



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 67

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Tuesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

30 October 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Before proceeding to routine business, on behalf of hon. Members I would like to extend a warm welcome to Ms Audrey McLaughlin, the Member of Parliament for the Yukon and Leader of the New Democratic Party of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

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

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, in reference to the statement made in this House recently by my colleague, the hon. Hubert Kitchen, Minister of Finance, I would like now to advise you, Mr. Speaker, and all hon. Members of the actions which are being taken by my Department to meet the overall expenditure reductions as outlined in Dr. Kitchen's statement.

I will note, firstly, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Works, Services and Transportation is, by its very nature, a Service Department.

My Department provides highway construction and maintenance service, marine ferry services, air services, and programs and services under the Motor Registration Division, to mention a few. These are people oriented services, affecting the day to day lives of all residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Because we are a service Department, we are always in the public eye, and, Mr. Speaker, any changes which are made in the services which we provide have an immediate impact on people.

Obviously, if these changes represent curtailments, they will be met with resistance, and they will not be welcome. As Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, I fully realize this and understand it.

But, Mr. Speaker, as the Government of this Province, and given the present state of the Province's economic position, we are now obligated to implement certain actions which, while unpleasant now, are absolutely essential if we are to ensure our future growth and development.

The Premier, in his statement of September 19, 1990, said that with the options it has, Government must place emphasis on expenditure restraint, and where areas of restraint can be identified, Ministers will announce appropriate reductions in their Departments.

To comply with these directives, Mr. Speaker, my Department has recently completed a review of departmental expenditure plans.

I now wish to advise this House that my Department is proposing the following expenditure reductions under current account: (1) closure of the Clarendville Motor Registration Division office and the weigh scale operation at Goobies; and the closure of the Motor Registration Division office in Wabush.

Some Hon. Members: Shame! shame!

Mr. Gilbert: Closure of the Clarenville Motor Registration office and the weigh scale operation at Goobies will save \$86,000 in the current fiscal year and \$247,000 in 1991-92.

Eight employee positions will be affected in the closedown of these two operations.

Closure of the Wabush Motor Registration office will save \$27,000 this year and \$83,000 next year. This closedown will result in the elimination of two employee positions.

The combined effect of the closure will result in a total savings of \$383,000.

These measures, Mr. Speaker, will mean a loss of service for the people in the areas concerned. However, people requiring licence renewals and other services offered by the Motor Registration Division can use the regular postal service or use the offices in other centres of the Province. Licence renewals received by mail are generally processed by return mail. Other initiatives such as using chartered banks for the processing of licence renewal is being considered. Legislation for this purpose will be presented to the House very soon.

Another initiative, Mr. Speaker, is: 2) the Change Islands Ferry Service will revert to a single-ferry service for nine months of the year, using the Beaumont Hamel, and a two-ferry service for the other three months of the year. This is similar to the service that was in place from December 1988 to June 1989.

Some Hon. Members: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Gilbert: This measure will result in a savings of \$187,000 this year, and next year the savings will be \$450,000.

I want to make it clear that this change does not reduce the number of crossings per day for either community.

The Beaumont Hamel will continue to overnight at Fogo Island. Should an emergency situation arise on Change Islands, the vessel will be dispatched immediately and should arrive at the ferry terminal at the south end of Change Islands at approximately the same time as the patient who has to travel from the community of Change Islands.

Also, the helicopter pad constructed at Change Islands for the emergency medical service will continue to be utilized.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, another expenditure reduction measure by my department involves the payment of overtime compensation.

The Department of Works, Services and Transportation will change its policy for compensating supervisory position employees who work overtime.

These employees will now come under the management overtime policy, rather than the previous policy where they were compensated in a similar manner to union positions.

It is estimated, Mr. Speaker, that this will save a total of \$550,000 this year.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the people of Newfoundland, through this hon. House, that the expenditure reductions I have

outlined were made only after very careful thought.

We fully realize the effects these measures will have, but, in reaching our decisions, we took into account all possible money-saving options and we chose those which would affect the least number of people.

And I am not minimizing these effects, Mr. Speaker, I am saying simply that we had to make some very hard and very difficult choices and we made them as carefully and as fairly as we could under the circumstances.

We are in difficult times, Mr. Speaker, and economic problems are not unique to Newfoundland. Many provinces are experiencing serious difficulties. We are all faced with a period of restraint and retrenchment until the financial situation improves.

We are facing difficult times in the immediate future, but the measures I have outlined today will be subject to frequent review, as conditions change. Thank you.

Mr. Winsor: The same level of service we had last year you said.

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

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that today the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation in this Province can stand and, on the first page of his statement, give all the reasons why this should never be done and then go along and gut the Department of Works, Services and Transportation to save somewhere in the vicinity of \$1 million,

just about the amount of money he wasted on the Ossokmanuan Bridge contract, when he gave the largest contractor in this Province a gift of \$1.6 million or \$1.5 million. He does not save that much money in this statement, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: On the backs of the poor people.

Mr. R. Aylward: Clarenville again has been hit. Last week it was hit by the Minister of Finance, who saved \$50,000 by destroying four or five jobs in a rural area of our Province. Mr. Speaker, Clarenville will again lose in this statement to save very little amounts of money. Actually, the amounts of money saved by closing the Clarenville office and disrupting the service for the Burin Peninsula, the Bonavista Peninsula and all the area around Clarenville, which had some service with Motor Registration, will be just about two years car allowance for the Ministers - the \$8,000 allowance they receive is what they are saving here with this closure. So they can have their new cars and drive around, while the people on the Burin Peninsula and the Bonavista Peninsula have to suffer. It costs extra expense for them to come in here.

I do not understand for the life of me why they would close the weigh scale operation in the Goobies area. That is very important. That will cost them money. They will not save money. Truck drivers who now overload if they wish because there is no one checking them, they can overload with anything they want, cucumbers included, except that you closed the place down. That will cause damage to our highways, it will increase maintenance to our

highways. It is shameful!

But the worst - the worst - cutback in this statement is the way that overtime is being paid to supervisors in Transportation. The people in those positions are people who are out all hours of the day and night during the winter, and they ensure that snow clearing operations are put in place so that the safety of children riding on early buses, going to school, will be ensured.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will probably have, and I hope not - but maybe this is not as important as it seems. With the way the Minister of Education is cutting back on teachers positions in this Province, maybe we will not have so many schools open, maybe there will not be a need for school buses in a year or so, Mr. Speaker. They are going to cut the buses, and now the highways will not be safe for them anyway.

Mr. Speaker, the change in the Change Islands ferry service was tried before. We tried it. I will admit that we tried it when we were there. It does not work. The people in the area will tell you it does not work, your own departmental staff will tell you it does not work. Mr. Speaker, you are decreasing services to people in parts of our Province who can least afford it, the isolated areas.

I note the statement was made while the Premier was not here, and that might be intentional, because all the bad news is supposed to come out when the Meech Lake hero is out of the Province.

Mr. Simms: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Aylward: He is probably up in B.C., in Fantasy Land with Vander Zalm again, is it?

Mr. Speaker, this Premier is the Premier who said he would decentralize Government in this Province, but since he has come to power he has centralized every service in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Aylward: The rural areas of this Province are under attack from this Government, and with the cutbacks which have come out of this Cabinet over the last little while, and will continue to come over the next little while, I say to the children of this Province, Christmas is in jeopardy. Because they are going to cut that back, too, if they can!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the announcements that the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation brought before this House today, and other announcements that I suspect are coming over the next number of days, it will only be the rich people who will be able to stay in Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker. The poor will not have a chance to survive here at all.

An Hon. Member: Right on.

Mr. Rideout: Now Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Fogo

asked that same Minister about the ferry service to Change Islands and Fogo. And the Minister told him that nothing was happening except to revert to the winter schedule. Mr. Speaker, how can that Minister today stand in the House, having deceived this House yesterday, having been deceitful to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, and want us to believe that he did not know that answer, or did not know that that decision was made yesterday? How can the Minister be so dishonest and so deceitful, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Simms: That was yesterday.

Mr. Rideout: That was yesterday.

Mr. Gilbert: That is not a question -

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

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

Mr. Gilbert: That is not a question, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Fogo asked me about why the service was changed yesterday. I told him and I told him that I would get him the other answers later on.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: You talk about deception.

Mr. Rideout: Mr Speaker -

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Now Mr. Speaker, there is a prime example of arrogance - a Government that is

in office less than eighteen months. Well, if that was not deceitful, let me ask the Minister this: How could the Minister this morning at ten o'clock have a group of his officials travel to Fogo Island to talk about transportation matters with the citizens of Fogo Island, knowing full well that at 2:00 p.m. today he was coming into this House to announce that there was a downgrading of the service, Mr. Speaker?

An Hon. Member: Good question.

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

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, that is a very easy question to answer because of the fact that we wanted to make sure that any of the changes that we were going to make - as I said in the first part of my statement, as the Member commented on - I talked about the fact that we are a service Department, and that there were going to be people affected by the changes. So rather than for me to make any statements in the House until such time as all the people that were affected - because my people are on Fogo Island and Change Islands today, they are in Clarenville and they are in Wabush, talking to the people who are going to be affected by this. Believe me, this was not a decision, as I said, that we went into easily or callously. This was a very serious decision. It was one that was dictated to us by the fact that we are into tough economic times, not only here in Newfoundland but the country. A depression that I would say is induced by his colleagues in Ottawa -

Some Hon. Members: Hear hear!

Mr. Gilbert: - and we had to do it. But we believe that the people of this Province who are going to be affected should have known, before those people over there had a chance to make political gains out of it.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) he's got to blame us.

Mr. Rideout: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, what we have here today and in this Province today is a made-in-Newfoundland deficit, that is what we have. If the Minister, Mr. Speaker, had any fortitude at all, it would be him today who would be in Change Islands and Clarendville and Wabush, passing out the pink slips, Mr. Speaker. That is who would be out there.

But now let me ask the Minister this question: In view of the fact that he is going to change the overtime policy for management personnel in his Department, is the Minister now going to leave a situation in Newfoundland where school buses are going to leave before dark, get on icy roads, be out in ditches with school children's lives at stake? Is that the legacy that this Minister and this Government want to leave to Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I do

not know the answer to that, that would be supposition by me. And certainly, no, we have no intention, we intend to provide as good a service as was ever there, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. The Marine Institute students will soon be the principal victims of the labour dispute that is going on between Government and the instructors' bargaining unit. About 25 per cent of the students have their tuition and their living expenses paid by Canada Employment Immigration Commission. We were told by the Student Union late yesterday evening that continuation of the CEIC sponsorship will be reviewed by the end of the week. Now if that sponsorship is cancelled on Friday 200 or more students will be out of the institute and they are going to be out of their careers as well. I want to ask the Minister has she raised the issue with CEIC? And if not, will she do so to secure the continuation of the CEIC funding for the duration of that strike?

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

Ms Cowan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

No, I have not raised that issue with that particular group, at this point I have not seen a need to. Conciliation officers are in touch with both sides, and we hope that it will be resolved before there is any undue harm to

students.

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

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Minister that conciliation has very little to do with CEIC. And the Minister, having met with the Federal Minister yesterday evening, I would have thought that she would have raised that issue with the Federal Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Doyle: Now, that strike is over a week old. It is ten days old almost. And the fall term is going to end in about a six week period. Is the Minister aware the courses taken in this institute this fall are not going to be available during the winter semester which means the courses that will have to be taken in September of 1991, they will not be able to take these courses this winter? That is going to have a tremendous impact upon the students at the Marine Institute. Now the Minister has appointed a conciliation officer. The Student Union is saying that the instructors are willing to talk and want to talk. The Government is saying it is ready to talk and want to talk. Now if both sides are ready to talk can the Minister indicate to me why there are no talks ongoing? Is the conciliator willing to talk?

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

Ms Cowan: I find that a most unusual question. The conciliators that are involved in resolving the Marine Institute are also the conciliators who have

been involved in resolving a number of disputes involving educational institutions around the Province, and have made very good headway. It is a very tricky business in conciliation to know when parties are ready to come back to the table. Very often they will say they are ready when, in fact, the conciliator knows because of his or her understanding of the case that indeed they are not ready to come back, and by coming back they may further entrench their positions and be at loggerheads for an even further time.

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

Mr. Doyle: As usual, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to get any information out of this Minister. Let me put it this way to her; given the fact that the Employment Immigration people could cancel this funding at any time, and have said that they will review it on Friday, and given the fact that the students now have their lives placed on hold, and given the fact that the situation is a serious one and requires a little bit more of an effort than the usual token effort from the Minister, will the Minister have both these sides brought together immediately, before the students are caught in a bind they cannot get out of?

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

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I guess I am going to have to give another lesson on what it is that the role of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations is all about. It is not my position, and I have found students very understanding of this. They seem to have a

greater knowledge of labour relations than the Opposition does. It is not my position to get the two sides back together again.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms Cowan: It is not. I recall the past Government was often criticized very harshly because of the fact that their then Minister did become involved and in that way jeopardize the neutrality of the office. I do not intend to do that. I have a great deal of confidence in my conciliation officers. They will know the time and they will move when that time is right. They have nothing to gain or lose by resolving the situation. They are looking at it with a very impartial eye, and they will be ready to move when the time is right.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to pose a question to the Province's chief negotiator, the President of Treasury Board. The instructor's strike at the Marine Institute, as we have just heard, gives every indication that it could continue for an extremely long time. We understand from public comments that job security is an issue, which the Minister refers to as a philosophical issue, which makes one wonder why a philosophical issue would allow such a strike to occur. Whoever heard of the like? We understand wages have not been discussed, we understand there other issues are still unresolved, and no one, as we have just heard from the Minister of Labour, seems to be talking. Can the President of Treasury Board tell the House the current status

of the negotiations, and can he give us an indication of when he expects this dispute to resolved, so that those who are suffering as innocent, third-party victims can get back to class?

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to reiterate a comment made by the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations as to the role of the Department of Labour in such situations. The Department of Labour is supposed to be the intermediary and is not supposed to be on either one side or the other. It is supposed to facilitate discussions, and that is what they have been doing. The collective bargaining aspect comes under Treasury Board.

An Hon. Member: What have you been doing?

Mr. Baker: If the member would hold on for a minute, and listen for a minute, I will tell him. I will answer his question if he is patient. I, just this morning as a matter of fact, had a full briefing on all of the intricate details of that particular dispute. I have had discussions with all parties involved. It is a three-party kind of situation: there is the workers and the union, and then there is the Marine Institute management and then there is Treasury Board. So we got together today.

I can say to the member at this time that, first of all, we are very concerned that there may be some serious effects from this strike if it carries on very much longer. I have expressed this view to the parties involved, and

indicated that I would like to see the bargaining process get started again, within the next couple of days, as soon as possible. So contacts hopefully will be made with the conciliator very quickly, with a view to getting the talks started within a couple of days.

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

Mr. Simms: I was waiting for an answer, Mr. Speaker. I did not really get much of an answer. I asked him when he expected the dispute to be resolved? He does not give us any indication of that.

May I ask him another question about another dispute. On Thursday night in this Legislature the Minister of Education, speaking in debate, gave the House every impression that a solution to the student assistants strike was just hours away. Five days later, the strike continues. Can I ask the President of Treasury Board, then, what is the current status with that particular dispute? Can he tell us if a settlement is about to be reached, or when we may expect one?

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very concerned that the member is dissatisfied with my previous answer. I cannot answer the question, when will it be solved? When will it be over? If I were to suggest that and give a time when it is going to be over, I would be accused of being dictatorial and trampling all over the collective bargaining process. All I can say to the hon. member is that the collective bargaining process will get back into operation in the very near

future, and beyond that, hopefully, quickly a resolution can come. But I am not going to dictate to anybody when that resolution will come.

Now with regard to the student assistants, Mr. Speaker, the member is absolutely right in some of his statements. The dispute, at this point in time, should not be going on. My information says all of the 410 workers - there has been a resolution of all the situations. I understand there were meetings all through the night last night, and I am hoping that something will happen very, very soon. Unfortunately, we had reached a collective agreement after the school year had started and there were some problems with the implementation.

The collective agreement itself, although ratified by the union, has not been signed, because we are getting copies done up and this happened between the ratification and the signing. The question then becomes, is a contract in place? If a contract is in place, then the union should go back to work and resolve the two or three problems that may remain out of the 410 workers through the grievance process which is in the collective agreement.

So, in summary, there is no reason for these people to be out on the streets right now, and we hope they will go back immediately.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely unbelievable. The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations does not seem to want to take any action, and the President

of Treasury Board seems content to sit back and assess the situation and think about it. But there are innocent third parties, as I have mentioned, the students at the Marine Institute and these handicapped students, who are at risk. Their futures are at risk. There is no question about it, their education has been placed in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker: Question, please. Question.

Mr. Simms: They are innocent, third-party victims, Mr. Speaker. Can I ask the Minister this? Will the Minister, the President of Treasury Board, take his responsibility seriously as the chief negotiator for the Province? Will he not take a personal interest or initiative in trying to get both these disputes back to the table so that you can get the matter resolved before things get worse than they are even now? Will he take a personal interest as the Province's chief negotiator? He has the ability to do that.

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

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, none are so deaf as those that will not hear. I just finished explaining that within the last hour or so I did take a personal interest, and now the Member says, will he take a personal interest?

Mr. Simms: A personal interest!

Mr. Baker: Why don't you listen?

Mr. Simms: Call the union in!

Mr. Baker: Why don't you listen?

Mr. Simms: Call the union in! Do

that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Baker: We have made sure that the process will now start.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

The question has been asked and I am sure that hon. members want to hear the answer. The Chair is having great difficulty hearing the answer and deciding when an answer has been satisfactorily made.

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We will ensure that the process will proceed, and I am hoping that a resolution will come soon. In terms of the student assistants, there is nothing at this point that can be done. Government negotiated a first collective agreement for a group of workers, the agreement was ratified by these workers, we agreed with the agreement, and the conditions of the agreement have been met. There is nothing more that can be done. At some point in time the workers have to go back to work.

Some Hon. Members: You broke the agreement. You broke the agreement.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education who should be showing some leadership in these disputes, not

just sitting on the fence. Maybe he is too busy fending off substitute teachers because of his remarks yesterday.

The Minister said yesterday cuts were made because of the difficult financial position of the Province. The fact is, cuts were made last March in the Budget. Will the Minister finally come clean and tell us the real reason he made the cuts?

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

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, we, in the past, have been trying to run this Government in a financially responsible way -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Dr. Warren: - since day one.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Dr. Warren: We are always looking at ways to make more effective use of the monies that Government makes available for all services. In the area of education, we thought this year that Government could reduce very slightly the amount of funding for substitute teachers. We thought, as a goal, as I said yesterday, we would reduce it from about \$14 million to \$12.8 million.

Mr. Speaker, I have here the report of what happened in 1984. If the hon. Member wants to hear how the government tried to act in 1984 to reduce substitute teachers, I can read what the government said about it. But I will not. That is irrelevant; maybe, at this point in time.

An Hon. Member: It didn't happen, though, did it?

Dr. Warren: How they tried in negotiation after negotiation. The Government position was to reduce the amount of money for substitutes. I can tell the public how they wanted to do it, but that is irrelevant.

Mr. Simms: But they didn't do it, did they?

Dr. Warren: Let me answer the question.

Some Hon. Members: They (inaudible) do it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Dr. Warren: They wanted to do it, they tried to do it.

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

If hon. Members want the answer to the question, then we are going to have to afford Ministers the courtesy. We cannot debate the answer. The question is asked and hon. Members should hear the question, and in view of the confusion that was caused, I assume that hon. Members do not want to hear the answer and I will go to the Member for another question.

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says we tried in negotiation. That is the place to try to get gains, not arbitrarily, as the Minister is now doing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

A question.

Mr. Hearn: Let me ask the Minister: since he said all he was

asking was teachers to give up one day, realizing that 80 per cent of the leaves are non-discretionary due to sick leave and compassionate leave and so on, teachers have very few days, probably two days for in-service and professional development, is the Minister asking them to give up half of their in-service and professional development days?

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

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, we did ask last year as a goal, the school boards to reduce one teacher substitute day per teacher. Teachers on the average use about eleven substitute days a year for all purposes, 57 per cent of which is for sick leave, which is not an unreasonable amount of sick leave I might say, Mr. Speaker, that is not an unreasonable amount. We made some comparisons.

Teachers do not abuse these leaves, but we thought, this year, with the difficult times the Government is having and with the needs for computers and all the things that we put additional money into, we could reduce substitute teachers by about 8 per cent.

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

There are some Members talking across the floor and it is making it very difficult for the Chair to listen. We are into difficult questions and the Chair wants to be able to assess when the Minister has satisfactorily answered the questions. With these noises back and forth, the Chair cannot hear.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that so I will not have to shout. I prefer not to shout in the House, Mr. Speaker.

We tried to reduce it slightly by about 8 per cent, it is our hope that it will not all come out of substitutes for in-service. We believe in in-service education and as I said in the House yesterday, teachers give up weekends, in the past they gave up evenings for substitutes, they give up time for in-service and the teachers in this Province have contributed greatly to the in-service and we do not want to hurt what they do. As a result, Mr. Speaker, we are asking school boards to try to save that \$1.2 million from all leaves and we hope that they can meet that goal this year, so that we have the money to spend on other things in education.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister knows full well that he is destroying professional development by eliminating half the professional leave, they, as teachers have. I ask him, was he serious yesterday when he said teachers should give up their evenings and Saturdays for professional development, knowing full well that teachers are involved in all kinds of extra curricular activities on weekends and during the evenings. Does he want these services to the students cut out also?

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

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I want to correct that. I said yesterday, teachers in the past have given extra time and once this dispute is over with the teachers right now, they have been advised right now, not to give any extra time to in-service.

I think you will find, Mr. Speaker, that as real professionals in this Province, once this dispute is over, teachers will go back to giving their time because teachers are interested in the welfare of students in this Province. They want to do what is best for education and they will not do anything to devastate in-service education, Mr. Speaker.

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my questions are for the President of Treasury Board. I know the Treasury Board President has recognized what the Premier refused to see, namely that there will be a reduction in health care services and programs as a result of the Government's freeze of hospital and nursing home budgets. However, yesterday the President of Treasury Board said that the Hospital and Nursing Home Association projections of layoffs and bed closures are incorrect, that they are exaggerated because the Government is going to absorb certain costs, including pay equity.

My first question is: Can the Minister confirm that the cost of pay equity for the hospitals and nursing homes will now be absorbed by the Government? Number two:

was this the original position of the Government, communicated to the hospitals and nursing homes? And number three: what will be the cost of implementing the principle of pay equity for employees of hospitals and nursing homes?

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That was a rather long preamble. There are a lot of things that perhaps I should respond to about me recognizing certain things that I have not recognized. The situation very basically is this, I did not say that about the estimates by the Hospital And Nursing Homes Association and refer to them at all. I said that the individual hospitals, when they are doing up their estimates, and individual institutions including nursing homes, when they do up their estimates are perhaps, and I said I have not seen them all, are perhaps including things like the payroll tax, which we have announced publicly, and in practice have ensured that that is in and out and has no effect on budgeting at all, the payroll tax. That there was an amount in this years budget for the eventuality of pay equity, so if the amount is in this years budget then obviously this is part of this years base budget and would not be an extra expense next year. And some of them may be considering, simply because the pay equity has not come in yet, they may be assuming that when it comes in it is an extra cost in their budget, but in fact it is not because we budgeted a universal figure for pay equity.

So, my point was that the individual institutions may be, in

getting their figures, using information that ultimately will be seen to be not correct. I am not suggesting that they are doing it deliberately. I am suggesting that these figures are in there and the impact that we are getting from these statements by the individual administrators of institutions is, in fact, inflated because of that.

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

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister referred to the estimate of the Association of Hospitals and Nursing Homes. I would remind him and other Members that that forecast was that the Government's freeze in hospital and nursing home budgets will mean effectively \$60 million less than those institutions require to carry on their present programs and services. The President of Treasury Board is saying that that is wrong (inaudible) -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member is up on a supplementary. She should get into the question.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the President of Treasury Board for his estimate, if \$60 million is exaggerated, what is his estimate of the effective reduction? And what is his forecast of the number of jobs that will be lost in the health care sector and the number of hospital and nursing home beds that will have to close?

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I say without equivocation that figure cannot be correct because nobody knows yet, nobody can estimate what it is that hospitals and nursing homes and so on would have ended up with in next year's Budget. What they have been told is to have a look at your Budget and tell us what would be the effect of existing next year on this year's Budget. So figures, percentages can be thrown around, but not with any degree of certainty, and I can say that that \$60 million figure is not accurate because there is no information on which to base such a figure. Now having dealt with that the direct question was - I missed one in her previous lot of questions about pay equity, the cost of pay equity, we do not know yet because the process has not been completed. We have \$6.3 million in our Budget. However -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker: Do not get excited.

- because the process has not been completed, the hon. Member knows that it could be more than that or it could be less. It might even be more. But we do not know what the ultimate figure is going to be. Everybody knows that there were \$6.3 million in this year's Budget.

An Hon. Member: One (inaudible) basically.

Mr. Baker: No.

My estimate as to the number of people who would have to be laid off, the number of hospital beds that will close, we are going through this process to simply find out what effect there would be on the system if institutions had to survive on this year's

allocation. We are doing the same with all departments of Government and so on. The question is being asked, look, go through it, do it up on the basis of this year's allocation, what will be the effect? When we get the information back and analyze it, then and only then will any decisions be made. Once we go through that process we will very gladly inform the hon. Member as to our conclusions.

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

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question now is to the Minister responsible for Historic Resources, the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. I would like to ask if the Minister is aware that Hampshire Cottage in Harbour Grace, built in the 1820s and one of the few remaining early planter houses in Conception Bay, may soon be torn down? And does the Minister's department have any strategy for preventing the destruction and loss of such major elements of our architectural heritage?

An Hon. Member: A good question.

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

Mr. Gullage: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very familiar with the Hampshire Cottage and the problem we have with buildings such as this one throughout the Province that have historic value, and yet the cost of refurbishing and rebuilding these structures is exorbitant compared to the amount of dollars that are available. In this particular case we have a value of some \$10,000 - the

structure as it exists right now. It may cost upwards of \$40,000, so I am told, to rehabilitate that structure to its original facade. So it is indeed a problem. It exists not just with Hampshire Cottage but other historic properties throughout the Province. I am encouraging, wherever possible, that these historic societies would work with the city councils to try to access funds at the community level, and fund raise, because indeed, if we were to try to rehabilitate and restore all the historic properties we have throughout the Province, and in Labrador, the cost would be well beyond our reach, and indeed the Province is not capable of doing it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Question Period has expired, if my use of new technology is correct.

Before proceeding to other business I would like to, on behalf of hon. Members, extend a warm welcome to a former Member of this House, Mr. Willie McNeil, and he is accompanied by the Mayor of Stephenville, Mr. Cecil Stein.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Notices of Motion

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

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

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has introduced Bill C-69, "An Act To Amend Certain Statutes To Enable Restraint Of Government

Expenditures".

An Hon. Member: Mr. Speaker, we can't hear him down here.

Mr. Simms: You will get a copy shortly.

Mr. Speaker: Maybe the hon. Member can speak up. Or maybe the mikes are not on.

The hon. the Member for Bellevue.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) Bill C-69.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Barrett: WHEREAS this Bill if passed will see a decrease in Federal funding of various social programs, including Medicare and post-secondary education; and

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

WHEREAS Bill C-69 will move the financial responsibility to cover the cost 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;

NOW THEREFORE 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.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Petitions

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

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present a petition on behalf of 196 constituents who happen to be in the teaching profession in Labrador West.

The prayer of the petition is: We, the teachers of the Labrador West branch of the NTA, strongly object to the action taken by Mr. Baker in his attempt to discredit our Association. And we also strongly object to the Government's refusal to sit down and negotiate a collective agreement with the teachers of Newfoundland and Labrador.

They are concerned that the President of Treasury Board has written to the teachers directly, attacking the credibility of the NTA and undermining the collective bargaining process. They are asking me to return the offending letters to the President of Treasury Board, and I will do that.

I have approximately 164 letters to return to the hon. President of Treasury Board on behalf of the teachers of western Labrador. I did not get them all, they wanted to keep some of them to use as scrap paper in their classrooms as part of the budgetary cutbacks they will undergo in the classroom processes in education in western Labrador, which this great Liberal Government has put upon them.

Of course, western Labrador, as probably known by most of you people in here and undoubtedly all the residents of western Labrador, is the best area to get an education for your children in this province, and that has largely been due, I believe, to

the additional revenues that were put in there by the mining companies, by local generated revenues that were put there to establish the facilities, first of all, and to pay a little larger remuneration to the teachers who work and teach in the facilities in western Labrador.

And to make a better use of in-service opportunities which would be made available to them, and more of them, in western Labrador, that was able to attract a better quality teacher in western Labrador, and we, as residents of Labrador, have been able to make use of that through sending our kids there. That is, I believe, one of the reasons why we have the highest per capita number of students who attend post-secondary education of any area in this province, and I think that is largely due to the better quality teacher we have in western Labrador.

Teachers have told me, when I meet them in the street in Labrador City and Wabush, that they are concerned that we are going to lose these better teachers, because they are tired of being attacked by this administration. They are tired of the cuts this administration is proposing upon their sector. They are especially disappointed, and they wanted me to express this, about the lack of people speaking up, people with whom they had worked previously, people they had elected to their NTA executive, and who are now sitting in the House of Assembly of this Province and do not speak up for them. They have asked me to express their concern about this. They recognize that these individuals, the hon. Member for Exploits and the hon. Member for Conception Bay South, have used

the NTA offices as a profile to get elected, and it was also a platform they used in public to get the seats they presently hold, and the offices they presently hold in this Province.

They moved from the classroom to the boardroom, and they forgot the concerns of the classroom in this Province. That is what the teachers are concerned about. These cuts in in-service are undoubtedly going to affect the quality of education, not just in western Labrador, of course, but in this whole Province, and they are very concerned about it. Some of the letters, I have to admit, have some things written on them to the President of Treasury Board, and I will just make a few quotes, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

They say, 'Dear Mr. Baker: I have been paying into a pension fund for over twenty years now, and as I near retirement, I am told that there is not enough money to sustain me in my old age. I wish to express my displeasure over the misuse of earlier pension money and the prospect of substantial gains in my contribution. This, coupled with education and health cutbacks, convinces me that a Liberal Government is not the best Government to run our affairs in this Province.'

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. A. Snow: May I just have one moment to clue up, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: No leave. No leave.

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

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I want to draw Your Honour's attention to a copy of yesterday's Hansard, Page 10, in which the remarks of the Minister of Education yesterday are attributed to me.

Mr. Speaker: Probably neither hon. member would want those set of circumstances to stand, so we will act accordingly.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak to the petition presented by my colleague, the Member for Menihek. I do not know if the President of Treasury Board was listening to the contents of this particular petition.

Mr. Murphy: Table that letter.

Mr. Simms: I am just going to refer to it in debate.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: What is the hon. member talking about? Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the hon. Member for St. John's South is talking about, which is not unusual, but he will continue to make his interjections.

The prayer of the petition - I did not think he heard it - essentially it is another situation where the teachers of Labrador West, represented by the Member for Menihek, have asked the Member for Menihek to present a petition in the House, signed by 196 people, teachers I presume, most of them at least, trying to point out to the Minister that they strongly object to the action taken by him in his attempt, in their words, to discredit their Association, and his refusal to

sit down and negotiate a collective agreement with the teachers of Labrador West. That is the purpose of the petition.

In addition to that, they have asked my colleague, in presenting the petition, if he would return a bunch of letters to the President of Treasury Board which they object to violently, and the object is also contained in the prayer of the petition signed by 196 teachers in Labrador West. I am not sure how many letters are here. There is a bunch of them, anyway. Most of them, many of them, have comments attached to them, as he is well aware, and I think for the record it would be appropriate to refer to some of them. Some of them, by the way, I am not sure I would want to, but here is one, for example, which has writing all around it and it says to, Mr. Baker, I guess: 'Please define the definition of negotiations as you see it. Obviously, there must be a big difference in opinion. Also, you asked us to trust you, a politician, and not our elected union leader' - the President of the NTA, they are referring to. 'I would think you knew better. 'Wake up and smell the coffee.'

Now these are all comments which are attached. They would like a reply to this particular individual. I presume they have signed it?

An Hon. Member: Yes, they have. They have.

Mr. Simms: Many of these have their signatures attached, by the way, so you will be able to respond. Here is another one, an excerpt from a letter. This person took the time to write a letter, attached to the letter:

'Dear Mr. Baker: As a second year teacher in this Province, I am not in immediate jeopardy with regards to the pension plan. As a responsible adult, however, I must plan for my future. As you stated in your letter, the Government has failed to meet its obligations in the past and who is to say - who is to say - that the same situation will not re-occur in the future.' These are the kinds of concerns. And seeing what this Government has been doing, this Liberal Government, I suspect they have all kinds of reasons for fear. Any others?

'The NTA is our bargaining unit. Pension updates should come from the NTA, not from the President of Treasury Board.' And this one: 'How is your pension fund balanced?' - which is a very appropriate question, a very timely question. 'Where are all the honest people who were elected?' And on and on and on and on it goes, Mr. Speaker.

'Were you as big a disgrace in your former profession as you appear to be in your current one?' These are not very -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well, they are coming from teachers. I expect that most teachers in the Province are quite intelligent, Mr. Speaker. But the action by the President of Treasury Board, and this is the whole point, in writing directly to those teachers and referring to the action of the President of the NTA has, he has to admit, and I am sure he has heard it from the Member for Exploits and the Minister of Labour, infuriated teachers around the Province, even though the Minister himself gets up from time to time in the House

and talks about how rosy the picture is, things are going along dandy with teachers, and so on.

So I trust the Minister will take the prayer of the petition to heart and will pay attention to what the teachers are saying.

One final one. I just had a phone call in our office, before we came up, from the Lewisporte Branch of the NTA. 'Please mention to the President of Treasury Board that the President of the Notre Dame Lewisporte Branch of the NTA called the Opposition office today to express her extreme disappointment in their Member, Mr. Penney.' Mr. Speaker, we promised them we would pass it on in the House of Assembly. Table all these?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a few words to this particular petition, and to the representations which have been made by the two hon. Members who have just finished speaking.

Mr. Speaker, the litany of condemnation read out by the hon. the Member for Grand Falls applies directly to the situation that was specifically created by the former Government when they sat in power.

An Hon. Member: Oh, no, by you and your (Inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: They destroyed the pension fund of this Province.

Mr. Matthews: (Inaudible) You! You! You!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Order, please!

I shall have to remind the hon. Member for Grand Bank that I am standing.

Mr. Matthews: Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: And I want to remind hon. Members that as far as I know, when the two hon. Members were presenting petitions, not a word was uttered from this side. There are only five minutes, and hon. Members should extend the same courtesy to the Premier.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is truth that cuts so hard it puts them into an absolute frenzy. They cannot cope with it, because they are so totally unfamiliar with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the simple truth about the teachers' pension fund and what Governments, the former Government over there and the Government before that, the Liberal Government -

Mr. Simms: That has nothing to do with the petition.

Premier Wells: Yes, it has a lot to do with the petition.

Mr. Simms: No, it does not. Not a thing to do with it.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I will still like to speak. If the Members will not refrain from speaking, would you ask they be removed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Again, I ask hon. Members, please, there are only five minutes. The House only operates effectively

with the co-operation of all hon. members. I remind the Premier and others that when we are speaking, of course, we must speak to the material allegations of the petition. One does not know many times if a member is speaking to the material allegations within the first few seconds, one has to hear the point being made.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking specifically to the comments the hon. the Member for Grand Falls read out of the petition. I am speaking and addressing specifically the comments we were asked to address. He sat there and he read these additional letters. Now answer this allegation. Here is what they are saying about you. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are answering them. They have such an aversion to facts and truth that they cannot sit quiet and hear it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask him just to sit quiet for a minute and hear the explanation, and the explanation is fairly simple. At one time, Mr. Speaker, the former Liberal Government, instead of contributing an equal amount with teachers to the pension fund, they not only did not contribute, they took back out what the teachers contributed and used it as general revenue with the undertaking that the Province would pay the pensions.

The former Conservative Government, headed by Mr. Moores, when it came into power, continued that for some significant period of time, until 1980, some nine years. Then, Mr. Speaker, it was changed, in 1980, and from that time on they so mismanaged the fund that in addition to the problem that was already there of

the shortfall, they so mismanaged pension and pension obligation, and so failed to provide adequately for it, that in addition to the shortfall that is already there, here is the situation today that they have created.

Mr. Speaker, the pension fund, when you assess it today, if you operate on the assumption that there would be no increases in the pension, the pension fund is at this moment one billion two hundred and some-odd million short of the funds it needs. Of that one billion two hundred and some-odd million, \$216 million relate to the failure of the former Liberal Government and the former Conservative Government to contribute. So if the Government today went to the market and borrowed the money necessary to repay to that pension fund every cent that was taken out, every cent that Government failed to put in, and every cent that those funds would have earned in interest in the meantime, it would take \$216 million, and the pension fund would be still more than \$1 billion short. Now that is the truth of the situation, and somebody should tell the teachers of this Province the truth so they will know.

Mr. Rideout: They know that.

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, our commitment is to make sure that the teachers who have dedicated their lives to teaching the students of this Province, when the time comes for them to retire will have a secure pension. That is our first and foremost obligation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Premier Wells: Our first and foremost obligation is to the teachers, and we intend to discharge it. Our second obligation is to the taxpayers of this Province. We could say forget it for now, it will not happen until about 1998 or 2000 and by then we might be ready to retire and maybe the other side might be having a crack at Government and leave it for them. Now that was the philosophy of the former Government. We are not prepared to do that to the taxpayers of this Province.

An Hon. Member: Why do you not tell the truth for a change. (Inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: (Inaudible) the truth for a change.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, would you restrain the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: You should be restrained.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I remind the hon. the Premier that his time is up, and he has asked the Leader of the Opposition to restraint himself.

Premier Wells: If they would give me one more second I will finish.

Some Hon. Members: No leave.

Premier Wells: No leave.

Mr. Speaker: No leave. I am sorry.

Premier Wells: Too bad. They have such an aversion to truth they cannot stand it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

I will recognize the hon. member when we get some order.

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to present a petition, and I hope that the Premier will respond to this petition. The petition is of several residents of the St. John's area. Many of these people are constituents of the Minister of Finance. I think a few are residents of the district of the Minister of Education. Others live in the district of St. John's East where I notice the Liberal candidate is campaigning on a platform of improving the lot of single mothers and battered women.

The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is: Your petitioners urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to reverse its change in policy and continue to permit social assistance recipients to retain a substantial portion of maintenance and child support payments as well as regular social assistance.

Mr. Speaker, as I trust all the Members of the House of Assembly realize by now, on October 1st the Minister of Social Services and his department sneaked in a regressive change in social assistance regulations. A change that resulted in an instant decline in income for close to

1,000 single parent families throughout Newfoundland and Labrador. For many of those families that decline represented as much as twenty per cent of their total family income.

Now, Mr. Speaker, astoundingly the Minister of Social Services has been defending this change. The Minister responsible for the Status of Women has been silent as have many of his colleagues. The Premier has endorsed the conclusion of the Minister of Social Services that this change was done for the sake of - guess what - fairness and balance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the Premier has failed to explain is how was it fair to reduce the income of some of the poorest people in the Province? How was it fair to decrease the income of a single mother with three children from \$650 a month to \$550 a month? How was it fair to negate the benefit of the support enforcement agency for the people who need it most, the people on social assistance? How was it fair to take away the incentive for single mothers to go to court and seek orders for child support? And how is it fair, how is it balanced, how is it consistent to allow children of social assistance recipients who are married and living together to benefit from the income of the father's earnings from a job, when denying those same children the benefit of the father's earnings should the father leave the children and separate from the mother? How is that fair?

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the last few days no Member of the Government has been rising to address this type of petition that I have presented. Every day that I have been here since this sitting began

I have presented a petition of people of the Province protesting the change. Initially the Minister of Social Services and the Premier responded. The Premier, on October 18th, acknowledged that he did not know the details of the change, but he did undertake to the House and the people of the Province that he would get the details, that he would investigate, and that if he saw a mistake was made he would announce it and correct the mistake. Sadly, the Premier did not deliver on his promise. He did not get all the details. All he did was talk to the Minister and take the Minister's glib assurance that, oh yes, this really was done for the sake of fairness and balance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Premier has conducted a detailed investigation in the last day or so, and I await his response today.

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had not intended to rise again today and to speak on this particular petition because it seems it is an ongoing thing every day. And the more often we talk to the hon. Member for Humber East, and the more we explain, the less she understands about what is actually taking place as far as maintenance income for single parents goes. And day after day in Question Period she will not ask a question but she will phone over to the officials of my department and ask questions, but she will not ask the Minister about the questions. So she is not really showing a true concern about the single parents in the

Province, she is just trying to play politics.

And I suggest to the hon. Member, I suspect that she was on the phone last evening phoning the seven single parents that she is representing in St. John's East, because there are approximately 2,200 single parents in St. John's. You have a petition representing seven. So you made seven phone calls last night, or several phone calls, and that is the type of business you are trying to drum up. Because last week, or two weeks ago, she met with the single parents in the city, and she asked them to have a march on Confederation Building to try and get the Minister of Social Services to change his mind, and they said no. In fact, most of the single parents who I have spoken to in meetings agree with the decision made by the Department of Social Services and the Government of today.

I will explain. In fact the Member for Springdale sent the copy of Hansard out to one of the reporters in Western Newfoundland. That individual called me. And when I explained the decision we had made and what it was doing, that reporter said to me on the phone - who is, by the way, a single parent herself - what are they talking about? And I will quote: 'What in the name of goodness is the Member talking about? What is the Member for Humber East talking about?'

It is absolutely stupid. Single parents want an opportunity to work. They do not want to stay on social services. They do not want to be dependent on social services. And it is very clear that the hon. Member for Humber East is not willing to listen to

the answers given by this side of the House. And I suggest - and if the hon. Member for Humber East would listen to my conclusion - if you really sat in your sit last Thursday evening for thirty minutes and listened to the explanation I had given, and you do not understand, then I will go up to Hansard, although it is not yet printed, and I will get an excerpt from Hansard of my speech. And I will give it to you, and deliver it to you, so you can take it home, sit down in the quietness and peace of your home, read it and absorb it, so you will not get more confused than you already are, and you will feel as good as everybody else does in the Province in understanding the situation.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A couple of points. Number one: As I understand from my colleague, the petition is not necessarily signed by single parents, it is a petition of people concerned about the matter. I understand -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hewlett: I understand it was a petition -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please!

Mr. Hewlett: - publicly available at a local food store in the city of St. John's and signed by customers of that store.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hewlett: Okay. The hon. Minister indicates he would rather have single parents earn a living and not be on social services. That is very commendable. I have no argument whatsoever. The problem here Mr. Speaker, is we are talking about single parents who are on social services. If the single parents concerned are earning a gainful wage in the regular work force then they are not on social services, they are not having anything deducted from their social services because they are not gaining any social services. There is nothing wrong. The Minister is to be commended for every person that he finds gainful employment for.

But I would like to go back to a point that my colleague made. If two parents are together and they have some earned income they are allowed to retain, I think, up to \$115 a month of earned income. Earned income. Now Mr. Speaker, if a family separates and a judge says to the absent spouse, you must pay x dollars a month to your absent family, then obviously that individual under the court order is earning some income. No individual on welfare is going to be made to make payments by a judge. If the individual is earning income the only thing that has changed is, number one: he has a court order requiring him to pay it, and number two: he is separated physically from his wife and children.

When he is together with his wife and children they are allowed to be the beneficiary of up to \$115 a month of that income. The fact that he is separated physically from his wife and children does not in any way lessen the

entitlement of his children to monies from his earned income. And let us understand one thing here Mr. Speaker. We are talking about people who are on social assistance.

If the hon. Minister through the good offices of his Department can provide these people with gainful employment so that they are no longer on social assistance then this is an academic matter. This does not apply to such people. The problem we have here is the reduction of a benefit to people who are on social assistance.

And I would say to the hon. Minister, fine, come up with all the programs you can to put people to work, provide these single parents with the necessary day care services so they can obtain gainful employment in our society, and what the petition was all about would be totally academic.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Motion 4, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? Motion 4:

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak briefly in this debate and I have to go to Labrador later this afternoon, so I wanted to take a few minutes now to address the question that is effected by Motion 4 which is, in fact, a closure motion, I assume we will debate the balance of the question now.

An Hon. Member: What time is your

flight?

Premier Wells: The flight is at 5:50 or something and I have to go home and pack a bag and do a few other things. So I would just like to take a few minutes to address the questions.

An Hon. Member: He wants to vote on the motion.

Premier Wells: I am sorry, am I altering the procedures of the House, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Simms: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Simms: I do not mean to interrupt the Premier. No, I had talked to the Government House Leader and asked if we could perhaps have a five minute recess before we started and got into the debate simply because we were thinking it would not come probably until Thursday. So I just wanted to have five minutes, there are a couple of points about whether we will take a supper break and these kinds of things that I wanted to discuss.

So we could do it now or if you want to go ahead and speak we could take our break after.

Premier Wells: Okay, let us do that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the hon. members, Mr. Speaker.

There has been a great deal of confusion about what is motivating the Government and what the Government's objective and plan is in this connection. Before I do

and on an not unrelated subject because it deals with financial requirement over the next number of years, I just want to finish the last point I would have made on that comment I was making with respect to the petition on teachers pensions.

The last point that I wanted to make is, bearing in mind the background that I had just detailed, here is the alternative that is facing the Government at the moment; either we do nothing and let the plan go bankrupt and in 1998 here is the alternative open to the Government, the Legislature and the people of this Province - let the teachers who have worked and expected a pension have no pension, and that, Mr. Speaker, is unthinkable. We have an obligation to those teachers who have dedicated their effort over the years in the belief that they would have a sound and reliable pension on which to rely when they retire.

The other alternative is to leave it to the taxpayers to pay it. And the financial advisers tell us, Mr. Speaker, that if we leave it to the taxpayers and we do not take these steps now, it will cost on average \$200 million a year for the ten years starting in 1998 and running to 2008. Now those are the alternatives. Let the taxpayers take it on the chin for \$200 million a year and still have nothing in the pension fund, or leave the teachers without a pension. Both of those alternatives are unacceptable to this Government and we intend to address the problem. Addressing the problem means addressing the question of the cost of the pension, and the entitlement that we are building up.

So we have to put this thing forward for discussion and concern and consideration by all parties concerned. And we have to make a commitment that the Government and people of this Province will make good for what the Government failed to do in the past. Now we are prepared to commit this Government, for as long as we are in power, to putting additional funds into the teachers' pension fund every year in order to make sure that we protect the teachers and we do not bankrupt the people of this Province ten years from now.

Now we must do that in a responsible way, and that is all we are doing. And all these political shenanigans of the Opposition to bring in and put together these petitions in this way, and all of the criticisms and comments of the members of the NTA cannot possibly alter those facts. They are the fundamental facts with which we are faced. We believe, Mr. Speaker, we are handling them in a responsible way. And if the Opposition and the teachers do not think we are, we are prepared to fight an election on the basis of which we are handling this - without question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Premier Wells: We are prepared to go to the people of this Province and ask them if they think we are handling it in the right way.

We will take the political heat for what we are doing but we cannot be railroaded by either the cries and screams of the Opposition, or the pressure efforts of the teachers. We must protect the interests of those dedicated teachers who put in that

effort, but we must do so in a way that responsibly deals with the position of the taxpayers for the next ten, twenty, or thirty years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to deal more specifically with this particular motion the Government's original concern - well, I should say the officials became aware of it at least by the 3 April. I know that because that is when they tell me they got it. I do not know when the officials drew it to the attention of the Minister, but they treated this as normal every month advice and they don't draw this to our attention because it goes up and down. Now, I cannot say when they drew it to the attention of the Minister of Finance, but I can say, from the best of my recollection, that I seem to have had the potential for it, or the indication that there was an estimate of a shortfall in the coming year of a substantial magnitude, perhaps sometime in June. I do not remember when it might have been and I cannot be any more specific than that. Then when looking at it, and looking at other indicators, we saw sometime by July that our own revenue from Provincial sources would be down as well. In August, when we took a look at this and put it all together, the Minister of Finance, I believe, made a statement indicating that there was the possibility of a shortfall this year of as much as \$65 million, and we could have a \$55 million deficit, depending on how it was going. He indicated at that time that the trends in our own revenue collection were downward so there might be an increasing problem, and we were watching it. By September, I guess the Minister of Finance had a little bit more reliable information, and by then the economic recession had hit

this country. And don't forget, Mr. Speaker, that we in Canada are in a genuine recession and the consequences of that to the Province, which is not of our making, we did not cause it, but we suffer from the consequences, as all parts of the nation do, and every other Province of this nation is facing this problem now, including the national Minister of Finance, Mr. Wilson, who made his statement yesterday about the cuts he has to make. That is the position we are in, the whole nation is in it. We happened, Mr. Speaker, to have moved faster than anybody else. Not only were we not late in advising the House but we were ahead of any other Government. Every other Provincial Government in this country had the same information that we did at the same time that we did and not one of them moved before we did. We were the first. How can they, with any credibility, criticize us for delaying it? It is totally unsupportable, Mr. Speaker. We moved quickly to deal with the problem and we are concerned about the extent of it, and how big it could be. We looked at it, and with the potential for a \$120 million problem for this current fiscal year we know that we cannot possibly make the kinds of reductions in governmental expenditures that will allow us to offset that effect, so we know we are going to have to greatly increase our borrowings for this year because of that. We know and accept that, but we hope to reduce it by as much as we can. We also admit, quite candidly, that we do not know whether it is going to be \$120 million, \$80 million, or \$150 million. It may be up or down from the \$120 million and there is no way of projecting it at this stage. What we said, and if

anybody looks back at Hansard they will see me saying, if there is no further change, no further circumstances that causes change, or that result in change, it should be approximately \$120 million. If Hibernia has a more positive impact, or if something happens on the national level that causes a lesser reduction in the equalization payments, then it will not be as bad, but if things happen in the other direction, if Hibernia does not contribute as significantly as we hope it will, or if national circumstances are such that it results in a greater reduction, then, Mr. Speaker, in those circumstances we could have a higher one. I do not apologize for the fact that we are not saying it is going to be \$120,415,000, we do not know what it might be. We are taking responsible action now to deal with a matter that is of major concern and major proportion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for this year, that is a serious problem and we know we are going to have to borrow, but having had a net \$70 million surplus last year, it is not so serious. We know that we can confidently go to the market and say, look, last year we ended up with a \$70 million surplus, after taking an extra 20 million and putting into the teachers pension fund, we still had a \$70 million surplus, so our financial situation is not really serious, if we have to borrow an additional 70 or 80 or 90 of the 120 million we may be short this year, I am sure the market would be understanding and responsive.

What they will not accept lying down, Mr. Speaker, is for us then to follow on the heels of that with a Budget for next year that projects a \$200 or \$300 million

deficit if we do not get our expenditures under control for the coming year, and the only way to do that for the coming year is to start to take the action now.

Now, I can say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not know and there are two key reasons why I do not know what our financial situation will be in next year's Budget, and I cannot even make a very substantial guess, but I look at the national recession.

If that national recession persists, and Ontario performs steadily worse, as it has been recently, then the level of equalization is going to go down still further in this Province, so we are going to have substantial cuts again.

If the recession continues, tax revenues in Newfoundland will also go down as they go down in other parts of the country, so our revenues from provincial sources will also be down, so there is a potential for having a very significant reduction in our revenue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if Hibernia causes a different economic situation in Newfoundland, then it could offset that and our revenues could be up, but nobody, right at this moment can predict that situation with any degree of confidence or certainty. So that leaves us in this situation and what do we do, do we gamble on being left in a situation where we may have to Budget for a \$200 or \$300 million deficit next year, or do we take responsible steps now to try and keep us within reasonable bounds, reduce our expenditure and if things turn out more positive we will have more money to spend and we can

re-introduce some of the proposals that we may have had to delay or defer or cut out, or rehire some people whom we may have had to lay off, but we do not know.

We do, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime have an obligation to the taxpayers of this Province to act responsibly. We cannot act with absolute certainty because there are so many unpredictables, like the length of the recession, the depth of the recession, the extent of the impact of the recession, the extent of the impact of Hibernia and a variety of other factors. We cannot risk threatening the financial security and stability of this Province, so we have to take action in a responsible way.

And what did we do? We did not go to the hospitals or the different departments and say you are going to be cut this and that, you have to cut out 800 jobs, you have to do this or something else, we said, how is the best way to handle this. We do not know ourselves, the Ministers sitting around the Cabinet table do not know the best way to cut expenditures in individual departments or agencies of Government, so why don't we go and ask the people concerned.

Now if we asked them how much can you cut, in every case where that is done, every year, and the hon. Members Opposite, I am sure, are very familiar with it, including the Leader of the Opposition, they will come back and say, oh, not only can we not cut, we have to have an increase.

This is normal, that is the way the departments and the agencies function, so we said, we have to give some kind of guideline that

will be fair to everybody. What will we do, what will we give them as a guideline to operate? These are not decisions, these are guidelines which we have put in place and the guideline that we put in place was to cap the expenditure, the planned expenditure for next year on the basis of the amount expended this year.

So what we said we will do, we will go to each of the departments and agencies and say to them, come back with a proposal and tell us what would be the impact of your planning next year's Budget on the basis of having no more money than you had this year. How we will handle it, the extent to which we will implement it in any particular department, the extent to which it may be more severe than that in some departments, less severe in others, we do not yet know. And I say that with absolute honesty and certainty and conviction. We do not yet know. And that is what the President of Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance and myself whenever we have spoken have been trying to say to people. What we are asking them to do is to give us some recommendations as to how we can deal with this very serious problem. And we are, in effect, consulting with the people who had to deliver the service. We are also consulting, Mr. Speaker, with other people, with the leaders of the unions, of the public service unions. The President of Treasury Board called in all the leaders and met with, so far as I know, all the leaders of the public service unions, explained to them what we were trying to do and what the Government's intention was and what we were trying to achieve and ask them to come back and have an input in the future. And once we

get this information in from the civil servants and from the heads of the different agencies of Government we intend to take the information and what it shows and we will talk again to the public service unions and say here is what we are thinking. Here is one possibility and here is another. What is your input?

Now, you cannot do any more than that. What we cannot do and will not do is surrender to the heads of the public service union the right to make the decision. That is Government's and it can only be dealt with finally in this House, Mr. Speaker, affirmed or denied by the Members of this House. So, while we are prepared to consult we will never, ever surrender the right to decide to any outside group. Government must take that and make that decision because that is its responsibility. And we will do so, but there is nothing wrong with the process that we are going through of consulting and seeking advice, and that is essentially the process that we are in now.

Now, in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the process was fraught with a bit of a difficulty because it is perfectly understandable that when the head of a particular agency is faced with this and he knows that the effect of it may be a reduction in his or her ability to deliver the services of that agency, a reduction of employees, he gets his back up and raises the great spectre of a monster that is going to be created and puts this out to the public in order to pressure the Government not to cut so severely.

So, I understand the tactic. I am not naive. The Opposition sees it as a good political opportunity

and they beat the devil out of the Government day after day in the House about what the Government is doing and failing to deliver on its commitments and so on, and they get as much political mileage out of it as they can. And that is what we have seen in this debate. I am not entirely happy about it, but I have some understanding for it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I want to remind the hon. the Premier that he has one minute left.

Premier Wells: It will only take me a couple of minutes to clue it up.

So, I understand that, Mr. Speaker. But I suggest that we are unduly frightening the civil servants who are involved. We are unduly frightening people in the Province who will have to rely on medical and educational and other services. And I think that is unfair because I state categorically, nobody knows at this moment what will be the extent of it. The decisions are not made. We are merely canvassing all possible alternatives and we are asking for advice as to what the impact will be and we will make the decision when the time comes. Now, that is what we have been saying from the beginning, and I wanted to have this opportunity to re-state it so that people will understand clearly that what we are seeking to do is manage the affairs of the Province in a responsible way and try and reduce the expenditure, because we do not know where this recession will lead and what kind of a financial burden it will put on the Province.

Mr. Speaker, it is not our objective to cost jobs. It is our objective to have jobs created. We do not want to see a single job lost, but we still have to be responsible. What has happened over the last sixteen or seventeen year, Mr. Speaker, and I will pass this around so hon. Members can see it, I just got this this morning and I thought it spelled it out accurately.

I am not putting this around, Mr. Speaker, to make political points and say, here is what happened in Newfoundland and Labrador during the sixteen years of Tory rule, I do not blame the former Government for this consequence. I blame the former Government for failing to recognize the real problem and deal with it. But they did not cause this. I do not blame this on them.

What I am handing around, Mr. Speaker, to all hon. Members, and I will ask the Page to do it now, is a chart I got this morning from the Economic Council of Canada. And what it shows in each of them is the differential between the unemployment rate in each province, over Ontario. So when you look at 1971, Newfoundland had an unemployment rate that was about 1.5 per cent higher than Ontario. In 1971.

Then it shows it in 1981, then it shows it in 1986. And it shows the same thing for every other province except PEI. Now Mr. Speaker, look at what has happened to Newfoundland. In the intervening sixteen years between 1971 and 1986, the unemployment, the differential between Newfoundland and Ontario, has climbed to be at least eight times what it was in 1971. Now it happens to coincide with the same

period that those hon. Members governed this Province. I do not, for political reasons, attribute the responsibility for that to them. That is a consequence of national policy - some of it by a former Liberal government, some of it by the current Conservative Government - it is not attributable solely to them.

What I attribute to them is the failure to recognize the real problem and cause the real problem to be dealt with. That is the political responsibility that I think they will ultimately share.

So when you look at this Mr. Speaker you will know that it is not our intention to cause any job loss in the civil service, in the private sector, or anywhere. Our objective is to build the jobs in this Province. But here is what happened in terms of comparing Newfoundland with Ontario. But look also at New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, going in exactly the same direction. The other provinces are different. Why is that, Mr. Speaker? It is because of the benign patronizing way that national governments of all political stripes have treated the Atlantic Provinces in terms of dealing with economic disparity.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to put ourselves in a position to address this problem and these kinds of problems in an effective way. Maintaining the financial viability of this Province and the financial stability is key to that. And if we do not address this budgetary problem that we have now in an effective way, Mr. Speaker, we will never be able to address this overall problem and correct this kind of disparity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will have time

to address this further on another occasion. But I do want to thank hon. Members for extending me the courtesies they have this afternoon, and I appreciate it very much, but I wanted to make these comments, because I want to stop irresponsibly creating concerns for our citizens and for our employees until we know the full measure and what the alternatives are.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

For the benefit of hon. members and to ensure that we are proceeding the right way. Hon. Members will recall that when the President of Treasury Board had called the Orders of the Day, the Chair asked for the question. Because what was supposed to happen is that we were supposed to vote on Motion 4. It is not debatable, we just vote on it, that we do what we are supposed to do, what motion 4 says. Then we are supposed to move into the Committee of the Whole. But I then assume that we allowed the Premier to speak by agreement.

So, if we would now go back to where we were, where the President of Treasury Board called Motion 4, which was "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province", standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Finance, and any amendments to that Motion shall not be further adjourned and that further consideration of any resolutions, amendments, clauses, sections, preambles, schedules, titles relating to Motion No. 1 shall not be further postponed.

And I think also, the agreement was, that when we moved into the

Committee of the Whole I believe we were going to break for five minutes.

To move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means to discuss said bill, and that I do now leave the Chair.

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

Committee of the Whole

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, before we begin proceedings, and before the clerks start taking time, I had a brief discussion with the Government House Leader and I wonder if we might be able to have a short recess, five minutes, maybe ten maximum - we will alert the Chair, to give him time to ring the bells - just for a number of discussions. One of the things we want to discuss, the normal procedure in this process would require that you carry on debate right through supper. But I think maybe by agreement we might be able to make some agreements on a break for supper.

There are a couple of things like that, so I wonder if we might have agreement to have a short five, ten minute probably, maximum, recess?

Mr. Baker: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is fine.

Mr. Chairman: Okay. The

Committee recesses for ten minutes.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) call for a vote.

Mr. Simms: Could call the question, I suppose.

An Hon. Member: And then a division?

Mr. Simms: You had better get used to it. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I only have twenty minutes, as we all do, and I shall try to keep within the twenty minutes.

First of all, of course, I would be remiss in my responsibilities as Opposition House Leader if I did not make some reference to the procedure the Government is using, the tactics the Government is using now to once again use their majority, ram through legislation which has not been debated at least to the satisfaction of Members on this side of the House, nor, we believe, to the satisfaction of the people out there in the general public.

We have lots of questions to ask, we have been asking lots of questions. We have been asking questions in a labour relations area, about the problems the President of Treasury Board and the Minister of Labour are facing in today's current situation, raising questions about the fire fighters who have been hard done

by, fire fighters who have not seen the Minister of Municipal Affairs attempt to right a wrong that was put on to the fire fighters recently. We have seen all kinds of representations from teachers around the province because of the tactic used by the President of Treasury Board and so on. So we have raised all kinds of those questions in this particular debate.

We have raised time after time again, as evidenced by the press and the news media coverage, questions in the House during Question Period as well as during debate, about the Province's financial situation. Why it occurred, asking the Minister of Finance to explain to us this very complicated situation, which he tried to explain last night but, in my view, made it even more complicated and confusing. We asked the media how come they did not discuss that issue yesterday that was raised in Question Period. Most of them said it was because it sounded too complicated, very difficult to understand.

I say to the Minister of Finance, I am accurate in what I am saying. And, so, we are trying to raise questions. Now the Government is not satisfied to let us continue to ask the questions because the questions are putting pressure on them. And to avert the pressure, rather than answer the questions, they have decided to use what has now become a favourite tactic of theirs, and that is to invoke closure, which stymies and cuts off debate, and does not allow the Members of the House of Assembly, duly elected, to express the views of their constituents on a particular piece of legislation.

The Premier, of course, did not even mention the closure issue. I regret very much that the Government has chosen this tactic. But we see, as I said, from a Government only in power now for a year and a half, on the other hand a Government that will be starting its third year in office, six or so months from now. In a little less than six months or so, they will be starting the third year of their mandate, which is so hard to believe, and, Mr. Speaker, already they have used closure on at least a couple of occasions that I recollect just off the top of my head. Unheard of!

In our terms in office, closure was not used all that frequently - occasionally. The Government House Leader reminded me that they used filibuster tactics one time before in a closure debate that was imposed by this House, yet he gets up time after time and chastises us and accuses us of filibustering in this particular situation. It is not a filibuster. It is genuine concern on the part of Members elected to this side of the House to represent the views of their constituents by raising questions time and time again until they get answers. Unfortunately, what has transpired is that we have not been able to get answers.

Now the Government used all kinds of other little intimidation tactics. If we were going to continue to ask questions and pressure the Government, it was their intention to have night sittings. They will try to wear us out by bringing us back at night. Well, of course, the Government House Leader saw that that tactic did not work. We had no problem sitting at nights. We

sat Thursday night, we sat last night, we are going to sit again tonight, obviously, and we would have been prepared to sit whatever nights would have been required. But that was the first little intimidation tactic by the Government House Leader.

Then he says, well, if we do not get through all this important legislation we have to get through, we may have to come back in January. He floated that out to me - may have to come back in January. That is the second little intimidation tactic.

And now, of course, the ultimate tactic, closure. The gag order. The guillotine has been brought down on us. Not allowed to speak anymore. Then he gets up in the House last night and he says, it is all the Opposition House Leader's fault. The first week or so, while I was away for a few days, lots of co-operation, the Opposition was ready to cooperate and ready to let the loan Bill go and all that stuff. There was never, I understand, any commitment given to that extent.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)
Hibernia bill only.

Mr. Simms: The Hibernia bill was the one we promised we would let go through, not have a big debate on it. But I can assure the House Leader now, just so he is aware, and I will say it in front of my colleagues here now in the caucus, that if I were to try to use my influence in caucus meetings to determine how debate in the House should proceed, I can assure him I would have about as much luck as he has, because I do not think he has a lot of luck in trying to use his influence. I advise the caucus as best I can on House

procedure and the options the Government House Leader has. They are fully aware of the night sittings. They are fully aware of closure, and they are fully aware of the House maybe coming back in January. They are fully aware of all of that. But they were determined and committed, every last one of the members on this side of the House, they were determined and committed to raising questions in this Legislature, trying to get the Government to provide the answers to the people that we represent, to our constituents. That is the reason why we continued to debate the loan bill, Mr. Chairman, and I want to make that perfectly clear.

Now he made reference last night to all the important legislation we have to get through. We have a lot of stuff here on the Order Paper, forty pieces of legislation - a lot of stuff we have to get through. So I took a quick glance today at some of these bills and tried to see what the amendments were and how detailed and complex these issues were.

Order 10, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Education." Now that is a big heavy bill I will tell you. "An Act To Amend The Welfare Institutions Act". Have a look at that one. See how big and major that one is. "An Act To Amend The Day Care and Home Services Act". Minor amendments, Mr. Chairman. "An Act Respecting The Department Of Social Services". Pretty heavy stuff. That is pretty heavy stuff. "An Act To Repeal Certain Obsolete And Spent Statutes". Now that one will probably go into closure too, I suspect. I dare say they will call closure on that.

"An Act To Revise The Law

Respecting Securities". Now I understand this is a complex bill, but the only one in the House who will have anything to say at any great length, I suspect, will be the Minister of Justice. "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act". Just get a copy of that and see how heavy that one is. "An Act To Amend The Corporations Act". "An Act To Amend The Western Memorial Hospital Corporation Act". I think it will do something with the board, change the number of the -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes. Now that is pretty heavy stuff.

Mr. Rideout: We will take hours on that.

Mr. Simms: Pretty heavy stuff. I bet you we will go into night sittings on that one, or maybe the Act To Amend The Amusement Rides. Maybe that one will -

Ms Cowan: That is important.

Mr. Simms: I know it is important. I did not say it wasn't important.

Mr. Rideout: How long is it going to take is the question.

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, who is not in her seat again and continuously tries to interrupt, should know better being a former teacher - not being in her seat, not practicing the parliamentary rules, interjecting. She should not be doing that, Mr. Chairman, as you know, and I call her to task on that. I did not say it was not important. I say to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, these are all important

items, but they are not items that the President of Treasury Board touted last night as being major, major, pieces of legislation that we have to get through.

"An Act To Amend The Summary Proceedings Act". I remember debating those in the past and, by God I will tell you, if it did not require a speech from every member in the House, there was something wrong. So there is pretty heavy stuff there, I agree with him. There is other important legislation, as well, that I know is controversial. The Regional Services Board: We know full well and he knows full well that we are going to represent the views of the people who made representations at those public hearings around the Province. The Labour Relations Act, The Crown Lands Act, The Ombudsman's Office, he knows we are going to speak out on those issues. We would have expected him to call those bills, if he was so concerned about rushing them through and getting them through. With respect to the loan bill, he said himself last night, 'Now we are no panic. We do not need the loan bill.'

An Hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Simms: Oh, the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Rideout: I offered it to them, if they had a problem.

Mr. Simms: And the Leader of the Opposition has said to them, I believe privately -

Mr. Rideout: No, it was publicly, in the House last night.

Mr. Simms: No, publicly - that if they had a problem and needed it urgently, then we were a group of

people who were prepared to be responsible and have a discussion about how we would deal with it and maybe let it go.

But he said himself last night, there is no panic. We are not in a panic. We do not need The Loan Bill right away. Now we would like to have it, because if there is a chance that we might get some special interest rates or something, we would like to be able to go. Well if that happened, all he had to do was tell us.

The last thing in the world he needed to do, Mr. Chairman, was to bring in closure, to envoke closure, to cut off the right of members elected by their constituents to speak in this Legislature. I regret it, and I am sure he regrets it as well.

Now, Mr. Chairman, since we only have a few minutes, I want to direct some questions to the Minister of Finance. We get chastised for not asking questions of the Minister of Finance, and here is the Minister of Finance absent from his seat. He is not even here in the Legislature. He is out having a coffee, I suppose, or something like that.

An Hon. Member: You are not even supposed to mention that.

Mr. Simms: No. I did not say he was absent from the House, I said he is absent from the Legislature. he should be here, Mr. Chairman, he should be here in the House.

Throughout this debate there are two or three issues which have arisen time and time again; they keep repeating themselves, I guess, and for good reason. I do

not know if people out there are as confused as I am -

Mr. Flight: No, they are not.

Mr. Simms: Members opposite say they aren't. I ask the Minister of Forestry then to go out to Central Newfoundland and explain to the people in his area and my area, when a freeze is not a cut. Would he go out to that area and explain that to the people in Central Newfoundland? And would other Members please go out and explain to their constituents when a freeze is not a cut? Now that is one of the most interesting observations I have made over the last few days, listening to the debate back and forth in the House.

The Premier stood up in this House in response to questions in Question Period, and in response to debate others have said, a freeze is not a cut. And we see the President of Treasury Board getting up from time to time, and other Ministers, trying to explain when a freeze is not a cut.

I have seen them wiggle, I have seen them squirm, I have seen them twist, I have seen them try to talk around the issue, I have seen them try to, in essence, cover it up, because that is all they are trying, trying to defend the defenceless. Everybody in the Province knows -

An Hon. Member: The indefensible.

Mr. Simms: No, the defenceless. Everybody in this Province knows that the Government has indicated publicly and, indeed, in writing in some cases, to hospital institutions and so on, that there will be a freeze next year of the Budget for those particular institutions. There will be a

freeze, they will get the funding they have this year and that is all. That is what they will get next year to operate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I were to ask the hospital in Grand Falls what that meant to them, they would not necessarily have to try to calculate pay equity, they would not have to talk about the imposition of the payroll tax as being one of the main features for what they would assess a freeze to be, what they would understand a freeze to be, they would say to me, it will mean anywhere from \$2 to \$3 million less that they will have next year, that they would need to simply keep up with inflation. To keep up with the salary increases that have been awarded to nurses and other hospital workers, they would need \$2 to \$3 million extra.

Now, the Government has said they are not going to get \$2 or \$3 million extra. The Government has said you will get what you got this year - a freeze. Now, how is it that freeze is not a cut? How is it that freeze does not mean that hospital is going to have to cut from its existing funding to make sure that they live within the Government's directive?

It only means one thing to the hospital, Mr. Chairman, it means there will be beds closed, in their estimation it means there will be fifty job losses. That is their estimation, fifty job losses. By attrition, layoffs or whatever process they use, fifty jobs gone, beds closed for a significant portion of the time, and layoffs.

There is no other way for them to get the \$2 or \$3 million they would need next year just to deal with inflation and to deal with

salary increases and those kinds of normal things. So a freeze is a cut! A freeze is a cut, is a cut, is a cut, and Ministers opposite try to get up for some strange reason and say - in fact the Premier said it categorically - a freeze is not a cut.

Now that is one question that we have asked consistently throughout this debate to which we have not received an answer. Nobody can answer it, at least not to our satisfaction.

The second issue that has been prominent throughout this debate, is the exposure, I guess, by Members on this side of the House, the Finance critic and the Leader of the Opposition in particular, about the Government's knowledge of their own financial situation. The Government's knowledge, when they knew about this significant cutback, when they knew about this issue of transfer reduction, which is itself a debatable point, and we know now that they knew about it back when the Budget was tabled in March. They certainly knew about it before the Budget debate got underway, and certainly knew about it before the Budget was concluded. They have admitted that.

The Premier has admitted he was aware of that, and I think we had a letter - I was away for that day, but I believe there was a letter or something which indicated that was the fact. So, Mr. Chairman, you wonder why the people out there in Newfoundland and Labrador are saying to themselves, well, what kind of a god-awful mess have this crowd over there got us into? They say they did not know what the situation was, yet it has become evident by comments in the House

by the Minister of Finance and by the Premier himself that they, in fact, did know the financial situation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the comments by the Finance critic back in March or April, when he said this was a deceptive Budget, when he said this was a fraudulent document, were dead on. He was deadly accurate. So our Finance critic, without the aid and assistance of all the public servants, senior officials in the Department of Finance and Treasury Board, knew back in March or April that this was a fraudulent document, that he was overestimating. We knew it back in April. We were able to predict it for God's sake and nobody else could, particularly on the other side. That is a major issue that has not yet been satisfactorily answered.

All you have to do is take a taxi from here to Holiday Inn. A cab driver said to one of my colleagues today or yesterday, what kind of a mess? Do you mean to tell me they knew all about this back in March or April? That is the question that is being asked by people around this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I can tell members that that is the question, and they might as well face up to it instead of just sitting there trying to defend it.

Mr. Chairman, I only have two or three minutes left so I want to address one other issue that has been prominent and for which we have not received satisfactory replies or answers, and it is the question of where has the rest of the money gone? Where has the rest of the money gone, the \$120 million deficit the Minister

refers to? He says it is because of a reduction in transfer payments. That is a question that is in dispute at this very moment, and we will pursue that through our questioning by other colleagues. However, if there was \$60 million, if there was \$6 million, whatever the amount was, it still leaves a sizable amount unexplained, \$60 or \$70 million if you gave them the \$60 million, if we agreed with that, which we do not. Where has the \$70 million reduction otherwise come from? What has caused that?

Mr. Murphy: It is a shortfall on -

Mr. Simms: A shortfall on what?

Mr. Murphy: On revenues.

Mr. Simms: What revenues? Can the Member for St John's South answer the question better than the Minister of Finance? I doubt it.

Mr. Murphy: Tax revenues are down.

Mr. Simms: Taxation? Tax revenues are down \$70 million? Retail sales tax is down \$70 million? Ah, Mr. Chairman, we have an answer from the Member for St. John's South, a member of the Government. I wonder if the Minister of Finance will confirm what the Member for St. John's South has just said. He said one of the main reasons for this deficit is because the retail sales tax estimation by this Government six months ago is down by \$70 million.

An Hon. Member: He never said that.

Mr. Simms: Oh, he did say that. Well, where did it come from? Does the member know where the \$70

million came from? That is my question. No, he does not know. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. John's South, a member of the Government does not even know where the \$70 million came from. That is what he just said, he does not know. That is why we are asking the questions, despite being criticized and attacked. I only have a minute remaining, so surely the member can interrupt me after I am finished, can he not?

Mr. Hewlett: He can speak for twenty minutes after you have finished.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

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

Mr. Murphy: The Opposition House Leader, Mr. Chairman, is continually referring to a \$70 million.

Mr. Simms: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: Now, there is nowhere that that \$70 million, in my recollection, here in the House has been said. Now, I think, really, that the hon. member is misleading the House by using a figure that is nowhere - it is not printed, it is not in estimates, it is nowhere.

Mr. Simms: It is.

Mr. Murphy: So, where is he getting the \$70 million?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

There is no point of order.

Mr. Simms: I think I only have a minute left, but I have to respond to that unfortunately. That is the third issue.. I say to the

Member for St. John's South, surely he got some education, surely he learned arithmetic, surely he knows how to subtract. Now, the Minister has said \$60 million of the \$130 million difference -

Dr. Kitchen: \$120 million.

Mr. Simms: - \$120 million deficit, but you projected a \$10 million surplus and that is \$130 million.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: And he said \$60 million has come from transfers. That leaves \$70 million.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: Just to clue up, I have been given leave, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: No leave.

Mr. Simms: No leave?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: I would be happy to raise it on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

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

Mr. Simms: Shame on you!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: The Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island said no leave.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for St. John's

East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know that you are having difficulty in quieting some of the Members in the House, particularly the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island and the Member for St. John's South. But you finally accomplished it, Sir. I think you did an excellent job.

I am not pleased, but I avail of the opportunity to speak to this motion. A despicable, unforgettable motion that came to the floor of this House to restrict our getting out to the people what the truth is about this budget. You are impeding our rights as elected representatives to tell the people who we represent what is actually happening here in this House. How this Minister of Finance, in conjunction with the Premier and other Members of Cabinet brought in a document that, there is no doubt in my mind and I am quite sure there is no doubt in very many of the minds across the floor, that this was a budget of lies. A budget of deception. A budget where you could not find, if you went through the entire budget, one segment of truth, because a budget explains where money is to be spent, where expenditures are to take place. And because the Minister brought in the document in the first place and that document was a complete falsehood, then the rest of the budget was immaterial. What they did, the whole budget, the whole kit and caboodle is part of a fraudulent consortium of Ministers over there who thought to fool the Newfoundland and Labrador people.

You know, Mr. Chairman, the only thing that I can see that comes out of this is finally they

realized, the hon. Members of Government realized that the truth was finally seeping through and getting to the public, because we all know the Premier is on a high. He was on a high, but the height is dwindling, and they could not, the Ministers and the Premier, could not have that. Bring in closure. Stop. Shut them up. At any cost, shut them up, because it was finally getting across to the people: this crowd, look at what they are doing, look at what they are doing.

I had a call last night from an old friend, not with political alliance, not of my political stripe. But he said to me, what are this tribe doing?

I mean that is his exact statement, what are this tribe? He called you a tribe, I did not. He was a staunch Liberal.

An Hon. Member: Oh, my poor man!

Mr. Parsons: Yes. He said what are this tribe trying to do to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians? And I said, I do not know, really I do not know. I am at a loss. But then I explained to him where this fraudulent document, this Budget came to the floor of the House, now we are trying to tell those hon. gentlemen to bring in a new Budget, revise it, tell the truth to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. We are pointing out the discrepancies in that document. We have been pointing them out day after day to every department Minister asking them: please talk to the Minister of Finance, talk to the Premier, and say bring in a Budget that is truthful. Bring in a Budget that explains the situation, as it was in March, and as it was known to this present Government.

Mr. Chairman, I want to touch on a few items that have been controversial over this past few days. The Premier today was up espousing about the pensions. Mr. Chairman, yes, there is no doubt at all about it that I have been elected for two terms and I saw when I became a member of the Government at that particular time, that there was a pension problem, to finance the pensions, there was no doubt at all about it. You have to be truthful and say yes. We realized it. But in saying that, Mr. Chairman, you have to realize as well how the pension scheme came into things. In 1949 when we became a Province of Canada - before that era there were very few pensions. In fact, almost nil. I know what happened and I saw people retire from down on Water Street when they received a clock after twenty-five years, thirty years, fifty years service, well all that changed with the advent of Confederation.

An Hon. Member: A clock?

Mr. Parsons: That is right, a clock. That was for their service, in recognition for their perhaps fifty years of service.

An Hon. Member: A gold watch.

Mr. Parsons: When we joined Confederation the whole thing changed. A pension plan was brought into being. And over the years no one worried about the pension plan, and the pension plan was poorly funded, and in some cases not funded at all, and it went into general revenue because no one realized that there was a day of reckoning. No one at that time were drawing pensions because they all just started off. But twenty-five or thirty years later, now we realize in the late 1970s

and 1980s we realized that look, there is a problem taking place right now, we have to do something about it. And the previous Government addressed the situation, they addressed it by placing, I think it was \$5 million into the pension fund at that particular time. And more money was going in gradually, I mean the money was not there then, no more than it is now to put in a great amount. Now the \$20 million that this Government speaks about; when we look back perhaps ten years when all this started then that \$5 million at that particular time was equivalent moneywise, dollarwise, tangible as the \$20 million that this Government speaks about in 1990.

Mr. Chairman, the pension fund is a myth. Money has to be invested in it, and I believe it is a good investment. I say without qualification that the pension fund was not funded adequately. So what is new about that. We all know that, and we all know that someone had to put money into it, teachers, civil servants, whatever.

But, Mr. Chairman, when you consider some of the things that have gone on in this House over the last number of days, the only positive thing that I saw coming out of this were the speeches that were made by the members on this side of the House, bringing to the public's attention what was taking place, what was transpiring before our very eyes, but because they do not have access, they do not have time to attend all of the sessions of the House of Assembly, we had to try to get the picture out to them, and I hope that we did.

Now at some later date, I am going to suggest to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that his speech

of last night be sent out to every household in Newfoundland. As far as I am concerned, the speech of the Leader of the Opposition last night should be sent out to all the people, because in that speech he outlined the discrepancies, he outlined the inaccuracies this Government achieved by even presenting that Budget to the House.

Mr. Chairman, all we are asking of the Minister of Finance and the Premier is to come clean, tell the truth. They have a responsibility to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to tell the truth, tell it as it is. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us go back to March when this Budget was brought in. Ever since it is rhetoric, rhetoric. All we can hear in the House is payments, the Federal Government, equalization payments.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Parsons: That is a lie and I can prove it, Mr. Chairman. The Provincial Government in 1990 received more money in equalization payments than they did the previous year. In October statistics said you received \$960 million for this current year. Last year, you received less. So what the Minister of Finance, what the Premier, what the Minister of Development, what other Ministers over there have been trying to say to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador is not the truth. You received more money through equalization this year than last year. And the point remains that the Minister of Finance, when he brought in his document, he blamed the Feds for cuts in equalization. And I want to remind the hon. the House Leader that there are no cuts in equalization, none whatsoever.

Let me explain to the House Leader what happened.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) last year.

Mr. Parsons: That is what you got last year. This year, when it came out in October, you were to receive \$960 million in equalization. Last year you received \$966 million, but you were over paid \$34 million. Now, you had two ways of doing it, as we all know. Instead of coming out with that surplus last year of seventy-odd million, you could have repaid that \$34 million and then you would have gotten your \$960 million this year. What you are talking about is \$960 million this year, but now you say you have to pay back the \$34 million. That was never Government's money in the first place, it was an overpayment that had to be repaid and the Minister of Finance knew it.

I am not a mathematician by any means, but I think I am better than the Minister of Finance in calculating what went on. In fact, Mr. Chairman, in equalization payments alone we are ahead this year by \$28 million, over and above last year. That is the truth and I defy anyone on that side to say otherwise. Again I ask the Minister of Finance to come clean and tell the people that it is not the fault of the Federal Government. Tell them exactly the way it is. Tell them they knew of the situation when the Budget was made out. For what reason they brought in that fraudulent Budget I will never know. And I believe there are a lot of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians out there asking the same question - why was it brought in? I would like to ask the

Minister of Environment and Lands - I am his critic, but he is not in his place. I have asked and I will ask again, how are those cutbacks going to affect the environmental issues of today? I am always worried about environmental issues, and many others besides me. In fact, I believe it is the number one issue right across Canada, and perhaps North America. It is the number one issue.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when we have a freeze we have a freeze on employment, we have a freeze on people employed to do jobs now which are becoming more apparent than they were one year ago.

We have Hibernia coming on stream, we have that road, that development which is taking place in Great Mosquito Cove, which was not here, which was non-existent this time last year. Now we need supervision, now we need an active Department of Environment, not inactive. But the status quo is what we will have, a Department which cannot overshadow, cannot oversee the problems which could arise with Hibernia alone.

This is a new age, Mr. Chairman. We cannot afford to have a reduction. And when you freeze wages just because of normal circumstances, normal conditions, that is a cutback. With our environmental problems alone I can see the need for a great number of employees.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mistrust the conglomerates, the companies who are out there doing this work, but I do have to say that no matter who you are there is room for error, and this is what scares me. We have to be diligent, we have to be on our toes as all

these projects transpire, as all these projects become reality, to make sure our environment will not suffer because of that development.

That development and our environment can go hand in hand. There is no problem there, but it has to be censored, it has to be looked into. Laws, rules and regulations will have to be adhered to, and this is why I say to the Minister of Environment and Lands, we now need more people in his Department, we need more people to activate plans which I am sure are in the making. I am sure the Federal Government has done great work as it pertains to environmental impact studies and whatever, and I did not see any great need for the Province, in some instances, going over the ground that was already covered by those studies. Because, again, if it serves no useful purpose, then why waste the money on it? But I would also like to say to the Minister that we have to be forever cognizant of what could happen.

I am not a spreader of doom and gloom, but I am saying that the potential is out there. I am telling the truth, I am telling the facts. That Minister should be now asking Cabinet for about 100 per cent increase in -

An Hon. Member: What Minister?

Mr. Parsons: The Minister of Environment - asking the Cabinet for a 100 per cent increase in the number of people in his Department to go out and do the job that is necessary so our environment can remain clean, Mr. Chairman, even cleaner than what it is today.

I also want to direct a question to the Minister of Education. We

have been asking questions, we have been talking about education and what is happening in the educational system in Newfoundland and Labrador. I want to ask the Minister of Education, and we have asked him before, has he directed school boards to increase school taxes? We have asked over and over but the point remains -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: We have mentioned it in debate over and over, over and over. School taxes are going to increase. That is what is out there. That is what the people are saying. This Minister of Education, who was going to abolish the school tax, now is going to increase the premiums. More money coming out of the pockets of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians

Now, I do not know if that is correct, because the minister has never answered it. We are led to believe it is correct.

Mr. Winsor: The minister said that he was going to up the exemption and up rates. Up the personal exemption and up rates, that is what the Minister said.

Mr. Parsons: Yes. I am told the minister said he is going to up the rates and up the exemptions.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Winsor: Yes, before he (inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: That is what is reported out there.

Mr. Winsor: That is what you reported. That is what you said.

Mr. Parsons: We never had the

answer to those questions. That is why we could not let this money Bill go through. We could not allow this Government to spend monies, for us to give them the authorization to go up and get more money to do with it what they did with the last \$120 million. No one knows where that went. The Minister of Finance does not know where it went. The Premier does not know where it went. There is no one who knows where it went, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture was here in his place, but he has left. I am also wondering what these cuts, what this freeze is going to do to that Minister's Department?

An Hon. Member: Who is that?

Mr. Parsons: The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. What is going to happen to the silviculture programs? What is going to happen next year, when we do not have people working these fields? What about agriculture in Newfoundland? Sure members laugh, but I suppose they are thinking, well, agriculture in Newfoundland does not mean anything. It does not mean anything in this part, the Avalon, but there are parts of Newfoundland where it means a great deal. Agriculture is very, very minute in this part of the Province, with the exception of the Goulds.

An Hon. Member: What about (inaudible) in your district?

Mr. Parsons: They are dairy farmers, a different situation altogether.

Mr. Tobin: They are what?

An Hon. Member: Dairy farmers.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: By leave! By leave!

Some Hon. Members: No leave!

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Chairman, by leave?

Mr. Doyle: Yes, by leave. Carry on!

Mr. Tobin: Yes, he got leave.

Mr. Parsons: I got leave. The Minister of Health says yes and the Minister of Development says yes.

Some Hon. Members: No leave! No leave!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has leave for a minute, I hear.

Mr. Parsons: Oh, a minute.

An Hon. Member: Only a minute.

Mr. Parsons: Since they gave me the time, I am sure both those ministers would like me to ask those two gentlemen as well, what is going to happen within the Department of Health? We have questioned the minister. We have talked about it over and over, and I know he must recognize the fact as well as I, and many other people, that there is a problem. What kind of problem can we foresee in the next year?

Now the Minister of Development, I really feel bad about that young man. I think he has potential, as I have stated over and over in the House, but now I want him to come to the forefront, maybe come over here even, because he was doing a

much better job over here than he is doing over there. I mean, over there he is not doing anything, and I think he has great potential. I do not think we would be in this mess if the likes of that minister had a free hand. I do not believe we would be in this mess in Health, Education, or Development.

Mr. Winsor: Old Right Wing Decker got slashed, though.

Mr. Parsons: Even in Social Services, I do not think we would be in a mess if the minister had a free hand.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. Parsons: That is why we could not give authorization for this money. With that said, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down. Again, this motion is despicable. It is depriving us of our rights.

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

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In speaking on this closure motion, I must say I find it upsetting that -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I have recognized the hon. the Member for Menihek.

Mr. A. Snow: Yes, I find it unsettling, in fact, that not only do we have closure here on this particular debate, we have closure on offices in western Labrador. And for an area which has contributed so much to the economy of this province to be treated so

callously by this particular Administration is unconscionable, to quote somebody who used that word several times in the last fourteen or sixteen or eighteen months.

And it definitely does not have anything to do with fairness and balance. This particular Budget, when it was brought in, was talked about as being a truly Liberal Budget. It talked about their three priorities: priorities of economic development, health care and education. We saw what they did with economic development. They emasculated the Department of Development - the Department now, not the Minister - and passed it over to a group of academics -

Mr. Winsor: Sociologists.

Mr. A. Snow: - that was going to administer the economic future of this province. Probably nobody in there had ever, ever had any experience with regard to economic development prior to this particular appointment they received, this appointment to the Newfoundland Senate, if you will. I do not know of any of them who have ever had the opportunity or the responsibility of having to sign the front of a cheque. Because, believe me, there is a definite responsibility to having to put your signature on the front of a cheque, whereas I believe all these people have only the experience of having had the opportunity of putting their signature on the backside of a cheque.

And I think there is a definite experience gained and a responsibility, which these people do not show, and leadership that you gain through being in the private sector, having the

opportunity of operating your own business. That has been a dismal failure of this particular Administration, leaving this economic development to this newly appointed senate.

Mr. Simms: Right on, brother.

Mr. A. Snow: I think all you have to do is go out and listen to the people in the private sector of this Province, and they will tell you how disappointed they are with this particular move by this particular Administration. The fact that that was the one priority that has been ignored, if you will - probably if they had just ignored it rather than appointing this senate, it may have been better accepted by the people of this province, or at least the private sector of this province.

But in health care -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. A. Snow: It was unfortunate that I was not one of those people who had the opportunity of voting on that particular Hibernia bill last night. But I would have preferred that to working with this Newfoundland Senate. I would. And I am sure the hon. Minister of Development would like to have the opportunity to have the opportunity to get in and participate in the economic development of this Province rather than bring thrown down to the level of having to just do videos. I mean, I have faith in him. And I am sure the people of this Province have faith in him, that he would be able to do a good job in the Department of Development if he were given the opportunity, if the Premier would give him the opportunity. But, of

course, he has not been given that opportunity, he is relegated to making videos. He is definitely an asset, and when they get the music to go with the video, it is going to be tremendous. I hope it is a big seller. I do not know how much employment it will generate, but it should be a good seller. I understand the Minister of Development just suggested that he is going to get Rod Stewart to do the music with him.

This particular Government talked about a priority being health care and education. We see the result of what a priority means in development; we have seen that in the emasculation of the Department of Development. Health care: Let us just have a look at what they have been doing with health care in this Province. In particular, I would like to be able to have the opportunity of discussing what they have done, or what could possibly occur with health care in my particular area, Western Labrador, an area of this Province that possibly generates more economic wealth for this Province than any other single electoral district. We are seeing that they have been told to trim their Budgets to the tune of about 12 per cent. Now, how did they arrive at this 12 per cent? Because they sat down as a board and as a management -

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) your own hospital?

Mr. A. Snow: This is the hospital in Western Labrador, in Labrador City, the Captain William Jackman Memorial Hospital. They were told, I believe it was October 12th, in conversation with the Minister, that the freeze would be on, the new f word in this Province, freeze, is on for next

year and by their calculations they felt that if the funds were to remain for next year at last year's levels, they would see a 12 per cent cut, and that is what they set out to do.

And some of these cuts, they have suggested, they may not necessarily live with, you see, because that is a poor choice of words. They, indeed, might be able to live with it, but there may be some people in Western Labrador who will not be able to live with it.

Mr. Simms: People might not be able to live.

Mr. A. Snow: That is exactly the point. There may be some people who will not even live because of the effects of these health care cuts in Western Labrador.

The Premier talked earlier about frightening the people. I am not about to go out and frighten the people of Western Labrador, I am talking about cuts which have been proposed by the management of the hospital in Western Labrador because they were told you may not get the funds next year. So they had to be responsible in their management, and went out and look to see how they could do it and still operate a hospital in Western Labrador.

One of the things they have talked about that they may be able to do, would have to do because of this callousness is shut down eight beds in the Captain William Jackman Memorial Hospital. Of course this is the thing that this particular Administration said they would never allow, to shut down hospital beds. They were going to put beds above the bottom line, I think they talked about,

but in order to meet the bottom line set by this particular Administration our hospital has seen that they will have to shut down beds and this is unfair, and it is callous. To treat an area of this Province that has, as I said earlier, generated so much wealth in this Province, it is definitely not fairness and balance. They have talked about cutting back elective surgery in Western Labrador. The effect on cutting back on elective surgery in Western Labrador could have a devastating affect on the general health care of the people in Western Labrador. It is unfortunate that the Minister of Health is not here but I am sure he is listening to the remarks I am making tonight, because I have a few questions I would like for him to answer. What the people in Western Labrador are concerned about is that if they reduce the amount of elective surgery being done in Western Labrador in the Captain William Jackman Memorial Hospital, they feel there is a distinct possibility that the single surgeon that we do have there now on location may leave. If he does leave that means that the people in Western Labrador will not have the opportunity of having surgery, whether it is elective or emergency. I do not know how many of you people realize what type of position that puts the people of Western Labrador in. People that live in Western Labrador are completely isolated. Not only do they service just the people in Labrador City and Wabush, but this hospital has been given the responsibility of delivering health care to the residents of our neighboring province in Quebec. There are 3000 people over there that could need medical attention and would draw upon our

hospital care, and I might add that provides an economic gain to our hospital that is very, very substantial and helps pay the bills of health care. Now, if we lose the possibility of having a surgeon in Western Labrador what is it going to do to the people's morale, and if we do lose this surgeon, and there is a direct concern, I have talked to the management of the hospital -

Mr. Walsh: If the sky falls.

An Hon. Member: Mr. Speaker, tell the Member for Mount Scio to be quiet.

Mr. A. Snow: The hon. Member for Mount Scio may think it is funny about health care as the people in his district can walk to a different hospital. I am telling him and the Members of this House of Assembly that the people in Menihek cannot walk to another hospital, they live 1,000 miles from St. John's, and they cannot get out here.

Some Hon. Members: Be quiet.

You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. A. Snow: There is a distinct possibility that we could lose a surgeon.

An Hon. Member: You never opened your mouth since you came into the House of Assembly. The only thing you do (Inaudible).

Mr. A. Snow: I am saying what the administration are saying in the hospital in Western Labrador.

Mr. Walsh: Fearmongers.

An Hon. Member: That is your inaugural speech, you just made it.

Mr. A. Snow: Of course, the other thing that could occur, is that we may lose our physiotherapist.

Mr. Walsh: May, may, may, may.

An Hon. Member: Mr Speaker, can you silence (inaudible)?

Mr. A. Snow: They could leave because of the budgetary cuts. And as I said, then we will not have either physiotherapist in Western Labrador. And this is going to have a devastating effect on the general feelings of - I do not know how you could describe it - the quality of life in Western Labrador, would probably be the best way to describe it. I know I lived in Western Labrador for the last twenty-five years, and I know what it is like when we did not have a surgeon. I lived there, and I believe some of the Members over on that side of the House were living there at the time. And what was done, there was a concerted effort by the local citizens of Western Labrador, mining companies and council, unions, and private individuals, that went out and solicited and recruited doctors to come in to Western Labrador.

Contrary to what the Government of the day - some of these Members are still over here with me - they would not help that much, if you will, and get those doctors to go in. But the local people did do it. We did it because we the citizens of Western Labrador added benefits to entice doctors to come to Western Labrador and provide a service to the people. We recognized it then, that it was improper what was going on, and the people of Western Labrador recognize it today. That it is fundamentally wrong, that you should not leave an area such as

Western Labrador, that produces so much wealth, leave them without the medical care that they should have and that they have earned.

Mr. Walsh: The previous Government should never have doubted it. You are right.

Mr. L. Snow: This particular Administration sees fit to put education, to quote an educator in this Province, they see fit to turn education back twenty years. And this particular move in the health care is probably going to put the health care in Labrador City and Wabush back twenty years.

If these cuts will continue in the health care sector we will see that the health care in Western Labrador will be put back twenty years.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) the sky is falling.

Mr. L. Snow: And no, the sky will not fall in Western Labrador, but I am sure that the people in Western Labrador will not sleep as soundly when they know that if it is necessary for their child, if involved in an accident, will not have the availability and the opportunity of seeing a surgeon. Or an area that has the largest industrial complex in this Province, and if anybody gets injured on the job they might not be able to get the services of a surgeon, and that is unfortunate.

And I say to the Minister of Health, and I ask him what he would do if the surgeon did leave, and would he put in place a mechanism that would ensure that we, the residents of Western Labrador, would have the opportunity of a surgeon in Western Labrador.

Mr. Walsh: He would do a lot more than the previous Government did.

Mr. L. Snow: And I also have in the report that came in from the hospital in Western Labrador a suggestion that they may, indeed, have to cut down on the specialists coming into the area.

As you know, we have quite a few specialists who visit Western Labrador from the Province of Quebec and Montreal, mostly Quebec City and St. John's, and with a reduction of these; because it costs quite a bit of money to travel in and out of Western Labrador, they spend about \$60,000, we are going to have few. That is what they spend annually. And with a \$15,000 cut we are going to have fewer specialists visiting our area.

So, again, it is quite possible that this could put a drain on the local residents direct amount of money they will have to spend because they will have to go elsewhere now to visit a specialist. They will have to come here to St. John's, and at \$830 airfare now that can be quite expensive.

So, I would ask the Minister of Health to check with the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation to make sure that we can hopefully get the Labrador air transportation subsidy back so that the people of Western Labrador will not have to bear the total burden of having to travel to St. John's for health care purposes. Also in discussion on the Budget on this Loan Bill I had discussions with the Minister of Environment and Lands several months ago concerning his office in Western Labrador. We presently have two wildlife officers

patrolling an area of about 25,000 square miles. There was a suggestion that they would hope to be able to have more resources placed in the hands of these officers and thus be able to do a better job, if you will, and be able to cover that area more easily, such as with the use of a helicopter. I specifically asked the Minister of Environment and Lands to inform the people of Western Labrador when he was going to be expanding that office, and not necessarily just shutting down the office such as the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation did with the Motor Registration office in Wabush.

The most important issue today in Western Labrador is the health care, and I want to remind the Minister of Health of the importance of health in Western Labrador specifically, because we have so many people living in this area who are completely isolated from services, unlike the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island who thinks it is humorous that people would have these concerns, of course. I want to tell him that people in Wabush, Labrador City, and the people of Fermont who do derive a service from this hospital do not think it is humorous or funny, and they are hoping that the Minister will reconsider and not institute these drastic cuts that he is proposing on the people of Western Labrador.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I think we have reached an agreement to break for the normal supper hour from five to seven o'clock. I do

not think it is necessary to rise the Committee. We will just adjourn and come back at seven if that is acceptable.

Mr. Chairman: Before we recess I would like to point out to hon. Members Beauchesne, Paragraph 336, Page 100, "that Members should not sit on chair arms or on desks with their backs to the House when conversing in private." I notice that has been happening in the House quite frequently and I just want to call hon. Members to that rule according to Beauchesne.

Mr. Simms: A good point.

Mr. Chairman: We will recess until 7:00 o'clock.



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 67(A) (Night)

PRELIMINARY REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Tuesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

30 October 1990

The House resumed at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

Mr. Woodford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would just like to have a few words -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I recognize the hon. Member for Humber Valley.

Mr. Woodford: But once again thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have a few words on this closure motion. I never looked back to see how many times closure was used over the last year or so, but I imagine this is -

Mr. Tobin: Seventeen.

Mr. Woodford: - I do not know if it was the third or fourth occasion, maybe the Minister responsible for Treasury Board can probably correct me on that later. But in any case a lot has been said here in the House concerning health and education and cutbacks or so-called threats of cutbacks in health and education. And on that subject, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that some members here this evening, more specifically the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island has been saying, buts, ifs, maybes, and so on, but I think it was the Minister of Health who, if I am not mistaken created the first alarm; that is where the first alarm came from and probably cautioning the Nursing Homes Association and some of the hospitals to probably have a

second look at their budgets this year and make sure that they look at it with the intent of probably some cuts.

But in any case that is where the insecurity, now the instability of the people in the health and education sectors, mainly in the Province, and people do not know what is coming next, especially when it is coming from the Government side, and it also came from the Premier, by the way, somewhere along the way, whether in the House or at a press conference I just cannot tell exactly where.

Mr. Tobin: The President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Woodford: But there is an awful lot of uncertainty out there in the health and education, and not only that but in other sectors as well, but more specifically in health and education.

But one of the areas that I would like to touch on now also is the fishery. It has nothing to do with cutbacks as such, directly, I suppose, with regards to programs not being instituted, and more specifically in this case probably some type of Fisheries Response Program. The fishery this year, Mr. Chairman, in the White Bay area of my District has been disastrous and the efforts made by certain companies in the area to try to secure different pieces of equipment and so on has been unsuccessful. And to this date we have ninety-five, as I said before, I will say it again, that ninety-five people in the Jackson's Arm plant and some thirty-odd in the Sop's Arm fisheries plant, I would say probably got seven, the most, if anything in either one of the

plants.

I would say tonight, Mr. Chairman, in this closure bill, maybe you would say it is the wrong place to bring it up, but as far as I am concerned it is not, because of the timing. My understanding is that over the next few days, I do not know, hopefully if not, there certainly should be an announcement made by the Federal Government concerning a Fisheries Response Program in this Province. And the criteria that they used last year to me was a bit archaic and after a little while, I suppose, we got it straightened out somewhat and a lot of districts in the provinces took advantage of it and a lot of the fish plant workers finally were able to get enough stamps to get some security and some income to take them through the winter.

This winter, Mr. Chairman, is no exception. In fact, it is going to be worse, if anything. Having said that about the Fishery Response Program coming from the feds over the next few days, I would ask the Minister of Fisheries for the Province to probably lobby his Cabinet colleagues, if he has not already done that, and try to have something come up with regards to a Fisheries Response Program in conjunction with them, if not separately, I do not care how, but separately, if necessary, to try and pick up the slack if the federal program does not meet it. And if I am not mistaken back in 1985-86, the Fisheries Response Program by the Provincial Government put something between \$3 million and \$4 million into a program to try and get the plant workers and fishermen, amend the plant workers their unemployment and meet the UI standards for that

season.

I sincerely and seriously ask the Minister of Fisheries, I would say he is probably after addressing it somewhere along the way with his colleagues, I know there are other members over there with districts this year where the fishery is in very hard shape, and the Response Program is going to be needed. And the thing I do not like about the Fisheries Response Programs, this year being no exception, the fact, I know you had to wait and see what kind of a fishery you have in order to bring in a Fisheries Response Program, but it is the timing. You have to do something really pertaining to the fishery, but at the same time what do you do come November, December and January in this Province? where the fishery itself is seasonal, construction is seasonal, agriculture is pretty well seasonal, forestry now is getting to the point now of being seasonal. So what do you do? In any case, I do not want to take away from the importance of what a Fisheries Response Program would do for the people in my district and I would say other districts in this Province, represented by members from both sides of the House. I would also like to mention some of the cuts that have already been made. Some reference was made today, like I said earlier, to ifs, maybes, and probably, cuts coming but nothing certain. Now, the announcement these last couple of days with regards to the Finance Building in Clarendville being closed, and the announcement today by the Minister of Transportation pertaining to the Department of Transport depot in Clarendville, and the scales being closed in Clarendville, those are not threats, those are not ifs, maybes, that is certainty,

Mr. Chairman. That has happened. The announcements have been made. When did they get notification, the some twenty-five, including finance and highways in the Clareville area? They were notified today, I would say, by bureaucrats and civil servants in those departments respectively.

An Hon. Member: They could have heard it on the news.

Mr. Woodford: Or they probably heard it on the news, and the Minister today announced it in the House. Now, that to me, Mr. Chairman, is wrong. There is enough uncertainty in this Province today in the health and education sectors, and in other sectors now, and that is brought to light today by the latest announcements, that those people should be given the courtesy, at least the courtesy of some time to give them a chance to get other jobs and to try and find some other accommodations, or whatever. I hope that both Ministers involved now, finance and transportation, will take that into consideration, and if they have not already done so they should do so in the future and give those people legitimate time to try and accommodate themselves, either in other jobs, or other areas around the Province. I go back to the wildlife officers in the Province who elected an individual, one of their colleagues, to represent them in a wildlife officers association, and they in turn, I suppose they would not have formed the association if they did not have something to lobby Government for, but at that time one of the things they wanted to lobby for was they figured they were not getting proper treatment from the particular Department involved right now, and they

wanted to get switched over to justice. Having done that the President of their association wrote the particular Department involved, and what happened to him after? He made a few comments to the press like anybody would, like anybody in a democracy, like anybody in the Western world in North America, Mr. Chairman. He made a few comments to the press and what happened to him? We just witnessed the tearing down of the walls of Eastern Europe, we just witnessed the democratization of the whole of Eastern Europe and other countries as well, and all of a sudden right here in this little Island of the North Atlantic we find that certain walls still exist, nothing physical, nothing that can be seen, but something that everybody can equate with, just because they made their feelings known and asked to be recognized

Mr. Tobin: There is only one reason for that. The Premier got in (Inaudible) with the Minister.

Mr. Woodford: It came out in the papers on a Friday and lo and behold on Friday evening they get a directive from the deputy or assistant deputy minister in that Department saying: you be in my office at 2:00 p.m. on Monday.

Mr. Tobin: That is something to be proud of, isn't it?

Mr. Woodford: Now I mean that is, I do not think there are too many Members on the other side - if a vote was taken, a secret ballot, probably, not a public one, or not where the Premier could see the show of hands, because I am sure that they would be shaking and shivering in their boots. But I think that if a secret ballot was held between the Members surely

God it would come out - probably the only one who would vote against it is the Minister responsible for that Department.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) arrogance.

Mr. Woodford: I mean, in this day and age, to say: you be in my office at 2:00 p.m., period. No questions asked. Nothing. I am talking about the President of the Wildlife Association in the Province that time, Winston Anstey. This is the fellow who I am talking about, who was told to come in. And he wrote to the Premier and he went to the Premier's office in Corner Brook, and it was finally put off until the next week. He still had to come in on that given Friday, the next week.

But he still had to come. He was reprimanded, despite - he never said much after. But all you have to do is read between the lines. And not only read between the lines like we are used to hearing to, but all you had to do was look at the man's face and read between the lines. I mean that to me is despicable. When a civil servant of this Province cannot speak out.

And just after that I see comments in The Sunday Express from the Minister of Justice in this Province. The top law maker and the top custodian, I suppose, in this Province when it comes to justice, making statements such as, if civil servants in this Province speak out against this Government they will lose their job.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Woodford: The statement was there. Whether he made it or not

I do not know, he can defend it. But if that is so, Mr. Chairman, it would put all the Sprungs and everything else to shame in this Province. When we are talking about Sprungs we are talking about money. When we are talking about individuals speaking out in this Province we are talking about individuality and we are talking about common sense and decency. And that to me - there is no \$22 million or \$50 million or \$100 million would negate that.

They should be allowed to speak out. He was not speaking out against Government as such, he was speaking out on behalf of the members of his Association. And he should be afforded that right. Regardless of what it is.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woodford: And because of some of those statements, Mr. Chairman, and the promises made by certain Ministers to come out and meet with - for instance, I refer again on another subject that leads into that, the Fisher Institute in Corner Brook. We were promised - and I say "we" because I always attend the meetings at the Humber joint council meeting in the west coast of the Province. Never miss one unless it is through sickness or I happen to be out of the Province, and that is very seldom. Asked the Minister of Education to come to a meeting and meet with the Humber joint council back last spring.

That meeting to this day has not been held. That is so. Twenty-three municipalities on the west coast of the Province as represented in the Humber joint council, covers the whole area from Corner Brook right to Jackson's Arm in the south, and so

on down the Bay of Islands. And he has not had the courtesy - and I do not know. Something tells me that if the Minister of Education had his way he would have been out to speak to the Humber Joint Council. He would have been out. But I do not know what happened in the interim. Now, if someone can tell me at that time and again today that now there is nothing wrong with this, it is not going to hurt Corner Brook. It is no good for Stephenville. Now, can someone tell my why it was done? It is not going to hurt Corner Brook, and it is no good for Stephenville. Now if someone could give the rationale of why the decision was made in the first place -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Woodford: Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I think this group should be afforded the decency of a meeting with the Minister of Education. Now as of last Saturday in Howley, another Humber Joint Council meeting was held in Howley, a letter was there for the Minister saying that he was going to meet with the Humber Joint Council in the near future. The decision has been made, a press conference has been held and now he is going to meet with Humber Joint Council. Now, to me that is wrong. If there were any particular reasons for it, give it to them. At least tell them. Let them know where they stand. They are mayors and councillors representing, like I said, twenty-three municipalities in the whole West Coast area. That is fact, not fiction. They requested a meeting and did not get it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, since last year this administration has been so called, I suppose you want to say

going up the ladder, really heading for the stars. It was great. I looked across and I saw all kinds of barbs coming across, signs of cockiness for want of a better word. Now, that cockiness has sort of turned to arrogance, and some of the statements by Ministers. I would even like to caution Members opposite that going up is okay, but coming down will show the measure of a man. And I will tell you, if some of the Ministers and Departments opposite do not soon take a look at what it is like - take a last look at what it is like to be up because I can assure you on the way down there are not going to be too many pats on the back. I can assure you that. And when some of the decisions being made as of late - and I am sure, as sure as I am standing here tonight, lots more to come. Well, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, I must say, has been getting a so called free ride. I have to admit that although I am his critic he has been getting a free ride.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) in Stephenville.

Mr. Woodford: The first few months, I would have to say, I will be the first to admit - I mean he is from Buchans. - a good buddy of mine reared up next door, boy. I can hardly believe it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Woodford: He even worked underground for a little while.

An Hon. Member: Did he work underground?

Mr. Woodford: But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister - I have heard some reports as of late and probably hearsay, but the

next few weeks it will all come to light, probably cuts in forestry, cuts in staff with regards to agriculture.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woodford: Ag-reps and (inaudible) representatives walking around; forestry officials out trying - what is going to happen, I ask the Minister, what is going to happen to the people who got domestic cutting permits, who have crown land cutting permits? One of the problems, Mr. Chairman, that we had in the past was the fact that we did not police the cutting of wood on crown lands whether it was for sawmill or whether it was for pulp wood. So one of the questions I put to the Minister here tonight, will those services be able to be maintained? Obviously not, if there is any, he can probably answer that lately. And the same thing in the agriculture part of it, it is no good for an Ag-Rep to be sitting in an office in Pynns Brook for instance or Corner Brook, in this case, and expect to do the job through the total farm population for the whole of Western Newfoundland. He cannot do it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: By leave! By leave!

An Hon. Member: What a shame?

An Hon. Member: By leave? By leave?

An Hon. Member: Oh, yes, by leave.

Mr. Woodford: Oh, my twenty minutes.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member for Kilbride.

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

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

I have recognize the hon. Member for Kilbride. And if anyone wants to speak afterwards they can. But I have recognize the hon. the Member for Kilbride.

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

I would like to have a few words on this closure motion that we are debating now, Mr. Chairman. The motion that was moved by the President of Treasury Board today, Mr. Chairman, to limit debate on asking questions of the Ministers, and in particular the Minister of Finance on what happened to his great people's budget that was presented here in this House last April. Mr. Chairman, the motion was moved today to muzzle the Opposition, but obviously yesterday in caucus the motion was moved to muzzle the members across the House because none of them are allowed to get up and speak their minds.

So the President of Treasury Board would not do that. He would not mind doing it to us, but I am sure it was the Premier that muzzled these hon. members over there, Mr. Chairman, so they are unable to get up and speak for their constituents who are being hurt by the cutbacks that Cabinet Ministers in this Government are

doing, Mr. Chairman. And one in particular, Mr. Chairman, is today's announcement from the Department of Transportation. Mr. Chairman, I expected to see the Member for Lewisporte on his feet at the first opportunity telling the Minister of Transportation the exact situation on Change Islands when he changed the ferry service, Mr. Speaker, from a ferry service for Change Islands to a one boat system for Change Islands and Fogo Island.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Lewisporte is well aware of the experiment that we tried in December of 1988 to June of 1989, when we tried to see if the one ferry system will work on Change Islands and Fogo. And, Mr. Chairman, I will admit that it was a failure. It did not work. And I am sure the Member for Lewisporte will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that the system that we put in place that was brought back by an announcement today for the Change Island ferry service, Mr. Chairman, will be a failure again. Mr. Chairman, it is suppose to save \$450,000 next year, and \$187,000 this year, figures that I would question because of other deceptions that we are seeing in this House by the Minister of Finance's Budget and other statements that are being made, by the Premier particularly, but Cabinet Ministers somewhat.

One thing in this statement that the Minister did not explain today, and maybe he will when he gets up, and I certainly would like him to participate in this debate just to explain his position on the first item here, the closure of the Clarendville Motor Registration Division office and the weigh scales in Goobies. In that closure he says eight

employee positions will be affected by the closedown of these two operations. Now, two employees are going to lose their jobs as he says in his statement, so we have six other employees involved in this move who will either be transferred to some other area, probably St. John's, or they will be transferred to some other Department or some other job. And I would request that the Minister of Transportation would answer the question as to what is going to happen to the other six employees. Are they fired? Will they be without a job? I understand, I heard from two of them, that they are going to lose their job. I know two in particular who will lose their jobs. But to move eight families out of a community, families who have been settled in a community, have their homes, have their children in school. -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, it was bad, they felt bad about it. They were very upset over it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: So you are going to do it. So two wrongs will make a right. They were very upset over that, actually. Most of them who are still out there are happy with it now, they are delighted they are there, but -

An Hon. Member: They were not moved to be laid off, they were moved because of Government policy.

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, they were moved for a specific reason, Mr. Chairman, a reason that this heartless Government would not be able to understand. If we

remember when Forestry was moved to Corner Brook we had a crisis situation there at the time, where Bowaters were moving out of Corner Brook. And under the decentralization policy of the former administration -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: - we said that in order to help out the Corner Brook region it would make sense to have the main Forestry headquarters in Corner Brook. It still makes sense, I think, I do not know why it was ever in St. John's. If you are going to have Forestry employees and a Forestry operation certainly it should be in an area where there is Forestry activity, certainly the main Forestry activity in the Province.

So in order to help out the possible closure of the Corner Brook mill and the devastation that that would cause to that area, the administration on this side decided that the Forestry operations, the major part of the Department of Forestry, would be moved to Corner Brook, which is a sensible move. I think that is good. That was a part of the decentralization programme of the former administration, a programme that this Premier promised to continue when he was campaigning eighteen months ago. One of his main objectives, or one of his main campaign planks, was to decentralize Government. And what are we after seeing since the last election on his decentralization? He was also one, when he was over here, I heard him mention it several times, how cynical the public has become with politicians. And he was very concerned about that. So what does he do but go out and make promises during an election

campaign, and just about every promise that he made, every promise that he deceived the electorate of this Province with, he has broken them in the last couple of months.

His decentralization programme is non-existent actually. He is not going to move jobs from the larger centres out to the rural areas where they could be just as efficient and help out the smaller communities. Actually, what his Minister of Transportation has done today is try for a greater centralization of Government services. And I guess probably six of these jobs will be moved into the Mount Pearl headquarters, which is certainly not a decentralization programme, and I am sure the people.... And what he is going to do, he is going to close down the Clarenville Motor Registration Division, and the weigh scales which will cause undue maintenance problems on our highways, and what is he going to save? He is going to save \$86,000 this year. Big deal.

He is going to close down the Motor Registration office in Wabush. A great saving in that one, he is going to really clean her, he will certainly wipe out the deficit that the Minister of Finance has managed to build up in an eight month period. He is going to save \$27,000. He is going to get more than that or almost as much as that in three years on his car allowance.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, he might open a (Inaudible) office in Buchans, that might be a good idea. I do not know but there is one out there somewhere.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) the Opposition ran out of speakers they can propose an amendment, right?

Mr. R. Aylward: Mr. Chairman, the combined savings under all the announcements that the Minister of Transportation made today, jeopardizing the safety of the school children as they travel back and forth to school on the buses this winter -

An Hon. Member: They could make an amendment to (Inaudible) something like that.

An Hon. Member: Yes, they could do it.

Mr. R. Aylward: - callously not considering the safety and welfare of the people on Change Islands by taking away the ferry service. The total of the savings that the Minister will make will be somewhere in the \$1.3 million range. Next year, not this year, but next year he expects to save \$1.3 million. Just about the exact gift that he gave to McNamara Construction Company this summer by bungling a contract. I think it was exactly \$1.3 million, the difference in the bid that he allowed McNamara to escape from. And by putting out the new tender gave them back the contract again for \$1.3 million more, and this is where he is going to save that money now because of his blundering. He is going to take it out on the residents of Change Islands, which I am sure the Member for Lewisporte will be up speaking on their behalf very shortly. He is going to take it out on the residents of Clarenville and Wabush, and that one really surprises me, that he is going to close down Wabush. It is a remote area of our Province,

it is a fairly isolated area of our Province. There are very little savings, it was hardly worth the time to write up the statement, with \$27,000 savings this year.

Mr. Chairman, the close down will eliminate two employee positions in Wabush. The Labrador City - Wabush area of this Province probably contributes more to their provincial economy or tax base than any other region in the Province. And what thanks do we give them, what thanks do we give the people who contribute more to our economy, I would expect, than any other single region, certainly any other two towns? What thanks do we give them, Mr. Chairman? We cut the services, we cut the meagre services that were provided there by saving \$27,000. I do not know what that will do to the Minister of Finance's Budget. Probably as much as when he closed the tax office in Clarenville and saved \$50,000. Mr. Chairman, we are talking about \$130 million of lost money here, and we have Ministers going around saving \$50,000 and \$25,000 and \$27,000, and we have the Minister of Social Services trying to save money on the backs of single parents. No wonder people in this Province are becoming cynical with politicians, and the trouble with it is it affects all of us. It is not only affecting the ones who are making these ridiculous cutbacks, Mr. Chairman, but it affects all of us as politicians. No matter how sincere we would try to be, particularly some of the Members on the back benches on that side, and again I refer to the Member for Lewisporte, I am sure he will be on his feet in a couple of minutes, Mr. Chairman, to - I do not think the Member for Bellevue, the Chairman of Committees, is

here now. I am pretty sure he will not be up to speak about the cutbacks in the Goobies area because he is much too ambitious to. He wants to keep on the good side of the Premier because he expects that he will be the next fellow to be shifted into Cabinet. I doubt that very much, but it is quite possible.

Mr. Chairman, because we have a premier in this Province who tried to promote the image of politicians we would expect that he would at least give some credibility to the statements that he makes, Mr. Chairman. And if he makes a statement on an issue that he would probably stick with his word and try to implement that unless he is proven wrong.

Mr. Chairman, we have the Premier and the Minister of Finance's Budget which one day they read in this House, and it is on page one or on the highlights of the Budget that they have a \$10 million surplus for the second consecutive year. And then six months later the Minister will get up in this House and say that he never said it, Mr. Chairman, and it is here in writing whatever he is saying. But, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I want to address from this Budget just to show why people in this Province are becoming cynical with politicians. It is a statement by the Minister of Finance and it shows his confidence, in my mind, it shows that he has no credibility. I will just read a paragraph from his Budget in April of last year when he is talking about the GST. He was very concerned the GST. 'The GST will result in a series of -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: Five minutes already?

An Hon. Member: By leave. By leave.

Mr. R. Aylward: Alright, Mr. Chairman. When he was talking about the GST, one of the statements - I will not read it all now, Mr. Chairman - that the Minister of Finance made, and I am sure he will be interested in this statement because when I read it today it came to mind, I heard it again yesterday. The Minister of Finance says: for all the reasons that he mentioned before, this Government has been, will be, and is firmly opposed to the GST. He forgot to tell his Premier that he was firmly opposed to the GST. But the reason that rang a bell when I heard it the weekend, and if you take the editorial from today's Evening Telegram I mean, you might find in that editorial a statement by another prominent Liberal. Happens to be leader of the Liberal Party nationally now. Mr. Chretien stated: that I am opposed to the GST. I have always been opposed to it and I will always be opposed to it.

That statement is probably worth as much as the statement that the Minister of Finance made last April when he delivered his budget. And suggested that he would never support the GST, yet his Premier came out a month ago saying they are going to have to support it. Now again he has to support the same GST.

Some of the damages and deceit -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: What?

An Hon. Member: He did not say he

supported it, he said he understood it. That is more than you (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: Who said that?

An Hon. Member: The Premier.

Mr. R. Aylward: The Premier understood the GST? But he is going to support it and he is going to piggyback on it too, that is what he said.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: He did not understand it here, he did not support it and he did not understand it right here, but he supports it now and he is going to use it. But some of the deception that had been brought on this Province - and twenty minutes is not enough time to go over it - but I will just list them off.

We have a budget in this Province that was supposed to have a \$10 million surplus and we now have at least a \$130 million deficit, or \$130 million lost. I will not call it a deficit.

We have an amalgamation issue that was running through this Province, where a Premier of this Province said: we will never force any community into amalgamation. His precise words, when he talks about being precise, his words actually were: the Cabinet will never do it in secrecy. They would bring it into the House of Assembly and force them.

They are going to abolish the Ombudsman's office, the only place in the western world that has been heard tell of. The Minister of Health sends out a letter to the nursing homes associations one week telling them that they have

to cut back, and the next week he gets up in this House and says that no decisions are made and I did not say any such thing. We have a payroll tax here in this budget that was brought into the Province to improve health and education. It was a health and education tax. And the two areas in this Province that are under attack right now by the Ministers of Finance, Health and Education, are health and welfare.

I do not know why they brought in the tax. I guess they are going to cancel that tax now seeing that they are not going to use it for health -

An Hon. Member: Because the payroll tax was for their payroll.

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, it is for their cars. Cars for the Ministers is what it is going to be used mostly for.

Student Assistants: the Department of Treasury Board and school boards signed a memorandum of understanding with the Student Assistants one week and put them all back to work, and then break that memorandum of understanding within the next couple of days. The Minister of Transportation came in, was asked a question only yesterday about the Fogo Island - Change Islands ferry service. And he got up in this House yesterday and said there are no changes. And he got up in this House today and read off one of his cutbacks in his Department to save \$450,000 is to gut the service from Fogo and the Change Islands.

Wildlife officers in this Province, when they want to speak their mind, when they want to speak out on an extremely important issue to them, they try

to make a point publicly because nobody in Cabinet will listen to them - extremely important issues to them. The Minister of Environment would not even meet with them, Mr. Chairman, before they made a public statement. What do they get for trying to speak out publicly on an issue with this Government, Mr. Chairman? You get a kick in the teeth.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, if the President of the NTA or the President of the Health and Safety Association could not speak out on issues, I am sure the Minister for St. John's South would not sit by and have his Minister of Labour reprimand his association. (Inaudible) -

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

Mr. R. Aylward: Maybe the security people in the Province -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will yield if any Member opposite wishes to get up and speak because they have been rather silent over there. I will yield, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Social Services or the Minister of Labour wishes to get up.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Employment. Over the last couple of weeks we have been trying to get some information from the Minister of Finance to

give some details on the infamous Budget that he brought down a number of months ago. And we have not been able to get those answers. You had the Leader of the Opposition asking the Minister of Finance eight or ten questions over the last couple of days and the Minister refuses to answer those questions. And here we have the Government today bringing in a closure motion in an effort to muzzle the Opposition to keep them quiet because of the pressure that we have been putting on the Government and on the Minister of Finance in particular to give us some details of his miscalculations.

And, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely unbelievable, you know. I have been following politics in the Province for about twenty years and it is almost unbelievable the arrogance that this Government is getting on with after only eighteen months into its mandate. I think this Government will probably go down in history as the most arrogant Government that we have had since Confederation. And that type of arrogance seems to be filtering down all the way into every single department of Government: into the Social Services Department in particular, into the Health Department, and also into the Employment and Labour Relations Department.

And I want to touch for a moment, Mr. Chairman, on the state of labour relations in the Province, the dismal, dismal state of labour relations in this Province. Well, what appears to be by the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations almost a total lack of concern to try and create some kind of a half decent climate for labour to operate in this Province. There

seems to be a total lack of concern not only by the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, not only by that particular department, but by the Government generally. The President of Treasury Board seems to be giving no indication either that he is willing to try to create some kind of a decent labour relations climate for labour to operate in this Province. I heard the Opposition House Leader just a couple of days ago quote the head of the biggest public sector union in the Province saying that they thought they had it bad. They thought they had it bad under the previous administration, but they have not seen anything like this administration when it comes to labour relations in the Province. They say, at least when you were told by the previous administration no or yes, you could depend on that same answer being applicable tomorrow. But not with this administration. You could be told today that you are going to have an agreement, like they did with the Student Assistants, sitting down with the Student Assistants and signing a tentative agreement, and telling the Student Assistants that if they went back to work they would have the same number of hours and they would have the same number of workers. And then the next day or the next week you have the Student Assistants going out again because the Government failed to keep its promise. The Government -

An Hon. Member: That is not -

An Hon. Member: It does say it!

Mr. Doyle: Okay, what does it say then?

Mr. Winsor: You have to start

telling the people of the Province.

Mr. Doyle: Are the Student Assistants lying? I would ask the President of Treasury Board. Were they not told by the Government, by Treasury Board, that if they went back to work that they would have the same number of hours reinstated? And that they will have the same number of people back on staff again? Were they not told that?

Mr. Baker: Within certain exceptions (Inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: In certain exceptions.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: Well, in any event, Mr. Chairman, the Government broke that agreement because we had the Student Assistants operating now 2,200 hours less. And instead of the 410 Student Assistants coming back on the job we have 200 back on the job. So that is the perfect example of the poor labour relations climate that this Government has been fostering over the last number of days and weeks and months. And that is why the Student Assistants are now back on the picket line again, because the Government failed again to keep its word.

And on three separate occasions the Student Assistants were told that if they went back on the job they would have the same number of people brought back and they would not suffer any hourly loss. The number of hours would be the same. On three separate they were told by the Minister of Education, they were told also by the Premier, and again when we signed that tentative agreement that there would be no loss in the number of hours and the number of people who

would go back on the job would be the same again. And they said we had 410 originally and only 200 have been recalled. The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations looks at me like she has never heard any of that before.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Government has reneged on the promise and they signed the MOU with the student assistants and deliberately broke that agreement. On top of that the student assistants agreed in that negotiating process they would take lower wages, if they could go back under these circumstances.

So, Mr. Chairman, make no wonder the state of Labour Relations is so bad in this Province. There seems to be no one looking after the shop, no one looking after the Labour Department. And how many questions have I asked the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations over the last number of weeks -

Mr. Tobin: Do you hear what the Minister of Education is saying?

Mr. Doyle: - over the last number of weeks and over the last number of months, how many questions have I asked the Minister? And she just fails to click with her. She just does not seem to understand what is going on in her own department.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Doyle: We have the Marine Institute instructors who are out. And the principal victims of that whole walkout right now are the students over at the Marine Institute. Almost 25 per cent of the students who are at the Marine

Institute are having their tuition and their expenses paid by the Canadian Employment and Immigration Department. We had the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations meeting with her federal counterpart yesterday evening and, Mr. Chairman, it was absolutely unbelievable the Minister could have a meeting with the federal minister. Maybe when she gets up in a few minutes from now and speaks on this particular motion she will give us some reason why she would meet with the federal minister and not even bring up one of the most vital issues that is facing the students of the Province over at the Marine Institute, 25 per cent of the 1,000 students who are over there have their tuition and their expenses paid by CEIC, and we have the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations meeting with the federal minister yesterday evening and we met with the Federal Minister afterwards - and she never even brought that issue to the attention of the Federal Minister.

Now I find that absolutely unbelievable, flabbergasting.

An Hon. Member: She does not know.

Mr. Doyle: That the Minister of Employment could be so negligent in her duties with 250 students directly affected over at the Marine Institute by CEIC funding which is going to be cancelled, we are told by the student's union. Yesterday evening we had a meeting with the student union out in the Common Room just before they met with the Minister of Education, who indicated to us that 25 per cent of the entire student body depend upon CEIC funding.

And I said, well surely, that will

be brought up this evening with the Federal Minister. Because the Provincial Minister of Employment is meeting and therefore this is naturally to be one of the main items on the list which she will talk about. And she never even mentioned it to the Federal Minister.

An Hon. Member: Is that right?

Mr. Doyle: Never even took the time, a minute or two, to speak to the Federal minister about that vital issue.

An Hon. Member: How about the change in UIC proposals (Inaudible), did she discuss that I wonder?

Mr. Doyle: Now, I would say to the Minister of Employment, if that sponsorship is cancelled by Friday then there is going to be an awful lot of hardship suffered by these students this winter. And the strike is now going into about a ten day period, it is over a week old. And the fall term over at that institute is going to end in about six weeks and the courses that these students are taking at that Marine Institute this fall will not be available during the winter months. They can only take them in the fall. And those same courses are not going to be offered again until September of 1991.

Now that one fact alone should have been enough to prompt the Provincial Minister of Employment to speak to the Federal Minister and to impress upon her the urgency of the situation. And it is going to have a tremendous impact upon the students. And we find that the Minister today, she tells us that she has appointed a conciliation officer to look into

the dispute, but she does not know what the conciliation officer is doing. We find from the student union yesterday that the instructors are ready to sit down, to talk about the issue, and to get it all on the table and to try and solve the dispute and get back to work again. So the instructors are all ready to sit down and talk.

The President of Treasury Board has indicated that the Government is ready to talk. But the only one who does not seem to be willing to pitch in and find out what is going on is the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. She has a conciliator appointed but she does not know what the conciliator is doing. We are listening but we are not getting the information.

The President of Treasury Board has been trying to muzzle the Opposition. Sitting back in his arrogance.

Mr. Simms: Shirking his responsibilities.

Mr. Doyle: Yes, and shirking his responsibilities is right. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister today to directly intervene. She has a conciliator appointed but she does not know what the conciliator is doing. So we ask the Minister to directly intervene today and to try and get these two sides back on track again so that the students, the people who are directly suffering from this walkout, might be able to get some relief from this.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Tell the Minister to stop interrupting!

An Hon. Member: Why don't you

solve it?

Mr. Doyle: But it is pointless, useless, to talk to the Minister of Labour about that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Do you want Clyde to get in touch with you?

Mr. Doyle: And it is true what the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations said a few mornings ago on an open line show. I happened to be driving from Avondale into St. John's and I heard the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations on an open line show.

An Hon. Member: Yes, what did she say?

Mr. Doyle: She was saying well, my responsibilities in the Department of Labour is not to get to involved with large groups, I get involved with little groups, she said.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Doyle: So that is why we do not get involved with these large groups in the Province. That is exactly what the Minister - we are a monitoring department, she said.

Mr. Simms: A new policy, is it?

Mr. Doyle: She said: we are a department that monitors. We do not get involved with large groups like teachers and large groups like the Marine - well I would not put the Marine Institute in that category.

Mr. Simms: Maybe she does.

Mr. Doyle: Maybe she does. I

almost ran off the road when I heard the Minister say that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: She said, one of my responsibilities -

Mr. Simms: You would have run into John Efford.

Mr. Doyle: - is to cater to the little groups in the Province, but not for the large groups like the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, lab and x-ray, the nurses, but the smaller groups.

Mr. Simms: Is that what she said? Ah, she never said that. I do not believe that. She did not say that.

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Chairman, I think it is time for a change in the Department of Employment and Labour Relations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: We have a member over on that side who would make a fantastic Minister of Employment and Labour Relations -

An Hon. Member: I would say two.

An Hon. Member: Who?

Mr. Doyle: - who has a thorough working knowledge of Employment and Labour Relations Department -

An Hon. Member: Do not pick out Tobin or (inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: - who have been involved with construction, who has been involved with the fishery, who is liked to a certain extent in the Labour Movement.

Mr. Simms: Who in the name of heavens is that?

Mr. Doyle: The Member for St. John's South.

Mr. Simms: Is that who it is?

Mr. Doyle: Yes, I have been talking to some of the people over there.

Mr. Simms: Oh, my, oh, my!

Mr. Doyle: So, Mr. Chairman, it is time we had a change in the Department of Employment and Labour Relations.

Mr. Simms: What about Melvin Penny from Lewisporte? The teachers do not like him, but he is liked.

Mr. Doyle: We had a little bit of a shake up and put somebody in there who is experienced in the Labour Movement, who knows labour.

An Hon. Member: I would like to see Roger Grimes in here in the Labour Department.

Mr. Doyle: Who knows what it is to be out on a picket line -

Mr. Simms: Yes, Roger knows that.

Mr. Doyle: - and to have nobody listening in the Department of Labour. That is what the Minister of Labour is lacking. She is lacking that knowledge of what it is like to be out on a picket line.

An Hon. Member: She is lacking more than that.

Mr. Doyle: And she knows that nobody in Government is listening.

Mr. Tobin: She is lacking more than that.

Mr. Doyle: Now, Mr. Chairman, it is time we had a little bit of a shake up over there because all we have been getting from this Government is a litany of broken promises, and that litany of broken promises is going to continue, as long as the Government, is -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Doyle: - is trying to balance its budget on the backs of the ordinary people of this Province.

Mr. Simms: The working poor.

Mr. Doyle: And the Government promised, Mr. Chairman, to consult with Labour -

Mr. Winsor: The Minister or Education -

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Education would make a good Minister of Labour because he says yes to everybody.

An Hon. Member: The President of Treasury Board (inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: This Government promised, Mr. Chairman, to consult with Labour. Did they consult with the teachers on their pensions?

Mr. Tobin: Fire more teachers.

Mr. Doyle: Did they consult with the firemen?

Mr. Simms: I agree with you (inaudible).

Mr. Doyle: Did they consult with the student assistants? No, Mr. Chairman, this is not a Government that consults. And the disappointing thing about the teachers and the problems that

they are having with their pensions, the teachers have two direct representatives sitting on the Government benches and one in the Cabinet.

Mr. Winsor: In the Premier's Office.

Mr. Doyle: One sitting in the Premier's Office, and one as the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. Both former NTA Presidents, close to the seat of power -

Mr. Simms: Close to the seat anyhow.

Mr. Doyle: - and they had failed the profession miserably and used the NTA as a springboard to get into the political life in this Province. That is what they have done. They have used the NTA as a political spring board to get into the political life in this Province. But I dare say, Mr. Chairman, when the next election rolls around, the NTA will remember the Member for Conception Bay South and they will remember the Member for Exploits and how they let them down and how they failed to come to their aid. It is a funny thing, you know, when all of a sudden - I remember out in Avondale one night the Member for Exploits as the President of the NTA coming out and tearing strips off me out there.

An Hon. Member: Past President of the NTA.

Mr. Doyle: Yes, that is the past President.

Mr. Simms: Tearing strips off of you?

Mr. Doyle: Tearing strips off of me -

Mr. Simms: Because you would not negotiate with the teachers.

Mr. Doyle: - doing everything he could to embarrass me.

An Hon. Member: Who?

Mr. Doyle: The Member for Exploits.

An Hon. Member: When was that?

Mr. Doyle: Oh, that was about three years ago.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

An Hon. Member: By leave.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

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

Mr. Murphy: You know, Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that when hon. Members opposite were going to try and make points about a motion of closure that it would be filled up with fire and brimstone, and tearing into the Government for bringing in a motion of closure; however, I have not seen that. All they have done actually is a continuation of the financial bill that was before us this time last night.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: I realize that. And repetition after repetition, but I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that it is appropriate on the eve of Halloween that the Members opposite are trying to spoof our friends and get on with a whole lot of gibberish appropriate to the time of the month. But you know, Mr. Chairman, I think our

friends opposite are suffering from political alzheimer's, and how soon they forget, and many of them over there are rambling on about the last fifteen or sixteen months.

Mr. Chairman, let me read into the record the Canadian press clipping, 'Newfoundland Government makes painful cuts: expanding on piecemeal economic statements from his Governments over the last two weeks, Premier Peckford said that the provincial Government is facing a current account deficit of \$66 million and cuts will have to be made. Now did that sound like an echo of yesterday and today?

Mr. Simms: Is that a Newfoundlander speaking?

Mr. Murphy: 'The budget squeeze is on,' Mr. Peckford said.

An Hon. Member: When was that?

Mr. Murphy: Financing levels from the Federal Government - from the Federal Government! - for established programmes - hear this now - such as health care, secondary education, have dropped \$19 million to \$136 million from a projected \$155 million this year. Nineteen hundred and eighty-two dollars.

Mr. Peckford's government.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: Now b'ys, stay quiet.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I think

I have -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

Mr. Murphy: I think Van Winkle from Clarenville just came to!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

I want to remind the hon. Members that it is unparliamentary to be interjecting and interrupting a Member when he is addressing the House.

An Hon. Member: Mind your mouth.

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

An Hon. Member: Mind your mouth (Inaudible)!

Mr. Murphy: And I sat here this evening and today and never uttered one word while the hon. Members opposite spoke. Not a word!

Mr. Simms: Leave the House! That is like all the other (Inaudible) things you have been saying to us, I guess this is more of it!

Mr. Murphy: This is a very appropriate piece, Mr. Chairman. Seventy million dollar, Peckford's economic forecast, \$70 million shortfall. And right adjacent to that it says: 'Mobile moving offices to St. John's, says Premier'.

Now that could be said of today. Mobile have moved to St. John's, but not on a part time basis, on a permanent basis. Now, Mr.

Chairman, do you remember the ghost of the free vote? Do you remember the ghost of the free vote last spring, who was in there? The fellow with the big glasses, the big round face? Here he is, look. 'Crosbie tells Province to clean up'. Now. 1987. Not 1982, Mr. Chairman. Transport Minister John Crosbie has a message for Premier Brian Peckford. He is mad and he is not going to take any more. Now! And Mr. Crosbie goes on to say: 'I do not intend to be a fall guy for anyone.' Alright? Crosbie angrily stated -

An Hon. Member: He is not like you!

Mr. Murphy: - as he said, the Provincial Government has been blaming Ottawa and everyone but itself for the financial crisis it claims to be in.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: Now, Mr. Chairman, you talk about political old-timers. Right? Yes. Now the hon. Member, Mr. Chairman, stood up tonight, and he loves editorials from The Evening Telegram. The hon. Member for Kilbride, he always has an editorial from The Evening Telegram. Finance Minister John Collins - what district did he represent, I wonder? - St. John's South! I knew it was a familiar place.

An Hon. Member: He won it by more than one vote!

Mr. Murphy: A bad - yes, that is right! That is right, but I will remind the hon. iron worker, or the hon. Member from Harbour Main, who has been unjustly picking on the Minister of Employment and

Labour Relations, and trying to make political points and trying to upset what happens to be a very good relationship between myself and the Minister.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: And I carry on, Mr. Chairman, to say that the Province is in dire straits would be putting it mildly.

An Hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Collins, John Collins.

An Hon. Member: Dr. Collins.

Mr. Murphy: Dr. John Collins. Dr. Jangle Collins.

An Hon. Member: The WBC landlord.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Hyde, whatever. With each passing day we are getting deeper into debt. There is no end in sight, and the Torys have decided to go further into abyss. Mr. Collins predicts their current account deficit for the calendar year will come in at an estimated \$172.6 million! Now!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: Oh yes, sure. The hon. Member for Mount Pearl is coming to now, look. Based on his track record, Dr. Collins predictions can be taken with a grain of salt. They have all managed to go awry. In last years Budget he had predicted - listen to this the hon. Member for St. John's Centre - in last years Budget he had predicted a current account deficit of \$49 million and it came to \$40.9 million, but only because of an infusion. This is why I feel proud reading this, and you will understand. The hon. -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: He will understand. It says it came to 40, but only because of an infusion so: \$48 million from the sale of Fishery Products International, which I helped - I was working there at that time and helped decrease the deficit.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: Yes. Hear this now, without that extra money the deficit would actually have been \$90 million. Now, that is in 1987 money which is about \$120 million in 1990 money. Ah ha! Has the water on the beams changed when the federal government does its dirty nasty deeds? No.

Now, more, more, more! We are only started yet. And I am going to pass this - I have enough information here to drive all of you out of the House.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: Now I am glad! Now, Mr. Chairman, you heard that. Did you hear that, Mr. Chairman? The hon. the Member for Placentia West talks about trips. I knew all you have to do is throw out the hook and the line, put the right bait on her and the old cigar lighter it will come to her every time. Out he comes out of the darkness. Peckford travels in style. The Premier's staff spent \$51,000 in sixteen days the record shows. And seven hon. Members stood in their place over there in the last two days, Mr. Chairman, and talked about the \$8,000 that is obviously necessary for the Ministers to get around and do their job. Now, let me ask you, Mr. Chairman, if this stuff is necessary to get around and do your job? Brian Peckford

may be the leader of Canada's poorest province, but he is king of the road.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: He stays in luxury hotel suites, is partial to chauffeur driven limousines, and brings along a lot of company.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: Now I move to the back page, and we will talk about some of the company. Let us talk about the company he is keeping. The Premier, Mrs. Peckford, well we do not mind Mrs. Peckford, she should be with the Premier, and Mr. Clarke flew to St. John, New Brunswick where they joined eight more members of the Newfoundland contingency.

An Hon. Member: Was it eight more?

Mr. Murphy: Yes.

And including Glenn Tobin -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: Alvin Hewlett. Is that the right pronunciation? Hewlett. Mr. Alvin Hewlett, Helen Miller, Herb Clarke, another co-worker at Fishery Products.

An Hon. Member: Frank Petten.

Mr. Murphy: Yes, Frank Petten. He had to bring the scribe along to write everything down, Hal Stanley, Barbara Knight and Fred Way. Now the Premier's two trips -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: Wait now! That is all right.

Now look this is public knowledge.

An Hon. Member: I do not mind Frank Petten. (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: Well this is public knowledge. The hon. member knows it is public knowledge. Now if the hon. member is not going to read out names then he should be equally as courteous when he is on his feet, slandering, and jabbing and jumping.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: Oh, yes, well why can he not defend himself?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: I do not see any letters to the editor after this article was written, I remind the hon. member.

An Hon. Member: The opportunity (inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: He had lots of opportunity. Wait now I am back to the cigar lighter. I do not want to forget him.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: Yes, sure.

Frank Petten the Premier's Press Secretary, -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: All right, I will listen to the hon. member.

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: Ah, boy drop dead!

Mr. Murphy: Halloween, the old werewolf over there.

Mr. Tobin: Take off your mask, boy!

Mr. Murphy: Oh, yes, Frank Petten the Premier's Press Secretary went along on all parts of all four trips, as did Glenn Tobin the MHA for Burin - Placentia West, and formerly the Premier's Parliamentary Assistant, Alvin Hewlett, the Premier's Principal Secretary went all parts of three trips. Now I do not know but I suppose I should, as the hon. member said not get into other members, but these people are obviously political people affiliated. Now, Mr. Chairman, I could talk about what it cost.

Mr. Hogan: Retroactive approval. All without authorization.

Mr. Murphy: That is right. Now therein lies - here is serious stuff, all without authorization. Free authorization. It had to be done after the fact. Retroactively approved.

An Hon. Member: It is not true.

Mr. Hogan: Oh, yes.

Mr. Murphy: Listen! Listen! All right, not true says the hon. member.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: Well now - now we were muzzled a few minutes ago. You have to make up your mind. We were not allowed to get up and speak, we were listening to the members opposite all day long, chastising the members over here, chastising the Minister of Education, chastising the Minister of Social Services, he has done this on the back of the poor, and he has taken away \$100 a month and \$51,000 in sixteen days. Is that what I need to remind the hon. members that they have political Alzheimer's.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: This is 1957.

An Hon. Member: Alzhemier's, boy!

Mr. Murphy: Alzhemier's whatever! That is a bad memory, my friend. A convenient bad memory.

An Hon. Member: You will never get in Cabinet.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Murphy: Five minutes. I only just started.

Mr. Murphy: If I have to do what you fellows have to do to get in Cabinet, I do not want to get in it. If gallavanting all over - you know something, Wilt Chamberlain, I would like to remind the honorable members, yes I am a bit of a sports fanatic, Mr. Chairman, and I do know a little bit about sport. As a matter of fact, I won the scoring championship in, I do not want to remember the year, before the honorable member from Humber Valley even laced on his skates. As a matter of fact, I remember the honorable member from Humber Valley well one night in Buchans, when he looked up and he said, Mr. Murphy can I have your stick?

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Murphy: Being the caring, sharing man I am, I said here my son, do you want me to autograph it, and he said by all means. And he told me outside the House that he still has the stick and he treasures it, and I appreciate that. But you know, one of the outstanding records, Mr. Chairman, that have been accomplished by an athlete in both

the professional and amateur fields, is that of Wilt Chamberlain. Wilt Chamberlain is a black American who scored in excess in his career of 30,000 points, as a basketball player.

Somebody said to me one time that the honorable members opposite, if you multiplied Wilt Chamberlain's record by ten, it would only be close to some of the travel points that are contained in the portfolios of the honorable members.

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Murphy: When I was working, Mr. Chairman, with Fishery Products International, I had occasion to fly many, many times, and I became a good friend of the Minister of Development, I think he was, the Hon. Hal Barrett, because he is the only one that was -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: - well, I am telling the truth, I am allowed to tell the truth in the House, you do not, I can tell the truth in the House - I got to know the honorable member on an airplane, because everytime I got on, as a matter of fact, I thought he was working for Air Canada.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Burin-Placentia West on a point of order.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, the Member brought up about points. Let the Member tell the House whether or not he has obtained any points since he became an elected Member based on tickets that were paid by the taxpayers. Answer that, tell the truth.

An Hon. Member: Are we on a point of order?

Mr. Chairman: No point of order.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I said not five minutes ago, I love to stand here and tell the truth. Certainly, I have accrued points since I became a Member, certainly I have, as the past-president of the Canadian Society of Safety Engineering, the national past-president, in going back and forth -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) back to society, the organization (inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: - I would, only I realized that the honorable member is a part of society.

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Murphy: The werewolf has spoken again. Every now and then, Mr. Speaker, he comes to. I do not know if there is a full moon out tonight or not, but however, Mr. Chairman, I had absolutely no intention of rising in my place this evening, but after all, there has to be a time when honorable members opposite - the Premier this afternoon stood in his place, he told this House exactly what the circumstance and the situation is. If the international market place falls - we have a stockbroker over on the other side, who knows only too well - the honorable member from Mount Pearl knows only too well the consequences of the 1982 problems, he knows it and they go around and they finally file their way through the United States and into Canada, through Mr. Mulroney, through Mr. Wilson, and we end up in Newfoundland taking our share, more than our share I would

suggest, of that economic position.

And the Premier explained that this afternoon, and we talked about the shortfalls in Newfoundland's fair share of balance of payments from Ottawa. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not need to get into any more of this stuff. The hon. Members only know too well what I am saying to be true and actual and factual. You know? I mean, if there was ever a Premier in this Province who fought with Ottawa - Smallwood fought, and I do not know if the hon. Mr. Moores fought - but Mr. Peckford fought with Ottawa constantly, and the hon. Members know it, about what we felt - by leave.

Some Hon. Members: By leave, by leave!

Some Hon. Members: No leave! No leave!

Mr. Murphy: I would have had leave only for Zamboni Sam.

An Hon. Member: No leave.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can understand why the Member for St. John's South left the House. Because things were going very well all day until he stood to his feet. And he brought this debate down to the guttersnipe level, there is no question about that.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: And we all know that he has got the potential to do that but we did not think that tonight was going to be the night.

An Hon. Member: And you are going to raise the level of it now?

Mr. Matthews: I am going to raise the level, yes. I am going to raise the level of debate just like the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations has raised the level of consultation and cooperation with labour in this Province.

Mr. Simms: Right on.

Mr. Matthews: The Minister (Inaudible) earlier this evening said, he wondered if the Minister of Labour should take sides. And I said to my colleague when he made the comment, no, we do not want her to take sides, we would like for her to get off her backside and get out and get some settlements out and about this Province!

An Hon. Member: Do something (inaudible)!

Mr. Matthews: Do something for a change! And I want to refer to the Member for St. John's South and his history lesson that he gave us here this evening. I am surprised that he did not go back to the Smallwood days of the chocolate factories and the rubber factories, and all and on and on it went. And through the Moores and the Peckford days.

But we are here today to talk about today. And we are here to talk a Government, a Premier, who has invoked closure on this Legislature on a bill asking us to approve a \$325 million loan bill. Six months after this Minister of Finance, who is not sitting in his right seat -

An Hon. Member: Cold hard fact.

Mr. Matthews: - came in here and projected a \$10 million surplus. That is what we are all about, Mr. Chairman, here this evening. That is what this is all about. And to hear him read through the people who travelled with Premier Brian Peckford as he went about this nation. And it is just a few short months ago, Mr. Chairman, how well I remember, and all the people of this Province and Canada remember, that one Clyde Wells said 'Goodnight, Judy'.

Well, it just so happens that Frank Patten at the time had the same position as one Judy has now. Except Frank was not as well paid, by the way. Frank was not as highly paid as Judy is now.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: Goodnight, Judy.

Mr. Matthews: I will not eat those words because I know what Frank Patten's salary was because I sat around the Cabinet table when it was decided.

An Hon. Member: How much? How much?

Mr. Simms: Less than Judy's!

Mr. Matthews: And I know one Judy is getting more! Less than Judy's!

Mr. Tobin: Goodnight, Judy!

Mr. Matthews: And then the question was asked the last time I spoke in this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, just a few days ago actually, when we were talking about expenses and travel, when I asked the President of Treasury Board could he confirm that the Premier took a chartered plane to Ottawa and on the tarmac for a week. We have not heard the

answer yet! But like I said that night, the silence is deafening. And how many more were with him at the time? We saw some of them.

Mr. Tobin: Was Judy there?

Mr. Matthews: We saw some of them when they bid goodnight.

Mr. Tobin: Was Paul Dicks there?

Mr. Matthews: The Minister of Justice was there. The Member for Pleasantville was there. The press secretary was there.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) Premier Peckford.

Mr. Matthews: Now you should be quiet. The Member for Exploits should be quiet. If there is a person in this Legislature at this particular time who should be quiet it is the Member for Exploits. He should shut up, because if there is a man that has used a bunch of professionals in this province to get where he is today it is the Member for Exploits.

An Hon. Member: Four years. Four years.

Mr. Matthews: (Inaudible) a bunch of professionals. You used them to the degree that in the 1984-1985 dispute you went in front of 700 or 800 of them and you wept. You wept openly in front of them. For what? For what? I can't get anymore for you. You are getting a lot for them today. You have gotten a lot for them today. You used them. I am telling you something Mr. Chairman, let me say to the Member for Exploits that I don't have to say that to them today because they are all scratching their own heads and asking the

question about the Member for Exploits and the Member for Conception Bay South how they could rise through the ranks of the Newfoundland Teachers Association and turn tail on the teachers of this province.

Mr. Windsor: After using their money to campaign for four years.

Mr. Matthews: That is what you did..

An Hon. Member: From the classroom to the boardroom.

Mr. Matthews: So I say to the Member he should bite his tongue, you should bite your tongue, because you have been a big disappointment to the teachers of this province, a big disappointment. And you know it and that is why you are so sore today. That is why you are so sore. That is why you are so touchy. That is why your nerves are raw. That is exactly why because your own colleagues who thought that you were on their side have been let down by you and the Member for Conception Bay South.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: You can't take it Roger.

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Exploits wants to take part in the debate I would suggest that you ask him to be quiet and get up after I sit down.

An Hon. Member: It would be nice to see him in his seat for a change.

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible)

Mr. Matthews: Now, Mr. Chairman,

this has come about because of this governments cuts in health and education in this Province. Health and education cuts. There are going to be a thousand to twelve hundred people laid off in the health care system. I watched the news before I came here this evening. I watched Mr. Burnell on there. He talks about how serious it is. I have every reason to believe that what he says is correct because the Premier stood in his place and said well they know better than we do. They know better than we do. The Hospital and Nursing Home Association knows better than we do and that gentleman was on television for the people of this Province this evening telling just how serious it is. And he said they looked at two or three options, two or three options, and he says in some cases in hospitals and nursing homes there are going to be severe layoffs.

Mr. Tobin: Who said that?

Mr. Matthews: Robin Burnell. In other cases there will not be any more in the nursing homes, particularly there will not be any more people admitted. There will be less patients in the homes and in other cases there will be a reduction in services such as transportation, recreation, food etc. Now that is how serious it is in this Province today with health care and right on back of that there was another report that says it looks like in St. Pat's Home there's going to be a layoff of 38 people and a reduction of services and on back of that they shot right to Labrador, right to Labrador with the problems we are experiencing there. Now that is what we are facing in this province. Look at education, look at education. The Minister of

Education is not in his seat. You look at what's happening about our schools. Children on a daily basis around this Province are being sent home, sent home, because there are no substitute teachers. Right on the back of a report to the Minister of Education by Dr. Crocker, I believe it was Dr. Crocker, the Crocker Report that recommended that the length of the school year in this Province be lengthened, said that our school year was not long enough-

Mr. Winsor: More instructional days.

Mr. Matthews: More instructional days. It talked about other countries where the school day is longer and consequently the students are better prepared. What are we seeing in this Province -

An Hon. Member: Send them home.

Mr. Matthews: - by a Minister of Education right out of the closet up at the University? Less days than we have ever had in this Province before. Less days instruction, and it is in the best -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Fewer days? Fewer days? The mad doctor corrects me on my English. I accept that. It is just too bad he cannot take corrective measures on his Budget. But that is what we see in this Province today, less school days per pupil.

An Hon. Member: His English (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, his English - there are a lot of things not

right about him, but we will not get into that.

We are seeing students being sent home on a daily basis because of cutbacks by this Government.

An Hon. Member: Where?

Mr. Matthews: From every community in the Province. In every community in the Province they are being sent home. And if the hon. Member does not know that, I suggest to him he get in touch with his schools to see what is happening.

An Hon. Member: It is true.

An Hon. Member: Every community in the Province?

Mr. Matthews: Yes, every community in the Province are sending kids home.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: It is so!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: Every community in Newfoundland, 300 communities, sent children home.

An Hon. Member: Yes, (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: The other big question, Mr. Chairman, is the lay off of the teachers in this Province. There are going to be hundreds of teachers laid off in this Province in the next year. There are teachers in the profession who already have jobs and are very worried, but the bigger question, Mr. Chairman, is what is going to happen to those who just a few days ago graduated from Memorial University and will be graduating again in a few

years? What future is there for them in this Province? That is another question that this Government has to address. The biggest thing that the education system in this Province needs is an infusion of new blood. But if you are going to see hundreds of teachers who are currently in the system laid off then you are not going to see new teachers hired. And as far as I am concerned, that is going to compound the educational problems in this Province because if there is one way that I see to improve education in this Province it is to somehow provide for an infusion of new blood and new teachers in the teaching profession. So, I say to the Minister of Education, the Minister of Finance, the Member for Exploits and the Member for Conception Bay South that your educational cutbacks -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Do you see how they twist and turn when the truth starts to hurt them? No use for teachers.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, it is not the logic we use. It is the kind of budgeting and the budgetary measures that you are taking that is causing the problems in this Province. That is the problem we have. And then we hear the Premier again today saying that he might have to go to the electorate on the teachers issue. Someone who has been working for twenty-five to thirty years in this Province paying in pension premiums and you are going to take it away from them. Can you imagine how some of you would feel if you were paying into a pension fund for twenty-five plus years

and someone told you that they were going to reduce your benefits? If there is one thing that is sacred to people in this country and this Province, it is pensions.

An Hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Matthews: What is not true?

An Hon. Member: Imagine how I would feel if somebody else spent it.

Mr. Matthews: Yes.

An Hon. Member: You spent it. Seven years of spending.

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island up there who yesterday made some great quotes about teachers. He said, 'if I had Easter, Christmas and all summer off I would not mind giving up a few days'. And, then today he says that all the teachers in the schools in his district agree with his statement. Well, we will see over the next two weeks how much they agree with you once they get a copy of your statement. We will see about that. And wasn't it ironic today to stand in this legislature and to see the Premier stand in his place and point fingers about how the pension problem was not addressed earlier. The pension issue was not addressed and put in its proper light until 1980. Brian Peckford became Premier of this Province in March 1979. They went to the polls on the 18th June 1979, and in 1980, less than a year after he was Premier of this Province he set up a proper pension fund. The first time in the history of this Province.

An Hon. Member: The first time.

An Hon. Member: How much did (inaudible) proper pension?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: I just asked the member to be quiet up there.

An Hon. Member: Hitting a raw nerve.

Mr. Matthews: No, you are not hitting a raw nerve with me. But what is ironic is that Clyde Wells was a member of Joe Smallwood's Cabinet back when we all remember.

An Hon. Member: Minister of Labour.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, Minister of Labour, when he decertified a union in this Province.

Mr. R. Aylward: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Matthews: But more importantly on the pension issue, there were no corrective measures taken to address the pension problem.

An Hon. Member: What union did he decertify?

Mr. Matthews: It was a union of chicken cookers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: There was a union at Knickerbockers.

Mr. Walsh: What union (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: I am sure it was not a union at Beothuck Ford.

Mr. Walsh: What union did he decertify?

Mr. Simms: The broiler makers.

Mr. Matthews: The broiler makers, not boiler makers.

But how ironic, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Walsh: Certified union (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: How ironic, Mr. Chairman, to hear the Premier of the day, a former Cabinet minister who sat at the Cabinet table and criticized someone else -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: - for not setting up a proper -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Doyle: Why are you afraid to get up and speak? Get up and speak.

Mr. Chairman: I am just trying to make things quiet for the hon. Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Oh, I love it, Mr. Chairman. You do not need to make quiet for me. Because the more interjections they make the better it is.

Dr. Kitchen: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

Dr. Kitchen: I would like to ask the member to state just which union he meant. If it was the IWA decertification, it certainly had nothing to do with the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: That is right.

An Hon. Member: He does not know

what he is talking about again.

Mr. Simms: Who said it did?

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: When you strike close to the bone, Mr. Chairman, that is the way they get you know.

Mr. Simms: The present Leader said he wanted to outlaw strikes in the public service. (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: He should be back at the university.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, that is right. That can be verified. Mr. Chairman, again, to the Minister of Finance, I am sure that he can remember when he was President of the Progressive Association of Newfoundland and Labrador that he can remember that. When he was President of the PC Association of Newfoundland and Labrador, he can remember when the now Premier did all these things. Because he criticized them, you see, at the time.

An Hon. Member: That was (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: No, he never did.

Mr. Matthews: He criticized them. We are going back in history.

Mr. Tobin: What one was it, Bill? Which one did he decertify?

Mr. Matthews: But we are here this evening, Mr. Chairman, because government has evoked the closure motion on the Legislature. Because they are financially and fiscally incompetent.

An Hon. Member: The IWA.

Mr. Matthews: Fiscally incompetent. That is the problem, Mr. Chairman. And everyone else in this Province now -

Mr. Simms: He did not say -

Mr. Matthews: Health and Education, Social Services, Transportation, Finance have all got to pay for the incompetence of that government.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible) history, boy!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, -

An Hon. Member: That member should get flung out if he is going to keep that up.

Mr. Simms: That is all he is at all night.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: You give somebody thirty minutes and -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. John's South, you know, he brought the debate down and he is continuing to do the same thing.

Mr. Murphy: No, no!

Mr. Simms: Clyde is not here.

Mr. Matthews: I just want to say to the member that there is only so far you can take things and get away with it. So I would suggest that he just keep it down a bit.

An Hon. Member: Cool it!

Mr. Matthews: Cool it a bit, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) do as I say.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, you should name him.

Mr. Matthews: There are some people, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot make suggestions to.

Mr. Simms: He never interrupted you once, by the way. He never opened his mouth.

Mr. Matthews: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, at the time that what is happening is that the people of this Province, in every community of this Province are suffering because of the financial incompetence, the fiscal incompetence of this government. We are going to see teachers laid off, youngsters sent home from school on a daily basis because substitute teachers are not provided.

An Hon. Member: They are now!

An Hon. Member: Scare tactic!

Mr. Matthews: Teachers' pensions are going to be reduced.

An Hon. Member: Health care.

Mr. Matthews: Health care.

An Hon. Member: Not true.

Mr. Matthews: People are going to

be laid off. Hospital beds are going to be closed. Old age citizens who want to get into nursing homes cannot get in, and on and on it goes.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

An Hon. Member: That is fact.

An Hon. Member: What is fact?

Mr. Matthews: Single parents, Mr. Chairman, being hurt by this government.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hewlett: When are you going to close your department?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, when you see them booting out the Ombudsman, firing the - who was it they fired in the public? The Auditor General?

An Hon. Member: The Auditor General.

Mr. Matthews: Fired the Auditor General at a meeting of a conference downtown somewhere, then announced he was gone. Calls in the President of the Wildlife Officers Association and tells him to shut his mouth and disciplines him. And today they invoke closure on this Legislature. Some democracy, some open-minded Government, some democratic

Government. Well I can tell you something, that as Government's are in office for a long period of time, wherever they are usually they become arrogant. And they take things for granted. And as I said the other night in debate in this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, that we were not as arrogant in eighteen years as this Government has become in eighteen months! Eighteen months. You have become more arrogant than a Government that was in office for eighteen years.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, and I am going to tell you something. You are the sitting definition of arrogance this evening in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: They should remove the definition from the dictionary and put your picture by it!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) can't see you!

Mr. Simms: They'll see us!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) standing up defending your interests!

Mr. Matthews: But let me tell you something. One of these days when there are 10,000 out on the steps and you have to come to work you will know what it is all about. The very same people who you used to get where you are - you and the Minister of Labour. She is in a worse position! Because she is Minister of Labour.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: You go out and ask

them what they think about you today, Roger! Ask them what they think you did to them today, Roger!

Mr. Simms: Those are their own words (Inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: And the hon. Minister of Labour speaking, she is not even in her own seat. She does not know anything about labour and she does not know anything about Parliamentary rules.

Ms. Cowan: Neither do you, I am allowed to speak.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, could I have a ruling please? Is the Minister of Labour allowed to speak from that seat? Could I have a ruling please? I need a ruling, please.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

As all hon. Members are aware it is unparliamentary to interrupt a speaker whether you are sitting in your own seat or any other seat in the Chamber.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simms: Wrong once again.

Mr. Matthews: She has been wrong now on six or seven strikes and she is wrong this evening. She has got a good record. She has a worse record than the Leafs, Mr. Chairman. And that is some record. Worse record than the Leafs.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Pardon, that is my team, yes. Oh yes. My team. Yes, yes.

An Hon. Member: Ten to one.

Mr. Matthews: Ten to one. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude my remarks this evening.

An Hon. Member: Good idea.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, it is a good idea. But let me just say this. That at least, Mr. Chairman, I was willing to get up and to talk about what is happening in this Province as a result of this Government coming to office some eighteen months ago. As a result of the Minister of Finance bringing in a very fraudulent document projecting a \$10 million surplus and now it is a \$120 million deficit. And as a result of that fraudulent document we are going to see people hurt, laid off, out of work. And our health care system in a bigger crisis than it already was in. Our education system in the biggest crisis I would say it has been in in thirty years in this Province. And the Minister of Finance still has the nerve to sit over there and throw barbs across the Legislature when it is his sole responsibility, the state that we are in today in this Province.

You can not blame it on anyone else. You have to take the responsibility yourself. That comes with getting elected, it comes with once you are sworn in to a Cabinet as the Minister responsible. You have to take that responsibility. It is no good to try and slough it off on someone else. You are the incompetent person, you are the

one delivered the Budget Speech in this Legislature and predicted and projected a \$10 million surplus. And six months after, we have the Premier go on with an economic statement that we have a \$120 million deficit.

So if you are telling me I am wrong then what you are telling me is your deficit is not as bad. Now is that the truth, is the deficit not as bad, and all this anguish and agony that is going out and about the Province is not true?

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

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you.

Mr. Simms: C'mon, Efford, you're next.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: No!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

An Hon. Member: Not allowed to speak.

Mr. Efford: No, I can not resist. (Inaudible). Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Now, don't the intelligent cucumber from Mount Pearl start. Because I am not going to sit here in my seat all night now and listen to the nonsense that has been coming from the other side. Utter nonsense.

The hon. Member stood to his feet and he made some clear points, but he started off saying that the Member from St. John's South reached down in the gutter.

An Hon. Member: So he did.

Mr. Efford: But I tell you one thing.

An Hon. Member: Not as low as you did, though.

Mr. Efford: You wait until twenty minutes after then you will see how low I can go.

An Hon. Member: You are there anyway.

Mr. Efford: Wait, give me twenty minutes. But at least when he stood to his feet he took excerpts from the news media and quoted it, it was factual, it was not false information that he presented to the hon. House of Assembly. He did not stand up, Mr. Chairman, and point to the Ministers of Labour and Finance and other Ministers in this House of Assembly and make statements and call names as the hon. Member just did.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: He took facts, Mr. Chairman, and he read the facts. Whether they are true or not it is not the hon. Member from St. John's South, it is the news media.

Mr. Matthews: Point of order, Mr. Chairman!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: It is the news media, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Order, please!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

The hon. Member for Grand Bank on a point of order.

Mr. Matthews: Just on a point of order, a clarification. I thought facts were always true.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Matthews: I mean, how can a fact not be true?

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: It just shows you how stunned they really are, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Matthews: No, it shows how stunned you are!

Mr. Simms: Anyway, let us see how low you can go.

Mr. Efford: Okay, let's go. Let's talk about the financial situation of the Province. And let's stop pointing for a second. Let's stop pointing for a few minutes and see who is really responsible for what are the affairs of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador today.

No, the hon. Minister, when he was in Government, and especially the former Minister from Mount Pearl, how could they be responsible for what is happening in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador today? This Liberal Government must be responsible.

An Hon. Member: You're the Government!

Mr. Efford: We must be responsible. I mean, we created \$5.7 million debt? We will take full responsibility. If that is what you wanted to say, if that makes it a fact, that we created \$5.7 million.

Some Hon. Members: Billion!

Mr. Efford: A billion dollars. We are paying off a debt, \$485 million a year. We caused that? The former administration - heaven forbid to say that the former Ministers in Government - the Minister of Finance was walking through the door because he cannot listen to the truth. He would not cause a debt like that. Four hundred and eighty-five million. I wonder, would that have anything to do with the reason why the teachers and everybody else in the Province today is finding it financially difficult to maintain a decent life-style?

They would be responsible for what is happening in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador today. This Liberal Government must be responsible, we must be responsible, we created a \$5.7 million debt? We will take full responsibility if that is what you want us to say, if that makes it a fact that we created \$5.7 billion, we are paying off a debt of \$485 million a year. We caused that, and Heaven forbid to say that the former Ministers in Government, the former Minister of Finance is walking through the door because he cannot listen to the truth, he would not cause a debt like that, \$485 million.

I wonder would that have anything to do with the reason why the

teachers and everybody else in the Province today is finding it financially difficult to maintain a decent lifestyle. Would it be because we have a \$485 million interest payment a year. Would that be the former administration that did that, or is that the Liberal Government of today. Make a choice, make up your mind. We will take the responsibility, we are the Government in power today, so we must look at it and we must say, okay we do not have any debt to pay off. Let us take the attitude of the former Tory Government, we will not pay off the debt, we will not worry about the loan, we will not worry about the \$5.7 billion, we will not worry about the \$118 million debt retirement. No let us take the attitude of, let us go out and borrow Mr. Minister of Finance, let us go out and borrow another \$200 million to take care of the deficit for this year, plus let us spend an extra \$80 million and let us increase the wages of everybody that comes. On top of all the debt that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is incurring now, we will incur more debts.

And as the Member for Trinity North said, close the Social Services office in Clarenville, close the Social Services office in Bonavista, close it down in Buřin-Placentia West. We do not need it, because we will borrow enough money in Newfoundland and Labrador with the Tory philosophy to give everybody enough money to live on. Guaranteed income, that is what we will do, we will not use any financial responsibility, for our grandchildren, our great-grandchildren and our great-great-grandchildren will be paying off the debt. That is sensible, responsible Government.

That is Tory philosophy. That is what the honorable Members want us to do, drive it in debt.

Where did they ever go to school and get their business training. Where do you ever get the common sense to say that we can keep borrowing and borrowing and borrowing and borrowing, and a province or a bank or a Government or a business can survive. Now, I will tell you one thing, the honorable Member from Grand Bank said that the Premier was in Ottawa and he said 'good night Judy'. I can tell you one thing, when he was saying good night Judy he was not handing out \$250 tips. That is one thing he was not doing, and he was not smoking hundred dollar cigars, but he was up there fighting for the survival of this Province and the survival of this Country, and if it cost a week and a plane to go to Ottawa, fine, let it be done. It was responsible financial management of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and Canada, the reason why he went to Ottawa, and if it cost \$10,000 it was worthwhile spent.

And I do not think there is one honorable Member on this side of the House of Assembly who will hold his head in shame. But I tell you one thing, I still hold my head in shame this day, even now that I am in the Government, from the days when I was on the Opposition I had to witness the Premier of this Province driving around Canada and driving around the United States with an entourage that no other Premier in Canada would even imagine presenting to his Government. And what did he do. He took the trips and he paid out the tips and he rented a stretch limousine and he stayed in \$1250 hotels, and they

come back and what do they do, they have to get the requisition signed after they come back. That is the kind of responsibility, and I can tell the hon. the Member for Trinity North one thing, that if I had half the money that was wasted in the last seventeen years in travel alone I would put another ten social workers in Clarendville with great enthusiasm. You would not ask me if I am considering closing an office, but I have to consider closing some places now. I have to consider it because of the financial responsibility that we have towards this Province. You cannot put a money tree in your back yard. You cannot pick twenty dollar bills off a tree that is not there. The money has to come from somewhere. And you are a part of an administration that drove us into debt whether or not you want to admit the responsibility. And you can go out into your commons room, lie down and nap, drink sauce, you can do whatever you like but you are going to hear the facts. If you can stand up over there and hand it out, then you are going to sit here in this part of the Confederation Building and you are going to take it. Don't think that the teachers of this Province are so blind that they cannot see what is happening. I met with teachers in Clarendville and Conception Bay last week and they said: 'the one thing that we want is when I retire I want to be able to go to the post office and get a check that I can change. I do not want a bankruptcy slip. And if it takes good financial responsibility of the administration of this Government I am willing to pay the price.' And any Member who stands in this House of Assembly and says otherwise is misleading, telling the untruth, but whatever

terminology you want on it he is not bringing true facts to this House of Assembly. And if you bring one teacher into this House of Assembly who will tell me that he does not want a pension when he retires, then I will resign tomorrow. Bring one teacher to tell me that when he retires he does not want a pension check. Not one man will come into this House of Assembly and do that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Now, you be quiet.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Efford: Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility now that we are in Government. We will take responsibility for what is happening in 1990 because of what happened from 1972 until 1989. You cannot change that. You cannot be playing politics with the fact that responsibility lies over there. Now, we are responsible, and if we are responsible we have to have a Minister of Finance who will incur debt with a reasonable sense of responsibility only with a sense of responsibility that is not going to be forced on our great grandchildren to pay off.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: I do not know how he can manage even to pay off the mess we are into now. I mean if you would make some sensible suggestions, if you would make some sense of responsibility you would at least show the people of this Province that there is something positive happening. You go out and promote, you insight, you make all kinds of false accusations and you would think at least there would be one hon.

Member of the former administration who is a part of the downfall of this Province who would at least say, 'well, we cannot borrow anymore money'. You cannot go out and borrow another \$200 million to \$400 million. You cannot go out and put the Province further in debt, so what way do you do it? You look at all the options. And unless I am sleeping twenty-four hours a day and not aware of what is going on, I do not know of one decision that is being made in this Province today to say that the teachers will not get their pensions, that the schools will not be teaching in the classrooms next year, that hospital beds will not be open. I do not know of any firm decision. All I know is news media, people from the Opposition throwing accusations. People out there are wondering and deciding which is the best way to live within Budget next year. There are no decisions made. But while the Member for Kilbride sits over and puts his head and pretends he is not listening and pretends he is not a part of responsibility, I only wish we had the \$23 million that was there. I will tell you one thing, the Member for Humber East would not be standing on her feet today and telling me that we had to cut back the maintenance income of single parents or the Minister had to close hospital beds or the Minister of Education. If I had the interest on that alone - the interest - never mind the cost, the interest on that alone. But what did I have to face?

Mr. Reid: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Carbonear on a point of order.

Mr. Reid: I am new to the House and I am not sure of the rules and regulations, but I take exception to the fact that no more than ten minutes ago an hon. Member from this side of the House was basically told by you, Mr. Chairman, that she could not speak because she was not in her proper position. The hon. Member for Kilbride is continuing to interrupt this speaker from this side of the House; he was not in his seat. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to make the same ruling on that Member as you made on the Member from this side of the House. Thank you.

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

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

Mr. R. Aylward: Obviously the Member for Carbonear is not listening as he usually does not listen in the House. The ruling that was made on the Minister of Labour, at the time was sitting down somewhere in that part of that House, was that she said, 'I am allowed to speak from this chair if I like'. Now, I was speaking from that chair and I realize and I apologize to the Chair, Mr. Chairman, for interrupting. I know that none of us are allowed to be speaking from any part of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

To that point of order, I just want to read for -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

To that point of order, I just want to read for hon. members information, Standing Order 11 (c) 'When a member is speaking, no member shall pass between him and the Chair, nor interrupt him, except to raise a point of order.' (correct).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Last year we spent \$237 million in the Department of Social Services, \$115 million of that we will pay out to in excess of 20,000 people on social assistants. Now I have been Minister of Social Services for eighteen months, that money was spent when I was Minister of Social Services for twelve months.

Now do I have to take responsibility, does this government have to take responsibility for leaving and causing 23,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to be dependent on social assistance? That is the kind of silliness we are hearing on a day to day basis, \$237 million, almost half the debt, the interest that we pay each year. Almost half. We pay on interest alone, it goes out in social services. Now I caused that. The Minister of Social Services today will take responsibility for causing this to 23,000 people who depend on social assistance.

An Hon. Member: You caused the recession.

Mr. Efford: I caused the recession. Sure we caused it. I will take responsibility, if that will make the hon. members feel

happy over there. We caused the recession in Newfoundland, we cause the recession in Canada. My God take the whole world, the globe, do we want to go that far? Will that make you feel better? Will that solve the problem? Will that solve the financial problems that we are into? Will somebody tell me how we can come up with \$485 million, \$118 million to pay the debt retirement charges? Money to run the Province? Money to increase all of the things that the hon. members opposite are saying, and still continue on to survive financially? Now if that is the kind of common sense, if that is the kind of business sense that is coming out of the members opposite then I say make no wonder they spent \$23 million growing cucumbers for cattle feed. That is the type of interest, that is the type of common sense we have. Common sense. Reality. \$23 million to grow cucumbers for cattle feed. Think about it! That is the kind of thing.

An Hon. Member: It is really good business administration.

Mr. Efford: Really good business administration. You should stand proud in your seat and condemn the Minister of Finance for what he is not doing because you really, really made wise decisions when you were in government.

Mr. Chairman, it would make you sick to your stomach to listen to the tripe from the members opposite when they know very well what the position of this Province is. Now if they were newly elected members, if all of the members opposite, if every member opposite had lost his seat and there had been all new members, like there are some new members opposite, the hon. the Member for

Fogo, I can understand came asking questions, if they were new members, not being a part of the financial administration of the former government, I understand why he should stand up. He has a right to. He was not a part of that system. But for ministers, the Minister of Finance, the former Minister of Agriculture, the former Minister of Career Development, and other ministers who were part of the administration to know full well every detailed thing that is taking place in the Province to stand up here.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Efford: Let me tell you about another thing that was taken off? If we had some of the SSA tax that the former administration -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Efford: Let us talk about the SSA that the former administration did not collect. The RST, the retail sales tax. Let us talk about it. How many hundreds of thousands of dollars and millions, not hundreds of thousands, but millions was written off the books in the last ten years? How many times did I stand on my feet as an Opposition member and ask what about the \$300,000? What about the \$70,000? What about the \$200,000? What about the \$500,000? Why is it not being collected?

An Hon. Member: Did you write many off?

Mr. Efford: No, Sir. No, Sir!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: I can stand on my feet and tell you that all of the

years that I was in business never did I operate on a government loan, never did one government thing come inside of my door.

An Hon. Member: Government! Government!

Mr. Efford: I never wrote off anything, Sir. And I can be sure of that and the books are open. But I can tell you one thing, when I ran a business, I ran it financially responsibly and I did not drive it in debt.

An Hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Efford: Yes you can stand on your feet anytime you want to, out in the corridors or in here anytime you want to, Mr. Speaker, this is what we get, this is what you talk about condemning the Member for St. John's South for bringing out the facts. They stand in the doorways, in the corridors, have not got the courage to come in and listen to the true facts. They are playing little games. The people of the Province know full well what the financial state of the Province is today. They know full well why it is in the position it is today and you can talk all the tripe and all the nonsense you like in this House of Assembly. My margin of victory will not decrease one iota, not one vote with all the nonsense that has gone on in here in the last week or two weeks. In fact, no! In fact my worry is to increase it. My worry is to increase it and I think it has increased and I enjoy seeing the honourable Member stand up and make the statements because I think the more statements he makes it adds another little vote on the highest vote in the Province in the last election. Still climbing. Still climbing so you

have no worry. Yes, yes it is a worry because I worry and I cringe at the thought of ever another administration in this Province like the former administration. I cringe at the very thought and so do the people in my district. For five years from 1984-1985 up until the last election 83,000 dollars went into Port de Grave district for four and a half years. 83,000 dollars total! Total! Total! From the Department of Transportation, Department of Municipal Affairs and all other departments, 83,000 dollars. Why? Now you didn't play politics, no! No member opposite ever played politics. That is beneath you, that is beyond you. The former Minister of Labour criticized the Minister of Labour today. He didn't refuse the people of Makinson's Mayor 11,000 dollars for drinking water, no. He didn't sit down in his office and tell me absolutely there was not one cent left in the treasury, in the revenue, in any department of government to give the people of Makinsons 11,000 dollars. He didn't say that. When there were ten people in from Makinsons to tell him that we have absolutely no drinking water, he didn't say "NO!" you are from a Liberal district. No that honourable member did not say that. That is far beneath him to ever consider that.

Ms Verge: He was keeping it for Harbour Main.

Mr. Efford: That is far beneath him to ever do that. They would not punish a Liberal district. No for seventeen years I never saw a Liberal district get any money. Seventeen, now we have the cry of patronage, the cry of looking after your own districts. You are lucky I'd say that you got a Premier sitting in that chair. If

I was sitting in the chair you would have something to worry about.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Efford: I can assure you of that. You are lucky you have a Premier there who believes in fairness and balance. You are lucky you have a Premier who believes in fairness and balance because I can assure you Mr. Speaker, the (Inaudible) would be coming in to the top of the head before there would be anything go out in that district.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Efford: Make no mistake about it. When I see what my people, the people in my district for ten years, ten years went by in my district with not five cents. The Municipality of Bay Roberts, the best run municipality in the Province, second to none, for ten years Bay Roberts never got five cents, not five cents.

An Hon. Member: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Efford: And the council came in year after year after year begging but like I told them I would not beg. I would not beg to the former administration. I would not put myself down to begging. I would look them straight in the eye and ask them and if they haven't then that's it child go on because there is a day coming, and the day is here and people now are getting treated fairly in this Province. The Minister of Finance has the responsibility to see that people get treated - not only today Mr. Speaker, not only today but we have a future. We can talk about today and we can talk about tomorrow and we can talk about the

next two years but we have a government in power today and a Minister of Finance who is concerned about not only today, not only about the next election, not only about the future but the future beyond the next generation. Because we have children and we have grand-children, and we have great grand-children and we don't want those people to continue paying off the debt of the former administration and added to by this administration. It is not going to happen.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible) on the mainland? Well, that will be a fine place to go, considering what we got in Ottawa right now. God forbid if they ever decide to go to the mainland. I would sooner put him out on Kellys Island and tie him on. If they ever take it in their minds to go to the mainland, the situation we are in up there now.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member for Ferryland.

Mr. Power: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I have some comments to make about closure and about the state of affairs in this Province. But first of all I want to say, listening to the Minister of Social Services, I really pity the Premier. I honest-to-God pity Premier Wells and this Province. This place is going nowhere except going downhill. And it not going downhill because of what the

former administration did; it is not going downhill because of what happened twenty years ago or (Inaudible). It is going downhill because of what is happening today. The Minister of Social Services is a prime indication of what is wrong with this administration.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Power: He is immature and inept. He's vindictive to punish other people in this Province, not punish the politicians over here, but punish the residents of Ferryland, who got punished this year. I got \$20,000 this year out of all the capital budgets of the Departments of Municipal Affairs and Transportation. You talk about fairness and balance? There is vindictiveness and spitefulness. It is backward-looking, backward-thinking. He is an inept, amateur historian who sees history - all he sees is cucumbers, pickles, \$23 million and the amount of money that the Peckford and Moores administrations may have wasted in this Province. That is all he sees.

He just spoke for twenty minutes in a debate where closure was enforced, where the rights of the people of this Province are being walked upon without any question. That we do not have adequate time to debate and to discuss the real issues in this Province. And that Minister gets up, collects \$100,000 a year plus his car bonus, I suppose, and says what? Did he make one suggestion to improve Newfoundland? Did he create one job? Did he make things easier for one widow in Newfoundland? Is one student better equipped after that speech

to get a job in this Province? Is there one more job available?

If poor old Premier Wells, who has four or five good Ministers with him, wants to save some money, he should start by taking people like the Minister of Social Services, get him out of his Cabinet and caucus, and try to find some people with some positive outlook. Some people who are capable of intellectually looking at the problems that we have and trying to analyse them and do something with them. But for the Minister of Social Services to get up and simply talk about cucumbers... I mean the reality, if you really wanted to look at reality and what has put all the blame on the Tories, the biggest single mistake made in this Province in the last forty-odd years, was the Upper Churchill Agreement.

That did not do away with \$23 million. It did away with \$600 million and \$700 million per year during the mid-seventies and early eighties'. That is where our problem rises. We did not waste \$487 million when we were in power on travel. We spent that on social services, education, roads, infrastructure. It did not all go to waste. There is wastage. But if you think - any of the Members who are trying to get into Cabinet - if you ever think that when you get into Cabinet you will prevent all the wastage in a large bureaucracy, it is impossible to do. You limit it and you control it.

And I have to say, in the ten years that I was in Cabinet - yes, in the last year or two we wasted some money on cucumbers. But there were a lot of other things we did very well. To keep the

fishing industry in this Province around, to improve the educational system, to make health care available. When I look at Come By Chance -

An Hon. Member: Krugers.

Mr. Power: But I do not mind Come By Chance and Krugers. They were only small things, they happened once and they cost a pile of money. But that Upper Churchill Agreement, done by Liberals, to create 5,000 jobs for a few years. That is what caused Newfoundland to be have-not!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: Every Tory voted for it!

Mr. Power: And the amateur historian who now finds himself, very temporarily I suspect, in Social Services - and for the benefit of people in Newfoundland, I hope very temporarily involved in politics - for all of his vote-getting that he may be able to do, he has also got to be able to contribute in a constructive manner. And I do not see that happening, certainly with that Minister.

Mr. Chairman, on this closure motion: one of the things that the Premier wants to say, and as one Member of the Opposition I take offense with bringing in a closure motion this early in a session, I can see it done if there is a deadline when you have to borrow or employees have to be paid, and you get that, it happens every year in every Parliament in the country, I suspect.

But when the Premier says he has to bring in closure because of an unruly Opposition and he has fifty

pieces of legislation that he needs to do, urgent legislation that has to be done - do you want to see what forty-one pieces of legislation are on this? Want me to show you where the jobs are, where the improvement is in the life-style of the people of Newfoundland. We have an Act Respecting The Auditor General on that list. We have An Act To Amend The Assessment Act, An Act To Amend Urban And Rural Planning, An Act To Amend The Freedom Of Information Act. So you bring in closure so we can get to it? An Act To Amend The Welfare Institutions Act, An Act To Amend The Livestock Act, An Act To Repeal Certain Obsolete And Spent Statutes.

Those are the fifty pieces of legislation that we have to bring in closure so we can get to these? To do what, Mr. Chairman? Little small housekeeping things that are not going to make this Province any better. So that closure movement itself -

An Hon. Member: He wants to get to the regional services bill so he can take democracy out of municipal affairs.

Mr. Power: Well, the municipal affairs fiasco I may get a chance to mention in the small amount of time I have. But, Mr. Chairman, let me tell you something. As one person who was involved at the end of an administration, believed in part that we needed certain very substantial changes, I wish they had been made by electing a new Conservative Government with a new Premier with some new direction. But we did not. We believed, as people in this Province, some in Ferryland district, this Liberal manifesto, this Liberal manual. That is what we believed that was

really going to change things in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, if you could walk around the hospitals as I visited a couple of my friends this evening, and talked to some of the nurses and the nursing assistants, and the patients. All who are deeply concerned as to whether they will be working in three months time and about the quality of care that their patients are receiving. And all are convinced that this Government is going to do something to health care, education, social services and job creation that was certainly not mentioned in any of these documents. The biggest disappointment was that those, the group opposite, I cannot say they were all in waiting as Liberals, some of them were very strong Tories, some of them were NDPers, but they stayed in waiting, they saw an opportunity, they became Members of the Liberal caucus, and they became elected, some of them.

But the biggest disappointment is that after seventeen years so few of those individuals came to that Cabinet table and caucus with a sensible idea to improve conditions in this Province. When you look at the Minister, listen to the silly comments of the Minister of Social Services about blaming in the past. You know something? Our Minister of Finance this year, a Liberal Minister of Finance, will probably have the largest single deficit in the last twenty years. The largest single deficit will be this year if his figures - most recent ones, \$120 million - are accurate. I do not think that in any of the Peckford or Frank Moore years there was \$120 million deficit.

Now, you cannot blame that on people in the past. That is money that you are spending this year that you do not have. That is the great-great-grandchildren who the Minister of Social Services is talking about who will have to pay that debt. Mr. Chairman, somewhere along the way - and the Minister of Social Services and a lot of the other Ministers think that the people of Newfoundland are not concerned. Well, I guarantee you that the people are concerned that decisions are going to have to be made. You can postpone as long as you like - the Minister of Social Services, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Health - but if you are going to do what you say you are going to do, it is best to be done quickly.

This postponing, this indecision, is not helping the teacher, is not helping the educational process in this Province. It is not helping people in hospitals. It is not allowing doctors, nurses and hospital administrators to plan properly. So if you are going to cut the budget then do it and have it over with and tell the people the honest-to-God truth. But the lies and deception that we have seen in this budget document, going from a \$10 million surplus to a \$120 million deficit, \$34 million which you knew you had to pay back and did not tell the people, did not tell this Legislature. You knew it was coming off your transfer payments and you did not tell us, and you predicted less money from the Government of Canada, when in effect there was more money coming but you had to pay back some. But you knew that and we did not. But the people of Newfoundland will not forget.

Mr. Chairman, when I look at what this budget has done and what this administration is about to do to this Province it is shameful. If we lived in a banana republic, if we lived in a Third World country, there would be a revolt. There would be riots. But the people of Newfoundland are not violent in that sense, but maybe, just maybe. The Premier hopes that when the next election comes around people are going to vote with their hearts. This wonderful, courageous Newfoundlander fighting the world on Meech Lake. Trying to supposedly keep this country together. I think he made a pretty substantial effort in tearing it apart. He thinks he was keeping it together. But I think the people of Newfoundland next election may just vote with their pocketbooks and with their minds. And they will see what happened.

This gobbledygook that was in this. When I look at what is happening in education today, when I see what teachers are being told - told, not negotiated, not discussed, being told - about their pensions, you know what I really believe is happening? I really believe it is happening. The teachers are being told that their pension is going to be changed, even though everyone knows it is supposed to be negotiated, because this administration needs teachers. It needs to save \$2 million a day while teachers are on strike. That is what this administration needs. It needs to close down the educational system for a period of time, two weeks, three weeks, a month, and save \$2 million a day and then maybe the budget will not look so bad. That is what a lot of teachers are suspecting is

really happening in this Province.

When you look at some of the comments about saving money, with all due respect to the good Minister of Fisheries, whom I have known for thirty years I suppose, I do not know why we have a Department of Fisheries - why bother. Everything that happens in this Province, it is said the ministerial jurisdiction is federal. We cannot do anything. Why not have an enlarged Department of Development, put in a division for fisheries, the same as we have a division for tourism, and let it happen that way. Why do we waste money?

When you listen to this, I just have to read the thing because it is so silly. No industrial activity is more important to Newfoundland than fishing, the Liberal manifesto. A Liberal Government would recognize the Department of Fisheries as the key industrial division of Government, when the key industrial division of Government is the House Commission, it is not even the Minister of Development. A Liberal Government would achieve - this is an interesting one, I would like to see some day how far the Minister has progressed in this - a Liberal Government would work to develop and implement a workable catch failure insurance or assistance program to relieve the hardships suffered by those who work full-time in inshore fishery, but experience poor seasons and substantial reductions of income or sometimes even a total loss of income.

Mr. Minister, when are you going to make your report and tell us where this new program for catch failure insurance or assistance program is. There are a lot of

inshore fishermen in this Province who would like to know and it is not happening, I suppose it is Federal again. When I look at Forestry and Agriculture, the parts of the Province where you can create some employment, how many new sawmills do we have? What is happening with the tremendous wood resource in Labrador, any new industries up there? What is really happening in Forestry, what is really happening in Agriculture, where are the new jobs in Fisheries.

With all due respect to the Minister of Development, a person that I have some respect for, who is one of the better persons in that administration, when I look at comments that he made today about what the Royal Commission, the House Commission has done is to find a new financing plan for the Twillingate Fish Plant. We all know how the Twillingate Fish Plant, which happens to be in the Minister's District, got financed, how that fish plant was kept open and some others were closed. We are not all stupid you know, we can see what is happening.

In the resource departments the Premier could definitely save some money. Close down some of those departments, lay off some Ministers, put them into the Department of Development as divisions of this Department of Development, and you would not have an any more ineffective Province, and you would have no less jobs except for the few Ministers involved, which the Province would be better off without.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the really important sections of this Province, the part that is really going under crisis, that is in a

catharsis now that is going to continue, the Minister responsible for Treasury Board soon has to tell the people, you cannot hide. This Government is indecisive. The only decision they can make is to bring in closure. They can control this place, but when they go out through the door, they have absolutely no idea what to do with this Province. When you look at education in this Province, again I have to look at a quotation from this wonderful Liberal document that caused this group to be elected and to become the Government of the Province.

First, our economic, social and cultural development depends on improving the quality of education available to our people.

Mr. Tobin: Is the Minister of Education listening?

An Hon. Member: Make no wonder you hang your head down.

Mr. Power: Newfoundland and Labrador cannot hope to participate fully in Canada's 21st century if we continue to neglect our responsibilities in education. Our future economic success depends more on the improvements we make in our educational programs than on any other single factor. What is happening to education in this Province to day? Is it better, is it worse, is it the same as it was a year and a half ago? The reality is, what this administration has done to try and save a few measly dollars is penny wise and pound foolish. You are robbing from one and giving to somebody else.

What is happening in education in this Province does not give anyone any degree of encouragement to

stay in this Province to be able to access new job opportunities. What is happening in education is shameful and I honest to God believe as I mentioned a moment ago, that this Government has to find a way to solve the problems in Newfoundland. You are solving it partly by substitute teachers, by cutting back their They are robbing from one and giving to someone else. What is happening in education in the Province does not give anyone any degree of encouragement to stay in this Province, to be able to access new job opportunities. What is happening in education is shameful, and I, honest to God, believe as I mentioned a moment ago that this Government has to find a way to solve the problems in Newfoundland. You are solving it partly by substitute teachers, by cutting back there. The other parts of this were the rural and urban. Disparity is going to be relieved where we are going to have the same education system, where the Liberal Government will abolish school taxes and directly fund school programs. All the lies - they can only be perceived as lies. I cannot believe you were naive enough eighteen months ago to believe all the things that you put in that document to get yourselves elected. Either that or you were as inept there as the Minister of Finance was going from \$10 million surplus to \$120 million deficit. And I cannot believe that all Liberals are that inept, so I must believe that there is some dishonesty, disservice. Something is not all right there.

In the post secondary education system, are there any improvements being made? The Minister of Education would think so. I talked to the staff up at the

Marine Institute today. I talked to the students I saw in our common room yesterday, and let me tell you that those students do not think that education is better today than it was eighteen months ago when you fellows took office. It is worse. Talk to Mose Morgan. We had some changes which I was personally involved with as Minister, and when I looked at what happened in career development I really say that the Minister has made some very serious mistakes. He has taken some improvements that we made and he has to cut back. He cuts back, on one hand, because the Minister of Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance says we have to cut back. Education does not then become a priority, it becomes something which is lost and something which, I suppose, somewhere down the road somebody will do something with.

The health care system: as I mentioned I visited the hospital this evening over at the Health Sciences, a great facility which does a tremendous amount of work, the nurses, doctors and nursing assistants and administrative people in that hospital. The Province would be lost without it. But, Mr. Chairman, there are so many people over there who are afraid they are going to lose their jobs. There are so many people in hospital who are not going to be able to access decent health care. I know an awful lot of people. My wife works in a nursing home. I know what is happening in the nursing home field. The Minister responsible for Treasury Board will have to make some very tough decisions. The decisions are going to be to lay off people and close beds. Now, this Government has to make some priorities and they do not

seem to be willing, able or capable of doing that. They seem to want to avoid, they want to do PR work.

An Hon. Member: PR is a priority.

Mr. Power: PR is a priority. Making sure the Premier's image is good across Canada; making sure he has lots of travel and lots of speaking engagements or priorities. Mr. Chairman, what happens in Municipal Affairs? It is bad enough in health and education. What is happening in Municipal Affairs in this Province? Isn't the Province trying to put on the backs of municipalities all the financing for municipal infrastructure? Have I seen any increase in budgets? Have I seen better services? Are Newfoundland outports small rural towns better off now than they were eighteen months ago? The reality is that they are absolutely and positively not. They are worse off. They are confused. They have no direction. They get no leadership from the Minister of Municipal Affairs. All they get are confusing and conflicting statements about whether or not they are going to be amalgamated whether it be one town or several towns.

Mr. Chairman, what is happening in labour in this Province? What did Mr. Bill Parsons who just retired as the President of Federation, what did Mr. Parsons say about this Government? The worst they have ever been. They thought they would get better when Peckford and his crowd left, and what has happened? They got worse. Why is that? That does not even take money. That takes a stance of negotiating, of caring, of willing to listen. But this Government is

not willing to listen. This Government has its mind set on doing certain things, and fiscal responsibility seems to be the one that you say is going to be your be all and end all. When I look at the Liberal document, when I look at the Budget - the Budget which was if not dishonest terribly inept. Incompetence has to be part of the process that anybody who can go from a \$10 million surplus to a \$120 million deficit in a matter of six or seven months, that has to be incompetence Mr. Minister of Finance. It is not personal. Either your people who support you and give you advice, yourself or the Government decided to change the figures to make it look good for one temporary day, one great day to have a little party downstairs and pat the Minister of Finance on the back and say he is a great guy. How did you do it? You are a magician. Yes, you were a magician. But the smoke and mirrors fell apart and the truth had to come out. And that is what happened.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Power: It was magic for a very short period of time. What is happening in this Province, Mr. Chairman, and I know closure is here, I only have a moment or so left, but I will say what is happening in this Province is something that we are on, it is a very slippery slope, and I suspect that this government is not capable, mentally, intellectually, I do not think they have the process, I do not think they have the ideas. I do not think they have the courage to do things that are right and they are going to do certain things that are going to punish an awful lot of people in Newfoundland, the workers of

Newfoundland are going to have to pay the bill, and as the Minister of Social Services refuses to acknowledge, this year's \$120 million deficit is on the backs of this administration, the closure of hospitals, the pending teachers strike which this government will fabricate to solve some of their problems, all those things will be the responsibility of this government and many generations to come will remember what this administration has done, and the hopes that after seventeen years of a Conservative Government, when this Province thought there was going to be something different, a new administration, new people, new ideas, it is terribly disappointing to see what is happening in the short eighteen months. I can only say I hope it gets better, but I sincerely believe it will get much worse before it does.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

An Hon. Member: He has already spoken.

An Hon. Member: No, not on the (inaudible).

An Hon. Member: Nobody allowed to speak over there or what?

Mr. Tobin: Now, Mr. Chairman, I can tell the Member for St. John's South that I am going to enter into this debate and I want to enter into it without interruptions from him.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: I have seen it brought

to a new low tonight in my eight years here, I heard some comments going across this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, in eight years and some of them, I suppose, to some extent that I have been involved in and none of them, those of us who are involved in from time to time, to be very proud of.

An Hon. Member: Terrible.

Mr. Tobin: But what the Member for St. John's South started with tonight and what the Minister of Social Services interjected with was the lowest comment that was ever made in this Assembly in the eight years that I have been here. I have seen it pretty low. I have seen it, Mr. Chairman, when you think members were snakes, but tonight I have seen it where the snakes would have to jump over the members. That is how low this debate got tonight, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister of Social Services brought this debate tonight to the lowest ebb that has ever been brought in his comments, and he should be ashamed of himself. And furthermore the social workers of this Province will not appreciate the comments that Minister made, nor will the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, nor should the Minister of Justice be very amused by the comments made by the Minister of Social Services tonight, nor anyone else.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: Yes, I am sure there are people in the legal society who will be listening tomorrow of what we have heard tonight in this Assembly is something that I hope there is not too much more of it left. And if that is the best contribution that the Minister of Social Services can make to this

debate, and to his department or acting on behalf of the social workers in this Province he should resign. Because social workers are professional people and should have as their minister whether it be Liberal or PC or NDP a professional person who will carry out and work within the ethics of that profession. It is not important whether they be a social workers or not. But what is important is that they adhere to the ethics of the social work profession and tonight we did not see that. We saw a vicious, low surly attack on a member in this Assembly by the Minister of Social Services, and I would suspect, I have to say it, I honestly believe what I am going to say and that is the Premier of this Province will not be very excited when he finds out what the Minister of Social Services had to say. I believe that, Mr. Chairman. I really believe that the Premier will not be very happy or excited when he finds out what that Minister said tonight.

And I think that the avenue for that low racket that was created by the Member for St. John's South and I can say to the Member for St. John's South that it is fine for him to come in here and it is probably politically wise for him to come in here, Mr. Chairman, and attack me for the trips I made with the former Premier or the Member for Green Bay. Albeit go to it, we are here, we can defend ourselves, we can argue, but for God's sake the bureaucrats in the system like the names you mentioned tonight, some dedicated and committed people in the senior ranks of this government and in the previous government are not here to defend themselves and they should not be dragged up. If you want to go after me for the trips

I made with Peckford go after me. I'll pin back your ears and go after me, no problem. No problem, Mr. Chairman, and let the chips fall where they may but for God's sake, for God's sake have the decency to leave alone the bureaucrats in this government. They served our government, Mr. Chairman, with honour and loyalty and I am sure that the bureaucrats today that the Minister dragged on the floor of the House tonight, the Member dragged on the floor of the House tonight are serving this administration with loyalty and honesty and integrity and they should not, they should not be subject to that type of comment from the Member from St. John's South.

We must remember that every person, whether they sit in this chamber or whether they sit outside this chamber, who work in the public service are human beings. They have feelings and they have families. We can defend ourselves. The electorate sent us here to defend ourselves and what the Member for St. John's South had to say tonight about me...fair ball, Mr. Chairman! Fair ball! I am here and I can take it and if I can't take it it's too bad, but the senior bureaucrats in this government and the former administration who are not here and cannot be here to defend themselves and should not have such a vicious attack that was issued tonight by the Member for St. John's South, and I am sure that there are Ministers in that government and I know the Minister of Fisheries-I have known him-my colleague for Ferryland says he has known him for 30 years. I have not known him for that long but I have known him the best part of my life and we disagree in this

but I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, and I can say to the Province that if there is one man in this Assembly I have respected all my life and still do it is the Minister of Fisheries

An Hon. Member: Here, here.

Mr. Tobin: No I do, I do and I am serious about that and the Minister of Fisheries knows what I am saying is true, and not only do I respect him my entire family respects him, my father and my uncle and everybody else and the Minister knows that is true, and he has been a good friend of ours and he is not the type of a person who is going out and attacking the character of senior bureaucrats whether they were in the former regime or the new regime or anything else. He is too honourable a man to do that. He is too honourable a man to do that and I think the Member for St. John's South and others who clapped and cheered when he issued his vicious attack on the senior bureaucrats in this government and the previous one should talk to the Member for Twillingate, the Minister of Fisheries, a good honourable, decent man.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: No that is true. He is. I have known him, Mr. Chairman, I would suspect I have probably known the Minister of Fisheries longer than most members or any member on that side of the House.

An Hon. Member: The Member for Gander is not a bad fellow either.

Mr. Tobin: No the Member for Gander is not a bad --I'll tell you one thing--

An Hon. Member: The Minister of Energy is a good fellow.

Mr. Tobin: The Member for Gander, I'll have my disagreements with him, the way he chops up the Budget and the way he is socking it to the sick and the suffering of this Province but in terms of being a man of integrity he is that. He is honest.

An Hon. Member: I wish you could say that for St. Barbe though.

Mr. Tobin: Well I tell you something right now that I have had no problem with the Member for St. Barbe.

An Hon. Member: Windsor-Buchans.

Mr. Tobin: And the Minister of Energy, one of the finest men, one of the finest men that has ever walked into this assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

An Hon. Member: He is a real Tory.

Mr. Tobin: Well I don't know if he is a real Tory or a real Liberal or a real NDP'er, but the Minister of Energy is one of the finest who has ever walked into this this Assembly, and I mean that. Yes he is an example to all of us. As a matter of fact, I look up to him. The Minister of Justice is over there pointing like this at himself. I cannot say it, let me say to the Minister of Justice, I cannot say it. No I am not talking about you, I am talking about him. I cannot say it. He is the most arrogant Minister we have ever seen, the Minister of Health. That is why he is pointing at him, because he knows he is arrogant. Mr. Furey, I have nothing to say about him, he has been a - we go back a long

way.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that all Members should realize is that we have to be responsible in what we say in this Assembly, and we have to accept responsibility for what we say. I can hear what you are saying too - and yes tonight we have seen this Assembly brought to the lowest time I have ever seen in my eight years. And I have seen it, Mr. Chairman, when Members were named. I have seen all of that, but I have never seen such personal vindictiveness that I have witnessed tonight.

When somebody is inept in this Assembly and lacks the intestinal fortitude to respect others, then that is what we can say. And I can tell you one thing, that I have been as vocal as anyone in this Assembly in the past eight years, and I have said things that I regretted saying, but never, never in my eight years in this Assembly have I said anything personal about another Member. Never, and there is not one Member in this Assembly or in the former Assembly can ever remember me saying something personal about another member. And God help me, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that that never happens, because I can tell you something, that if I said something about the character of another person in this Assembly, I would be rather ashamed of myself.

I know that there are times when you get involved in the debate, and in the heat of the debate you may say things that you regret, and I have, Mr. Chairman, and I will admit it. But I do not think that I have ever, and the Member for Gander has been here before, this is his second term here with me, I do not think he can remember

me personally saying anything about anyone in this Assembly. And I can have my barbs back and forth, and I have had them, myself and my friends there, the two of them, probably two of the best -

An Hon. Member: They are laughing at you now.

Mr. Tobin: - yes, well no they do not laugh at me, we laugh with one another. But I can tell you one thing that I consider my colleague from Placentia, a fellow I have known for quite a while, I have known him Mr. Chairman and I felt bad when he lost the Tory nomination.

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Tobin: I felt bad Mr. Chairman when the Member for Placentia twice lost the Tory nomination. I wish the Member for Placentia had been in here and been a colleague of mine. And the Member for Carbonear, he has always been a Liberal, he has been a Liberal his lifetime and I respect him for that. The fact that he ran three times to get here does not bother me, and it does not bother him.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: But I still consider both of them to be honourable gentlemen, and I honestly think that the Premier should seriously look at him in terms of bringing some credibility to his Cabinet. Because with all due respect to my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I am not saying anything about him either tonight, because he and I got a (inaudible) coming to us next week or the week after, is that both of these gentlemen here have been mayors to large towns and

understands the operations of councils in rural Newfoundland, and there is room for them in the Cabinet. And they are competent people and I think the Premier should look very seriously at them.

Mr. Simms: You are exaggerating.

Mr. Tobin: No, I am not. No, I am not!

Now, Mr. Chairman, today we heard the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation coming into this Assembly.

An Hon. Member: Cape Canaveral.

Mr. Tobin: And what did he do?

Mr. Decker: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: He got up and he told us about all of the work that his department should do and how it is a people's department and the service of the department. He said all of that.

An Hon. Member: Then he shut her down.

Mr. Tobin: Then, Mr. Chairman, did he ever let the axe fall. He said to the Bonavista Peninsula and to the Burin Peninsula and to the Clarendville area that the service that the Conservative Government had given you will no longer exist. Mr. Bonavista, Mr. Burin Peninsula, Mr. Clarendville, if you want your licence now go to St. John's. Mr. Bellevue, go to St. John's.

An Hon. Member: Wabush.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Wabush, go to Mount Pearl.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: That is what this Minister said today. I tell you something that I hope the Member for Bonavista and the Member for Bellevue will not stand by and let their constituency suffer because this Premier or this government wants to keep the Economic Disaster Committee. I hope that the Member for Bonavista South will take his place in this Assembly tonight and let us know where he stands as it relates to supporting his constituents. And that the Member for Bellevue, the man who takes responsibility for taking the Eastern Community College Headquarters, since I support the Government for putting it to Clarendville. I hope he will tell us now about the jobs of his constituents in Goobies and the weigh scales. Do they support the actions of this government or do they not?

An Hon. Member: Yes, they do.

Mr. Tobin: That is the question that has to be asked and that is the question that has to be answered.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: Does the Member for Lewisporte support the actions of this government as it relates to the Change Island ferry system. That is the question that has to be answered in this Assembly. The Member for Lewisporte is over on my side now, and he is telling me he does not support it, but let him stand up and say he does not support it. That is the question that these members have to answer. The Member for Bonavista South and the Member for Bellevue and the Member for Lewisporte when the government took such drastic action against their constituents today. Is that what they

support? Is that where they are coming from?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Is that parliamentary, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: What is that?

Mr. Tobin: But anyway, I will say nothing. He just bought a new house down in - anyway, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of things that we have to debate in this Assembly. I could debate and I only have five or fifteen minutes left. I could debate in this Assembly. I would like to talk about the Premier of this Province in his chauffeur driven cars. I would like to know how many - the Member for St. John's South talked about five or six traveling with the Premier. I would like to know the names of the people who were on that chartered plane to Ottawa. I would like to know who was on that plane. We saw a couple on television. We saw the Minister of Justice. I assume he was on it. We saw the Minister's press secretary. The Member for Pleasantville, we saw him. I assume he was on it. But we would like to know, and we have a right to know, the names of the people who were on that charter. We have a right to know where the plane was chartered from and how much it cost directly and indirectly.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Now, Mr. Chairman, now we got it coming. Now we got it coming. We asked the Government how much the plane costs and they said, 'it is none of your business'. It is my business, and it is the business of everyone in this Province. What have they got

to cover up? What are they ashamed of? Put the names, Mr. Chairman, and I will venture to bet that they will not table the names of the people who were on that plane. They will not table the names, and we know why they will not table the names.

An Hon. Member: Talk a bit about the French.

Mr. Tobin: We will talk about the French lessons too at the appropriate time. But we want to know who was on that plane and how much it cost. The people of this Province have the right to know who was on the plane that the Premier chartered to go to Ottawa. Why won't you give us the information? What is the big secret? What is the secret about who was on that plane? I am asking now. I am asking the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Let me write it down.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, he should write it down. Will the President of Treasury Board supply me with a copy of the names of the people who were on that plane? Will he?

An Hon. Member: He is very quiet about it.

Mr. Tobin: That is the question that we want answered before closure is brought in, before we are gagged. No wonder -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: No wonder they are trying to gag us, Mr. Chairman. They brought in the gag bill before they gave us the information as to who was on the plane. They brought in the gag bill and will not give us the information. Will the Minister of

Development? I can tell the Member for St. John's South one thing, that they will never have to gag me for being as low as you were tonight.

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

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Tobin: I got leave.

Mr. Chairman: No leave.

The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Chairman, I hesitated to get up right away because I expected one of the Members on the other side to speak.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that surprises me about this debate is that it is so one sided. I have been here in this House of Assembly for some fifteen years. I do not think I have seen closure more than four or five times in that fifteen years and I have seen closure twice in this year.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Yes, we have closure on the -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised because this is one of the first times I have ever seen the Legislature, regardless of who was where, when the government did not defend its actions. Now Mr. Speaker throughout this whole debate if one goes back to Hansard and looks at the daily Hansards one will see that this side has

been on it's feet concerning the very serious situation that has happened in this Province. Health cutbacks in particular, health and education cutbacks in this Province, but Mr. Speaker, no one-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Member wants to speak he should stand when I sit down, but I know that the House Leader over there has told him, has told everybody, he has tried to gag them. Mr. Speaker I would expect in this House of Assembly that we would have a government which has brought in cutbacks of this magnitude to stand and defend its actions. Mr. Speaker I would also expect that a government which has brought in closure would support their actions. We have been in this House of Assembly a little over two weeks, no the first week we were here only three days. We have been in this House of Assembly for ten days. The government House Leader in his wisdom saw fit to bring in this bill. I understand that the first bill he was going to bring in was going to be a social services bill because that's the information that was passed over to this side. Had he brought in those social services bills they would be passed. Mr. Speaker this is a bill, a money bill, a bill that gives the opposition a chance to talk about the current situation in the Province today and, Mr. Speaker, I find a sense of arrogance when a government makes decisions that affect so many people's lives in this province and then will not dignify the House of Assembly or dignify the Province by explaining or even debating in the House of Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hodder: Now Mr. Speaker tonight since this closure motion came in, which is a gag motion, ten days Mr. Speaker. I saw the opposition when they were over here speak for five weeks pretty well on one bill and closure was not brought in. No work was done. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the people of this Province realize how serious this particular action is. It is the height of arrogance and Members on the other side, the only two who spoke tonight did not speak to the reason why they brought in closure they did not speak to the cuts in health care and education. Mr. Speaker, it was nothing but a litany of past sins. Mr. Speaker, when this side took power, on May 5th. I understand was the day the transition took place, May 5th., 1990. They brought in a budget on June 6th., 1989 yes, May 5th. 1989 they came into power. One month later on June 6th., 1989 they brought in the Budget and that Budget, Mr. Speaker, was a Budget that they had nothing to do with, but Mr. Speaker that Budget projected a surplus of 5.3 million dollars. Now, Mr. Speaker, in mid-year in December, the Minister of Finance came into this House, revised the projections and projected a 52 million dollar surplus. Mr. Speaker, even the last Budget that we saw in this House not so very many months ago projected a 10.2 million dollar Budget. Now how can Members who, when they took power with a surplus of 5.2 million and then a projected surplus of \$52 million, would some member on that side stand and I will sit down, and tell me how you can look at the past performance of the last Government and say it is our fault. Mr. Chairman, I would think from the facts, the figures of the previous budgets that when

they took over the Province, the Province was in pretty good shape. But, Mr. Chairman, we are not that way now, we have never had this kind of a projected deficit of \$120 million in the history of the Province, or at least in the history of the Province since 1949.

Mr. Chairman, what happened? The Government projected these massive surpluses right up until six months ago and Mr. Chairman, they set the scene for labour negotiations in this Province with the nurses' settlement that was very, very generous. Mr. Chairman I agree with that settlement, but the scene was set. The rest of the health care workers went to binding arbitration and of course, Mr. Chairman, with the projections in the budget by the Government and the settlement with the nurses as their bench marks, the settlements were quite high. Now we hear the Premier saying, if they are going to get high salaries like that, then we are going to cut back on jobs, we are going to cut back on health care services, we are going to cut back on hospital beds.

Mr. Chairman, the people assumed that there was a surplus. The people assumed that this Province was in good hands. The people assumed that there were good times. Mr. Chairman, everything that the Government had done until that point in time showed the people of this Province, who are now negotiating the Public Service Unions of this Province, had no reason to believe that there was anything wrong. But, Mr. Chairman, I know what happened. This Government was asleep, they were asleep for the last five months. The reason they were asleep, Mr. Chairman, is because

there was only one issue on the minds of the honorable gentlemen and that was the constitutional issue.

And, Mr. Chairman, I do not know if honorable members remember when Trudeau brought home the Constitution, patriated the Constitution, and while he was doing that with his one-track mind, the whole Country went down the drain, and we have just seen the same thing happen here in this Province. While we have been playing around with the Constitution and fighting foreign wars, Mr. Chairman, the Ministers were asleep, particularly the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Chairman, I hear, I talk to the people of my District, the people of Bay St. George, the Sir Thomas Roddick Hospital where we have severe problems, the senior citizens home at Stephenville Crossing, the people of the Port au Port Peninsula which I represent, many of them are on social assistance for the first time in their lives, and I remember back to the election campaign - I should say this to the Minister of Social Services - when the Premier came to Port au Port, he came three times during the election campaign. And he complained about the roads, and he complained about the poverty.

He went to Carbonear after one of his trips and he went down and he mentioned Port au Port on the East Coast, that he was going to be the Premier that was going to do something for this area. Of course, at the same time, Mr. Chairman, he was talking about bringing Newfoundlanders home. Mr. Chairman, what has happened there since? I have represented Port au Port for fifteen years and

never has there been a year when people have been treated so brutally by any administration.

And, Mr. Chairman, it was the chairman of the Economic Recovery Commission who said that in hard times we should spend more on education. And, Mr. Chairman, the people of this Province are having their services cut. Substitute teachers are being cut and the Minister of Education gets up and he says, Mr. Chairman I was a teacher, I was a high school principal for many years. And when the Minister says that teachers should spend weekends - it has been my experience with teachers that - I was principal of a modern high school with all of the facilities, and my teachers worked on weekends. The teachers in the schools in this Province work at night. I think I heard one of the Members on the other side say something about teachers have two months off on holidays in the summer.

Well, I should tell -

Some Hon. Members: Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

Mr. Hodder: Mount Scio - Bell Island, that is who it was. But, Mr. Chairman, I should point out for the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, in case he does not know, that teachers are paid for ten months of the year, they are just paid over a twelve month period, their salary is, but they are paid only for ten months a year.

But when the teachers are there, and if the Member had ever been in a classroom, I do not know if he was, but those who have been in a classroom should not forget, yet -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Yes, if he went to school, I suppose he did. That is an unfair comment, I take it back. I am sorry. But, Mr. Chairman, we have a situation in this Province where it was the most ludicrous thing that happened. When the Government took power there had been a report on employment and unemployment opportunities in this Province. There have been reports before on the economy of this Province and there have been studies. And they have been good studies. And they have been studies that were taken by the Government and they were used by the people who should use them. They were used by the Cabinet, the people who were governing the Province at the time. And this Government thought that they would try something new. A report was done and they decided to take the people who studied the report and put them in charge. That has never worked before in the history of mankind and it will never work again under the democratic system. And it is not working now.

But I think if there is a phrase to use where you want to use silly and stupid; which we hear the Premier say so often, it is silly and stupid to think that any man or woman or group of persons in this Province can be formed and then solve the problems of the Province. And when Members over there get up and accuse the past Government - this Government is elected now, this Government has been elected for a year and a half, and this Government have to take the blame. They certainly take the credit, they have to take the blame for what is happening in this Province.

And I would like to see Members on that side of the House stand and tell us and defend. We are not even getting a defense. All we are hearing, the Minister of Transportation comes in here today and destroys a ferry service, knocks a few people out of jobs, closes offices and that sort of thing. And tonight we are here in this House to ask questions. We have been here for two weeks and Members opposite will not get up and try to even debate, to even defend. I find that to be arrogant, I find that to be the height of arrogance.

There are a lot of problems that are facing this Province. I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services: now we have some 200 people in the Waterford Hospital who are not psychiatric patients. They are mentally delayed. And they should not be in the Waterford Hospital. I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services what this Government is doing to look after that blot on the social services' of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, every Member in this House of Assembly knows that these are hard times in this Province. And the social workers who have to look after the poor of the Province have not increased. Yes, there have been some increases in social workers in certain areas. But not the social workers who have to look after the case load day by day. Do the Government in these economic times intend to increase social workers? Because if you are cutting everywhere else and if your unemployment is somewhere around 18 per cent, you have got to be able to look after people somehow. And every Government I have known of in this Province have been able to at

least look after the poor of the Province, and God help us if we cannot look after the poor, and we have a lot of it.

Mr. Chairman, when this government came to power they started - the first thing we saw in the first Budget was a personal income tax of 2 per cent in this Province. Then, Mr. Chairman, we saw the health and education tax, which was the first time that we had ever seen a government which has decided to raise money for health care and education by taxing hospitals and schools. That is what we have, Mr. Chairman. That was the most novel tax that we have ever had in this Province.

An Hon. Member: That is nonsense.

Mr. Hodder: Nonsense. The Minister says, nonsense. The Minister of Finance pretty well destroyed the Tory Party when he was President of the Tories, the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland and Labrador. He pretty well destroyed the party at that point and they had to drive him out. Mr. Chairman, when he became the President of the Liberal Party, I mean, I could tell stories about the Minister of Finance and the hon. Don Jamieson in some of the battles that I found myself in the middle of and just how that wonderful man what he thought of the - what was it? No, I think it would be unparliamentary to mention some of the words that the hon. Don Jamieson who was then Leader of the Liberal Party had to say. But he knew what the Minister was like. Unfortunately the present Premier does not know what the Minister is like. Mr. Chairman, I predict that he will do the same to this government as he tried to do to the Progressive Party back

in 1971.

Mr. Chairman, all I said about the payroll tax is that this is the only Finance Minister that was ever to raise money for health care and education by taxing hospitals and schools.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hodder: Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister will have to agree.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: No, do not be so sensitive.

An Hon. Member: We got him to his seat.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister of Finance, on a point of order.

Dr. Kitchen: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

It must be clearly stated and as everybody knows opposite the schools and hospitals do not bear the brunt of the payroll tax. Government puts the money in and hospitals pay it back. It is a simple flow through procedure and it is inaccurate of the member to state otherwise.

Mr. Simms: Do they have to pay it?

Mr. Chairman: No point of order.

The hon. Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: I do not know what type of point of order that is, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister does the school boards have to pay this? Can we now make a release to the Province that the hospitals and the school

boards and employees over a certain number do not have to pay this?

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Chairman, as I said, the Minister of Finance who has not stood yet - and when I spoke of other members who should be speaking in this debate and who you would expect to stand and defend their government, particularly the new members, but, Mr. Chairman, the one who should have been on his feet from time to time and into the fray of this battle from beginning to end, perhaps we would have learned something, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Finance had been on his feet. Perhaps we would have worked out those figures in this House and perhaps the people of Newfoundland and Labrador would understand what the government is trying to hide.

Mr. Simms: Exactly.

Mr. Hodder: Why have they stayed silent? Why has the government stayed silent? Why has the government brought in closure? Why has the government not stood to speak in their places through a debate that has gone on for over two weeks.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is elapsed.

Mr. Hodder: My time is elapsed, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: By leave!

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Chairman, I challenge the members opposite to stand and defend their record.

Mr. Simms: Right on!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is probably ironic, Mr. Chairman, the theme of my remarks in this particular debate, I spoke three times on the main motion and I will speak now in the closure debate. The theme of my remarks has been basically about real change or lack thereof. The Liberal party when running for election had as its major campaign theme Vote For Us For Real Change. And, Mr. Chairman, real change is what we have certainly seen. Unfortunately it is not real change from one administration to the next. It is real change from opposition to government.

When I was sitting here listening to the debate earlier this evening I said to myself in most major debates I do my poem so I will do a very short one now to maintain the role that the honourable Members opposite have given me as Poet Laureate of the Opposition and I entitled my poem, Mr. Speaker, "Real Change".

The Honourable Minister sat
on his Budget,
Hiding his means and ways,
The Liberal theme of Better
Times is
Being saved for future days.
Is it a deficit or is it a
surplus?
The Minister seems unsure,

But the cuts are coming, sure
enough, despite their
Election allure.

If it wasn't so serious
it would be funny,
And I wouldn't be so terse,
Real Change we've got and got it
aplenty,
And it's all real change
for the worse.

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Hewlett: And I said many times in this Assembly Mr. Speaker, on the occasions I have had the chance to speak over the last year and a half, "Will the real Liberal Party please stand up". Because, Mr. Speaker, we had a party that presented to the electorate a center-left agenda, a real small "l" liberal agenda Mr. Speaker, and so far all we have seen out of this particular party is ...I cannot even say a center-right agenda, Mr. Speaker. All we have seen out of this party is a right-wing agenda.

The health care system in the province, Mr. Speaker, right now, workers in the system are subject to what you might call some sort of yo yo effect. Now you are frozen, now you're not. One wonders if the behavior of the Government in that regard isn't some sort of softening-up campaign with regard to the workers of this Province to get them, in order to save their jobs, to accept some sort of wage restraint or probably a wage freeze later this year. One wonders if the object of the game is not to make people so terrified of their work situation in a recessionary time that they will take whatever the government hands out and be thankful that they have anything.

This does not speak well,

Mr. Speaker, of the labour relations record of this government at all. The unions in this province have been saying that labour relations are the worst they have been in years. I remember working for the former Premier when we went through a major recession, an International recession, and we first entered into a restraint program and when that didn't stem the tide we had to enter into a zero-zero wage freeze program and the labour movement in the Province quite predictably had some very negative things to say about the Peckford administration. Yet today major union leaders, especially union leaders representing government workers, indicate that at least they knew where the former Peckford administration was coming from. They knew when they were in a freeze. They knew when they were in a restraint program. They had no idea that with this new government they wouldn't be sure from one day to the next whether they are frozen or they are not. Whether they are cut or they are not, whether they are laid off or they are not, whether beds will close or not. Nobody knows for sure. I think this is a deliberate attempt to confuse and upset the entire situation so that when the government finally figures out what its real financial picture is they think they will be able to get away with whatever they need to do because people will be at least relieved at that point in time that they at least know the situation.

In the health care system I remember quite vividly sitting in the gallery or listening on the speaker in the ceiling of my office when the Liberals in Opposition repeatedly attacked the closing of hospital beds for the

summer months. These were temporary closures to obtain savings in a severe restraint situation. But even temporary closings were regarded as, somehow, social crime. Today we get word that, well, we face the prospect of permanent closures for several years maybe, certainly for the next year or so. Many institutions in this Province face closures not for the summer but year round and heaven knows how long that will last into the future.

And with these closures of beds come layoffs. Nobody is really sure exactly how much. The Government has been very vague, very contradictory, as to the meaning. In my own district of Green Bay the health care system in Springdale faces twenty-four bed closures in the senior citizens' complex. Two pediatric beds, the only two children's beds in all of Green Bay, face closure, and twenty staff face layoff. The Minister of Health, the hon. the Premier, indicate no, that is not going to be the case, we have not made up our mind yet. But still they seem to be firm on the concept of a freeze. So if Green Bay does not get cut that severe then obviously some district nearby will get a cut even more severe than they expect from their own calculations.

How does the Government square the animosity of the teaching profession in this Province with the fact that we have two doctorates in Education in the Cabinet, we have two former NTA presidents in the Government? How does the Government square that with the animosity of the teaching profession today? I happened to be in the office during the lunch break today when a call came in

from the Notre Dame branch of the Newfoundland Teacher's Association. The branch president called to indicate that she wanted to pass on her concerns about how teachers felt in her area, how she was dissatisfied with the performance of her Provincial Member of the House of Assembly, and that she wanted to ensure that the concerns of the Notre Dame branch of the NTA were brought to the floor of the Assembly. The hon. Member for Grand Falls made mention of their concerns in his presentation in Petitions this afternoon. But one wonders how in such a very short period of time, not quite two years, that a Government laced with so many people from the education field, can be so at odds with people who are practicing the education profession in the field on a daily basis.

One wonders as well how this Government countenances going around the union leadership and writing direct letters to individual union members to make their point of view. As I pointed out in debate earlier in the week, when I worked for the former premier I conducted many public relations campaigns but one area of public relations campaigning was always forbidden me, and that was direct mail, direct solicitation of union memberships, going around the union leadership. Because that was regarded as an extremely provocative form of political behavior and the premier of the day expressly forbid it on every possible occasion.

There were many times, Mr. Chairman, when we felt that it might be nice to have our point of view put directly to the membership. But unions elect

their own leaders and the government of the day that I worked for made it quite clear that the government would deal with the leadership of the unions and that going directly to the union membership was out of the question. Yet we have this new Government in office a very short time with two PhD's in Education, two former NTA presidents, going deliberately around the leadership of the Newfoundland Teacher's Association directly to the membership, totally counter to normal collective bargaining practices and certainly very disturbing to many teachers in the Province who expected much more from educators who they elected to the current Government.

I have indicated as well that the hon. Minister from Gander, my former elementary school teacher, who taught me many things in Grade IV, I have no doubt, but he made his political reputation on being against chemical spray programmes in our forests. The Peckford administration, when we were faced with a severe insect infestation, did indeed proceed with a chemical spray program after a one year study. For that we receive much criticism from both the environmental movement and from the Liberal party then in Opposition. Since they have come to power, twice, Mr. Chairman, they have stood in this Assembly and boasted about the fact that they were using a biological spray program rather than an insecticide to control insect infestations in our forests. And yet, Mr. Chairman, this very summer what did they do? They used a herbicide chemical to control deciduous growth in our forests which ironically is an optional forest practice. Insect infestations must be controlled to

save the forest. Killing birch, alder, aspen and berry bushes, these are competitors for pulp wood forests. They will not kill a pulp wood forest like an insect infestation would, yet the very administration that boasted about a biological spray on a must do program used a much surer killer, a chemical herbicide, in its attempt to control deciduous growth in a new growth pulp wood forest. That, Mr. Chairman, is a double standard. That is hypocrisy. That, the Government has not even tried to defend. All they have said is that the herbicide spray program was pioneered by the former Peckford administration and therefore by some extension it makes it logically okay for them to put it into full effect. The chemical insecticide program was in use by the Peckford administration. It was wrong for this current administration to bring it over into current times. But somehow it is okay for the administration to bring over a herbicide program into current times and they see no contradiction in these two policy areas. And that, Mr. Chairman, is hypocrisy, it is a double standard and it is something that the administration is ashamed of and does not speak readily about in public.

The administration, Mr. Chairman, has made much about diversifying the Newfoundland economy. In my district we have not opened a mine in years. The mining exploration industry is in decline because of a federal program of blow through shears that was eliminated. We have a marginal fishery at best. Forestry is in desperate trouble because we are running out of trees. We have tried to develop a tourism industry on the south shore of Green Bay through the

development of Crescent Lake Provincial Park. What does this administration do when it comes to power? It takes the one opportunity that that area of the district had to diversify its economy by boosting greatly the tourism potential of the area, and what does it do? It shuts down Crescent Lake Provincial Park. The alders which were not sprayed in Crescent Lake Provincial Park have nearly overgrown the road ways and camp sites, and the monies that were expended by the former Peckford administration are totally gone to waste. The park is going nowhere whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier tabled a graph in the House of Assembly today, a graph which according to the way it is written indicates that the unemployment problem in our Province, our economic problems are mainly structural in nature and are not of the sort that can be changed by policies or programs of the Provincial Government. How convenient the graph, Mr. Chairman. How convenient to have a situation that shows that the Premier need not do anything in order to bring about a change because change is structural. And the change that he is talking about in rural Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, essentially amounts to resettlement. Now, they did not have the nerve to say that in the general election campaign, Mr. Chairman, but the only kind of structural change the Premier would have us believe they would bring about in the rural economy of Green Bay is basically to move the people out. We had an option in tourism, they killed that stone-dead. We are running out of trees, we have no fishery worth talking about, what fishery we have is depending totally on the

Northern cod allowance for next year, so, Mr. Chairman; this is an extremely convenient graph for the honorable the Premier to bring forward. It shows that there is nothing he can do, it explains I suppose the fact that he has done nothing in the way of economic development at all in this Province.

The new Enterprise Newfoundland Corporation, to its credit I will give it this, is holding a seminar this weekend in Green Bay and they have invited business people etc. from around and about. They even invited me, Mr. Chairman, believe it or not, to bring greetings, and I intend to attend the seminar, Mr. Chairman, and I intend to tell the people that the gentleman organizing the seminar is a senior official of this new Enterprise Newfoundland Corporation. The man presumably has power to move things throughout the provincial bureaucracy to make things happen. Hopefully, the people involved in tourism and the people involved in small business will avail of all the services he has. I am sure the individual will be more than forthcoming, I certainly hope he will, and assist with the diversification of the economy of Green Bay which is something so far that has not happened at all under the Wells administration.

Mr. Chairman, in the few moments I have left, we should talk about the Budget in general. The current provincial Budget is in a mess, the current Provincial Government would have us believe that the major cause of the mess is the Federal Government. There appears to be some controversy as to the degree of cutback in Federal transfers to this Province. One reads figures and one hears the old saying there are

lies, darned lies, and then there are statistics. Mr. Chairman, it is sometimes very difficult to get to the bottom of where exactly the figures are. But one thing is very clear, that the degree of Federal transfer cutbacks is not as great as the honorable people opposite would have us believe. They are trying to blame a lot of their deficit problems on someone else, when I say more than 50 per cent, the major part of this \$120 million or probably larger deficit is of their own doing. They have a made in Newfoundland and Labrador deficit, Mr. Chairman, and no matter what they say to the contrary, sooner or later they are going to have to come to grips with that reality.

To my colleague the Minister of Energy, I would ask the following question. How does he jibe the fact that the Provincial Government policy is driving up the price of electricity in this Province while at the same time in these times of international turmoil, he is only talking about controlling the price of oil. Now, mind you Mr. Chairman, the changes they have made in the Public Utilities Board have almost guaranteed a continuous round of increases to the large power utilities and Heaven help us if they start to regulate oil, because I doubt very much if they will do anything better in that regard. The Energy Department has a Minister who is probably very well meaning, but he serves in an administration which is a big business administration, a Board of Trade Administration, a big utility administration, a big company administration. It is not an administration dedicated to the well-being of the little guy in our society whatsoever.

We see that, Mr. Chairman, with cuts in social services, cuts in education, cuts in health. You would swear, Mr. Chairman, that instead of two PhD's in Education and two former NTA Presidents, we had a House full of surgeons on the other side because all we get are cuts, cuts, cuts.

An Hon. Member: Oh, oh, oh!

Mr. Hewlett: So real change has been their theme, Mr. Chairman, real change, and real change we have seen. We have seen real change from the Liberal Party in Opposition to the Liberal Party in Government, a Party which portrayed itself as a centre left party is very much, not even a centre right party, it is a far right party; it is not a party which is a friend of the ordinary people of Newfoundland and Labrador. The Liberal Party is no longer Liberal, Mr. Chairman, it is an ultra right wing party and it should be ashamed of itself, the real change that it has brought about has not been for the best at all.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Ms Verge: Chairperson, how right is my colleague from Green Bay.

The Government of the Province is an ultra conservative Government because it is a Government dominated by one man, by the Premier who is ultra conservative, who is elitist, who is completely out of touch with the everyday lives of ordinary Newfoundlanders and Labradorians; somebody who grew up in rural Newfoundland but turned his back on his roots, who climbed the materialistic ladder

of success and who like Daddy Warbucks, did not mind tramping on a few people on the way up because he did not intend to have to go down again.

Chairperson, there are Members of the Cabinet and the back bench who must be chafing, who must be chafing under the restraint of the Premier. There must be individuals sitting opposite me here this evening who are extremely upset with some of the regressive measures the Premier has forced upon them.

The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations for example, must have a hard time sleeping these nights, living with the cut in social assistance to single parent families, living with the betrayal of her NTA colleagues, with her former teaching colleagues.

The Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, makes a lot of noise from his seat, I am surprised he has not risen in his place to assert himself. He must have some ideas of his own; as a backbencher, he has some freedom to speak his own mind, he is not restricted by Cabinet solidarity, so I trust before the evening is out, we will hear some original thoughts of the Member for Mount Scio-Bell Island. I understand he has called himself the jewel of the Liberal backbench.

The Member for Eagle River, who so passionately and eloquently serves as an advocate for the people of Eagle River, must be extremely upset by some of the ultra conservative measures forced upon his caucus by the Premier. How long is the Member for Eagle River going to sit and take the callous cuts to the social sector, cuts that will hurt his constituents as

well as people elsewhere in the Province. There seems to be a malaise over the members opposite the same as over many people in the general population. This Premier has reverted to the tactics of his first political mentor Premier Joey Smallwood. We have seen all kinds of Smallwoodian tactics of intimidation. Shortly after assuming the office of Premier the Premier cold-bloodedly fired senior public servants, deputy ministers, and assistant deputy ministers, with outstanding records of public service. That set the stage and the Premier then set about dismantling the Public Utilities Board and getting rid of the consumer advocate Andy Wells. The Premier then had his Finance Minister announce the Government's intention of disbanding the Ombudsman's Office. The Premier set about delegating, to an unelected, unaccountable commission, which I call the Economic Disaster Commission, the whole economic development mandate of the Government and through the Economic Development Commission embarked on an never ending process of reorganization, dealing out some career public servants who had been regional development officers and dealing in the provincial Liberal campaign manager, anointing that gentleman as the central Newfoundland Vice-President of Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador, and dealing in other Liberal affiliates as regional Vice-Presidents. During the years of the two PC administrations strides were made in establishing a professional public service in which the merit principle reigned. The Public Service Commission was established to recruit and evaluate candidates for permanent public service jobs

and over the years a professional public service was established. That merit principle has been seriously eroded in the year and a half of this present administration. The Government appointed Mr. Grant Chalker a well-known Liberal bagman and campaign worker as one of the public service commissioners. Mr. Chalker, had no personnel qualifications and no public service experience. How are applicants for Government jobs to have any confidence in the impartiality of a selection process with Mr. Chalker occupying one of the three Public Service Commission positions? Chairperson, all of these moves have contributed to a climate of intimidation, apprehension and fear on the part of people in the Province. It is as though we have regressed to the 1950s when if you dared to utter any criticism about the Smallwood Government you would risk losing any opportunity of a Government contract, any chance of getting a liquor licence, any shot at getting a government job, we are regressing instead of advancing.

Chairperson, now over the last six weeks or so the government have announced a devastating Budget reversal, \$130 million slippage. The Minister of Health wrote the chairs of the hospitals and nursing homes saying that each of those institutions is going to have to operate in the budget year 1991-92 with the same amount as the net revised budget for this year 1990-91. Mr. Chris Decker signed each of those letters. The hon. Chris Decker, the Minister of Health signed each of those letters.

Now the Premier and the President of Treasury Board are trying to

back peddle: Now they are saying that really they were not sure about that. Really they just wanted to see what kind of reaction they would get. Well I will tell the members opposite what kind of reaction there has been already. Nurses are applying for jobs outside of the Province in some of the nursing schools. The student nurses approaching graduation wholesale are looking to the Mainland and the United States for jobs. They are giving up on any notion of building nursing careers here in our Province. Doctors, GPs and specialists are reconsidering their commitment to this Province.

I met a general practitioner in rural Newfoundland serving in the district of one of the member's opposite just two days ago. That practitioner was just delivered an edict that the associate GP position in his clinic would not be filled, and therefore he would have to do the work of two GPs and be on duty all nights as well as days for the first time in many, many years. This is a senior GP.

There is already an erosion of the health care sector, the trial balloon floated by the Minister of Health by writing the heads of all the boards of the hospitals and nursing homes has already precipitated a tide of health care personnel out of the Province.

Now the Minister of Finance, as well as the President of Treasury Board and the Premier are saying that there may not be the kind of harm to the health care sector as originally indicated, as the Hospital and Nursing Home Association concluded after they received the correspondences from the Minister of Health. In answer to my questions in Question Period

today the President of Treasury Board said that there might not be an effective 12 per cent budget reduction for the health care institutions. There might not be an effective \$60 million reduction for those institutions next year. But when I asked him to give me his best gift he is saying it might not be as bad as 12 per cent less. It might not be as terrible as \$60 million reduction. He would not tell me the figures that he is now estimating. Well, is it not time that we took the health care institution administrators, the nurses, the physicians and other health care workers, as well as the patients and their families, out of their misery? Is it not time that we provided some guidance and certainty for the people of the Province? Why is the Government putting people in the health care sector through this misery and agony? Why? Is it part of some grand public relations scheme that the Premier's chief of staff is orchestrating? Is this all leading to, not a 12 per cent reduction, but only a 6 per cent reduction, with the hope that eventually people will conclude that a 6 per cent reduction is not all that bad? Is that what this is all about?

Now in the case of education, the Minister of Education glibly says that school boards might have around \$30 million less next year. It might be less, it might be more. But both the Ministers of Health and Education have already instituted cuts and both the Ministers changed the rules in midstream. The Minister of Health changed the rules after the Government rushed to give generous salary increases to the nurses and agreed to put to binding arbitration wage and benefit

packages for the lab and x-ray and hospital support workers. The Government did not tell those employees at the time though that the eventual salary awards and settlements would come at the cost of jobs.

And what is the Minister of Health going to do for nursing homes? What flexibility do nursing home administrators have to absorb a cut in their funding? What leeway do they have? Many of their costs are fixed. Surely the only choice is to lay off staff and necessitate bed closures. And how is that possible? Does that mean turning the elderly and the infirm out on the street? Does it mean trying to force relatives to take back their bed-ridden, chronically ill mothers and fathers? Does it mean folding up beds and putting them in the closet after elderly residents of nursing homes die? What else can it mean? Why is the Minister of Health not participating in this debate to give us some answers, to give some reassurance and comfort to the people of the Province? Where is the Minister of Health?

The President of Treasury Board seems to have a handle on what is going on. Unlike the Minister of Finance the President of Treasury Board seems to be intelligent and competent. He gives the impression of knowing what is going on but why does the President of Treasury Board not come clean? Why does the President of Treasury Board not give us his estimate of the extent of the reduction in the health care and education budgets? Why does the President of Treasury Board not give us his best guess of the number of jobs that are going to be cut, and the magnitude of the service reductions?

The President of Treasury Board in debate last night accused the Opposition of not raising questions. But he would have to admit now that there are lots of questions on the record, questions that he and his colleagues have avoided answering. He is pretending that he does not hear me now, but his conscience must be bothering him.

I come back to the Minister of Social Services. The Minister has never told the House or the people of the Province how much money his department is saving as a result of the notorious October 1st cut in social assistance for single parent families. The Minister of Social Services has never admitted what paltry amount of money his department is saving on the backs of a thousand single mothers and 1,500 needy children in this Province. All the Minister talks about, daring even to have a smile on his face when he does so, is his wonderful dream of getting jobs and educations for all the social assistance recipients. A laudible goal, Mr. Chairperson, but the reality is that the Minister is failing miserably and the truth is that there are more people on social assistance now than at any time for many many months. The social assistance case load has been growing. The Minister's employment budget, his community development budget at the same time has been reduced. It was reduced in the March Budget from \$16 million to \$12 million. Now, if the Minister has some new information, perhaps in all the juggling that has gone on from March until now there has been a change. Perhaps the growth in provincial expenditure is partly attributable to an increase in spending by Social Services and community development projects.

That was one of the questions that I asked the President of Treasury Board last night.

Now, before I run out of time, before the muzzle is put on me in this debate - it certainly will not be put on me in my career as a politician as the Minister of Justice found out in Corner Brook last week. I will repeat some of the relevant questions in this debate. Number one: what is the actual amount of revenue the provincial government is going to be receiving from the federal government this year according to the most recent figures provided by the federal Government? Will the Government, will the Minister of Finance table documents showing the most recent estimate of federal revenue for the provincial government for this fiscal year? Will the Minister of Finance stop mouthing the words of the document he is reading and please contribute to this debate by tabling proof of the government's claim that there will be a \$60 million plus reduction in federal equalization payments from what he forecast in the Budget? The Opposition's information is that there is only a \$6 million difference. If the President of Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance are right in their claim that we have wrong information and that the actual difference is over \$60 million, prove it. Prove it Minister of Finance. Neither gentleman is rising, presumably because they cannot prove it. If they could demonstrate factually through an official document issued by the federal Department of Finance, wouldn't they do it. Another pointed question: what is the actual negative variance in provincial revenue? What is the slippage in collection of provincial retail sales tax and

other provincial taxes? And third, what are the revised provincial expenditures this year

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms Verge: - particularly expenditures on health, education, social services?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Now you should keep quiet. (Inaudible).

Ms Verge: Those three key social departments which account for most of the government spending. What is the revised spending amounts on the Economic Disaster Commission? What is the revised spending amount by the Department of Fisheries? Would the President of Treasury Board table revised expenditure figures for each department of the government?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: It will not appear in Hansard.

Ms Verge: In total, will the government explain what happened to the \$130 million? What happened to the difference between the \$10 million surplus the Minister of Finance forecast in March and the \$120 million deficit they are claiming to expect now?

We have been debating this borrowing bill for many hours now. The Opposition as a group have kept the debate going because we have not gotten answers to our questions.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible) questions.

Ms Verge: Now the Minister of Social Services says -

An Hon. Member: Order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Efford: You have not asked one question.

Ms Verge: - we have not asked any questions?

Chairperson, I cannot help it if the Minister of Social Services cannot fathom an intelligent presentation, I cannot help it if the Minister of Social Services does not listen.

But in summing up will the Minister of Finance table information on the latest revenue and expenditure projections? Maybe the Minister of Finance has been keeping us in suspense. Maybe he has been building drama. Maybe he thinks that by dragging out this debate and even bringing in closure that when he gives the answers to the questions on the Budget he will get more attention. The Minister of Finance has been teasing us because every now and then he will rise in his place to give us a little tidbit or to make us think that finally we are going to get answers. Now I say to the Minister of Finance, he is scribbling and he is talking, talking in a low voice, I say to him, please take us out of our misery, take away the suspense and give us the real information. He got elected on a real change mandate. Well, how about explaining the real change in the budget?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

The hon. Member's time is up.

The hon. Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can not help but look at the Minister of Finance there. Reminds me of my days in elementary school, when we had three or four grades in our classroom. Poor teacher was often befuddled with some student who was reading out loud much to the consternation of those who were trying to do math some where else. And the teacher would have to reprimand the person who was reading out loud or talking out loud. The Minister of Finance reminds me very much of it. He had to read his letter out loud, mumble it, and then he had to mumble some kind of a response about Deer Lake and Gander and fifty-seven thousand or fifty-seven. It was quite audible on this side.

An Hon. Member: He is practicing his speech.

Mr. Winsor: He is practicing his speech that he is going to deliver in a little while. But I did not intend to take part in this debate tonight until the Minister of Transportation, or responsible for transportation, or I should say the lack of transportation, delivered his eulogy, I will have to call it, on the Fogo Island - Change Island ferry system today. What amazes me is that the Member for Lewisporte who has been so affected by it has been able to sit in his place and make no comment, and has no reaction to the terrible reduction in service that was provided to the people of Change Islands and Fogo Island.

Mr. Walsh: (Inaudible)

Mr. Winsor: Now, the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island has had

adequate opportunity to talk. He has become the number one heckler in the House. Last night he proved he knows very little about the teaching profession in this Province. Last year he proved he knew nothing about transportation. He decided he would install, new gearboxes, I think that was his term, new gearboxes, new motors, and new propellers in the Hamilton Sound. The Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island should keep quiet and if he wants to debate he can debate it later.

Earlier this week the Minister of Transportation laid a serious blow on the people of both Change Islands and Fogo Island when he reduced the number of crossings from five to three per day. As it now stands a resident of either one of these Islands, Fogo Island in particular, because Change Islands has a smaller population so not as many people travel, but people who live on Fogo Island have to get up at five o'clock in the morning to catch a ferry that leaves at seven-thirty. Now, that is a fact of the matter. I was out there this weekend and on Saturday morning at quarter to six a knock came on my door and I was told I had better get my car in line because there were twenty-six cars in line. That was at quarter to six in the morning. People leave at five o'clock to get in line. The next ferry leaves the Island at one o'clock in the day. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a fairly long time. If you miss the ferry at five o'clock in the morning there is no boat that leaves the Island until one o'clock in the day. Add to that the fact that now there is going to be no boat coming back at its normal crossing time of eight-thirty because the boat is

going to have to leave Fogo Island, go to Farewell, back to Change Islands, back to Farewell, and back to Fogo. That is going to mean that that is a ten o'clock trip and it is going to be ten-thirty before businesses can carry out their functions on Fogo Island. Businesses are reluctant because they are now going to have an overnight stay on Fogo Island because the last ferry leaves at five o'clock and it is impossible to carry out their activities during that day, so they stay overnight at some hotel. Who pays that cost? Does the business pay it or is it passed on to the consumers who buy the products on Fogo Island?.

An Hon. Member: The hotels are going to get a little tidbit.

Mr. Winsor: The hotels are going to get a little tidbit and the consumer is going to get a little tidbit, too.

An Hon. Member: Hire more employees. (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: The system that this Minister announced today is obviously a backward step. The step was tried in 1988, from December of 1988 to June of 1989, and it was found to be totally inadequate. There was no question the service did not work. It will not work today. Added to that is the fact that this service will now be in place for nine months of the year. The Minister yesterday when I asked him a question, the Minister said, we are just reverting to the winter run. The Minister obviously does not know much about transportation in Fogo Island and Change Islands. What the Minister should have said is, we are reverting to a fall run because the winter service is even

reduced more. The question is: Is the service being compromised for the balance sheet? The answer is obviously, yes. That the service to the people of Fogo Island and of Change Islands -

Mr. Gilbert: If Beaton Tulk was the member that would not happen, you know.

Mr. Winsor: Beaton Tulk was the member - well you just prompted me to - I will now have to respond to what the Premier said I did not intend to. It is a letter to the Transportation Committee on Fogo Island, and I can table it before the Member for St. John's South says 'table it'. "I write in response to your letter in which the Fogo Island Transportation Committee has asked for the support of the Liberal Party ensuring a two ferry system when the Liberal Party forms the next government. I have recently met and discussed this issue with your MHA Beaton Tulk who has tirelessly presented your cause to the House of Assembly on several occasions.

I assure your Committee that the Liberal Party is committed to ensuring the people of Fogo Island and Change Islands a fair and equitable transportation system to replace the present system that is inadequate."

Now if the system was inadequate in 1989,

Mr. Decker: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: - if the Minister of Health wants to have something to say, then we will gladly give him some time. So the system was inadequate in 1989. The Premier of the Province indicated it was not adequate in 1989, how then is it adequate today? The demands of

the system have increased significantly, yet the service has declined.

Mr. Decker: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Chairman, could you ask the Minister of Health to remain silent while I continue?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I ask the hon. members to permit the hon. member to be heard in silence.

Mr. Winsor: So, Mr. Chairman, what we have here, we see two people who suffer because they are isolated. The fact of the matter is if you live on an island you have to suffer anyway. That is a fact. That is real life. The people who live on these islands recognize that. That is a part of life. But now to have a government to inflict additional hardship on these people is unfair. It is totally unfair.

Mr. Baker: I will straighten it out.

Mr. Winsor: The President of Treasury Board says he is going to straighten it out. I hope he does. Because there is only one way that the President of Treasury Board can do this, it is to reinstate the two ferry system and additionally increase the trips. The ten o'clock trip that was eliminated in the morning has caused undue hardship on the people of both islands and I am sure the Member for Lewisporte can agree that the elimination of the ten o'clock trip was a dastardly deed. What we have had happened today is even more reprehensible and this government has to change its policy on it.

An Hon. Member: What did the PC put into the year?

Mr. Winsor: It was only tried for one year. It was tried for one year, found to be a dismal failure, one year -

An Hon. Member: That was the election year.

Mr. Winsor: - one year it was tried -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Yes, it was tried during the election year, it was tried in - actually just before the election year and then we decided that it was wrong.

An Hon. Member: Right.

An Hon. Member: Who decided (inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Our Party decided it was wrong and we committed ourselves to a two -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: No, I was never with these fellows.

An Hon. Member: You were never with the Liberals?

Mr. Winsor: I was never with the Liberals though.

An Hon. Member: Tory (inaudible). A Tory all his life.

An Hon. Member: A Tory all his life and had nothing to do with (inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Enough on transportation, because I have got to come back, I cannot say enough about Mr. Tulk, Mr. Tulk is - No,

I should not tell that, no.

I had a constituent who bumped into him in Halifax at an airport and he was telling me he was off doing some recreation - I will not tell what he was doing because the President of the Treasury Board could get hungry.

An Hon. Member: Could get what?

Mr. Winsor: Hungry. I have to respond to the Member for Exploits and the Minister of Labour, whom I see has now left her seat after napping through part of the night, she seemed very tired, I think she was unable to take the criticisms which were rightfully passed her way.

The Crocker Report, when it came down last year, one of the recommendations in the report was that the school day needed to be lengthened and that the school year should be lengthened, because students were not getting the amount of instructional time which was necessary to allow them to successful completion of their courses.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: It is getting late, because the Chairman is tipping glasses. On several occasions this year, contrary to what the Member for Mount Scio and the Member for Exploits say, children have been sent home from school because there was no teacher.

An Hon. Member: In every district in the Province?

Mr. Winsor: In every district of the Province -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: - as a matter of fact, if the Member for Mount Scio would be quiet, I had the occasion to talk to a teacher a week and a half ago, and this teacher said to me, you know, she said, I am ashamed to have to write this letter home to parents, and I thought it was some student who had misbehaved.

She said, this is the second time this week, the second time this week I have had to write letters home to parents telling them not to send their children to school because we had no substitutes and school would be shut down.

An Hon. Member: The teacher should be fired.

Mr. Winsor: The second time that week!

An Hon. Member: Why should she be fired?

Mr. Winsor: The second time the-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) the work shop is more important than (inaudible) education for a youngster (inaudible).

An Hon. Member: It is the Minister's fault, and yours, and you are a former teacher and a part of it.

An Hon. Member: I hope Hansard is on now.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, could you silence the Member for Carbonear or will I have to read the letter I got from one of his teachers today?

An Hon. Member: That is right.

An Hon. Member: Go ahead and read it, (inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker?

An Hon. Member: No, no according to this you have not.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker?

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Winsor: Teachers in this Province -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible). point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, I will raise a point of order because I am legitimately standing in my seat.

An Hon. Member: A point of order (inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: I am legitimately standing in my place. I want to raise a point of order, Mr. Chairman? :

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, it matters not, if the hon. gentleman was up first, last, in the middle or second. He has to go to his own place to get up, Mr. Chairman, and that is the point of order I am raising.

If he goes to his own place, then he can get up; I cannot object and I will not.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition will notice that the Chair did not recognize the hon. Member for Carbonear because he was not in his seat.

Mr. Rideout: I noticed that sir.

Mr. Chairman: No point of order.

The hon. Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Carbonear, a former teacher himself, should know that if school boards direct teachers to attend workshops their superior - it is insubordination. The teacher could be dismissed for not attending.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: The school board - the Member says it is nonsense. The Member does not know very much if that is the case.

The case has happened time after time after time in this Province today, when students have been sent home from school because substitutes could not be called in because school boards are afraid that they will use the cap on the number of their days before the year is out. That is well known. The President of Treasury Board knows because I am sure he has had representation from teachers in Gander. That is the same board that serves my constituency, and teachers have, I am sure, come to the President of Treasury Board and said that the best guess that the superintendent can make is that by the end of April all substitute days will have been used. So, May and June, I do not know what happens if you get sick or you go to hospital. I do not know if the kids come to the hospital. Maybe that is what the Member from Carbonear would want them to do.

But, since the Member of Carbonear - I did not intend to do it - but the Member from Carbonear, I got a letter today from one of his teachers. And it said that also included is a sample of the many letters MHAs are receiving. Art

Reid is receiving them and he had better acknowledge it.

An Hon. Member: Table it!

Mr. Winsor: So, Mr. Chairman -

Some Hon. Members: Table it!
Table it!

Mr. Reid: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member for Carbonear on a point of order.

Mr. Reid: The letter was written therefore - the ruling that was made in the House this morning, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Chairman, and the Speaker made the ruling this morning, that if a letter is read verbatim and it is quoted then the name of the person who wrote the letter must be submitted as well as the letter must be tabled. So I am asking the hon. Chairman would he demand that that particular letter and the name of the person who wrote it be tabled in the House immediately?

Thank you.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

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

Mr. Rideout: Your Honour, I know, will clearly recall - and if you do not, I am sure Your Honour will check with Mr. Speaker - but the ruling and the quotation from Beauchesne -

Mr. Winsor: It is a Cabinet Minister (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: - referred specifically to Ministers quoting from documents. It does not refer

at all to backbenchers or private Members on either side of the House. I am sure His Honour is quite capable -

An Hon. Member: Mr. Speaker had already ruled on it.

Mr. Rideout: - and competent of checking on the ruling that was made earlier today referred to by the Member from Carbonear, but specifically documents quoted by Ministers, that is what has to be tabled in this House.

An Hon. Member: Maybe His Honour would like to recess for half an hour (Inaudible).

Mr. Walsh: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Member of this House (Inaudible) -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I have to recognize the hon. Member from Mount Scio - Bell Island.

The hon. Member from Mount Scio - Bell Island.

Mr. Walsh: If the Member had the intestinal fortitude to quote a letter belonging to and coming from someone in another Member's district, he should still have the intestinal fortitude to submit the letter.

Mr. Rideout: It has nothing to do with intestinal fortitude!

Mr. Walsh: If not, I do not - then it does not exist! Then it does not exist! Then the letter does not exist.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Opposition

House Leader.

Mr. Simms: I am rather surprised that the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island is approached in this discussion on this point of order. As the Chairman of the Committee of the House, charged with the responsibility of reviewing the rules of the House, and bringing in a report on behalf of all of us as Members in the House to improve the rules of the House and Parliamentary procedure, here he is standing up on such a silly point of order. Because if he is cognizant and familiar with the rules of the House he would be aware of the present rules which are quite clear.

Mr. Walsh: I am aware (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: And the rules say categorically, there is no requirement for a private Member to table any document that he might quote from or read from. It is only a requirement on the part of a Ministry, on the part of the Executive Council Members. So, I mean, the point of order is simply an occasion, I suppose, to try to usurp the time of the Member's speaking. He only has twenty minutes. You have already shoved the guillotine on us, you have already put the gag order on us. And when a Member gets up to try to express the convictions and the wishes of his constituents which he was rightly elected to do in this Legislature, you have Members opposite who get up with all these spurious points of order to try to waste time. I think it is shameful. The chairman of the Rules Committee should hang his head in shame, go out in the common room, have a coffee, cool off and read the rules once more, Mr. Chairman. There is no point of order as you have already ruled.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) have the nerve to table it.

Ms Verge: You have the nerve to stand up and make a speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: We are waiting for a ruling on a point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the the Government House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Chairman, I suggest you look back at paragraph 495 which refers to documents cited in Beauchesne's sixth edition. Before you make a decision, Your Honour, you should read that. Sub section two says, "It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the Table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest." But it does say, 'The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda.' The sections of the tabling of documents, I believe, are included primarily for the purpose of the Ministers of the crown and to protect knowledgeable statements that they have made to protect the fact that the house should be able to expect that the statements are knowledgeable and so on, and this is the prime intent of the section on documents cited. However, I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to comments made in the House quite recently about the tabling of documents, I believe, made by the Leader of the Opposition. But the matter raised by the Leader of the

Opposition at that time really had nothing to do with the fact that there are Ministers, but the fact that when a document is quoted from even if there is no strict rule that it should be cited or even if he is not referring to it, his point was that morally the document or letter should be available to the House to ensure that the signatures and so on - that it is a legitimate statement that the Member is making.

Mr. Simms: Just further to the point of order -

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

Mr. Simms: - which I am sure will clarify the matter. It is interesting how the Government House Leader likes to quote selective passages from Beauchesne. Selective passages to supplement his own argument, but he proceeds -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) read the whole book.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: It would not hurt for the hon. Minister and other members to read the whole book. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, not to get carried away with it, but let me refer Your Honour quite simply to the reference in Beauchesne, Sixth Edition, the same one that the Minister just quoted from, the Government House Leader, indeed the same paragraph 495. But let me quote the sentence or subsection 6 which the Government House Leader quite conveniently left out in his argument and here it is "A private member has neither the right nor the

obligation to table an official or any other document."

An Hon. Member: Now Art.

Mr. Simms: Now, Mr. Chairman, that should settle the argument. It is not much of an argument and it is not much of a point of order.

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

Mr. Winsor: We are on a point of order. Is it the same one?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member for Carbonear. On a different point of order?

Mr. Reid: On the same point of order. Mr. Chairman, I would not have questioned my hon. dignified honest fellow teacher if he had not mentioned two words 'Art Reid'. He directly referred to a member of this House as Art Reid and that is why I questioned. If he had said the hon. Member for Carbonear or the hon. Member, I would not have had any problems. But Hansard will show that he did say Art Reid. And I ask the hon. member to - with decency, because I would not do that to him. If I had a letter, Mr. Chairman, from some constituent in my district or in this case his district that made reference to him I certainly would not bring it up in the House, I would go to him with it and I would pass it to him like some of his colleagues have done to me in just the past forty-eight hours. And the point that I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that I would like to see the letter and I am asking without your ruling, I am asking this hon. gentleman to do the honourable thing, and maybe show me or provide me with a copy of the letter. If not, Mr. Chairman,

then any member of this House with the exception of Cabinet ministers can stand up at any time in this House and quote or make some comment about another member in this House and name the person without having to produce. I do not think, Mr. Chairman; that sounds like a democratic process to me.

So I am asking the hon. member quiet sincerely rather than let you make a ruling on that provide me, at least, with a copy of the letter that he referred to.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The Chair -

Mr. Rideout: There is four on that side, I would assume there should be four.

Mr. Chairman: Well I am ready to make a ruling on it.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) a further submission on it.

Mr. Chairman: But I will hear one more submission from the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For a member from that side of the House when we are operating under the gag to get up and talk about democracy, what a farce, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: What a contradiction!

Mr. Rideout: What a contradiction!

Now there are a couple of points I

would like to make, Mr. Chairman. The appropriate citations have been provided by the House Leader. And there are a couple of other points I want to make. The member, Mr. Chairman, has seen this particular letter. My colleague from Fogo Island has shown this particular letter to him.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rideout: And the point here is not how a member on this side of the House refers to another member on that side of the House or a member over there refers to a member on this side of the House. That is up to Your Honour to intervene and rule on. The point here, Mr. Chairman, is that my colleague has a document which says to him, and the member is upset that the name Art Reid is there, but it is there. Art Reid is receiving more than his share, and he better acknowledge it, Mr. Chairman, is what it says.

An Hon. Member: Says who?

An Hon. Member: The writer of this letter.

Mr. Rideout: Says the writer of this letter.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rideout: The member has had an opportunity to see it, Mr. Chairman. The member saw the letter, Mr. Chairman. And the point of order that the hon. gentleman raised, Mr. Chairman, was that this had to be tabled. Well, Mr. Chairman, it does not have to be tabled but I can tell you that there is no reason why it cannot -

An Hon. Member: It is an unsigned

document.

Mr. Rideout: It is not an unsigned document. There is no reason why it cannot be provided to the hon. member because he has dozens and dozens like it already, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simms: A good point of order.

Mr. Chairman: It is my understanding that the ruling made by His Honour a few days ago was that if an hon. member wanted to table a document that was not signed he was not permitted to do so, and I do not think he had any right to. What we are talking about here, and I think it is covered clearly under Beauchesne in Paragraph 495 (2) and (6) and I would assume that under Paragraph 498 (3) that when quoting a letter in the House a member must be willing to either give the name of the author or take full responsibility for the contents, so I would presume that the hon. Member for Fogo would take responsibility for the contents. It does not really say that he has to name the author as long as he takes the responsibility. That is the point of order we are in and I think the hon. Member for Carbonear referred to hon members not being referred by their district and nobody got up on that point of order so His Honour will not rule on this at this particular time.

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Chairman, I will check with the sender of the letter tomorrow and see if he would want it to be tabled in the House and if he has no objection then I will certainly have no objection in tabling it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Winsor: By leave.

Some Hon. Members: No leave.

Mr. Simms: A point of order.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I wish the Member for Carbonear would not leave because I want to raise a point of order about something that transpired here just a moment ago, during the debate on the point of order that had been originally risen by the Member for Carbonear. I do not wish to raise it while he is out of the House because I think it would be important for him to be here and he would want to hear it. I am going to make an accusation and it may or may not be right.

Mr. Baker: You cannot use a point of order to make an accusation.

Mr. Simms: I can. The accusation is one of unparliamentary language, I say to the Government House Leader. I hesitate to do it while he is not there so I was just wondering if he wanted to come back, but anyway it does not matter. I am quite certain that during the exchange in that debate the Member for Carbonear, when the Member for Fogo said that the Member for Carbonear had seen the letter today, I am quite certain that the Member for Carbonear said, liar. Now, whether Hansard will pick it up I do not know and if necessary we will have to review Hansard. Unfortunately, we

cannot get the Hansard night sittings printed as the Government House Leader knows because of some problem with time and staff. However, the parliamentary thing to do, the honourable thing to do, would be for the Member for Carbonear to simply stand in his place and indicate that he did not intend that to be the case, or withdraw it, or something. That is the simple parliamentary way to do it and that is why I did not want to raise it unless he was here in the House. I think he is out by the door so he is probably hearing what I am saying. He is not by the door. Okay, I am sorry, but I think he did say it quite clearly and that is a very serious unparliamentary term to use, as we all know, and I would hope that we will give notice of it now, raise the point of order now, and probably in all likelihood Your Honour would want to check the tapes, or check Hansard, and rule on it at another time, but I must raise the point.

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: On the point of order. Same point of order?

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

Mr. Hearn: To the point of order. Yes, and maybe it is something that the House Leader can clarify. My hon. colleague the Opposition House Leader just mentioned the difficulty Your Honour might have in getting the tapes? And I have also been informed that because of cutbacks in the office upstairs our committees are going to have difficulty getting reports done, and I wonder if this is going to impact on the work of committees. And I just take the opportunity to

maybe get the whole thing clarified. Because if we are not going to get copies of Hansard of different committees, and sensitive things come up at Public Accounts and so on, and sometimes you run into difficulties with witnesses, I am just wondering if that is going to be a problem for our - I have been told that it will be a problem.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There have been no cutbacks. As a matter of fact six extra people have been hired to try to handle the backlog. The problem is that we have had a lot of committee activity, more than the facilities are able to handle. We certainly hope to have that situation straightened out especially when we move to the new House. But it is a real problem we are running into. It is not a problem of cutbacks. We have extra staff on to handle it. There is simply so much legislative activity both in and outside the House going on, and it is really unfortunate.

Mr. Rideout: I would like (Inaudible) point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Rideout: I think it flows out of the point of order that my colleague, our Opposition House Leader, has made, but more appropriately the comment made by my colleague from St. Mary's - The Capes. And it really is starting to be a problem for committees and night sessions.

Now the Government House Leader

says there are no cutbacks. But, Mr. Chairman, something has happened. Because when we were into the all morning, all afternoon, all night sessions last spring, as the Government House Leader will know, and Your Honour no doubt will know, on the Meech Lake debate, there was no problem. In fact His Honour, our Speaker, went to offices I think from both sides of the House and sought overtime secretarial help to make sure that the Hansards were printed on time and on schedule. As a matter of fact, I know that for a fact because I was approached and asked if I would approach our staff and see if some people would like some overtime hours.

But now, because the debate is perhaps not so glossy, or it is not so in favour to the Government position, something is happening. We just cannot get those transcripts like we used to get them last spring. We just cannot get them for night sessions anymore like we used to get them last spring. And consequently the Chair could be in a very difficult position in terms of ruling on this point of order, which is an important one but perhaps not as important as something that could come up over the next several nights, who knows?

I mean there are going to be more night sittings I suspect during this session as the Government House Leader tries to ram what he calls an important legislative agenda through the House. But I think the point is a very, very serious one, Mr. Chairman. I think it is one that you should raise, if I might be able to suggest, with His Honour, Mr. Speaker, who of his own accord, I assume, was able to take care of

that problem last spring when the glossy Meech Lake debate was underway by tapping into overtime secretarials, additional secretarial help -

Mr. Baker: You have said that three times now, how many more times do you want to say it?

Mr. Rideout: Well, if I want to say it thirty-three more I will say it until His Honour sits me down!

Mr. Simms: Right on!

Mr. Rideout: Now the Government House Leader might be able to take this House on his back with a closure motion and a gag order!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: I do not need to kill time! We have enough speakers to take this debate until 1:00 a.m. Now I am not killing time, but neither am I - Let me tell you something, Mr. Chairman, the Premier or the Government House Leader or any Minister or Member over there, in a parliamentary sense I am not afraid of any of them, Mr. Chairman. They might be able to beat the hell out of me physically, but they cannot beat the hell out of me on the floor of this House. Now, do not go getting on with that anymore, Mr. Chairman. Tempers have flared in this House on two or three occasions this evening principally because of what has come from the other side. And then when you have to try to rise and make a sensible point of order you have to put up with the Government House Leader, 'you are making a fool of yourself, Tom. You said that three times, Tom. You are a youngster, Tom. You are lacking

in intelligence, Tom.' Mimic the boss, bye. What is wrong with you. I will stay on my seat hear until His Honour sits me down, not the Government House Leader. And what I was saying, Mr. Chairman, was the reality when it was to the Government's advantage last year to have Hansards printed because of the glossy Meech Lake debate, by golly, Mr. Chairman, they were printed. When it is now to Members advantage to have them printed in this House, they are not printed and that is worthy of Your Honour taking into consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I think I have heard enough. There are two points of order.

Mr. Baker: There has been one point of order and there have been two speakers on it over there.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, I will hear one more short (inaudible).

The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not really understand the intervention of the House Leader. I had just finished pointing out that, in fact, there were six extra people hired, that the problem was being handled as quickly as it could, that the reason was that there is a lot of legislative activity going on. But the previous Government does not understand because it had no intentions of having legislative committees. It did not have the full democratic process that we have now, so there is so much more legislative activity. I know it is difficult for him to understand it.

I pointed out that the problem is being handled, and all of a sudden he is coming up with a new idea that maybe we should go and hire on a few extra people. I just explained that they are hired on and the problem is being handled.

Mr. Rideout: Well, they are not doing the job.

Mr. Baker: Sure they are.

Mr. Rideout: They are not. They are not getting it out.

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

The hon. Opposition House Leader rose on a point of order indicating that the hon. the Member for Carbonear had used unparliamentary language. I was conversing with the people at the Table here. I did not hear the hon. the Member for Carbonear and if I had heard it I would have called him to order, but we will check the Hansard tapes and a ruling will be made on it at a latter date. And with regards to the shortage of staff, I think I will refer that to His Honour.

The hon. the Member for Fortune Hermitage.

Mr. Langdon: (Inaudible) debate that is in the late hours of the night. The morning sun is shining in the country of Japan, and if one looks at the newspapers we will find that all is not rosy in the economy of both of the worlds greatest countries and that is where the Americans depend mostly for their money. And I would realize that what the Province finds itself in is no isolated situations from a depressed economy that we see around the world. However, Mr. Chairman, as

was said in the House, and I have listened to both sides, I realize that this Province, because of successive governments, finds itself in a very precarious situation. I lay no fault on any particular Government but the situation still exists, that there is a problem. When you realize you have a Province of 500,000 people and you have a social services budget of \$235 million then something has been done wrong over the years. There is no doubt about that. When we have so many people in this Province depending on social services as a way of life there is something wrong. There has not been the initiative, and there has not been the ingenuity that should have been shown over the years to allow the situation to happen.

The same situation has happened in education and if we were to look at a \$20 million duplication of service in this Province over the last twenty-five years that is \$500 million, and we find ourselves in that situation here today. When one looks at the forestry situation and the lack of tree planting that has been done over the years we realize that our forestry is about to collapse around us because we do not have the workers in place to plant the trees, so obviously there is something wrong as well. I would think that probably the Government in its wisdom when it was thinking about creating jobs could have realized that situation and could have put a lot of people to work in this Province to plant trees so that we could have some security in the forestry industry for years to come.

The fishery is in the same situation. When I think of the Fortune Bay area, which I

represent, the bay is full of herring, full of mackerel, full of caplin, full of dog fish, and we cannot find markets for these, there has to be something wrong as well.

When we think of municipal affairs in this Province we realize that some of the municipalities have very, very low municipal fees so we probably have to look at that as well. For example in some of the communities you have a \$40.00 service fee for services for a year, and there is \$345 a year for cablevision, then I think we need to take a look at our situation there.

It would be remiss of me if I stood here and did not speak about teachers pensions which are also a problem for the teachers of this Province. There is no doubt that if there is a sacred thing for the teachers of this Province it is their pension. Teachers have worked hard, and thirty and out is something they have worked for and they honestly believe it is due to them, but over the years, and over the months we realize that communications have broken down between the Newfoundland Teachers Association and Government. I believe teachers in the Province are looking for improved communications so that they will indeed be able to go on with their work and not find themselves in the dire situation of uncertainty they find themselves in today.

As I said a few moments ago I believe we have come to the point of accountability. I heard one of the Ministers say that there were \$400 million used this year just to pay interest on the debt that has accrued in this Province. And that to me is a staggering amount of money. So therefore there has

to be, in my opinion, some new and innovative ideas on behalf of government to make sure that they can take us out of the economic doldrums. If, Mr. Chairman, the elected representative and the people of government do not find ways to improve the situation in this Province jobwise, and things continue as they are now, then to me it is - the word I am looking for is a betrayal, I guess, on behalf of the elected officials not to find a way out for the people of this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: Can't we come here to this House of Assembly tonight and look at ourselves and say that over the years we have not made mistakes, that we have not been innovative, if we have been, then we would not be in the mess we are in in this Province today. And that probably, Mr. Chairman, we can look at that from a country-wide and from a world economic viewpoint as a whole. So I have to in all honesty say that over the last number of years, or the last number of months, I should say, I have been here for eighteen months that I have seen bantering, on both sides, and to me I have wondered many, many times why I am here in the House at all, because as part of a municipal government I served seventeen years and when we went to municipal meetings, in a sense, we had respect for each other, and I honestly wonder sometimes if that happens in the House?

An Hon. Member: Never.

Mr. Langdon: We are grown people and we should respect each other. The problems are great. When I think of the town of Gaultois, for example, now with all of the

uncertainty and a ferry service for them and yet it is a chicken and the egg game that is being played continually. We need the quota, give us a quota, we will give you the ferry, we will give you the landing, the roll-on, roll-off ferry service. And the Federal Government could have easily last year provided a quota for the town of Gaultois and talking to the mayor today, they still do not have it, and probably in all sincerity it is going to be late this year before they even find out. But there is no reason for that. It could have been given. And there is politics. And there is no need for it.

That is why in a sense I find it very, very difficult as a member to realize that you tamper with peoples lives in that situation, and it should not be.

An Hon. Member: You would have had your ferry, if we won the government, brother.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Langdon: No, I am not blaming anybody. What I am saying is, you play politics with things for so long and you have to come honest with the people. You have to say to the people of Gaultois, if they are going to get a quota or not. To me it seems that the bickering between the different levels of government, and this is where the politics I believe plays into.

Now I have to comment on the point that Bill talked about. I went into Gaultois, and the Member for Grand Bank knows what I am going to say, we had a ride in a truck and I never ever thought we would make it, there had been no gravel

put on the roads in Gaultois for fifteen years. This past summer the government did accede to the wishes of the council and did go in and do the road.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: They took -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: - they took in a grader and trucks on the ferry and did the road for them, but that is not enough, they need more than that, and when I think of transportation, I think of the number of letters which I have written to the Minister regarding the trunk road from the Harbour Breton branch to Seal Cove.

A section of that gravel road is sixty years old; it is the oldest gravel road, I would think in the Province, and yet, with the two fish plants that it serves there is no pavement and the road has not been upgraded and to me that is wrong.

That is wrong, over all these years and that is why I honestly believe that if we are to survive as a Province, if we are to do the things that we have to do here, then we must do it in a way that we can bring the best buck for the dollar and we have to do that.

In Education, when we look at education and I think the President of the NFA said a few days ago at the Newfoundland Hotel, he hopes that the Government does not tamper with school tax. But I hope they do, I hope they do, because the students who are in my district, in Fortune - Hermitage, gets sixty-seven dollars per pupil from the school tax in Bay D'Espoir and just

across the way, in Exploits, I know, because I was chairman for four years and a member of that for eight years, they get \$200 per pupil and then they expect the smaller schools in rural Newfoundland in the areas to have the same equipment, the same ideas as one would find in the larger centre.

I know that Government has brought in equalization grants and have done these things, but it is still not fair, when the people from the Fortune Bay area go to Grand Falls and they participate and there are people who work in the woods operation and Abitibi-Price does not contribute to the taxes of that particular authority that is wrong.

So, Mr. Chairman, I realize that these are difficult times, but one must also realize that if the Government is to provide essential services and the revenue is not there from the Province, then there has to be borrowing and so, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have to support the Government in its effort tonight to borrow extra money so that the Province can work.

This is not the first time this has happened and it will happen again, and I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Government will look at the situation which exists in the Province in the term of health care, which is really important, but I also believe the situation too, is that we have to look at everything and we have to make sure that there is compassion for people and I am sure that when all things are done, there are no decisions being made, that the Government will, in its wisdom make the right decision that will be the best one for the people in

all areas, whether Social Service, Education or Transportation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: I do not think that anybody is to be vindictive and I also believe that it is the role of the -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Langdon: - I also believe it is the responsibility of all people as I said to be vigilant, to be honest, and to make sure that we indeed as elected Members here do co-operate, Government and Opposition, to make life as best as we can for people of this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: The heavyweight's up now.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Health - and his remark is just jealous of my slim physique when he talks about heavyweights, he is wishing that he had the same type of figure. Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss not to have a final few words on the present bill before the House. We have been discussing it for just a few short -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

Mr. Hearn: We have been discussing the bill, Mr. Chairman, for just a few short days and

there are a number of things that have yet to be said. More importantly, there are a number of questions that have to be answered. I thought perhaps, rather than just regurgitating what has already been said during the past week and several times tonight, I would ask a few questions in the hope that some of the Ministers would stand up afterwards and give us a few answers.

Let's see who is here. The Minister of Education. Just a short while ago the Member for Fortune - Hermitage was talking about the effect of the world economies on the Province and he is right. We are going through hard times, especially across the nation. And it is having a reflection on us here in the Province. Something else that is having an effect - maybe indirectly as such, directly in a couple of areas - is the present crisis in the Mid East. Within hours that area could be a battlefield which would again change the world economic situation immediately. But presently what has happened there and what is happening there has caused the price of gas to escalate tremendously. And one of the groups that have been affected more than anyone else are the school bus contractors. I would like to ask the Minister of Education if he would in his good kind way take into consideration the fact that many of the present bus contractors are operating as he knows full well on a very small profit margin.

Bidding for bus runs has become extremely competitive for a number of reasons. And he has been in Education long enough to know the new bus versus the old bus, the

\$40,000 bus that one person buys somebody else goes up to Quebec and buys a \$5,000 bus. And the Department has in recent times been trying to improve the conditions of buses and has changed that somewhat. But still, because of the discrepancies in the years, some people come in with an old cheap bus and underbid somebody who has been in the business. And it has gotten into a real cutthroat operation to the point where most contracts now are let, as I say, with the contractor operating on a very small margin.

With the present increase in gas, the profit margin has been reduced considerably. Now, if gas continues to escalate and if, as is predicted, the price of a barrel of oil goes to \$80 or anywhere close to that, the price of gas could double or even more so. And because school buses burn a tremendous amount, a lot of the money that a contractor gets goes to paying fuel. Besides his drivers and so on, fuel would be the biggest cost. It could end up that many of the contractors out there would lose their profit just by the price of gas escalating. So I ask the Minister if he would just file that away on his mental computer and -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hearn: You are meeting with the bus drivers?

An Hon. Member: Next week.

Mr. Hearn: That is quite good, because it is a real concern and a very legitimate one. One which the Minister cannot do anything about, at this stage, and one which they certainly cannot do anything about because it is dictated by what is happening in

the Middle East. So I thank the Minister for his attention there.

Some other questions I will ask him before I get on to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. In relation to the - and I will not use the word 'cutback' I will be very kind tonight, - possible freeze that is being talked about, and the Minister himself in the House has admitted that it is quite possible that next year there will be a shortfall of \$30 million, perhaps more than that, if we have to go on this year's dollars. Now today I think I saw a hint perhaps or heard a hint from the Premier and especially from the President of Treasury Board that maybe we are not really talking any more about operating next year on this year's dollars, which was said quite clearly last week, today I think I saw some backing off of that, and we talked about assessing, asking hospital boards and school boards and other agencies how would you survive? What effect would it have on your operations? Then we will assess what that effect is. That is fair ball. So am I hearing, and maybe the President of Treasury Board will answer it, am I hearing that perhaps boards, as they have been told, will not necessarily have to operate on this year's dollars next year? Is there a possibility that if school boards and hospital boards and other agencies show that the effect is going to be detrimental to their operations and cause hardship that there will be an easing off, that they will get more than this year's dollars? I seem to detect that today in what the President of Treasury Board was saying. That maybe we just cannot say you have next year's dollars, live with it, that they may not be able to do

that. So I hope that is the case and I would like to hear a little more on it later on.

But in the event we are going to tell school boards that they have to operate on next year's dollars. What is going to happen, as I have asked the Minister before, are teachers going to lose all their professional development opportunities? He has already taken away half by cutting the substitute teachers. Are they going to lose all of it? Are School Tax Authorities going to have to raise taxes? The Member for Fortune - Hermitage talked about School Tax Authorities and how important they were. He wants to get rid of them. He does not think they will do a good job. Certainly in the sense of equality and he is right. But the Minister when he talks, talks about his Triple E, Equality, Excellence, and Efficiency. And in relation to equality, he knows, as well as I do and others do that School Tax Authorities certainly do not distribute funds on an equal basis. They distribute what funds they collect. And if they happen to be set up in an area that is lucrative, they collect a lot of money and they distribute a lot of money, and St. John's is a typical example. If they are in a poor area, and Baie d'Espoir is as good an example as you'll find because I think it is on the far end of the totem pole, they cannot collect the money, simply, not because they are not efficient, they are efficient, as efficient as anybody else and they collect the same percentage perhaps as they do in St. John's or elsewhere, but the money is not there to collect. Consequently they cannot put it back into the schools and that is why we introduced the Equalization programme. A

programme which was highly lauded, by the way, by the Premier and his election campaigns and his pre-election campaigns and by members opposite, but they thought it was so good that we should have full equalization, equalize right across the board, which we started on a five year basis and then the government opposite picked up, but stalled. So I think full equalization is extremely important and nobody will agree with me anymore than the Minister of Education, but the question is, "Are we going to be able to do it next year, especially if we freeze our Budget?"

I have a number of questions, because one of the criticisms we have had during the past few days from members when they stood up is that you have talked and talked and talked, you have not asked any questions! Now I'm going to get a few new questions here. Thank you very much. I will reciprocate one of those days. So I have a few questions that I want to leave here for the members to answer when they stand up a little later. I am sure the Minister of Education is going to respond, the Minister of Finance certainly and the President of Treasury Board. So what is going to happen to school tax authorities? Are they going to be abolished or are they going to be asked to raise more money to help out at the local level? I support school tax authorities. I always did. I don't like them because they raise taxes and nobody wants to see that happening but the Minister will find I think that- if you abolish them, where are you going to find the 40-million dollars or so that they take in and have the same local control that they have? For instance, if the government does run into a tight bind, if things

get worse, and governments have to cut, not only to freeze but if they have to cut, if they haven't got the money well then they can only borrow so much, they cannot spend. If they have to cut the money that goes to school boards, if they in turn, also collect it through personal income tax or whatever, what money is now being collected by the school taxes, then undoubtedly government collects, government can give, government can take back. At least when the school tax authorities are collecting the dollars they are going directly into the school boards locally and the school boards have to use them however they want to use the dollars. A lot of people involved in education who understand that, will argue that it might be an evil but it is a necessary evil and we will get rid of it when you can show me something that can replace it and do the same job. The Minister nods approvingly and I know it will be very popular. He will be very popular if he could deliver on the promises made by the President of Treasury Board, by the Member for Burgeo who was very strong in his statements during the campaign that we will abolish school tax authorities. To say you will abolish them is one thing, but to live with the outcome is something else and it is not possible to do right now in this Province. What is going to happen to the pupil-ratio? If the Minister's Budget is frozen and if he cannot come across with the thirty million dollars plus that will be needed, above and beyond this year's estimates, what is going to happen, depending on the raise teachers get, if they get either raise, to the 200 to 500 teachers that will have to be laid-off because that is about the only place they can save that kind

of money? How is he going to handle the lay-off? Because of collective agreements he just cannot go out and lay-off teachers. One way you can do it is by changing the pupil/teacher ratio and then you do not have to give boards as many teachers, but that will not be a very popular thing to do and that might be what the Minister will have to look at if he is going to have the shortfall he is talking about. The other think that might be considered is are students going to have to pay for going on buses? I only have five minutes left so I have to get through my questions. Maybe I will get leave to finish. Are students going to have to pay to go to school on buses? Is the distance going to be increased? Right now we bus every student that lives outside a mile and in a lot of cases we bus students that live within the mile. if the boards can accommodate them on the buses, and there is nothing wrong with that because there is no extra cost. Is that distance going to be increased to a mile and a half, or to two or three miles? I had to walk over two miles to school every day when I was going but I would not want to see that happen again because on rainy days you stayed home, cold days you stayed home, and if the river overflowed you stayed home. It was good stuff and that is what happened. There are a number of other education questions I would like to ask. I have one Mr. Minister on top of my tongue about the teachers. How does he plan to lay-off 200 to 500 teachers? I will come to it after.

There are a couple of questions I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs if he is listening. In relation to the fire protection that his

Department is providing, especially in the St. John's area. The Minister and his Department is trying to do through the backdoor what they do not have the intestinal fortitude to do through the front, and that is to close down stations by their freeze on callback and their gradual phase out occasionally, and I am referring especially to the St. John's East station. If anybody is familiar with the new system that is used by Fire Departments they will see that every night now you have a limit on the numbers of people who are involved and if people cannot come in due to sickness, or whatever, then instead of calling in people to fill in for them, as they should, to make sure there is proper fire protection throughout the city, these people are left off the list and people are moved from one station to the next. A pickup assembly is left off at one station, probably the ladder truck is left off at the next, and gradually it goes down to the point where a station is closed. If so many people do not show up for a shift they close the station. Which one? The East End which they have been trying to close for sometime. That has happened on a number of occasions, and of course they then cut back in other stations, so if there is a serious fire in a place like the Battery, the Newfoundland Hotel, the Battery Hotel, or any of those then with the St. John's East station down that could be a very, very serious situation. After a while what they will probably say is, look, we had that station closed for fifteen different nights and nothing happened, we can get along without it, so now we can close it. What they are trying to do is rationalize why they should close and how they can

close the St. John's East fire station. Maybe then they will try to do something with Mount Pearl.

Another question for the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs: what happened to all the recreation grants?

Over the years, many Members, on both sides of the House benefitted greatly from small capital recreation grants. The softball fields which were created out around, the outdoor rinks which were built, the basketball courts which were fixed up, all of these things were done with small, \$5,000, \$10,000, \$15,000 grants each year.

Many communities each year benefit from them. This Minister has wiped them out completely, not only that, he promised a major change in how larger grants were allocated for regional facilities and so on and he has not delivered on that one.

I would like to ask him specifically, what is he going to do to help the people in Trepassey, whose stadium was closed on a number of occasions last year because inspectors from the Department of Labour came up with solutions which were not the solutions. They came in and made a quick check and said do this, that and the other and it will solve your problem. They were wrong, dead wrong. Who pays the price? Not the Government but the Town of Trepassey!

They made a request for some assistance there to offset the direct losses, not a handout, just to offset losses incurred by, I would not say incompetence because, I am sure the inspectors were competent but by a

misjudgement by the inspectors who went out and of course they had no other choice except to follow the rules because the stadium could not open until they complied with the wishes of the Government inspectors. The inspectors were wrong, consequently, the Government should pay the bill and it would assist Trepassey in getting their stadium reopened.

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

The hon. Member's time has expired.

Mr. Hearn: By leave?

Some Hon. Members: No leave.

Mr. Chairman: No leave.

Mr. Hearn: No leave? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will just sum up by saying we have on the paper right now or on the floor, a number of questions which I presume will be answered -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Hearn: -by the Gentlemen opposite when they stand -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Hearn: - to respond. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Question?

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

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

I guess it is fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that over the course of the last five or six days in debate on the resolution on the

Loan Bill and in the debate on closure this evening, I think practically every Member from this side of the House has spoken on at least one occasion and the vast majority of Members on this side of the House has spoken on much more than one occasion.

I think I spoke two one-hour slots yesterday, two one-hour slots on Monday. I know our finance critic has spoken several times, the Opposition House Leader - well every Member that I can practically see around me has spoken, on numerous occasions over the course of the last five or six days and again tonight, so, perhaps it is conceivable, Mr. Chairman, that for our side, I will be perhaps the last one speaking under this particular gag order, the guillotine rule, the closure under which we are operating here tonight and in that context, Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of things that I want to say.

In the little bit of time in which I have had to do some research on the use of closure in this legislature, I found something that I believe is interesting. I have not had a lot of time to do a lot of it, so I hope that I am basically in the ball park - but some information that we have gotten from some officers of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I can recall two occasions when we were the Government when we used closure. We used closure on Bill 34 in 1984, I believe it was.

Mr. Simms: Bill 37.

Mr. Rideout: With Bill 37 in 1984. We used closure on the budget in 1988.

Mr. Simms: In June.

Mr. Rideout: In June of 1988 after a budget came in in February. The Smallwood administration used closure in 1971. Seventeen years of Government by our Party, I think I am correct in saying we used closure twice, 1984 and 1988. In eighteen months, Mr. Chairman, of this administration -

Mr. Simms: In one session.

Mr. Rideout: - in one session only, this present session, this dictatorial Government has used closure twice, Mr. Chairman! Not only that, but they threatened to use it in their first session, and did not use it. But in this present session this Government has used closure at least the same amount of times that another Party used closure in seventeen years!

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame!

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

Mr. Rideout: I can shout as well as anybody on the other side, Mr. Chairman. For the next fifteen minutes or so I want silence.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that statistic should tell something to the people of this Province. I hope that that word goes out from this House tonight, that after six or six and a half days of debate on a money bill, with a Government that bungled the books and cooked the books and brought in a deceitful fraudulent budget -

An Hon. Member: Lies!

Mr. Rideout: - with a Government, Mr. Chairman -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: - that has refused to answer question after question on the fiscal position of this Province, that sat here tonight and allowed every Member of this Opposition to speak and ask - deliberately so, the record will show - four or five questions each, deliberate questions. Didn't anybody notice the Member of St. Mary's - The Capes asking deliberate questions of the Minister of Education? Did anybody notice the Member from Fogo asking deliberate questions of the Minister of Transportation?

Mr. Simms: Right.

Mr. Rideout: Did anybody notice the Member for Humber East asking deliberate questions of the Minister of Social Services?

Ms. Verge: (Inaudible) Minister of Finance.

Mr. Rideout: The Minister of Finance? Every Member who got up here tonight deliberately asked a question that ended, Mr. Chairman, lest the Government try to get out of it, with a question mark. So check the Hansard when it gets printed. And what have we seen? Have we seen a Government that has been forthcoming in providing the answers?

An Hon. Member: No!

Mr. Rideout: No, Mr. Chairman. Have we seen a Government that has been forthcoming in giving the fiscal position of this Province? No, we have not. We have not! And this Government, for using closure twice in this session, stands to be and deserves to be condemned by the people of this Province!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: Banana republic.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister of Education - and let it be known to anybody who is listening that I am asking a question, I am asking a question - does the Minister of Education know what the per capita spending on education in this Province was in 1971 as a percentage of the national average? Does he know?

Now, we did not provide answers before, we asked the questions. But I am going to provide an answer to that. In 1971 it was 56 per cent of the national average. Does the Minister of Education -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: - know what it was when we left office in 1989 as a per cent of the national average? It was 84%, Mr. Speaker, and let me ask the Minister one final question, Does the Minister of Education know from what source those statistics come Mr. Speaker? Does the Minister of Education know what the source of those statistics are? The source is the Warren Task Force on Education Financing in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

An Hon. Member: Shame on you, shame!

Mr. Rideout: I can remember the row, without giving away cabinet secrecy, Mr. Speaker, that we had around the cabinet table when our colleague at the time wanted to appoint him Chairman of that Task Force and it was almost written in blood in the cabinet, on the cabinet floor. He promised the

Minister that he had no further political ambition. Another indication of the honesty of the Minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to a couple of other members who are now Ministers on the other side, Mr. Speaker, members will remember, some members who are in this house, who were in here then will remember that in the budget that we as a government brought before this House in 1987-1988 we-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Mr. Rideout: That is not and the Minister can sling insults at me like he tried to do with other members tonight but it will not bother me, but I am going to speak until my twenty minutes is up. In 1987-1988, Mr. Speaker, we brought a Budget in this House projecting a deficit of a 173-million dollars, 12 months later when we came back with a new budget that deficit was reduced to 58-million dollars. The President of Treasury Board, who was the Finance critic at the time remembers it well I am sure, but, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the House what the Member for the Strait of Belle Isle, the present Minister of Health said about that Budget. Let me tell the House what he said. Listen to this now. He said "But there is a considerable difference between a projected debt of 173-million and an actual debt of 58-million". I wonder what does he say tonight about a projected surplus of 10-million and now a deficit of a 120-million?. What does that Minister say about that, Mr. Speaker? He went on to say, "I believe-"I have to get glasses I suppose eventually,"I believe"he said,"using my solar-powered calculator that there is a difference of a 115-million".

New,"How in the name of goodness?"he went on to say,"can a department make a projection and miss it by a 115-million?"

An Hon. Member: Oh!Oh!

Mr. Rideout: He went on to say,"Talk about aiming at the stars and hitting the picket fence", Mr. Speaker. That is what he said in April 1988.

Some Hon. Members: Oh!Oh!

Mr. Windsor: That must have been stellar-powered instead of solar-powered.

Mr. Hewlett: Solar-powered calculator!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker that is not all he said. He said, "They were really mixed up bad, so it would make me ask: what kind of terms of reference did the previous Minister use when he made his prediction and missed by a 115-million dollars? Was there something wrong with the computer in the Minister's department? Was there some sort of a bug in the machine? Did the Minister do it the traditional way and use his fingers to count off the millions and ran out of fingers?"

Some Hon. Members: Oh!Oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, that was a kind of opposition, I say to my former colleague for Fortune - Heritage, that we used to get from the Government opposite when they were over here. What did the Minister of Health - for the benefit of my friend the Minister of Education and his Liberal policy platform which he tries to skirt around when we bring it up

in the House - what did the Minister of Health have to say about another issue, Mr. Chairman? School tax. Here he is, Mr. Chairman, May 10, 1988, the same budget debate two years ago. And sitting over here was his present leader, Mr. Chairman, tapping the desk as he was saying it, the President of Treasury Board. What did he say about school tax? 'Number one: we will abolish the school tax.'

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: This is Hansard. He said, 'let the word go out. That is our platform,' he said. 'We will do it absolutely, absolutely, totally. We will abolish the school tax authority. Let every Newfoundlander know it and let every Newfoundlander hear it, Mr. Chairman.' That is what he said. May 10, 1988, the Minister of Finance exhibit (b).

Mr. Chairman, let me get to the present Minister of Social Services and see what he had to say at the same time. Just listen to him, Mr. Chairman. The nightcrawler we used to call him in those days. He tries to be a bit more dignified now that he is wearing ministerial robes. But, Mr. Chairman, this is what he had to say on May 10, 1988, 'That is what we have been doing here as Opposition Members, pointing out the seriousness of bed closures. And not only the Health Sciences, but all hospitals in the Province. We are talking about dollars and cents and the Government spending its money in the right way, the right manner to suit the medical needs of the Province.' He said, 'We are talking about bed closures.' And he went on to say on the next page, Mr. Chairman, just listen to

this. 'The Minister -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: - can take his pickle book and he can chew on it.'

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Rideout: The Minister can go and wean on a pickle, Mr. Chairman, if he so wishes.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: Listen to what the Minister had to say two years ago.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: Listen, Mr. Chairman. Any part of a Government who is going to put the knife to the health care system in this Province. Just listen to him. 'Deaths have been caused because of closures of beds. Nurses are over worked,' he said. 'When they close beds they lay off nurses and people will die and it is the Government's fault.'

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Now, I say to the Minister, so a pickle on exhibit number (c), Mr. Chairman. Now, let me get to the finance critic of the day.

Mr. Simms: Hypocrisy.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: Let me get to the finance critic of the day, Mr.

Chairman: the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Simms: Ah ha! This should be good.

Mr. Rideout: And there was yawns and calls and oh's and this and that when we called the budget sneaky, deceptive and a fraudulent document. I ask the Minister of Finance to cock his ear and listen. Listen to the critic two years ago. Mr. Chairman, I called it a sneaky deceptive budget.

Mr. Simms: O-o-o-h!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: And that is the first example of what I mean by being a sneaky, deceptive budget, he said:

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see who has some more here from the President of Treasury Board that are a little bit more to the point. I have a lot more here, but I cannot use them.

An Hon. Member: It is no wonder we brought the Government down.

Mr. Rideout: Yes, there is no wonder, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, the president -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Rideout: If there is something in Beauchesne to shove down the throat of the Minister of Social Services you are free to do it Sir, rather than a pickle book.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The honourable Member has asked to be

heard in silence. I ask the honourable Members to afford him that courtesy.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, this government is presiding over the layoff of a thousand or twelve-hundred people in the health care sector, a thousand or so people in the public service, 3 or 400 teachers and let us hear Mr. Speaker the words of jeweled wisdom coming from the Finance critic back in 1988 on our budget.

Mr. Simms: The Member for Gander.

Mr. Rideout: This is his quote Mr. Speaker. He says that there is going, talking about the Minister of Finance, he says there is going to be a cut of 400 jobs in the civil service and that these are jobs that have been vacant for 18 months and therefore they are no longer going to be filled and that is his explanation. The Minister, at the time, went on to say, "I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is a loss of a job, that is the loss of a job. No matter which way you cut it it is the loss of a job. It is a job that was in the past budgeted for. It is now no longer going to be budgeted for. It is the loss of a job. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I heard of one of them..."and he goes on, there's too many words here, "What kind of jobs were these?" he asked. "Permanent jobs, Mr. Speaker!" What kind of jobs are they cutting now, Mr. Speaker? Permanent jobs, Mr. Speaker!

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: Hypocrisy of the highest order.

Mr. Rideout: Now Mr. Speaker, that is exhibit "D". I have several more exhibits that we will be

going through in this session of the House. No wonder Mr. Speaker that this government has been forced to use closure the same amount of times in 18 months that the previous government used in 18 years. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, because the essence of incompetence, the essence of not telling the truth, the essence of not owning up to the music, the essence of not taking it on the chin, the essence of trying to cover up, the essence of trying to be a comical pickle book as a replacement for a competent Minister is written all over (Inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Rideout: - and everyone in this Province, Mr. Speaker, has started to wise up. Everybody in this Province has started to ask questions. What do we have? What do we have to show for the real change? We have fiscal mismanagement. We have a fiscal mess on our hands. A government, Mr. Speaker, that projected a surplus of 10-million dollars. A government that had the audacity to say to the public that part of the reason why we are 120-million dollars short is because we are short almost 64-million dollars from Ottawa, when the October first estimates from Ottawa proves that they are only 6-million dollars short Mr. Speaker. Deception! Deception! Deceit! Weaved all through this budgetary process, Mr. Speaker, and if that wouldn't turn the stomach of any member in this House I don't know what would. The least you can do is be honest. The least you can do is take it on the chin. If you made a mess of it take your responsibility for it, Mr. Speaker, not try to hide behind some crowd of bureaucrats down in the bowels

of Confederation Building. That is what the Opposition tried to do in 1988 Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Efford: Done a good job with it too.

Mr. Rideout: That's what the opposition tried to do back in 1988 and, Mr. Speaker, it is a long road that has no bends, Mr. Speaker, because now they find themselves, where, Mr. Speaker? They find themselves in a mess, not created by a balanced budget which they inherited, but a 120-million dollar deficit which they created, Mr. Speaker, and never let it be forgotten. Despite the Liberal policy platform on education, despite their policy platform of compassion and need overtaking the bottom line in the health care sector Mr. Speaker, despite not being worried about balance sheets what. What do we see today? We see a balance sheet government, Mr. Chairman. Balance it where you can.

Ms. Verge: A Board of Trade Government.

Mr. Rideout: A Board of Trade Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Balance the budget where you can. If that means setting the education system back twenty years, no odds do it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simms: Right on! Right on!

Mr. Rideout: IF that means suffering and torment for the sick and the old of this Province, do it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simms: The hell with the

people.

Mr. Rideout: Where is the compassion from the Minister of Social Services now that he is a Minister of a government, Mr. Chairman?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: It will never be seen.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: What did you suggest in Opposition?

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the first thing that this government could do to save itself \$100,000 is get rid of the kind of exhibition that we saw on the floor of this House tonight by getting rid of the Minister of Social Services. That is the first thing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: The second thing that they could do is get rid of the Minister of Finance, the most incompetent bungling Minister to hold that office since 1949. There is \$200,000, Mr. Chairman. I suggest you give us bungling contracts like the Labrador bridge, \$1.3 million. That could be contributed to hospital beds opening, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, this government to have the nerve, what do you suggest?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, they have been in power for eighteen months and they their great claim to fame, Mr. Chairman, is blaming

their present situation on somebody else. If you can stick it to Ottawa, do it. If you can stick to the Tory Administration that was here for seventeen years, do it, but do not stick anything to us because you got nothing to stick anything to, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Rideout: What time is it?

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

Some Hon. Members: By leave! By leave!

An Hon. Member: No leave.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the resolution carry? Oh, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Simms: Now we are going to get the answers.

Ms Verge: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: All the answers are coming.

Dr. Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have to get out my notes here now. I was interested in hearing the Leader of the Opposition's comment about closure. We all know that former administration applied the ultimate closure by not opening the House very often.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, I find

that the Leader of the Opposition the other day referred to a \$6 million difference between our projected equalization revenues and the Federal Government's, and what the Federal Government was ending up giving us. I explained it to him the last time that this is not so. He did not believe me even though I went over it in detail as to how the calculations were made. But thinking back I think what I will do is go over it again, so that it will be clear to everybody. Now there is no doubt that when the federal government talks about entitlements, they use the word entitlements and we estimated that we were entitled to, we now estimate...what am I trying to say here, wait now. In March when we got our second bit of information from the federal government about the changes in entitlement the entitlement had dropped. Now the problem with the federal government papers is this, they use the word entitlement and they say we are entitled or you are entitled to 961-million dollars on equalization and we are entitled to it. But entitled does not mean that you are entitled! That is the funny thing. It is a phrase they have been using for many years and they keep using the same phrase, entitlement, but it doesn't mean we are going to get it even though we might have been entitled to it under the old way they calculated because they have brought in a ceiling since they started using the word entitlement and making their calculations. They brought in the notion of a ceiling and equalization payments cannot increase faster than the growth in the Gross National Product starting 1987. What has happened...when this happens equalization is cut down to the rate that the Gross National Product increased. That means

that there have to be adjustments made for the ceiling and so even though we are entitled according to the March 30th. estimates of 961-million there was a ceiling cutting in for 1990-1991 of 20-million, over 20-million dollars, which brought our entitlement down and then there was a ceiling impact from prior years from 1988-1989, these two years for another 28-million dollars and there were re-estimates for prior years, not related to ceiling which reduced all this to 906.5 million dollars and-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Dr. Kitchen: That is what I gave them the other night. I gave you that the other day.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible)

Dr. Kitchen: No, no I gave you that the other day. I am reading from the same document now, and then I went on and the difference between that last figure and what we were projecting first is 60.3 whatever the amount was and then the other day we got a third estimate on equalization in October 1990 where the entitlement now went up to 997-million, the entitlement, but we don't get the entitlement, as I say, because we run into the ceiling and re-estimates again and this time the ceiling impact for 1991 became 36.7 million, which has to be subtracted and then you subtract the ceiling impact for prior years of another 28-million and the re-estimates that we talked about before of six and you are down to about 926-million. Which indicates that we might be getting another 19.5-million over and above what we thought. But, as I explained the last time I spoke, this is

very dicy, very tentative extra money, this \$20 million that the Premier referred to the other day. We believe, in the Department of Finance that this will not persist, and that when the January figures are released this will not be there because they were calculated based on the provincial budgets that were brought in all over Canada and all or virtually all the provincial budgets over estimated their revenues. And when this adjustment comes through then we will lose that and we will be back where we were before; that is if we lose the whole \$19 million. We might even lose all or more than the \$19 million. So, we are standing firm on our estimates of federal equalization. Now, I wish we did not have to do it. I wish we -

Mr. Simms: What is your projected guess? Did that change?

Dr. Kitchen: Just let me say now that we are not going to alter the \$120 million at the moment. And I want to say this because there have been hints made on the other side or suggestions made that perhaps the situation is not as bad now as we said when the \$120 million was first announced in that press conference. That \$120 million is holding firm. It is holding firm. It may be more. Even after the cuts that we have announced it is still likely that it will be very close to that figure. And so we cannot relax. I wish we could. I wish we could say that it was not that way. Nobody wants to take this bitter medicine. What the problem is, is that our best estimates are that we are still faced with this very real problem of - we will call it a deterioration in our fiscal position of approximately \$120

million or more, and we have to be very careful of that. We have to be careful about it, and we have to take steps to deal with it. Now, as it has been explained before, the fact that we came in better than the budget last year sort of indicates, even though we are worse this year, we will be alright as far as the credit agencies are concerned. I suspect that looks to be alright this year. But it is next year that we are mostly concerned with, so we have to put in place now measures that will deal with a projected deficit that we anticipate next year because if we have a similar or a higher deficit next year in all likelihood the credit rating may go down, and if so we will have great difficulty borrowing. And if we cannot borrow, I do not know what we are going to do because this year we are going to borrow, not the \$250 million that we projected in the Budget, but about \$370 million and this is a terrible situation. It is bad enough to borrow \$250 million, as my hon. colleague the Minister of Social Services pointed out in an earlier speech. What we are doing is going in the hole year after year in the good times that you were fortunate enough to be the Government in, and in this particular year that we are going through now, and hopefully in the years to come when times get better again we will be able to reduce that deficit. But the problem is that in those good years when we should have been hoarding the green and reducing the deficit these foolish virgins did not keep their lamps trimmed.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Dr. Kitchen: And as a result when a little downturn in the economy hurts we are caught. Now, what

are our alternatives? Can we increase revenues? Well, an alternative to making cuts in expenditures would be to increase revenues. Now, let me tell you why it is very difficult to increase revenues in the coming year. The people of Newfoundland are going to be faced, I believe now - it is pretty sure now - on January 1st with the goods and service tax. And the goods and service tax is going to place a burden on the individual tax payers of this Province of an additional \$163 million. \$163 million coming out of the men, women, and children of this Province. That means if you look at it, divide \$163 million by 500,000 people, \$320 for every man, woman, and child in the Province for an average family is about \$1,500 tax. Now that is something that is going to come out of the pockets of every man, woman and child in this Province from the GST, \$163 million. Now then, can we in this government decide that we are going to raise the retail sales tax by 3 per cent to get back \$120 million? Can we do that?

Some Hon. Members: No, no!

Dr. Kitchen: There is no way we can operate in that fashion. What has happened is that the Federal Government has moved into the provincial tax room and squeezing us out. There is very little we can do on the tax side at the moment. So the only way we can control our deficit at the present time with that GST coming in is to reduce expenditures, and that is the reason we have to do it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Efford: A pile of money. Right now we are standing firm on

\$120 million.

Dr. Kitchen: Yes, we are standing at that at the moment.

Now concerning the school tax, someone has raised the question of the school tax. I do not want to address the question of the school tax. But I would like to say a word or two about the property tax. Because of all the various types of taxes that we have in this Province we are taxing at or above the Canadian level on almost everything except property taxes. Now I am not advocating property taxes, but I am saying this that if you compare the way the property taxes that Newfoundlanders pay with the property taxes that the average Canadian pays we pay \$34 for every \$100 that they pay. This is the one area where we do not pay as much taxes as the other people.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Kitchen: Now I am not advocating that, because I know that historically in this Province there has been a tremendous resistance to the property tax. In fact, that is one of the reasons that the responsible government almost won the day in 1949, was the fear of the property tax. We have to be fairly careful about that whole question of how we raise taxes. I believe that there is very little we can do in the future to raise property taxes or any type of taxes.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Kitchen: I want to comment on a rather minor matter, perhaps I should not comment on it. But the hon. member for Mount Pearl in responding to a statement the other day about the closing of the

Clareville District Taxation Office thought it was a stupid move because I mentioned that we were going to move some of the tax auditors to St. John's to deal with the Hibernia situation and he said that since everything was out in Bull Arm, the tax auditors should be out there. But I do not know if the hon. member really understands what an auditor is.

An Hon. Member: No.

Dr. Kitchen: An auditor is somebody who looks at the books.

Mr. Simms: And you do.

Dr. Kitchen: He looks at the books.

Mr. Simms: That is only a cook's book (inaudible).

Dr. Kitchen: An auditor is somebody who looks at the books and it usually occurs at the head office or at an office of a company. As we all know most of the companies who are in the oil business will have their offices in St. John's and that is where the auditors are going to have to do almost all their work. They may take a trip out around to see how things are going but they will be spending their time in St. John's auditing the books of the companies because that is what auditors do, they look at the books. They do not go roaming around the site, so I wanted to mention that point. The final point I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, is that we need this Loan Bill and we need it immediately. We want to go to the market to borrow some money and as you probably know we have to be very careful when we go. We have to watch how the interest rates are, the market changes on a daily

basis, and up until now we have been very fortunate in our borrowings. We are usually able to dart in there at the appropriate time, get our borrowings, and dart out again. Almost every time we have made announcements about borrowings in this House we have nearly always found the appropriate window when the rates and the terms were good, and slightly before and slightly after the terms were less advantageous. We have to have that flexibility. Now, I would like to be able to say that we could bring it to the House and be sure it would be passed within a day or so at any future time. It has been suggested, but we cannot take that chance because you may decide you are not going to give it to us and here we have missed that window, so we must have that Loan Bill and I make no apologies for asking the Minister to introduce closure because it is absolutely essential that we have it. We must be assured of co-operation.

There is one other item I would like to refer to and it was made by the Member for Grand Bank. I thought it was a most unfortunate remark, and I believe it was because he realized that he made that unfortunate remark that he got so obstreperous in the last few minutes of his remarks, when he said that what we need in the teaching profession is new blood. He actually got up there and said that the teachers out there should be replaced by other teachers.

An Hon. Member: Who said that?

Dr. Kitchen: The Member for Grand Bank said we need new blood in the teaching profession.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank on a point of order.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is strictly that the Minister is misleading the House. That is not what I said in the House and the record has to be corrected. What I really said is that new blood in any profession is good, whether it be the education profession, the medical profession, or whatever. The more infusion of new blood you have in the educational systems of this Province by new graduates coming out of university and the institutes can only speak better and speak well for the education profession. The Minister is taking my remarks completely out of context and the point of order is that I think the Minister should be asked to correct those remarks because they are incorrect. When we look at the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Education I think anyone in the House and anyone in the Province can see why an infusion of new blood in the educational system would be beneficial to the students that they service.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member is using the point of order to clarify a statement that he made earlier and there is really no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, I think that is about all the questions that were asked that I have copied down. I certainly hope that we have answered all the honourable

Members questions and I hope now Mr. Chairman that we can proceed and pass this loan bill. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear!Hear!

Mr. Chairman: The honourable Member for Ferryland.

Mr. Power: Mr. Chairman on a point of privilege.

Mr. Chairman: I have to remind the honourable Member that my understanding is that a point of privilege cannot be raised in Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman: The honourable Member for Ferryland.

Mr. Power: Before we finish this part of this evening's proceedings, Mr. Chairman, a point of order is in order I believe in this House. I remember Speaker Ottenheimer trying to make a judgement one time whether the Chairman is supposed to be a referee or a judge and to try and distinguish between the roles that he has to play. In this debate this evening, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen as much of what I always thought in this Legislature was unparliamentary language. Unparliamentary language is something that is defined and controlled so this Legislature and all legislatures can operate with a certain amount of decorum. In this House this evening and possibly in my own words in debate because it was so prolific around the House, the words "liar", the word "dishonest", the word "hypocrite", the words "deceit, deception, fraudulent, deliberately misleading" were all

used in debate by members, some members on both sides, and members on this side. Mr. Chairman what I would like-

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Power: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to quote Beauchesne so we can have a ruling because for members who may not be familiar, if we set a pattern this evening, called a precedent, then that becomes the rules of this House forever and a day unless someone changes it, somewhere hence. In Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules & Forms, 6th. Edition, page 5, it talks about Precedents and Tradition, in particular it says, "Besides the written rules...lies the vast quantity of precedent", and it says in the same paragraph, "Parliament and the manner in which it works has developed over centuries and the written rules are relative newcomers to the procedural field. Indeed, increasingly the written rules are being used, not to codify existing practice, but rather to trim and adjust historic traditions to modern needs." Mr. Chairman, paragraph 489, of the same 6th. Edition of Beauchesne, page 144 for those who may care to look outlines - Mr. Chairman part of the problem here is the Member for St. John's South is a relative rookie to this House, total rookie who continues to use unparliamentary language, unbeknownst to himself through his ignorance I suppose or lack of knowledge of the rules, and all I am saying is that as one member of this Legislature I want to know what the future rules of the House of Assembly are going to be. Are we allowed to use hypocrite, liar, deceit, dishonest? In the precedents once we set it, it hasn't been challenged by the

Government House Leader. It hasn't been challenged by the Opposition House Leader. It goes on to say on page 144, Mr. Chairman, the kind of words in written part of Parliamentary procedure that are unparliamentary and it does include such things as dishonest, fraudulent, deliberately mislead, hypocrite, liar. I as one member of this Legislature would like to know whether precedent as established here tonight using this type of language are going to be the rules of this House or whether we go back to the written rules and let these words, which I purport Mr. Chairman, that these words should be unparliamentary, should always be ruled unparliamentary and should never be used in debate and should always be removed from debate whenever possible. So I would just like a ruling Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The honourable President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Tobin: You're not allowed (Inaudible) like you are blowing bubbles.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Government House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Baker: Yes, Mr. Chairman, when we get order maintained. First of all, I would like to start by congratulating the Member for Ferryland for bringing up a point and bringing to mind the situation as it has developed in the House. He perhaps was a little hasty, in one sense, in attributing remarks to an individual member.

Mr. Murphy: That is right.

Mr. Baker: I would like to point out that it is a little disconcerting sometimes to be in the House and hear from many sources on both sides of the House, the use of a lot of terms that are borderline and some of the terms and I believe he mentioned one like fraudulent has been ruled to be parliamentary, but at the same time I understand what he is saying. We have tended, Mr. Chairman, to use words that are not exactly in the spirit of what the parliament should be. I congratulate him for reminding us all of that. We go too far sometimes, -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker: - Mr. Chairman, with a bending and stretching a lot of the rules of the House.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: And I think -

Mr. Flight: Talk to your leader about his (inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Mr. Chairman, this is a perfect example -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Baker: - of the kind of thing that I am talking about. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is really no point of order in the sense that if Your Honour had heard certain words obviously it would cause an intervention, Your Honour would have intervened and so on. But be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact, I think, there is really no point of order, I think it is something that we all should keep in mind in the future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

An Hon. Member: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for St. John's South on the point of order.

Mr. Murphy: Yes, thank you very much Mr. Chairman. -

An Hon. Member: Is it on the same point of order?

Mr. Chairman: On the same point of order?

Mr. Murphy: I would concur with the hon. House Leader that the hon. the Member for Ferryland made a good point. And throughout the evening there have been many words I am sure that are unparliamentary. But I think it is totally unfair to stand and raise a point of order and single me, as the Member for St. John's South out, and that, Mr. Chairman, is wrong. Because I would remind the hon. Member for Ferryland, even though he did single me out, he also referenced that members on both sides of the House use unparliamentary words, and I would suggest to the hon. Member for Ferryland that his own leader used more unparliamentary words in this House this evening than all members combined. And I feel slanted, Mr. Chairman, by -

An Hon. Member: Slanted?.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Murphy: Yes, I feel slanted-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Murphy: I will tell you where

it is, it is somewhere in between backupable -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Will the hon. member clue up his remarks, please, on the point of order because the Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. Murphy: Again, Mr. Chairman, I have to wait for the Member for Port au Port to get on with his foolishness and now that he is finished -

An Hon. Member: You were slanted.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Murphy: I would suggest that if the hon. member would have a gawk in the mirror he would know what slanted means.

Mr. Chairman, I feel singled out here this evening in a lot of words that were said, and I think it is totally wrong for the Member for Ferryland to single me out. It is totally wrong for the Member for Ferryland to single me out and I would ask him, if he is an hon. member, to stand up and apologize to me.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Ferryland to the point of order.

Mr. Power: My point of privilege, or point of order, was simply to try to bring some decorum here rather than to make it worse. I did not mean to slight in any way the Member for St. John's South, except he did interrupt me while I was making my comment, which sort of allowed me to do that but he was no worse, nor no better, in parliamentary language than a lot of members who spoke this evening. If I slighted him in any

way I certainly want to apologize as I want to make the place better and not worse.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order raised by the hon. Member for Ferryland. While the Chair rules that it is not a point of order I think the point raised by the hon. member should be well taken by all of us here in this Chamber and while sometimes words may be used that are unparliamentary in one sense, or context, they can be used in another context which might be parliamentary. I believe we should all take a lesson from what the hon. member has said here tonight and judge ourselves accordingly in the future.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, what we are seeing tonight I think is the greatest miscarriage of justice ever to take place in this Chamber. We saw a number of months ago the Minister of Finance bring forward a document which has been proven now to be a faulty document and it was misleading. With respect to my colleague for Ferryland I have to use the terminology, it was a misleading and fraudulent document. That has been admitted now by the Minister of Finance and by the Premier. It is clear that the numbers that were in that document were not accurate and that the Government knew at the time that they were not accurate. That is very, very clear.

Mr. Chairman, to use closure on this particular bill, and I remind

hon. members we are talking about the Loan Bill. The Loan Bill was introduced essentially as part of the Budget document because the Budget identified a need for a borrowing program. This is a routine bill that flows automatically from the Budget document and it gives the Minister borrowing power, power to do borrowing periodically throughout the year as required to meet the cash flow requirements of the Province, so the Minister can pay the due bills of the Province. Clearly, Mr. Chairman, the Minister bungled on that as well, and not only did he bungle his Budget but he forgot to bring in his Loan Bill last Spring.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: What we are here about tonight, Mr. Chairman, is we are talking about borrowing authority because the Minister of Finance, I would suggest, cannot pay his bills next week. He has run out of cash because of his own incompetence, because they forgot to bring in this bill last Spring, so he now has to borrow.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Windsor: We finally got the silent Minister to his feet.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Finance on a point of order..

Dr. Kitchen: I wish to correct a very misleading representation that was just made, and because of the dire consequences, if anyone believes what he said, this Province is not in desperate need of money in that sense.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Dr. Kitchen: We can pay our bills next week but we must, as I said in my -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Dr. Kitchen: - but we must, as I said in my speech have the flexibility immediately to borrow when the time is right.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) get back to your seat.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The Chair did not hear all that the hon. Minister had said on the point of order, but I believe what he was trying to do, was to clarify a point that the hon. Member for Mount Pearl had raised and really it is not a point of order. It is just a point of clarification.

An Hon. Member: What a fool! (Inaudible).

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

Mr. Windsor: The fact of the matter is the Minister can protest all he wants, he is out of money. He is out of cash, he cannot pay the bills and he is now forced to go, because of his own incompetence at the mercy of the borrowing markets now. He has got to go to the money markets of the world on their terms, because he has now lost his flexibility to borrow when there is a window of opportunity.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: This bungle, Mr. Chairman, will cost the Province millions in additional interest charges because of the Minister's incompetence. Here we go again, a point of order. He does not like the truth either.

An Hon. Member: This is terrible, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Simms: Oh he will get something better, leave him alone.

An Hon. Member: He brought in closure, he (inaudible).

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

The hon. the Minister of Finance on a point of order.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow this untruth to be broadcast throughout the Province. We are not in desperate shape, we must have, we must have this opportunity. If we delay the loan bill-

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Dr. Kitchen: - much longer, it will be as the hon. Member has suggest, but it has not reached that point at the moment.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Simms: That is your second (inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, you are quite correct. It is not a point of order, it is just abuse and interruption by the Minister.

Then, if the Minister, is for the first time telling the truth, why, indeed is he bringing in closure, what is the urgency to close debate tonight, if the Government is not in desperate financial situations?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: He cannot have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. Closure is something that is done in absolute dire emergency, not at the whim of the President of Treasury Board or the Minister of Finance.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, I have never seen such a breach of democracy by the Minister of Finance in the House of Assembly, let alone anywhere else. It has never occurred before, Mr. Chairman.

Now, let us look at the numbers, Mr. Chairman. Let us look at the numbers; this Minister stood in this House and brought in what he called his people's Budget, with a \$10 million surplus. Let us have a look at the charts, Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at the graphs of where we were.

This Government is talking about the terrible time we are in, have a look at the Minister's Budget, Chart No. six. Have a look at the deficits and have a look at the deficit of \$87 million with which we ended up in 1984 or 1985.

Boo! during the worst recession this country has seen in decades, but the difference is, Mr. Chairman, we told the truth, we predicted the deficit and we brought in deficit. We did not predict surplus.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: There is no shame in finding out, during the term of the fiscal year, that things have changed, that things in Ottawa have changed, that the economy in central Canada which runs the economy of all of Canada has been good and therefore equalization changes! Here comes the jack rabbit again.

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

When the Chair has order, he will recognize the hon. Member.

The hon. the Minister of Finance on a point of order.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow the hon. Member to continue to state things which are not quite true and I would ask him to stick to the truth when he is speaking about the finances of this Province and in speaking about what has happened in the past. It is very important that the proper words come out.

An Hon. Member: Sit down boy.
(Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is trying to waste my time. Not only are

they closing debate prematurely, now they are trying to stop me from speaking at all in this debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, the record shows very clearly-- the record of the deficit to this Province is very clear. We came through the worst economic recession in decades in this country. We had a planned programme which we announced in the House of Assembly, honourably, truthfully, and we stuck to that program. We ended up with basically a balance budget in 1988-89, we allowed the Minister to come in with a surplus last year. He was able to project a little surplus this year. He projected \$4 million I think last year. \$10 million this year. Because of variance funding from the Government of Canada, his surplus went to \$37 million which we now find it was actually \$17 million. All right, but the Minister decided to transfer some of it this year, he is trying to play games with that and say, oh, well the members this year are not accurate now. Who does he think he is trying to kid? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we just fell off the page with the deficit for this year.

Mr. Simms: Right on!

Mr. Windsor: That is what happened. If you put the real deficit with what the Minister is projecting now on this graph instead of what is there, we are down below the graph.

An Hon. Member: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Windsor: That is what is happening, Mr. Chairman. And this

government brings in closure to stop debate on this. And they have not given us any answers. I heard the Minister of Finance a few minutes ago saying well, I think I have answered all the questions. What a joke! He has answered nothing, Mr. Chairman. He has still not told us where we are going to be at the end of the year. And I will predict we are still looking at \$120 million deficit, because this Minister has no control over the economy. He has no control over the finances of this Province.

An Hon. Member: A bunch of lies.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is -

Mr. Efford: What? What?

Mr. Windsor: - Mr. Chairman, that this government did not tell the truth about this budget. They have misled this House and the people of this Province about the state of affairs and they have lost the confidence of this Province about the financial affairs of this government and this Province, Mr. Chairman. Nobody in this Province any more has confidence in what that Minister says, as it relates to financial matters in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, what is the real deficit? You started off with \$10 million, then it went to \$55 million, then to \$120 million, now the Minister says well there is \$20 million variance favourably now. So maybe it is only \$100 million. But, by the way, we slipped in \$34 million that we could have paid last year, but it was to our advantage to take it this year. So that reduces it down to \$65 million. What is the real deficit, Mr. Chairman?

An Hon. Member: No idea.

Mr. Windsor: And if the deficit is not \$120 million, why are we barring people in Clareville and in Wabush and in other parts of this Province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: Why are we taking the (inaudible) of Change Islands from the silent Member for Lewisporte, who has not gotten up in this House tonight to defend that ferry?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Speaker*, there were seventeen people employed in the Finance Office in Clareville and six more in Transportation, that is twenty-three people. On a per capita basis that is equivalent to taking 1,000 jobs away from St. John's. That is what we are doing to the town of Clareville. They are saving nothing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: The Minister will pay our more in relocation expenses to the people in Clareville than he is going to save in the next three years.

Mr. Tobin: Shame!

Mr. Windsor: And I would predict that he will lose hundreds of thousands, probably millions of dollars in lost taxes because they are not going to be there now to do the job that they have been doing. And Hibernia is taking place in Come By Chance and in Marystown and in Placentia. What nonsense! It is the only comment

the stupid Minister can come up with.

I withdraw that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: By hook or by crook you will get there.

An Hon. Member: Oh, listen to that! After what you said tonight!

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

Mr. Windsor: I am not going to be distracted by that hon. Member.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) withdrew it!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

An Hon. Member: He is telling the truth!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: How Clyde got you in the Cabinet I will never know.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is we do not really know where we are. But we do know that this Government has announced that they are going to inflict a considerable amount of pain onto the people of this Province over the next number of months, under the guise of having a \$120 million deficit. Now we want to know, is there a deficit? These people who are being fired unceremoniously want to know, is there a deficit? Why is the Government taking this action? Why are we thinking about cutting back on school busing next year? Why are we going to piggyback on GST and let the Federal Government

take the political flak? And in fact, put taxes on children's clothing and heating fuel? That is what this Minister is thinking about doing. He has already admitted it.

Why are we closing down hospital beds that this Budget had so much to say about (Inaudible) budget? Of opening fifty-five new beds, was it? Fifty-five hospital beds: thirteen beds at Agnes Pratt; thirty-three new nursing positions; thirty-two residential care positions.

Mr. Tobin: Bunch of lies!

Mr. Windsor: The people's budget, Mr. Chairman! And what do we see? Cutbacks!

Mr. Tobin: Nothing but lies!

Mr. Windsor: Probably 1,500 people in the health care sector are going to be laid off this year. This is a Government that said, we have got to get into power and look after health and education! The biggest scam, Mr. Chairman, in history!

I have referred to the pie charts in this, Mr. Chairman, now I know what happened. Alright? I referred to these pie charts many times and said that the percentage of money being spent in the resource areas has decreased down to something like 5.7 per cent from 15.1 two years ago. Now I know what happened. They have not lost all that much in the resource sector. They padded the books! They cooked the books to put more money into the health and education sides in the Budget, now it has got to be cut off because they did not tell the truth!

That is what is happening here,

Mr. Chairman. That is what is happening. The Minister was very proud to stand up and talk about his people's Budget with a \$10 million surplus when he knew that there was no surplus. He knew then that he had a \$50 million deficit. And that is what his numbers - that he is telling us tonight he still has a \$50 million deficit if we believe what he is saying tonight!

Dr. Kitchen: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance on a point of order.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible) and told an untruth that I would expose it. I did not know at the time we read the budget of these changes in the Federal equalization payments. And the Member should not say I did, I did not. He should accept my word on that point.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Minister is again clarifying the statement made by the hon. Member for Mount Pearl, and there is really no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is accurate. He was told

on March 30 - he shakes his head but he has already told this House that he was told on March 30 verbally, and on April 5 in writing -

An Hon. Member: No, the Premier told (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Well, then he lied - I cannot use that word, no, I am sorry, I will take that back. Was he telling the truth when he made the statement last week, that that was when he was told?

An Hon. Member: Make up your mind, b'y!

Mr. Windsor: He can not have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. He was told while everybody was down in Florida on Easter vacation! Five days before the debate started in this House! We debated it for two months! And not one of those Ministers had honesty enough to stand in this House and tell the people of the Province that this document was a falsehood!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: Not one of them, Mr. Chairman. Two months every one of those Members stood in this House and boasted about their \$10 million surplus and all of the things they were going to do when they knew they could not do it because they knew they did not have the money to do it. They knew they had to come back before the year was over and admit that everything that was in this document was false. And there was not five cents for health or education. In spite of the fact that we brought in a health and education tax which put another \$25 million in his pocket. Where has that gone? What have we got that one for, so we can take away

school buses and substitute teachers and so that teacher aids could be out on a picket line this morning? Is that what it was all about, Mr. Chairman?

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am upset and my stomach is upset. I am sick to my stomach at looking at what is happening to this Province at the hands of this Government and so are the rest of the people in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: Now, you be quiet over there.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Windsor: We have been a victim, Mr. Chairman. We have been a victim of the biggest sting in history. We were told there was a \$10 million surplus and then we were told it was a \$120 million deficit. So, we have to go through all those terrible things. Now I am not so sure anymore. Is the Government starting to turn chicken? They are not going to deal with their deficit problem. Is that what is happening here?

Mr. Chairman, I attended the last two days, on behalf of the Opposition caucus, the conference of the APEC, Atlantic Provinces Economic Council. I noticed the Minister of Development, the Minister of Finance or the President of Treasury Board was not there. Nobody was there listening to the people. The Premier was down. The Premier was

there. He was not listening. He went down to speak to them. Did he speak to them about the economy? No! He talked about Triple 'E' Senate! He did not listen to anybody. He rode in on his chariot and spoke - he pontificated, and then he left again. You have to listen to the people. You have to find out what is going on out in the streets. If you intend to govern this Province find out what is going on around you. You cannot hide in your closet like the Minister of Finance is trying to do.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: The difference on this side is that there is only one leader, and the leader over here is the leader of a team, not a dictator.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: Where are all the mother's sons and daughters rushing home, Mr. Chairman? Where are they now. 1,100 more of them are gone since this Government took office. That is performance for you. That is performance. 11,000 are gone, but 10,000 came back. I was being kind to them. 10,000 souls came back to this rock. More than 11,000 have left in eighteen months. That is what we are dealing with here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simms: Another unfilled promise.

Mr. Windsor: This is the Government that we are -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Windsor: I would like to ask the Minister of Finance this, I am sure I am just about out of time.

I may have time for one more question. The Minister's budget also talked about ten gasoline inspectors being laid off. I am told, Mr. Chairman, that indeed was done. So we do not have gasoline inspectors in Port au Basques any more. We now have transport trucks coming into this Island with extra gas tanks on them. And if they are getting in here they are buying furnace fuel because you can burn furnace fuel just as well as diesel fuel in a truck, if there is nobody to stop you and there is no tax, not the same amount on furnace fuel as there is on diesel fuel. I am told that we have lost millions of dollars in gasoline taxes because we laid off ten loyal tax auditors, gasoline tax inspectors.

Mr. Simms: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Windsor: Is that the Minister's economy?

Mr. Simms: It is typical of the economy.

Mr. Windsor: Is that what he is talking about? Or are we talking about politics here, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, have a look at it.

Clareville has gotten the double whammy in the last couple of days. I wonder why? Because they dared to vote against this government in a by-election. I mean is this the fairness and balance this government was talking about?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Windsor: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and so is this government's.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

On motion, resolution carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report passage of the bill.

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

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

Mr. L. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to it referred and have directed me to report that it has passed a certain resolution and recommends that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion, report received and adopted, Resolution ordered read a first and second time, Bill ordered read a first, second and third time, now, by leave.

On motion, resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, A Bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province", read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper (Bill No. 39).

Mr. Speaker: On motion, this House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 2:00 p.m.