Bay. I share his concern for the consequences, for health care throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, of the financial measures that the Wells real change Government is proceeding to implement. Although the Premier and the President of Treasury Board have denied that budget decisions have been made, their colleague, the Minister of Health, has been telling the administrators of hospitals and nursing homes, orally and in writing, that the Government is proposing to freeze the health care institution budgets for next year at the amount of this year's revised net figure.

The institution administrators and staff who understand the meaning of that budget decision, are projecting the kind of service cuts and position reductions that would be required for them to operate with such a low amount of money. In the case of the Green Bay Health Care Centre, they have projected the necessity of closing twenty-four beds and eliminating - how many positions?

Mr. Hewlett: Twenty.

Ms Verge: Twenty positions. In the case of Western Memorial Regional Hospital, I have not heard exact projections, but they are looking at having to operate on something like \$5 million less than would be required to maintain current operations, and they are examining options such as closing or reducing the hospitals at Burgeo and Norris Point, as well as closing permanently beds at the main facility in Corner Brook.

The vast bulk of the operating cost of health care institutions is payroll, and there is no way

for institutions to absorb a budget freeze without lowering the payroll which, of course, requires eliminating jobs and laying off staff.

So I certainly endorse the prayer of this petition which is urging the House of Assembly to reject the Government's proposal to freeze health care institution budgets for next year at this year's level. To do so, will be to downgrade already inadequate health care programs and services, and literally put in jeopardy the lives and the health and the safety of citizens of our Province.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to support the concept that it is not good to cut back services in the Province, especially in the health care system. I would like to respond to the concern that people have around the Province that something drastic is going to happen to the health care system in the Province, and I understand where that is coming from.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have an Opposition in the House that is taking absolute glee in these circumstances. They are rubbing their hands with glee, Mr. Speaker, over these circumstances. Mr. Speaker, they are taking a set of conditions and exaggerating the conditions; they are telling untruths about the conditions; they are referring to the cutbacks we are initiating in the health care system, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

A point of order.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, there is only so much of this that you can take. The hon. the President of Treasury Board, the Government House Leader, who should know better, is, first of all getting up and attributing motives, then secondly, accusing us of telling untruths, which is absolutely false. I mean, that is just not acceptable parliamentary language and the Government House Leader should know it. We are merely referring to information provided to us by people who are going to be affected by these announced cuts by the Minister of Health and others. That is all we have ever raised. But to attribute motives to members on this side, that is unfair and unwarranted, and also unparliamentary. And to also accuse us of telling untruths, that is unparliamentary language too.

Mr. Baker: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Baker: First of all, in making the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House Leader said something else that was simply not true and that just goes to prove my point. I was not attributing motives. What I was saying was they are taking great glee in it. Now, that is not a motive, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious. It is not a motive. I said that their exaggerations and so on... That is not attributing motives, that is just telling the facts. The enjoyment, telling the facts, the exaggeration, telling the facts. The fact, Mr. Speaker,

that they are not telling the truth about what we have said, that is a fact. That is not attributing motives. Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order, simply because what the hon. member just got up and said is simply not correct.

Mr. Speaker: To the point of order. Two points have been made that the Government House Leader was attributing motives. As all hon. Members know, it is against the orders of the House to attribute motives. But I did not think it was a very serious matter that the Government House Leader was dealing with, and I do not see any real attributing of motive. With respect to the parliamentary language or unparliamentary language, again, there is no list of words as such. 'Untruth' said in a proper tone has been allowed to stand in the records of the House, so I do not consider it to be unparliamentary in that particular incident.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, on another point of order.

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

Mr. Simms: This is a point of order totally away from the issue, so I do not want to take up time - the Minister, I understand, has a couple of minutes left to speak on the petition.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, and we are prepared to give him that. But I want to raise a point of order as a result of some guests we have today in the galleries. It is very evident that here in this House of Assembly we do not properly provide for a large

group, representing the disabled community, to be able to actively participate by at least sitting and being able to see what is happening in the Legislature; quite a few of them I believe are still outside the House because we do not have the room. I wonder, would it be permissible and acceptable to make an exception? It is not really an exception, because we do it on important occasions, such as the opening of the House and so on. But might we not invite those who are unable to see, who have to sit in the back, to come in through the front of the House and perhaps onto the floor of the House? We would be quite prepared to accept that, and I think it would be a good suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think it is an excellent suggestion, and I extend a most warm and cordial welcome to all who want to sit and hear -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Premier Wells: - and we will provide an opportunity for them to.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader wanted to make sure they understood him. I did not know if he wanted the time deducted from the last point of order.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I made it clear. I checked with the Table and the Table said the Minister had about two minutes left in speaking to the petition. I did not want to take the time on the point, but I did want to raise this other point because I thought it was extremely important.

Normally that time would come out of his speaking time, but we are prepared to give him the two minutes he has left.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will simply conclude by pointing out that we have not ordered any cuts. We are simply going through and evaluative process. If we had not gone through this evaluative process and had simply tried to determine the effects ourselves, we would be accused of being dictatorial and doing things behind people's backs, and not consulting and everything else. We are going through a process where we believe we will get the best possible advice and help in terms of how to solve what seems to be a horrendous financial problem next year. Speaker, we are doing things properly, openly and aboveboard, and if any crime is ours, then that is it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Speaker: It being Wednesday, the hon. the Member for Bellevue on Resolution 19 on the Order paper. I ask the Member for Bellevue to introduce his resolution.

Mr. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure again for me this afternoon to stand in this hon. House and to speak on behalf of the people of the District of Bellevue, but I think the topic at hand is more encompassing of the whole of Canadian society than just the District of Bellevue.

I guess about two weeks ago, I had been receiving quite a number of calls from across Canada. I guess because of my background as sort of a social activist in terms of people in this country who are disadvantaged, people called me to see if I would introduce a private Member's resolution in this House to talk about Bill C-69 which has presently passed through the House of Commons and, to my understanding, is in the Senate.

I would like to go through the resolution I proposed last week:

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has introduced Bill C-69, an Act to amend certain statutes to enable restraint of government expenditures;

WHEREAS this Bill, if passed, will see a decrease in federal funding of various social programs including medicare and Post Secondary Education;

WHEREAS these cutbacks will reduce federal contributions to these programs to zero by the year 2004;

WHEREAS Bill C-69 will move the financial responsibility to cover the costs of these programs to the provinces which can least afford it;

AND WHEREAS the Federal Government has once again moved the welfare of the people of Canada to last place on its list of priorities;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House condemn the actions of the Federal Government in its attempt to relinquish its responsibility for the funding of social programs in this country.

The last time I spoke in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, I spoke in the

Meech Lake debate. I think with what is happening with Bill C-69, Bill C-69, from my point of view, probably has more importance than the Meech Lake debate.

Mr. Simms: What?

Mr. Barrett: If the hon. the Member for Grand Falls will listen, he will find out why.

Bill C-69 if enacted will permanently change Canadian society. The Bill introduced by the Government in Ottawa withdraws Federal money from national social programs and moves Canada in the direction of increasing regional disparities among support programs for the sick, the poor and the needy. Because this Bill has such far-reaching effects on the social programs of this nation, we as Members of this hon. House should be debating it and expressing our disagreement with this type of action.

Let us look at some of the history of Federal transfers to the provinces. Federal funding for health care and colleges and universities has been provided since 1977 under a financial agreement called Established Program Financing. Before 1977, post-secondary education and health care were cost-shared by the Federal and Provincial Governments, essentially on a fifty-fifty cost sharing basis. But, in 1977, the Federal Government changed the payment schedule to block funding, which gave each province a set amount of Federal money. Based on its population, the amount of the block funding for each province was to increase basically at the rate of growth of its population and the growth of the Gross National Product, which measures

growth in economic activity and cost of living.

The Canadian Assistance Plan, on the other hand, which began in 1966, is intended to help provinces provide adequate welfare and social services for people in need. Under CAP, the Federal Government has set up arrangements, with the Province's share on a fifty/fifty basis, the cost of welfare and social services.

The Federal Government establishes terms the provinces must meet to qualify for Federal money, but the provinces are solely responsible for setting up and running welfare and a whole range of social services. CAP funding social services help, Mr. Speaker, single parent families, mentally and physically disabled persons, the aged, children in care, or who need protection because of abuse or neglect, the unemployed, families and individuals in crisis, low income workers, and battered women.

Bill C-69 would introduce a 5 per cent per year limit on increases to CAP contributions for two years in the Provinces of Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia. But, some may say, that is okay, because it does not affect this Province. But we must be aware of plans the Government in Ottawa have for the future. Could the limits on Federal funding for the Canadian Assistance Plan, which are in Bill C-69, be the first step in gradually decreasing financial support for social assistance and social services?

Many social activists fear that future Federal budgets could easily extend the limit on Federal CAP contributions to all provinces

and territories in Canada, followed, perhaps, by a move to block fund and further cutbacks. They also fear that the Federal Government might move specific programs, such as child care, out of CAP altogether and, in so doing, impose expenditure limits.

Let us look for a minute at what Bill C-69 would do. Bill C-69 implements four measures for budget restrictions announced in the February 1990 Budget. They are, one, freezing Federal transfer payments to the provinces under Established Program Financing, post-secondary education and health care, for the next two years. Number two, Limiting the increase of Federal transfer payments in Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta under the Canadian Assistance Plan to 5 per cent a year. Number three, eliminating the Canadian Exploration Incentives Program. Number four, freezing public utilities income tax transfers over the next two years. Budget cutbacks for these four measures amount to \$1.1 billion in 1990-91; \$1.8 billion in 1991-92; and \$8.4 billion over the next five fiscal years.

This is the third time that the Federal Government in Canada has attacked Established Program Financing since 1986 and reduced its contribution to post-secondary education and health. Before 1986, the value of these transfers was based on the Gross Domestic Product per capita: the real economic growth plus the rate of inflation, multiplied by the population of each province. In 1986, the Government decided to de-index this formula by reducing the growth rate of transfers by two percentage points, and in last year's budget the Government

announced a further cut of one percentage point in the growth rate of the transfers.

To put this year's freeze into perspective, it amounts to an additional cut-off of some three percentage points in transfers to the Province. All these EPF cutbacks between 1986 and 1987 and 1994 and 1995 amount to the sum of \$31.1 billion, of which \$22.2 billion should have been allocated to health care and \$8.9 billion to post-secondary education.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial governments are responsible for setting up and running health care, education, welfare and social services, but Ottawa shares the cost of these programs and services. The Federal Government has established principles for Medicare and conditions for welfare which the provinces must meet in order to obtain Federal funds. If Federal funding is reduced, the provinces will bear an increased financial burden which, in turn, could jeopardize the availability and quality of these programs across Canada. This would result in a dramatic shift away from the Federal Government's commitment to vital social programs and to helping those most in need.

I would like to point out to hon. members that some of the organizations that are opposed to Bill C-69 are the Canadian Council on Social Development, the Canadian Association of Social Workers, the Canadian Association of University Teachers, the Canadian Child Welfare Association, the Canadian Council on Children and Youth, the Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association, the Canadian Federation of Students, the

National Association for Women and the Law, the National Pensioners and Senior Citizens Federation and the Salvation Army. That is just to name a few of the various organizations in Canada that are against this Bill.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that we do not see very many Chambers of Commerce, Associations for Independent Business, or various other groups across this country opposing Bill C-69, but every social organization in this country is against Bill C-69 and I would expect that every member in this House would be against Bill C-69. These people are against this Bill because it is bad for the poor and the disadvantaged in this country, and this Province.

The question I pose to my hon. colleagues across the House is, will they show some courage today and support all these organizations across Canada, these social organizations? This will see that the very fiber of Canadian society is done away with and that we will not have a social service system within this Province.

I stand in this House today a very proud Canadian, a very proud Newfoundlander. I think every citizen in this country should have the same opportunities that most of us have had over the years, and that is the provision of post-secondary education in this Province and in this country; that somebody who grew up in rural Newfoundland, who grew up in an outport, who went through an all-grade school, whose father died because of inadequate health care - when he was nine years of age; that every Newfoundlander and every Canadian in this country can

have the opportunity to come from a background of social services, where I spent the first nine or ten years of my life, and have the same opportunity, the same freedom, and the same availability of equal access to post-secondary education and health care in this country. That is what it means to be a Canadian. That is what it means to be a Newfoundlander, I assure you. And I call on my hon. colleagues in the senate to do everything in their power to reject Bill C-69.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: If this bill passes in this country, the whole Canadian society as we know it today, and I feel very proud to have an audience such as we have today in this House, to be introducing and fighting against this particular bill, and I can assure you that as long as I am sitting in this House of Assembly I will oppose any attack on the poor, the needy and disabled in this Province or in this country, and I suggest all hon. Members would support me in my efforts. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Verge: Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I support the motion put by the Member for Bellevue. The kernel of the motion, the resolution clause itself reads: BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House condemn the actions of the Federal Government in its attempt to relinquish its

responsibility for the funding of social programs in this country. That is what I am expressing support for.

The statements that precede that resolution clause, the recitals, in my view contain some inaccuracies and are politically provocative and I do not support some of those contents.

An Hon. Member: Do not play politics with this.

Mr. Simms: Don't be interrupting (inaudible).

Ms Verge: But what is at stake here, as the Member just said across the floor of the House, is above partisan politics and that is why I want to be straightforward in saying at the outset of my presentation that I do support the motion, the essence of the motion put by the Member for Bellevue.

Some of the measures contained in this proposed Federal Legislation follow on actions that were begun by earlier Federal Governments, Governments which were in office when some of us on this side of the House formed the previous Provincial Government.

For example, in 1982, the Federal Liberal Government put a cap on EPF, the acronym for Established Programs Financing, the Federal transfers to the provinces for health and post-secondary education. At that time I was Minister of Education and I expressed on behalf of the Peckford Government of the day, our opposition to that cap.

The present PC Federal Government has compounded the problem by further slowing the rate of growth

of Established Programs Financing to our Province and the other provinces.

This Bill, which we are now discussing, proposes to further slow the rate of growth of those transfers and that is going to cause problems for our Provincial Government, others as well, but perhaps none as much as ours, since our Provincial Government and our provincial economy are relatively fragile, and since health and post-secondary education are not as well developed in Newfoundland and Labrador as in the nation as a whole, and because it so happens that demands are escalating and costs are outstripping the rate of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Bellevue, last winter, made a private members motion condemning the Federal Government for proposing to eliminate core funding for women's centres; I, and all the Members on this side of the House supported that motion of his as well. The Member for Bellevue, I think, in both instances presented valid motions backed up by research and in those kinds of cases, we, on this side of the House, have no hesitation in expressing our support.

I would like to point out two inconsistencies in his behaviour and in the stance of some of his colleagues opposite however; number one, while they are quick to condemn the Government in Ottawa, and I do not fault them for that, they remain silent in the face of actions on the part of their colleagues who make up the current Government in this Province. I did not hear the Member for Bellevue expressing any concern about the cutback imposed

by his colleague, the Member for Port de Grave, the Minister of Social Services, in decreasing social assistance for about 1,000 single parent families in our Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Verge: For an individual who claims to be a social activist, I do not understand how he can be silent while he sees single mothers and children in this Province hurt in that way. That was a cut that had nothing to do with actions by the Federal Government in Ottawa. It was a deliberate decision of the Wells real change Administration which the Premier and his Ministers are defending in the name of fairness and balance. They are saying that it is fair to reduce the income of single parent families in our Province who are getting maintenance and child support, and that it is fair to do that without giving them any advance notice. On October 1 almost 1,000 single parent families in our Province were dealt a terrible blow. Their monthly income was cut by up to \$115 a month. The first they knew of it was news of a news conference I held on October 1, and in some cases the first they realized what was happening was received in a form letter included with their first social assistance cheque for October.

Now Mr. Speaker, back to the Federal Bill which is the subject of this motion -

Mr. Simms: Order, order boy.

Ms Verge: - it is known as Bill C-69.

Mr. Simms: Act your position.

Mr. Efford: She should tell the truth.

Mr. Simms: Act your position of Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Ms Verge: And -

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Ms Verge: Mr. Speaker, thank you for calling order. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bill which is known as C-69 has been -

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please!

The hon. Minister of Social Services on a point of order.

Mr. Efford: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is important that I have to stand on a point of order as Minister of Social Services and point out how the hon. Member from Humber East is misleading this House and trying to bring the wrong information out, of what this Government did when she, in 1989, as Minister of Justice, brought in the very same thing that we are implementing -

An Hon. Member: Not true!

Mr. Efford: - and she stated the very reasons why she was bringing in the Maintenance Enforcement Act was to relieve the taxpayers of this Province so that the spouses of the single parents would pay their share and the taxpayers of this Province would not. Now she stands -

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Efford: - in the House, Mr. Speaker, and contradicts the very thing that she brought in as Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: Mr. Speaker, of course there is no point of order. The Minister of Social Services can not defend the indefensible.

An Hon. Member: Hear hear!

Ms Verge: The Minister of Social Services made the change on October 1, 1990, a year and a half after he became Minister of Social Services. He is totally responsible. He and his Premier and the colleagues on the Government side of the House. The Minister has been trying to claim that the change reducing single parent families' income is fair. He is arguing that white is black, that down is up. But the people of the Province understand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence and with the cooperation of the Members opposite, I would like to return to the subject of this private member's motion, which is proposed Federal legislation.

This legislation, Bill C-69, has been in the Federal Parliamentary system since last winter. The Minister of Finance for this Province knew about the Bill when he drew up his budget. There is nothing in the Bill which has changed since the Minister of Finance presented his budget to

this Assembly last March. The Provincial Budget is now a mess, that has been exposed over the last several months. The Finance Minister originally predicted a current account surplus of \$10 million, now he and the Premier are saying that there has been deterioration and they may end up with a \$120 million deficit, that means slippage of \$130 million. The latest information from the Federal system indicates that only a small part of that is attributable to change in Federal transfers and the bulk of it has been within the control of the Provincial Government. So the current budget mess in this Province is made in Newfoundland and Labrador. It has resulted from the incompetence and the insensitivity of the members opposite. So let us not get the current budget mess in this Province confused with the problems involved in the pending Federal legislation, Bill C-69.

Now the Federal measure, as the Member for Bellevue has explained, contains four basic elements. One of them deals with the Canada Assistance Plan, and that is the arrangement under which the Federal Government reimburses provinces fifty cents on the dollar for social assistance, including the social assistance that the Minister cut from single parent families receiving maintenance and child support. The Minister of Social Services has never told us how much he is trying to save through that measure. He has never said how much they are trying to save, but obviously it is only 50 per cent of what has been denied the single parent families.

So this bill involves changes to the Canada Assistance Plan, but as

the Member pointed out none to our Province. The changes involve capping total reimbursement under the Canada Assistance Plan to the three have provinces in Canada; Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia, and those provinces are battling the change. They have taken legal action, as a matter of fact.

However, Bill C-69 does not in any way lessen Federal transfers and reimbursements to our Province or the other six provinces. The only impact is a negative impact on the three have provinces. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not find fault with that portion of Bill C-69, I believe it is a well motivated attempt on the part of the Federal Government to close the gap between the rich and the poor in our nation, to narrow the difference between the have provinces and the have not provinces. In fact, I would encourage the Federal Government to take more such initiatives, to redirect more of the nation's wealth to have not Provinces such as Newfoundland and Labrador, so that our economy can be stimulated to the point where we are contributing more back to the Federal system and so that our education, health and social programs can be upgraded to the national average.

The second component of the bill, however, does have an adverse affect on Newfoundland and Labrador, and that deals with Established Programs Financing or EPF, and as we have already explained those are Federal transfers to the provinces for health and post-secondary education. This particular bill accelerates a problem that was started in 1982 by the Trudeau Federal Government. It slows the

rate of growth of Established Programs Financing, although there is a guarantee that the transfers for health and post-secondary education will be at least as much as inflation. There is that guarantee.

The problem, however, is that the cost of providing health and post-secondary education has outstripped inflation, and a related problem is that demand for those services has been growing with the aging of our population, and also with increasing demand for post-secondary education. Now Established Programs Financing is derived in two ways, one is through a transfer of Federal income tax points, personal and corporate income tax points to the provinces, and that part of the EPF entitlement has never been reflected on the Province's books under the label EPF. It has been rolled into general federal transfers. The other part of EPF involves a cash transfer, and that is the part reflected on our books as Established Programs Financing. For a reason of which I am unaware, the present Government, as well as the former Government of which I was a member, reflected in our books under the title EPF only the cash transfer component and not the taxed point transfer component of EPF. This Bill, as I mentioned, has the effect of slowing the rate of growth of EPF overall, and of slowing in particular the cash component of it. If we assume with inflation and with the growth in the economy that the significance of the amount derived from the transfer of federal income tax points will grow and grow over the next several years it is possible, with a slowing of growth of the total, that that component will take on greater and

greater proportions and conversely the cash transfer part will diminish, although there is no evidence to support the conclusion contained in the third recital, namely that the cutbacks will reduce federal contributions to zero by the year 2004. Mr. Speaker, the third and fourth components of the Bill involve other adverse affects to our Province. There is a freezing of the public utilities income tax transfer at the 1989-90 level and the significance of that to our Province this year was close to \$9 million, so obviously a freezing of that federal revenue is bad for our Province. The final part of the Bill is a cancellation of the federal capital subsidy for oil, gas, and mineral explorations, and given the significance of oil, gas, and mineral exploration in Newfoundland and Labrador on land and on our continental shelf, sadly that cancellation will have a negative impact on our economy.

So, taken together, Bill C-69 contains a number of adverse affects for our Province and for our Provincial Government, and that involves slowing the rate of growth of federal transfers to the Province, obviously making it more difficult for the Provincial Government to deliver health, education, social services, and the other expensive social programs for which the Provincial Government has constitutional responsibility, and that is why I support the motion, the kernel of the motion, put by the Member for Bellevue.

As I say, when I was a Member of the previous Government, and the Trudeau Federal Government began to slow the rate of growth of EPF to pay for post-secondary education and health, I was quite

vocal in condemning that move, and I am equally opposed to the measures taken by the Mulroney Federal Government in compounding the problem by further slowing the rate of increase in federal transfers, therefore I join in condemning the Federal Government for the negative measures contained in Bill C-69. In doing so I would point out that these were all measures of which the current Provincial Government was aware when the Government prepared the Budget last winter and the Budget mess we are now seeing is not attributable to any of these measures. These are measures that will have effect in time to come. But the mess that we are now seeing results from incompetence on the part of the Minister of Finance in projecting provincial revenues, and lack of control and compassion on the part of the Government in regulating provincial spending. As the Member for St. John's East Extern exposed today, the Government, the Minister of Finance in particular, have never explained to us the negative variances -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the Member for Bellevue for proposing this motion. I think it is one of the most important that we have dealt with for some time and I want to congratulate him. I did not hear all of his speech or the speech of the Member for Humber

East, but I want to congratulate them on what I heard of both of their speeches.

I have argued for some time, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of defining dimensions of this country. There are a number of what I would call defining dimensions, and one of these dimensions is shared national social programs. I think these programs have been very important to this county. They provided a mechanism for the development of a sense of country, a sense of belonging, a sense of national identity I would suggest, Mr. Speaker.

During the free trade debate a consensus developed, I think, that this made Canada different. I think we were distinguished from the American form of Government and the American identity by claims that we had in Canada social programs such as medicare, which made us unique.

Now in the field of education, Mr. Speaker, education is constitutionally a provincial responsibility. And all of us are aware that term ninety-three of the terms of union of the Canada Act 1867 and term seventeen of the terms of union of Newfoundland with Canada, both state that. But in effect in this country education and health and social services have become a matter of national concern. Even though education is a provincial responsibility constitutionally it is a matter of national concern.

The Federal Government has become involved in education, I would suggest, for three reasons: One, because we need to promote in this country the general welfare, because an educated population is

essential to the country as a whole. If we are to preserve the form of government that we have, the social structure that we have, and if we are to compete economically in the world.

I think there is another reason why the Federal Government has gotten involved in education and perhaps in other social concerns for which they may not be constitutionally responsible. They have gotten involved because we believe in this country, in equality of opportunity among the provinces. All of us in this House know that the provinces vary greatly in their ability to finance social services, and we, therefore, expect the Federal Government to provide some degree of equality of opportunity.

The third reason why the Federal Government has gotten involved in education and in other social services is that through the Federal Government we are providing a more equitable system of taxation. The Federal taxes are more progressive. The Federal tax system is more progressive than the tax systems used by the provinces and by the municipalities. So I would suggest that these are the three or four reasons why the Federal Government in this country has become involved in such areas as education.

I have argued for some time, of course, that the Federal Government should be involved more, become more involved in the education of our people. That you cannot in this country quarantine ignorance. You cannot have one area of the country undereducated and underdeveloped. If you have poverty, undereducation and illiteracy the whole country

suffers.

We in this country - and I would like to talk directly to the Federal Government on this - need national policies in education as well as other social areas. I know there are many people who oppose greater Federal involvement in education. And I would argue that we must educate all of our people irrespective of where they live, of their colour -

Mr. Tobin: Stop the cutbacks!

Dr. Warren: - their creed -

Mr. Tobin: Stop the cutbacks!

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Dr. Warren: - whether or not they have special needs, we owe it to our people to educate every person.

An Hon. Member: Hear hear!

Dr. Warren: Expenditure on education -

Mr. Tobin: Stop the cutbacks!

Dr. Warren: - on health, on social services is an investment in our people. It is not a cost. We cannot afford not to educate our people. It is more costly not to educate than to educate, in terms of the needs of this Province.

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible).

Dr. Warren: If we are going to compete, Mr. Speaker, in the world, globally, internationally, we need a first-class work force. And we cannot develop a first-class work force without a first-class educational system. A better educated population of all of our people is the key to the

growth and the prosperity of this country. Educational expenditure, health expenditure, these expenditures are investments in our future.

I have a little slogan here I used to give out to my students at the University. "If you think education is expensive try ignorance." I believe that, Mr. Speaker. I believe it is essential that we develop a fully educated population in our country.

Now, a few comments about the Bill and about the Federal Government's involvement in education. The Federal Government is involved in education in a number of ways in this country. Firstly, the Federal Government is directly involved in education in the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, with the aboriginal peoples, with the armed forces.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is involved in support programs for students. The best example of a support program for students provided through the Federal Government is the Student Loan programme. The Student Loan Programme is a good example of the Federal Government's involvement. They are involved in scholarships and bursaries; in income tax reductions for those who are educated. But the Student Loan programme: I wish, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government would do what this Province did in the last year. Totally update and reform its component of the Student Aid programme. Why the Opposition - they got up in the past few weeks and they criticized this Government for what they said were changes in Student Aid policy.

Mr. Tobin: Cutbacks.

Dr. Warren: There were no cutbacks, Mr. Speaker. Why do they not use their energy to attack their friends in Ottawa, who have not updated their Student Aid programme since 1984. Why do they not get to their colleagues in Ottawa and get them to eliminate the 3 per cent administrative fee? Why do they not get with the students and fight with the students who I am fighting with, with the Federal Secretary of State, to try to change the Student Aid programme? The Federal Government must provide Student Aid. I would never have gotten to University. I grew up in a very small community. I came from a two- or three-room school. I would never have gotten to University without a grant from the Government. There are thousands of students in this Province who will never get to post-secondary education unless they get more Student Aid. And this Government, the Government that I represent, has reformed the Student Aid programme, we have added tremendously in the last year - \$1.7 million more. Please, Federal Government, please, I beg you to update your programme and provide increased help for students in this country.

Now, the third area where the Federal Government is involved, Mr. Speaker, is in the area of support programs for institutions. The Federal Government is involved in support programs for institutions. They provide money to the universities for research and development. Now, the fourth area is support programs for governments and this is where this Bill comes in, support programs, Bill C-69. The Federal Government has provided, as my colleague for Bellevue said, from 1967 they have provided

funding for education and for health. I have done a calculation of the cutbacks that have taken place in these EPF funds since the programs were initiated. Mr. Speaker, if this Province had gotten the monies we were due, if the program had been kept as it was introduced back in the 70s or the 80s, we would have, in the last seven or eight years, gotten \$577 million more than we are getting at the present time. The last ten years in particular, all the Federal Government has done is cut what it is giving to the provinces, cut the funding for Medicare, cut the funding for post-secondary education, and put the cost of education on the backs of the provinces, many of whom cannot afford to provide the equality of educational opportunity and health that our people deserve. We would have gotten \$577 million more from 1982 to 1991-92 if the Federal Government had kept the same programs they had in place in the early 80s. We are losing dramatically and now they are going to cap -

Mr. Tobin: Who changed it?

Dr. Kitchen: The Federal Government changed it. I would like to have time to pass on some of the statistics. We in this Province make a relatively high effort to support education but because we do not have a high level of ability our dollars figures are low, but we make a relatively high effort. We perhaps make the second or third highest effort in the country, in terms of our income, to support education, but we need federal support. If this country is going to survive as a country we cannot cut these social programs, we cannot cap them like they are

doing with the Canada Assistance Plan. You know they are only capping it for three provinces now, but do you know what is likely to happen? I understand the Federal Government has a deficit problem. We have a problem this year. I understand that, but please, Federal Government, do not cut the equalization programs and the EPF funding programs. I am frightened. That is the word I would use. I am really frightened by what may happen to this Province if the Federal Government continues to reduce its equalization programs and its EPF funding programs. Forty-five to fifty per cent of the Province's revenue comes from these programs. Eventually, Mr. Speaker, we will, in this Province, be a contributor to this country in terms of equalization payments. Eventually, we will, but in the interim we cannot experience the substantial decline in federal funding and still maintain the quality of service in health, social services, and education that our people deserve, as Canadians they deserve. We cannot continue to provide the quality of programs if the Federal Government continues to cut, therefore, Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous needs for social programs in this Province, because of our limited ability to pay, because we have had a backlog of needs, because, most of all, we are Canadians, and as Canadians, I think, we want to believe that we have something special, that we have an identity, a sense of country. When I travel Europe, I mentioned it in the House once before, I am proud to be a Canadian. I wore my flag with great pride, and, you know, something happened as we went through customs in thirteen

countries, in a period of eleven months, I never got stopped once. Do you know why I never got searched once? Because I looked like an honest person, number one, but secondly, because I am a Canadian and Canadians are respected in this country. I think our social programs, Mr. Speaker, help make us unique. People respect us, Americans respect us. They would like to have the programs we have but if the Federal Government continue to reduce its contributions to health care, and to education, and to social services, I think it will not just be devastating for provinces like us, and for our people all over the Province, who have special needs, have legitimate demands, I think it will be devastating to the country as a whole, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this resolution, because this resolution is what Canada is all about, sharing and caring.

Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take just a few moments to address this particular motion brought forward by my constituent, a good friend, the hon. Member for Bellevue.

Let me join with my colleague for Humber East in saying that obviously we cannot object to this resolution, any resolution which is aimed at, hopefully, convincing the Government of Canada not to cut back on transfer payments for health and education and such purposes, Mr. Speaker, obviously is a resolution that we have to

support.

I have some problems with the particular wording of the resolution, the preamble to the resolution. I think there are some inaccuracies in that, Mr. Speaker, and we can address those. In particular it suggests that cutbacks will reduce Federal contributions to these programs to zero by the year 2004, but that cannot be substantiated. There is no question there are some reductions in the amount of transfers that will be available in the cash side.

As my colleague for Humber East pointed out very clearly, there are two components here, one is cash transfers and the other is tax points. The Government of Canada, I think, would prefer to move toward tax points and it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Government does not, in its Budget, note tax point transfers as revenue from the Government of Canada.

Those are in there as simply revenue from Provincial sources, whereas, indeed, they are transfers of tax points, and it is an important point, so in fact, more funding comes from federal sources than actually shows up in the Provincial Budget by way of direct cash transfers.

There is no cut back in the tax points, in fact it is certainly possible over the coming years that the number of tax points will be increasing. What is being cut back is the cash transfers in certain areas, and let me correct myself on that, that is not a cutback either. In real terms, sure there is, in real terms there is, but in actual fact, there is a freeze for two years, and a freeze

is a cut back.

I cannot contradict myself and say on one hand that this Government is cutting back on funding for health and education when they say, no, no, we are not, we are freezing it. I cannot use the argument there that a freeze is in fact a cut back and here say, well, this is just a freeze, not a cut back. One must be consistent. A freeze is indeed a cut back in the actual value of today's dollars that will be available to Government to provide these services, so there is a reduction in the amount of funding available, and there is a reduction in the amount of money therefore available to Government and will make it more difficult to continue with the same level of service.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: I beg your pardon?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: No, no, they are not actual cutbacks. There is a freeze for two years under the Established Program Financing, I guess. I will get my numbers straight here. Under EPF there is a freeze for two years, the per capita transfer in 1991 and 1992 will be held to 1989-1990 levels, that is not a cut back, it is a freeze. There is an increase in fact of 1 per cent because of increased population, but on a per capita basis, it is simply frozen but it is not reduced, it is not cut back.

In real terms, because the value of money next year is less than it was two years ago - yes there is a cut back if you want to look at it from that point of view, but there

is no reduction in the amount of money that is being transferred, the value of that money will be less because of inflation. 1992 dollars are not as valuable as 1989 dollars, so to that degree, I will admit there was a cut back.

An Hon. Member: That is when a freeze is a cut, is that (inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: That is when a freeze is a cut.

An Hon. Member: In their case it is not.

Mr. Windsor: I am saying that the arguments have to be consistent and that the cutbacks we are talking about are indeed cutbacks. If you freeze the amount of money available to a hospital board or to a school board, that is a cut back, unless, in the case of a school board, there is a declining enrollment and then there is more money per capita on that basis, unless in the case of a hospital, there is less utilization of that hospital, then that is not a cut back, there is more per patient perhaps, but in our case I do not think that is true.

Education in certain school boards there may well be some declining enrollment and I think that is also accommodating - but I am not going to get sidetracked by that.

The fact of the matter is that there is no direct cut and that after two years, indeed EPF transfers, the cash transfers, will grow by 3 per cent a year, or 3 per cent less than GNP, so whatever the gross national product is - which is probably the best measure of the state of the economy of the country, the Gross

National Product - which is probably going to be in the order of 4 per cent or 4.5 per cent whatever, something of that nature. So the growth of EPF will be GNP less 3 per cent. Now the change there is that it was always GNP less 2 per cent. So EPF transfers will grow by 1 per cent less after two years, frozen for two years, and then they will grow 1 per cent less, they will grow at a slower rate after 1992. But there will be a growth.

So to say that by the year 2004 there will be no cash transfers is inaccurate unless we are to assume that there will be no GNP, no Gross National Product. I mean if we are not going to produce anything, then zero minus 3 per cent is minus 3 per cent and, yes, we could lose 3 per cent. I do not think any of us are predicting that, I think we are talking on a level playing field of seeing 4 per cent or 4.5 per cent real growth, maybe more, in the Gross National Product, and therefore we can reasonably expect to see an increase in the cash transfer each year.

So, therefore, I say that the second preamble, or the third WHEREAS: these cutbacks will reduce Federal contributions to these programs to zero by the year 2004, I would submit is inaccurate. So I have a problem with that. I do not have a problem with the resolution itself which is what my friend from Humber East said. In all conscience we must object to any reduction in funding for health and education programs coming from the Government of Canada, because it simply transfers the burden to the Provincial Government, to the taxpayers of this Province. So it is a reduction in the overall

level of equalization. These programs are basically designed to treat all Canadians the same. Certainly that component which is the component that has the greatest variance under Bill C-69, is the component which is designed to provide an equal amount of money to each Canadian. It is provided on a per capita basis. It is not something that is given to Newfoundland because we are a poor Province, it is given to every province of Canada and it will affect every province in Canada equally. And I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, very important, that the change in EPF will have exactly the same per capita impact on every province of Canada and represents less than 1 per cent of provincial revenues in 1990-91.

So here is an important point, Mr. Speaker, less than 1 per cent of provincial revenues. So when the Minister of Finance stands up and cries in his beer that his deficit is now gone to \$120 million because of reductions in transfer payments he is being misleading at best, and that is being generous to the hon. Minister, to say that he is being misleading. Less than 1 per cent of provincial revenues is the impact, the change in EPF. So it is just not going to wash. The Minister cannot, therefore, blame the problems in health and education, particularly, on EPF. It just does not work.

So, Mr. Speaker, what is the objective of Bill C-69? We debated it in this House under various headings. The GST, for example, that is coming in this year. And I said many times, I am on record several times in this House of saying that I do not like GST from Newfoundland's point of view, but from a national point of

view I find it very difficult not to support the GST, because the GST will strengthened the economy of Canada. It will go a long way in attacking the deficit of the Government of Canada, \$340 billion, I believe, it is now. And every economist in Canada, I think, has said -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: I beg your pardon? Do you have a question?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Yes, I never did accept that. The hon. gentleman, I think, will allow me that, that I never did accept the fact that this would be revenue neutral, and I knew it would not be revenue neutral. It could be presented as being revenue neutral but with any tax, it may be revenue neutral today but what is the tax rate tomorrow? So the flexibility is there. At any rate, I was never satisfied; I never did advocate that it would be revenue neutral per se.

And I supported the GST because of the impact it will have on the deficit, because of the impact it will have on the financial position of the Government of Canada, and whatever strengthens Canada is good for Newfoundland; it is good for us in the long run, even though, unless the Minister has new numbers, and I would be interested if he would give us some new numbers in due course, but the last numbers I saw indicated that the Province of Newfoundland would, in fact, be losing revenue, the Government itself would lose revenue under GST. The people of Newfoundland will actually gain because of tax credits. So the people of

Newfoundland are in better shape because of our lower per capita income, that the grants associated with GST are actually more favorable to Newfoundland than any other part of Canada. 30,000 to 35,000 families, I think, will actually receive cash back, will pay less Federal tax because of it; on the average of \$180 a year, I think, to those 30,000 families. So GST does have a positive side to it. It does have a positive side to it. And it is interesting, I say, that whereas we said well, in all conscience we have to support the GST, the Premier, on the other hand, was saying no, this is a terrible tax, he was attacking the Government of Canada until recently, and all of a sudden the Premier found his conscience.

An Hon. Member: You voted against it.

Mr. Windsor: I voted against it, and I said why I voted against GST per se. Even though I support the Government of Canada on instituting it, I could not stand here as a representative of the people's House of Newfoundland and support a tax which is negative to this Province. Yet, in the long term, as I indicated, I think it is better.

An Hon. Member: The Premier (inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: The Premier was dead against GST. The Premier was dead against GST until all of a sudden he found his conscience, when he went up to Toronto one time. Somebody put the fear of God into him, I suppose, and explained simple mathematics to him. And all of a sudden -

An Hon. Member: Now you know what

that means. Mr. Crosbie told you (inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Crosbie told me nothing, Sir. All of a sudden the Premier found his conscience and said, in all conscience I have to support GST. And I guess that is the position we are in in this particular case. We have to support what the Government of Canada is doing on it. It is another effort to deal with their deficit. I wish there were better means for the Government of Canada to deal with the deficit situation than to cut back on the amount of funding that will be available in due course for health and education and other issues funded under EPF. But, nevertheless, they have a problem and they have to deal with it.

Unfortunately, it transfers to the province that problem, or at least part of it, the component of it. The province will have to pick up the slack on that unless we are prepared to cut back. I guess my real concern here is what I am seeing. What I am seeing coming from the Government opposite are cutbacks which are not in keeping with the amount of lost revenue from EPF. It is not in keeping. The Provincial Government is using this as a great little hobbyhorse and they are jumping on the pigs back and saying, ah, it is the Government of Canada's fault. They are cutting back on EPF payments and other transfer payments.

Mr. Efford: Whose fault is it?

Mr. Windsor: If the hon. gentleman had been in his seat listening, he would know. I am not going to go over it again for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, because he does not listen and he

would not understand it if he did listen.

An Hon. Member: Neil is making a good speech. Listen!

Mr. Simms: Hear that? Listen to your own colleague.

Mr. Windsor: I could start again, in the Premier's words, Mr. Speaker, but I will not do it for the hon. gentleman for Bay de Verde, or wherever it is.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Speaker, is there any way to stifle the hon. Member for Port de Grave?

Mr. Tobin: Stick a turr down his throat.

Some Hon. Members: A what?

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

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Speaker, I am going to leave it at that and maybe we will hear the Minister of Social Services tell us what his great analysis of the financial situation of the Province and the Government of Canada is, and how he can propose to explain the level of cutbacks in health and education on the backs of less than 1 per cent variance in EPF at the hands of the Government of Canada. How does he propose to tell us that there is a \$120 million deficit, and that a major component of that are EPF transfers? It does not wash.

The hon. gentleman can try all he wants. I will be delighted to sit here and listen to him try to explain that.

Mr. Efford: You do that.

Mr. Windsor: I will do that. And I just might interrupt him as much as he has tried to interrupt me. He has not bothered me one bit, I might say, Mr. Speaker, because we are used to his incessant babbling from the other side of the House. We will carry on regardless.

Mr. Speaker, I have some serious problems with the preamble, because there are inaccuracies in the preamble. And perhaps the mover would care to remove that reference to zero revenue by the year 2004, which is clearly inaccurate and cannot be substantiated. But the prayer of the resolution we certainly can support. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, before I get in to the actual resolution presented by my hon. colleague, I want to make a few comments.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Yes, you deserve it. If there is anybody in this hon. House of Assembly deserves something thrown across the floor, Sir, you are sitting in the right chair. Make no mistake about that. And my hon. colleague from Harbour Main showed a pure example of what the Opposition is all about on that side of the House. At least, when I was on that side of the House of Assembly, when I asked a question or presented anything in the House of Assembly, I knew the answer and the facts before I did it, unlike you people sitting on that side today.

A disgraceful, disgusting thing you presented to the Premier today on the disabled people in this city. When I say anything in the House of Assembly I know what I am talking about. I do not go on a phone call from some Tory friend sitting downtown or wherever you get you information from.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) a disabled person who came into see me.

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, this Bill that is going to be presented before the House of Commons in Ottawa, the red letters, that is what I want to talk about. The red letters. Canada's social programmes are in trouble. I know why, Mr. Speaker, these red letters are here. This is an example of the blood of Canadians coming out, an example of Tory responsibility in Ottawa and they will tear the blood out of every Canadian citizen in this country. And this is their way of showing it, because any other thing would have been in blue.

But it is the blood of every Canadian person from coast to coast that this Bill is going to tear apart. And the Member for Humber East and the Member for Mount Pearl can sit around in the House and try to change the whole topic of the debate on what the financial ability of the Province is. It has absolutely nothing to do with what is contained in this particular piece of paper, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is very simple. There is a plan of action in mind, a plan brought in by the present Tory Government in Ottawa to destroy every social programme in this country; to take away, to wipe out, every social programme, and it will tear Canada to

pieces. There will be nothing left in the soul of Canada with this Prime Minister now in Ottawa. If somebody does not take him body and bones and remove him from his seat, take him and throw him out and put him up in Alaska somewhere on an iceberg or a mountain peak, there will be nothing left of Canada! There will be absolutely nothing left of this country. How any human being, any Canadian, any Newfoundlander, can stand in the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador and say anything with a clear conscience and try to twist and turn and protect their Tory buddies over politics, is absolutely disgusting. No person, man or woman, should be allowed inside the House of Assembly doors when we know the trend has started. And as sure, Mr. Speaker, as they started to destroy the fishery in Newfoundland ten years ago, with a plot in mind to wipe out the inshore fishery by implementing all sorts of regulations - taking away grants, subsidies, putting factory freezer trawlers on the Grand Banks, Mr. Speaker - the plot was laid.

And the plot is almost complete now, where the Newfoundland inshore fishery is nearly a complete wipeout. It was a design by the Tory Government in Ottawa that worked and, Mr. Speaker it is working well. Now the seeds are sown, Mr. Speaker, for every social programme. Can you just imagine, Mr. Speaker, if the Provinces of Newfoundland and Labrador, PEI, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have to pay the social assistance programmes in the Provinces? Just imagine if we had to pay. He is talking about single parents, about people hungry in the Province today.

Take away from the social assistance recipients the 50 per cent CAP plan to the Province today and how many people in this Province would be starving to death? Where could the people of Newfoundland and Labrador hope to get the money to cover off what the Federal Government is going to take away?

It is absolutely impossible for the Treasury of Newfoundland, or the treasury of any Province - the Province of Ontario, the richest Province in the country, could not sustain the cost. And be as bad as we might in putting all those cucumber farms in Mount Pearl, and wasting the \$30 million or \$40 million on this building, and make all the mistakes - we did not make any of those mistakes - we could not even begin to pay the cost of the burden this is going to put on the Provinces. We already saw it this year. Sixty-six million dollars shortfall in federal payments. Look at the devastating effect it has had on the Province. And if they ever - if we as Canadians ever allow - no, you can't call him a Prime Minister. We cannot talk about a Prime Minister who is concerned about the people! How can any Government in their right mind, with any concern for individuals even suggest that Provinces like Newfoundland, PEI and New Brunswick can stand to offset the cost in cutbacks in social programmes?

The Minister of Education in his speech today said if we ever hope to build a Canada for the future, if we ever hope to answer some of the problems we have today within Newfoundland and Labrador, the only way to tackle it, Mr. Speaker, is to put preventive measures in place, preventive

measures to help the socially disabled out of their dilemma, breaking the cycle. There is only one way, Mr. Speaker. We need money to put in our education system, in our health system, in our social programmes. And further cutbacks in the social programmes will destroy the very base of the plans of this Liberal Government of Newfoundland and Labrador for rebuilding the future, after, Mr. Speaker, we correct the mess we inherited from the former Tory administration.

And is not as simple as we hoped it might be, so we could deal with it. We inherited a tremendous financial mess, and there is no point harping or dwelling on it, or pointing fingers. Because they already know. All you have to do is look across the House of Assembly today at the newspapers up in front of their faces. That is the way they took it for the seventeen years they were in power. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that today we have to pay off the debt of our former administrators of this Province. But we will do it. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, we will do it.

But as long as Ottawa maintains an attitude towards the rest of Canada - I am telling you, this Prime Minister we have in Ottawa today is American - American taught, an American way of living. That is the reason he brought in free trade. One hundred and seventy-five thousand jobs went out of central Canada last year to the United States because of free trade. It is an American way of thinking. And when you start tampering with our medicare system, our social programmes, then you are leaning more than ever towards the

American way of thinking.

He wants one North America. One country.

Mr. Tobin: There is only one North America.

Mr. Efford: One country in North America, that is what he wants, one great unity, he wants to take away Canada.

There are two countries in North America my friends and I would not share this country with anybody in this world, bar none. I would not give up one right in this country for all the riches that the United States of America have within their power. Not one ounce of this country would I give up, not one Canada social program that we have in this country would I trade for the United States of America, let them have it, I do not want any part of it.

But I can assure you of one thing, while the hon. Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister of Canada, remains in the seat of Ottawa, we are getting closer and closer to the United States way of living, and I do not think, as do many Canadians, I do not think there are too many Newfoundlanders would ever contemplate supporting a Prime Minister or a Government with that thought, and every Member of the Opposition, though his Tory philosophy may be with him, knows full well, knows truly what I am saying is factual, knows truly, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is factual.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear, it is very clear, a prime example, one of the most prime examples of what is happening in this Province today. Let us give you an example, and the former Minister

of Social Service knows very well what I am going to talk about, child care. Already Ottawa took away the child care initiative programs and all the day care subsidy programs that they had planned from their last mandate to the next mandate, they took every dollar away. What do we have in this Province now in child care? This gives you a proven ability of what -

An Hon. Member: What we always had.

Mr. Efford: Exactly. Agreed - what we always had. It proves exactly what we are saying, when it is left up to the provinces, no province can afford with their own revenues to implement a program that is going to be beneficial to the needs of the people, and the child care program is a prime example. Ottawa did not come through with their promise in the last election on the new child care initiative.

What happens, we today have the worst program in child care in the whole country, in the whole country. We inherited from that former Administration, absolutely the worst disgusting level of child care. Now, can the Province of Newfoundland afford it? Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, and if we do not get any money from Ottawa, it is going to deteriorate even further. and I agree with the former Minister. What he said is correct, we have a disgusting, disgusting system in place for child care in this Province.

The most important program that we could implement, the most important part of our future is to educate our young children and provide service, and we cannot afford to do it. Mr. Speaker, we

cannot afford to do it without initiatives, without subsidies from Ottawa, without more money being put into the program we cannot do it, and if we do not receive money, Mr. Speaker, what do we get for our future, can you imagine the number of children in this Province right now, not receiving an education?

Twenty-five per cent of our children now who deserve an equal right and a fair opportunity for education, for early childhood education do not receive it, our social assistance, our child welfare, our welfare programs are going to further increase. The problems of Newfoundland and Labrador are going to further deteriorate.

Bill 69, how will it affect Canadians? It will destroy every Canadian, it will take the will, the pride and the initiative out of every Canadian from coast to coast. It will turn every Canadian into the same way and the same mentality as the Americans from coast to coast in every State in the United States of America.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, going into a hospital anywhere in this country and the only way that you could get out of hospital is to mortgage your house, that is what will happen. I can tell you that any person you talk to in the United States of America who has to go into a hospital for a major operation, the only way, if they do not have the actual cash to get into a hospital, they have to mortgage their house.

In fact, the hospital would not let them out. You are not allowed out of hospital until your bill is totally paid, whether it is \$1,000, whether it is \$10,000 or

whether it is \$40,000, you are not allowed out of hospital and that is a fact in the United States of America. And if it is your home, your car, your land, your boat, no matter what you have, they will seize it. That is something which we are facing, Mr. Speaker, and the plan is already set. Any fraction of cutbacks puts us one step closer to reality.

What happens if they start charging, if they say we can no longer subsidize medicare in this Province or in this Country, what will people do, what will people do Mr. Speaker, people will die.

In the United States of America, I got on board a taxicab. I have not travelled much in the last two or three years because I have not had much time, but before I became a Minister in Government, I had the occasion to go down to Los Angeles and I was on board a taxicab one day. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was talking about medicare in the United States of America, and I asked the person what happens if you do not have the money to get into hospital in the United States, he said we die, we die on the streets, we die in our homes, if you do not have the money you do not get in, and if you get into hospital and do not have the money you do not get out.

Is that something to joke about?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Yes I did, as a matter of fact, yes, I did. But I was very fortunate I had travel insurance, very fortunate, very lucky I had travel insurance. Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Social Services can sit there and babble all he likes, bibble and babble all he likes. It is a

normal practice. When he was over here on this side, I knew all too well what he was babbling about. I have been over there for the last eighteen months witnessing what he left.

I also know, Mr. Speaker, what he is doing in the Opposition. He has not made a contribution to the Opposition since he went over there, he only babbled and babbled back and forth, and sometimes it is a bit entertaining because you get so bored listening to him saying nothing over there. You have to smile once in a while to entertain him.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, that is a personal attack.

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, the question remains, what can we do about it? Now let us get down to some serious talking about this, Mr. Speaker. What can you do about it? The Member for Grand Falls knows only too well, what can we as Canadians, what can we as Newfoundlanders, from coast to coast, from province to province, what can we do about Bill C-69? The one thing that every Canadian across this country from coast to coast, regardless of your politics, regardless of the way you feel about one party or another has nothing to do with the future of this country in allowing something like this, and allowing the Government in Ottawa to do this. The Government in Ottawa has no concern for the people of this Province to implement even the beginning, even restraints in our social programs, if we had any thought for the people of this Province and the people of this country, we would increase social programs not deplete them.

I will never forget when I was a

young fellow about thirteen or fourteen years old, I will never forget what my father told me as a young boy, Tory times, Mr. Speaker, are hard times. Tories take away from the poor people and give to the rich. That is the philosophy, Mr. Speaker. The corporations, the international companies, the companies who got their twenty-five and thirty storey buildings with their big corporate elaborate limousines and airplanes, that was the Tory philosophy, support those people, take away from the backs of the poor people, Mr. Speaker. And if we had any concern, and if the former members opposite, Mr. Speaker, had any concern about the people of this country and their social programs they would agree that every word that I have said here today is factual and they would agree and we should support. And you talk about the 16,000 name petition that they signed yesterday for Sunday hunting, if they had any concern they would get up a petition right across this Province, every man, woman and child in this Province, 575,000 or whatever the number is, and sent it off to the hon. Brian Mulroney and his Tory philosophy up there, and say if you want to destroy Canada this is one Province who wants to keep Canada together, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: A quarter of a million (inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, it is not hard to see where we stand. It is not hard to see when something serious comes before the House of Assembly. And it is fine, I do not mind the babbling back and forth, and the quirks we throw at each other occasionally. But this is not something that has to do with provincial politics

here in this Province, any more than the fact that we should be joining together and giving unanimous support for this resolution put forth by my hon. colleague. Not only support, Mr. Speaker, but we should take it and the hon. members opposite with a closer relationship with some of their Tory buddies in Ottawa could get the message through that they are not going to be part of a party that would ever think about bringing in and cutting a social program such as this. They would have no connection with them whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Windsor: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Instead of the hon. Member for Mount Pearl standing in his seat and babbling on about the Minister of Finance and the deficit and about what is happening here in the Province. There is no relationship to it at all. There is no connection to it at all. Absolutely no connection, Mr. Speaker, at all.

Mr. Simms: You were not here. You did not even hear his comments.

Mr. Efford: I came five seconds before he finished and that was long enough to know the whole body of his speech.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Efford: Pardon?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: I could not help it really.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, Medicare killing it softly. It is not killing Medicare softly only, Mr.

Speaker, it is killing the country. It is killing every man, woman and child. It is tearing apart the program. If you read this, Sir, the hon. the Member for Grand Falls, if you read it here is what it says, killing it softly. Obviously you have not read this bill. It is quite clear he has not read the bill.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Well it gives you a full explanation of what it is all about. Kill Canada, kill the social programs, put us where people will have to live on the streets, live on park benches, put us where every man, woman and child in the Province will have to depend on their own way of living. Mr. Speaker, how could any man with a clear conscience expect that we can continue on with social programs? But I think there is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that will save us, we are about eighteen months away from a Federal election, and I think after the eighteen months, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. John Chretien, the next Prime Minister of Canada -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: - will save this Country, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. That Bill C-69 will be taken and torn up and destroyed, Mr. Speaker, and put down in the garbage where it belongs. That there will be absolutely nothing left in this country only a good future for the Canadians, that we will get away from the American way of living, that we will come back to Canada and bring Canada back together, Mr. Speaker. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. I do not want any part of that paper, I do

not want any part of the Tory philosophy, I do not want any part of destroying Canada. I want to stand, Mr. Speaker, as a proud Canadian and a proud Newfoundlander and implement social programs, increase the social programs because if we look after our people, Mr. Speaker, we will have a prosperous rich and resourceful future, and if we forget that, Mr. Speaker, we will destroy everything that Canadians believe in.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

An Hon. Member: The new motor Registrar.

Mr. Matthews: The Registrar of Motor Vehicles, the member says. The Minister of Social Services has left the House again. I was going to say whoever arranges the speaking order for the Legislature, it always seems I follow the Minister of Social Services or he follows me. I do not know what it is, but I am getting worried. The Minister of Development is leaving now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few minutes to speak to this resolution brought forward by the Member for Bellevue. I must say it is a very timely resolution to be brought forward for debate in this Legislature. I missed a bit of the debate today, because I had to leave the building for a few minutes to check on a few more cars and a few other things. It is a very timely resolution, let me say to the member. This Bill is one that I, as one member of

this Legislature, have concern about, this particular Bill C-69. I do have a very serious concern about what impact this Bill is going to have on future social programs in this country. The Minister of Social Services has so rightly outlined that we are really a country to be envied when it comes to our social programs, and the Americans talk about it quite often. For any of us who are fortunate enough to visit there on occasion, they are sort of envious of our social programs. So I want to go on record as saying yes, I am concerned about the effect of Bill C-69 and what it is going to do for social programs in the country.

Having said that, it is my understanding that the Bill is now in the Senate. I think the first flag or precaution raised about this Bill came from, I believe, someone in the Salvation Army. It really surprises me, with the number of members of Parliament representing this Province in Ottawa, that these concerns were not highlighted or raised before. If this Bill is going to have the effect the hon. the Member for Bellevue and the Minister of Social Services thinks it will have, then I am very surprised it slipped by our members of Parliament in Ottawa, in the House of Commons, was not picked up by any of them as a major concern, the impact it was going to have on this country, and particularly on this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I am really surprised by that.

Where were they? Where were the outspoken Mr. Baker and the outspoken Mr. Tobin? Where were they on this particular Bill? They did not alert Newfoundland and Labrador of the consequences

of Bill C-69. I heard Mr. Baker talking every day about overfishing, which is very serious and needs to be addressed, but not a word about Bill C-69. So I am very concerned about it. Where were they? How did it slip under their noses and get to the Senate without a word from any of our members of Parliament? And I say any of them, regardless of party stripe.

The Minister refers to social programs, and what is going to happen to social programs in the country and in the Province. I have to say to the Minister of Social Services quite sincerely that I looked upon the Minister of Social Services when he was in Opposition and when he first became Minister of Social Services, as one who was going to be the great defender, the great defender of the poor and the underprivileged of this Province.

Mr. Winsor: The champion of their cause.

Mr. Matthews: That is right, the champion of their cause.

But what a reversal we have seen in the last few months by the Minister of Social Services. One has to ask the question, who has tampered and who is tampering with social services programs in Newfoundland and Labrador? The very Social Services Minister who claims to be the great defender of these programs, he is tampering with these social programs, not as a consequence of what is happening in Ottawa, but as a consequence of what is happening in Newfoundland and Labrador, with the budgetary position the Province finds itself in.

Mr. Hogan: That is not true.

Mr. Matthews: I know that is true, and the Member for Placentia knows it is true, that his Minister of Finance is responsible for the financial mess this Province is in. No one else. Consequently, the social programs in this province are being affected, our health care, education and social services, with the single parents and other issues that are very seriously being affected.

The Minister of Social Services made another very interesting comment and a very correct one when he talked about child care and early childhood education being so important, and there is no one in their right senses who could disagree with that, that if we had a good early childhood education program then it gives children a better start to education and gives them a good foundation for the future. So, no one can knock that.

The Minister of Social Services made another comment that was not funny. It struck me somehow when he talked about what is happening in the country and that the Federal Government, in essence, should be increasing money for social programs. And he is probably correct. But again it is ironic and it is sort of hypocritical that we have a Minister of Social Services for Newfoundland and Labrador, fully recognizing the huge, massive deficit the Federal Government has incurred and is trying to address, the same way his Minister of Finance and he himself is trying to address the Provincial deficit, and if you are sincere about addressing that, then there is fallout, so how, on the one hand, can the Minister of Social Services for Newfoundland and

Labrador ask the Federal Government, with billions and billions and billions in deficit, to put more money into social programs when his Government has a \$120 million deficit and is putting in less, and is slashing, and chopping and cutting from social programs? So, the Minister of Social Services is not consistent. He is not consistent in what he is asking the Federal Government to do on the one hand and in what his own Government is doing on the other hand. That is the contradiction. That is the contradiction this Government finds itself in, Mr. Speaker. That is exactly where they find themselves.

So, if you are serious about addressing your own deficit, you are going to close up hospital beds and lay off 1,200 to 1,500 hospital workers, if you are going to lay off 300 or 400 teachers, close out classrooms, close out schools, cut back on school busing, cut back on transportation so that the safety on our highways is affected because of your own deficit, then how can you expect the Federal Government, with a worse deficit, to do anything but the same?

Now, having said that I want to reiterate again, Mr. Speaker, that I have grave concerns about what Bill C-69 will do to the social programs in Canada. I hope that they will not be affected. Having said that, I know I am probably only repeating what other people have said earlier today.

Mr. Windsor: But it bears repeating.

Mr. Matthews: It probably does. I mean, what Bill C-69 does is it authorizes restraint measures, and

I am sure there are any number of speakers who said that this evening, which was announced, by the way, in February of this year. Now, we have had the Minister of Finance stand in his place and try to justify the state he has put the Province in, because it is only recently he found out the amount of transfer payments or adjustments to the Province, when he knew in February. That is what happened. They were announced in February. The Canada Assistance Plan, Established Programs Financing and so on, fall under this particular piece of legislation which is now at the senate.

I do not know what people have said about it overall, but Bill C-69 limits the growth of Federal Government contributions under CAP to 5 per cent a year for 1990-91 and 1991-92 in provinces which do not receive equalization payments, and I think there are only three of them. I do not know if that has been pointed out before.

Bill C-69 does not affect payments under CAP to provinces which receive equalization payments, for instance, Newfoundland. The fifty/fifty cost-sharing arrangement will resume to all provinces in April of '92. Under the Established Programs Financing it provides for equal per capita assistance to the provinces in the areas of insured health services, extended health care services and post-secondary education. Every province gets the same per capita amount.

So these are some of the things which are happening with Bill C-69, Mr. Speaker.

Another very important point with Bill C-69, another affect it will

have on EPF transfers, that per capita EPF transfers in 1990-91 and 1991-92 will be frozen at the 1989-90 level. Now, this means the total value of EPF transfers in those years will grow only with population increases. So I do not know what that is really going to mean to our Province. Because I do not know right now what the population trend is in Newfoundland and Labrador and what that will mean in essence to EPF transfers to the Province.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few comments I really wanted to make about this particular debate and this Bill. It is kind of hard, I guess, to disagree with the prayer or the gist of the resolution. I guess all of us who have spoken - I said I missed some of the discussion and debate on the Bill - are concerned about what it means to the future of this Province, the country and to the social programs. We are wondering about that.

I guess it would be fair because of that concern and many of the things unanswered about Bill C-69 that I, as one member of the Legislature, will have no difficulty, really, in supporting the member in the resolution, and I am sure that most, if not all, members in the Legislature will do the same.

Mr. Murphy: I knew you were going to say that.

Mr. Matthews: I do not know why the hon. the Member for St. John's South knew I was going to say that, because it is not very often he knows what I am going to say when I get up.

Mr. Murphy: Deep down you are decent.

Mr. Matthews: Deep down I am decent? Oh, I see. Deep down I am decent. On the surface I am not, but deep down I am decent. That is what he said.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) licence plates.

Mr. Matthews: Oh, the Member for St. John's South brings up about the licence plates. When I came to the door after I left for a few minutes, the first thing he came with was, do you have any more licence plates? So I said to him across the House, yes, I do. I said, I have been all around the building now looking at licence plate numbers, trying to see who is driving what type of car?

Mr. Murphy: What is driving who?

Mr. Matthews: What is driving who? Who is driving who? But it is very important, you see.

Mr. Tobin: We have seen him on the golf course.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: It is very important, because here we are today debating a resolution the Member for Bellevue is concerned about, a Bill in Ottawa which could affect us very negatively. We are seeing actions taken by this administration in the Province with - I mean, to say that you are chopping social programs is an understatement. And while all this is going on and the people of the Province are watching what is happening with health care, education, social services, transportation, they, as well, are watching more and more how the administration, the ministers and the members, are behaving about the Province. As a

result of that, and it happens in tough times, the Government is watched more closely.

Because if people are expected to have reduced health care services, reduced educational opportunities and so on, they become kind of skeptical, regardless of what party is running the Government of the Province. And that is where the people of the Province are right now. They are very, very concerned about what is going on with this administration. We are getting calls about all this stuff, and it is because people are fearful of their own social programs, of their own jobs, and so on. That is why it is happening. And as times get worse it is going to increase. Members opposite know that. The Minister of Development smiles sort of almost in agreement, because he knows what it was like when he was over here. The Minister of Social Services certainly knows what it was like when he was over here and the calls he used to get and the things he used to uncover and discover.

An Hon. Member: At least he was factual.

Mr. Matthews: Oh! What I said today was factual.

An Hon. Member: No, you (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Oh, I am sorry. What I said today was factual. I mean, all you had to do was look at the faces of certain members and you knew how factual I was.

Mr. Tobin: Including the Member for Exploits.

Mr. Matthews: Now, I did not mention any names. I tried to do

the best I could, but I had a responsibility as an Opposition member to raise it, to ask the questions. Because it is very, very important in these difficult times that if the Premier or the Government espouses a certain policy, well you really have to determine if that espoused policy is being followed. And what we are finding of course is that the policy that the Premier announced months ago about usage of vehicles and so on, is not being followed. And I could have today cited addresses and places. But I decided not to do that. I think the Premier will investigate and hopefully he will come back and tell us the full story on it.

The thing is, as the Minister of Social Services said earlier, you should not ask the question unless you know the answer. And any time that I have risen in this House - since I have been in Opposition and asked a question - I have known the answer before. And I have proven that a number of times to Members opposite and the public of the Province. The fisheries issues, to the Minister, I asked him a few questions which he refuted and sort of said it was rumours and I can not deal with rumours, and two days after he had to rise in his place and inform the people of the Province that indeed what I said was correct. So the same goes for today. And the same will probably go for tomorrow and for a few more days.

Mr. Matthews: Airplanes tomorrow, airplane charters.

Mr. Matthews: No, airplane charters, I do not know about that. But the Minister of Social Services went on to say, and like I said it is becoming a pattern now, that I usually follow the

Minister of Social Services. He went on to say about Tory times being hard times. About his father told him something, I do not know what his father told him when he was growing up. He is not listening to me now.

An Hon. Member: Who?

Mr. Matthews: The Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Tobin: He never listened to his father.

Mr. Matthews: He said Tory times were hard times, and Tory times were take away times. Right? That is what he said.

Mr. Tobin: You never listened to your father.

Mr. Parsons: His father was a staunch Tory.

Mr. Matthews: His father was a Tory?

Mr. Tobin: His father was one of the biggest Tories in Conception Bay.

Mr. Matthews: Oh, his father was a good Tory. I did not know that. But I am just saying that you said Tory times were hard times. And I want to say to the Minister of Social Services that the people of the Province over the last few months - I have heard people say that as well. Tory times are hard times. But now you know what people are saying to me? They say, Matthews, times were tough when you were in there, but boy it has got a lot worse since this crowd took it over. Now that is what people around this Province are saying today.

That is not all the time I have

left?

Mr. Tobin: Bill, the Conservative Liberal Party they will call it.

Mr. Matthews: But people are saying - and of course, Members opposite laugh and joke as if it is funny and people are not saying it. But if they were to get up in their places and tell you truth, they are getting it all over the place in their own districts. All over the Province. I mean I know Members from St. John's that are scared now to go home in the nighttime. Because their strong supporters are telling them, boys you are finished. You are a one-term Government. What are you trying to do in there?

Now, that is the truth of it.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: That is what they are saying. And the other thing they are saying -

An Hon. Member: This is silly.

Mr. Matthews: Oh, of course it is silly, because it is true. It is simple.

Mr. Parsons: Everything is silly over there.

Mr. Matthews: It is silly, it is stupid, and simple. That is what is happening out and about the Province. And the Member for Exploits must spend all his time in a vehicle if he does not know that. Because that is what is happening.

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible) golf courses.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, well, maybe he plays a bit of golf. That is fair

enough. I like golf too. The four or five times I have played it in my lifetime.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: The people are saying that they cannot believe what has happened to this Province since this Administration took over. That a Minister of Finance could stand in his place and bring in a \$10 million surplus and now is telling us we have a \$120 million deficit, they are saying to me, Bill, where in the hell did it go? That is what the people are asking me around this Province.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) paying off your mess.

Mr. Matthews: Never paid off my mess, not one cent of it. Not one cent of it has gone to pay off my mess, let me tell the Member. Not a copper.

Mr. Efford: Went to pay off the pickles.

Mr. Matthews: Never mind the pickles.

Mr. Tobin: Like the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Matthews: You have got a walking pickle, let me tell the Minister of Social Services, a walking pickle. And he is going to cost this Government a lot of embarrassment, and a lot of dollars.

An Hon. Member: Tell me about it.

Mr. Tobin: You already know about it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, right, so that

is what is happening on the other side. The difference in the attitude of members opposite since we started it last month is unbelievable. It is like a boxer, I suppose. He goes so many rounds with a number of good body blows and you wear down. You get sore. You cannot fight back.

Mr. Efford: You would want to do a lot more boxing than you have done so far.

Mr. Matthews: Let me say to the Minister of Social Services that he is the only one over there with a bit of gumption, Mr. Speaker. He is the only one with a bit of life. The rest of them are gone awful quiet. Because they are hurting, you see.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Liberal times, Mr. Speaker, will go down in history in this Province as being the toughest times, the hardest times. Tory times were hard times, but Liberal times are harder times and tougher times. Yes, and Liberal times will be remembered as harder and tougher times. Now that is what is happening to the old turr stuffer. The old turr stuffer.

Mr. Tobin: John stuff the turr.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, Mr. Speaker, his only defence is the pickle book.

Mr. Efford: It's all I need, \$23 million (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Let me say to the Minister of Social Services that there is still a bit of life left in him, but there is not much left

in the rest of them over there, and for good reason, they are being battered. Most of them are new members and they are sensitive, every word someone says to them goes inside their skin and hurts them.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: Listen to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations over there. They beat her so sore the other night she shook like a leaf on a tree. She even had to get personal about people who were not there to defend themselves, Mr. Speaker. That is how sore she got.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, about as good a job as they did on you, and are continuing to do with you. A man, a member of this House, and a former President of the Newfoundland Teachers Association, to go and encourage teachers to use up their seven days sick leave, that is what he told them. And, do you know what they answered back, that would be dishonest Roger, we are not like that.

An Hon. Member: You must mean your good Tory friends in Buchans.

Mr. Matthews: I have no good Tory friends in Buchans.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. Matthews: In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the resolution.

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

Mr. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, again I rise to close debate on this resolution. I am not surprised that the hon. Member for Grand Bank supports the resolution, because, I think the hon. Member has a great social conscience. The hon. Member for Humber East mentioned that the hon. Member for Bellevue supports cutbacks in social services and all these sort of things. The fact that I supported, or not supported, is handled in the parliamentary way, in that there is a forum, as the hon. Member for Humber East knows, that probably a lot of times in her particular caucus, when she was a member, she may not have supported the actions or what happened in her Government, but publicly supported the actions. The people in Bellevue district are used to cutbacks in Government. They have been accustomed over the years to cutbacks. There were cutbacks in health care in Bellevue district when the hospital in Come By Chance was closed down, when the hospital in Markland was closed down, and unfortunately within the district of Bellevue I have roughly 1700 constituents that are over the age of sixty-five and I have a lot of problems with senior citizens that need to go in senior citizens homes. A lot of my calls from the district involve trying to get a senior citizen in a senior citizens home. The hospital in Come By Chance should have been converted into a senior citizens home but it was torn down, and the hospital in Markland could have been easily converted into a senior citizens complex. Every senior citizen in my district has to go to some part of the Province away from friends, relatives, and from their environment. They either go in the Harbour Lodge, Hoyles Home,

and maybe even in Corner Brook. They have to go all over this Province to get the care they need. The hospital in Markland was sold and is now a winery, which could have easily been converted into a senior citizens complex, so this hon. Member is quite familiar with cutbacks.

No, I do not support anybody in this Province losing his job, I know what cutbacks are. I know at one time I was declared redundant within the Provincial Government and my job was gone. I know the anxiety that these people are suffering, they do not know if their jobs are here or not. I do not agree with cutting back any jobs but sometimes it is necessary.

Ms Verge: What about cutbacks in social assistance?

An Hon. Member: Or perhaps (inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: Well, the point is, I think everybody should be treated fairly.

Some Hon. Members: Fairness and balance.

Mr. Barrett: Fairness and balance. I was from a single parent family and it is because my father died that it was a single parent family.

I think it would be very hard to know that there was somebody down the road who could get more social assistance than we could, with my mother, and I had two other brothers, and to know that some people would be better off, and, normally one of the problems I have with the whole social service system, is that normally the people who are in the greatest need are not the ones who normally

get it.

The reason I say the hon. Member for Grand Bank has a great social conscience, I, for years, within the Provincial Government lobbied and tried to get programs for people who were socially disadvantaged in this Province, and I must say that the hon. Member for Grand Bank, when he was the Minister for Career, Development and Advanced Studies, appointed a task force to look at the whole issue.

As a matter of fact, he was so good that he even recommended that I be part of the task force. That shows you how competent the hon. Member for Grand Bank is and I think some of the initiatives which we have today came out of that particular task force which was appointed by the hon. Member for Grand Bank, who at the time was Minister of Career, Development and Advanced Studies.

For years these sort of recommendations fell on deaf ears, but I must say when he became the Minister, he listened. As a backbencher, as a Member of this Government, I have had a few proud moments, quite a few in terms of what I see happening in my particular district and what I see happening in this Province.

When I sat here and heard His Honour read the Speech from the Throne, and when I heard the Budget Speech which advocated literacy programs in this Province, I was very, very proud. Another moment, and I never thought it would ever happen in the history of this House of Assembly, when I saw, through supplementary supply, \$300,000 for literacy programs in this Province.

These were very proud moments for me and it shows you - and I do not think that any one on this side of the House or on that side of the House can say that the hon. Member for Bellevue did not have something to do with some of these things, and it shows you the social conscience.

Another thing of which I feel very proud, is the re-organization of post-secondary education in this Province. The system that was devised of five community colleges and three provincial institutes saw us develop within this Province a sort of elitist organization. It meant that the bigger centres like St. John's and Corner Brook would get all the technology programs, and the rural areas in this Province would get all the leftovers. I see no reason at all why a technology program could not be taught in Burin or Grand Falls or Stephenville or any other area of this Province. What was built up was a system that was inefficient.

I am very disturbed by some of the comments that are coming out of Corner Brook. When I see the students on the news talking about downgrading the certificates at the Fisher Institute, which was the Corner Brook Vocational School, I see these students doing a lot of damage to themselves. I think we need to set the record straight. The Corner Brook Vocational School, under the leadership of people like Jim Howell, was one of the top institutions in this country and the graduates from the Corner Brook Vocational School were among the best in Canada. And if you go to the mill in Corner Brook, if you go to IOC, if you go to any major industry in this Province, you will see fine graduates from

the Vocational School in Corner Brook. And to see these students on saying that because of the name change, it means our quality of education is being reduced. There is no reduction in the quality of education. I think the hon. member understands what I am saying. There is no way.

What happened was a new system was developed which took over the Corner Brook Vocational School and it became the Fisher Technical Institute. This particular institution has a great reputation across Canada. The District Vocational School and the staff are among the best in Canada. And to have the students say that it is downgrading, you know, what is in a name? I am also aware that quality goes in before the name goes on, and the quality was already there before the name went on.

Ms. Verge: There is a change in the mandate (inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: Yes, but it does not have anything to do with the quality of the programs.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: No. I have been in post-secondary education for twenty years and I can assure you that the quality of the programs in Corner Brook will not change because of the re-organization. I think we have been top-heavy with administration in education in this Province, and I think we need to look more and more at expanding the services in Corner Brook and not wasting the money on organizations.

I am very proud to know, for example, that in the community of Whitbourne today there is a

program of adult basic education on a full-time basis which is being funded through the Department of Social Services. These people are socially disadvantaged. It will give these people an opportunity to upgrade their skills. Let's face it, the majority of the people in this province will not have an opportunity to do vocational or technical training, because they do not have the academic qualifications.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services approved an adult basic education program. Now, when he talks about channelling the money within Social Services in the right direction, I think we are headed in the right direction. We do not have enough of them. In a few weeks another program is going to be started in Green's Harbour, which will look after people from my district and the District of Trinity - Bay de Verde. We need more and more of these kinds of programs.

Also to the hon. member, when we talk about the CAP funding and is only Ontario, Alberta and B.C., I think one of the most startling experiences I have ever had in my life was about ten years ago, when the oil boom was on in Alberta, when money was flowing like water, and I happened to be in a hotel downtown and I looked out and saw the lineup at the soup kitchens of people on the street in Calgary, who did not have a job and were looking for handouts from the Salvation Army.

I think the issue we are looking at here, Mr. Speaker, is how are we going to divide the wealth in this country? I think this Bill, Bill C-69, shows you that people who are in greatest need will

suffer more because of this Bill.

At this time, I would like to table something that was in the Evening Telegram today. 'The Salvation Army opposes Bill C-69.' I would like all members to read it. And if people are questioning the figures when I say that these programs will be eliminated by the year 2004, here is a graph that is put out by the Social Development Council in Canada, and statistics from the projections based on Federal data by Tim Saylle. This has been published and sent all across Canada, and it will show you that by the year 2004, the Federal cash transfer payments will disappear. I expect every hon. member to support this resolution. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question! Question!

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour, please say 'Aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: Those against 'Nay'

I declare the motion carried.

The hon. the Minister of Development.

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

Mr. Speaker: Hon. member, there is no motion necessary.

Mr. Furey: Okay. Tomorrow, I am

told, it will be Supplementary Supply.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 p.m.