



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 62

---

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

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Tuesday

19 November 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MS VERGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:  
Mr. Speaker, I wish to give a full explanation of the appointment of Gillian Butler as Chairperson of the Province's Human Rights Commission and make clear that the appointment is entirely appropriate and in no way violates conflict of interest prohibitions.

On my recommendation in September of this year the Lieutenant-Governor in Council appointed Miss Butler Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission.

She was chosen solely because of her individual qualifications and suitability. Even the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) acknowledged that he has "a lot of respect for her as a lawyer and as a person." The people Ms Butler is associated with in the practice of law had absolutely no bearing on her appointment. I reiterate that Ms Butler was appointed as an individual and not as a member of a law firm or an associate of any other person.

Under the Human Rights Code the

Human Rights Commission are responsible for enforcing the code. The code applies to all people and firms within the competence of this Legislature; it also applies to the provincial government. From time to time the Human Rights Commission may have to investigate complaints against individuals or organizations with which Human Rights Commissioners are associated. At present there are seven Human Rights Commissioners, including the Chairperson. The Chairperson happens to be a member of a law firm; another member is employed by Memorial University; a third member owns a bakery; and a fourth member is a life underwriter. All members, as is to be expected, are associated with other people in various personal and business relationships.

From time to time complaints may be made to the Commission pertaining to any one of these associates. If this should happen, one or more of the Commissioners may have a conflict of interest and it is to be expected that those members would disqualify themselves from any Commission discussion of the matter. For the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that the Chairperson of the Commission has any more or less potential for conflict than any other member is completely unfounded and wrong.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the matter of remuneration for the Chairperson and the other members of the Human Rights Commission. All them receive only small amounts of compensation. The current scale of remuneration which applied to the previous Human Rights Commission is as follows: Hourly rate for meetings for Chairperson and all members

\$70.00; Monthly stipend for chairperson \$200. After the current Commission were appointed in September 1985, I discussed with the Chairperson the matter of remuneration and asked her to consider a lower rate for meetings, since the Commission had been increased in size and it appeared likely that the Commission would become more active and hold more meetings than in the past. The Chairperson subsequently raised this matter with the Commission and informed me they would accept a rate for meetings of only \$150 per diem.

As of yet, no payment has been issued to the current Chairperson and Commissioners. However, in keeping with past practice, the Chairperson's remuneration will be paid to her personally and mailed to her home address. A T-4 slip will be issued to the Chairperson personally. This was the arrangement for the payment of the previous Chairperson, Mr. Abe Schwartz, who is a lawyer practicing with partners in a firm in Grand Falls. In that case, Mr. Schwartz payments were mailed to him at his home address and he was issued with a T-4 slip.

In the case of Ms. Butler as with Mr. Schwartz, chairing the Human Rights Commission has absolutely nothing to do with legal associates.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to say that I believe the Province is fortunate indeed to have someone of Ms. Butler's calibre and dedication chairing our Human Rights Commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for having supplied me with a copy of her statement before she presented it to the House. I would have to say that I am somewhat surprised that it is the minister and not the Premier who is responding since, under The Conflict of Interest Guidelines, the Premier has a responsibility to carry out an investigation. I do not know if -

MS VERGE:

I am responsible for the Human Rights Commission.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I understand the minister is responsible for the Human Rights Commission, but I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if this is intended to be the report of the investigation that the Premier is bound to carry out under the Conflict of Interest Guidelines. If it is, it is not adequate.

Now with respect to the minister's statement, I will just go to the meat of the matter, where she says that for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that the Chairperson of the Commission has any more or less potential for conflict than any other member is completely unfounded and wrong. I would like to point out to the minister that she has not dealt with the essential question, which is: Will there not be, Mr. Speaker, pressures on the Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission arising from the fact that her senior partner is in the Cabinet of this administration?

Would any reasonable person say, Mr. Speaker, that the Commissioner could not be embarrassed? Could not be put in a position where under the Act, Mr. Speaker, there is a responsibility to decide whether to recommend that an inquiry be carried out? Is the minister saying that the chairperson of the Human Rights Commission can carry out her duties as a watchdog, as fully and as freely as if her senior partner was not a member of Cabinet? If she is saying yes to that question, Mr. Speaker, I submit that she is deviating from common sense and she is not giving an answer that the Province will accept.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. members time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:  
Oh, come on. I protest, Mr. Speaker!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Actually the hon. minister spoke for four minutes and the hon. member has now spoken for four minutes, so I was incorrect in allowing an extra two minutes.

### Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Vice-Premier, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and it is with regards to that contract we talked about

yesterday, Mr. Martin's contract with the government. Mr. Martin has been with the Provincial Government since 1972 and until August 29, 1985, he was the Senior Policy Advisor to the Premier. The Evening Telegram today - I am not sure that it quoted right - says that the government indicated the day that Mr. Martin left the employ of the government that he would be retained in a consultative role. So my question is did Mr. Martin, if that quote is true, use his position as Senior Policy Adviser to set up a more lucrative arrangement for himself? Did he, as Senior Advisor to the Premier, play any role in getting himself that \$150,000 contract?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, Mr. Martin, which is his right in any democratic society, made a decision and took a decision that he would like to leave government. He did it for a very good reasons. One of the reasons is that in addition to his other qualifications he is a graduate lawyer and he wanted to get into the practice of law. He has a competency in many areas, so he decided, on his own, of course, fully and freely, that he wished to go into private life. And after he had taken that decision, without any knowledge or any thought that there was any possibility of an engagement in government, I personally approached Mr. Martin from the viewpoint of engaging his services, particularly at this very sensitive and critical and important time with respect to the bringing on of the development of Hibernia and other related matters



to the offshore.

So I hope the hon. gentleman understands that. The hon. gentleman should not get on his feet in this Legislature and imply that Mr. Martin used his position as Senior Policy Adviser to the Premier to get a job as a consultant. That is completely, absolutely and entirely wrong. Mr. Martin made a decision to leave the government for his own private reasons. I am very glad that he decided and accepted the invitation to become a consultant to me on offshore matters, as well as to the Department of Development and the government generally.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister said that he personally contacted Mr. Martin. I wonder did he personally suggest the \$150 an hour as opposed to the \$62,000 annually that he was already receiving? I want to ask the minister this: For this fantastic fee of \$150 per hour, are there any restrictions in his contract to guarantee that Mr. Martin's services are available only to the Government of Newfoundland and not available to other governments, institutions or companies whose interests in our offshore is not necessarily in our better interests?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I will deal once again, as I did yesterday, I thought, with respect to the \$150 an hour which the hon. gentleman can project out to \$300,000 a year. The fact of the matter is the engagement of Mr. Martin, as on any professional basis, is on a fee for time spent on an ad hoc basis. There will be some months that he will earn, because he will expend time, more than he will in other months. So it is not fair for the hon. gentleman to project the \$150 an hour to be \$300,000 annually.

With respect to the other, Mr. Martin has no engagements with any other government and he has no engagements with any other companies and that has been understood that it would conflict with his duties with the provincial government.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor-Buchans should not have to speculate anything with regard to what Mr. Martin will earn under this contract so I ask the specific question: Are there any upper limits that Mr. Martin can earn under this contract of \$150 an hour? Is it specific or is it open-ended? So I will not have to rise again, Mr. Speaker, I want the minister to answer that question and to remind him that yesterday he indicated that he would table Mr. Martin's contract at the earliest possible time. Has he tabled it today? If not, when can we expect it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

On the Order in Council and its details, Mr. Speaker, I was otherwise engaged this morning and I did not have an opportunity to do it. But I will do it in my own time, within a reasonable time, and that is reasonable to expect. The hon. gentleman will get it. In actual fact I have advised the hon. member essentially of the terms of Mr. Martin's contract. Now, with respect to the matter of the upper limits that the hon. gentleman refers to, it is not appropriate to have upper limits of this nature in a contract or an engagement of this nature. Mr. Martin is not an employee, he is a consultant, and the only limits really are the times that we wish to employ him in the furtherance of the interests of the Province on the offshore and that will determine it. I can guarantee the hon. gentleman it will not be every day of the year and the total amount may not even exceed the salary that he was paid before. I do not know, it may or it may not, it may be less. But the point of the matter is every single dollar that will be spent on Mr. Martin in his competence, capacity, and ability to give us advice, every cent will be well spent and, knowing Mr. Martin, every dollar will be honestly earned.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). Yesterday, Mr.

Speaker, the Government House Leader in response to a question said, 'There is all the difference in the world between the opportunity to be dishonest and actually being so. A potential conflict of interest does not mean there is one, yet having the potential leaves one open for accusations, etc.' Now, I wonder if the minister would explain whether there has been a change of policy in the administration of which he is a member since November 8, 1982, when the hon. the Premier, in dealing with an Act To Amend The Conflict of Interest Act, 1973, stated, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the matter of the meaning of conflict of interest that, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of perception. Specifically, the Premier said, "How come the Opposition would be against the government trying to regulate its own conduct and regulate the conduct and the potential conflict of interests of public servants?" How is that consistent also with the Premier saying, "So that is number one, Mr. Speaker, the perception has to be attacked and this government is attacking the perception?" Has there been a change of policy in the administration since the Premier used these words in introducing An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I made my statement yesterday in the House. This is not a court of law and the hon. gentleman is not a prosecutor, but he has been trying to turn it into a prosecutorial exercise. The hon. gentleman knows full well what I mean by a potential

conflict of interest. Anybody who has any kind of interest, Mr. Speaker, at all, a private interest, and there is nobody in this world who walks this firmament who does not have a private interest and people who go into Cabinets have private interests. They have it either through property or through relationships with people or what have you. The question is whether private interests conflict with public interests. Just because you have a private interest, Mr. Speaker, does not mean there is an actual conflict.

I contend, and I will continue to contend, Mr. Speaker, that it is unjust and unfair of anyone to insinuate that there has been a conflict of interest unless they can either prove it or unless there is reasonable and probable grounds for a suspicion of it.

What the hon. gentleman is doing is trying to slither away I think, in an unfair way from his original attack. He first of all accused me of dishonesty. He then got on the air and said, "Mr. Marshall is an honest person," but in the next step he says, "But he has got to prove his honesty." That is what it is all about.

He expects, because I am a man who has carried on a -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I think the hon. the minister is straying from the answer to the question.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Well, Mr. Speaker, I will respond to your ruling but Your Honour must realize as well that these questions are questions that are

seeded and they are personal questions and I would think that there should be a certain amount of latitude for the person who is responding. But, in any event, Mr. Speaker, I will bow to your ruling but I will just say to the hon. gentleman, you can get on and you can read all the authorities you want, the question always comes in as to whether or not a person has acted improperly or dishonestly. If the hon. gentleman can prove it, that is fine. If he cannot, I suggest that he take the honourable route and make the same assumption that everybody else does in the Western society, that somebody is innocent until proven guilty.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
I have another question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister, has the policy of the administration with respect to conflict of interest changed since the hon. the Premier made this following statement in the course of that same debate on November 8, 1982 - it is on page 4858 - where the Premier talks about the reform which is involved here as "trying to reform and to put into practice what we have all preached for years, to try to make sure that the perception - " - Mr. Speaker, and then the Premier deviates a little: "it is one thing to be just, it is another thing to be perceived to be just - " - Does that sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? And the Premier goes on - "and here we are taking tangible, concrete action to ensure that the potential conflict " -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Question! Question!

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

I would like to remind the hon. member that he is really making a long quote instead of asking a supplementary question.

MR. BARRY:  
It is not a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, it is a new question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Alright, carry on.

MR. BARRY:  
The Premier said, 'and here we are taking tangible, concrete action to ensure that the potential conflict of interest situations, which come up for ministers daily and weekly and for public servants daily and weekly, are covered by some kind of guideline and some kind of regulation to ensure that what we want to happen, the perception we want to be abroad actually becomes the perception.' Has the administration changed since that statement, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
No, Mr. Speaker, this administration has not changed its policy. It still maintains a policy of honesty and integrity in government and I think it is recognized as that. So I will say to the hon. gentleman with his perceptions and all the rest of

it, no, it has not changed. The policy is the same. Now, that is the yardstick. You and Rex take it down in your little hovel and see what you can make of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, another question. I would like to ask the Government House Leader, has the policy of the administration of which he is a member changed since, on that same day, the Premier made the following statement, Mr. Speaker. Having referred to the responsibilities that were already there in terms of filing conflict of interest statements, he said: "That is there for anybody to get at any time, the information in the conflict of interest statements. It is already there. What we are doing now is improving upon that as it relates to potential conflict of interest, which has nothing to do with what I own, what I possess, but has to do with the day to day running of government as it relates to loans and grants, getting land, getting jobs, and all the rest of it, to bring it one step further, to improve upon a very valuable piece of legislation that was there all of the time." Would the minister confirm, has there been any change of policy since the Premier made that statement?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, you know, I could respond all day to these questions. I will just say again, no, there has been no change in the policy of the government. The hon. gentleman now has gone from allegations of dishonesty to saying that I am honest, to saying that even though I am honest I must now prove I am honest, and that is what the perception of conflict of interest is all about. He tries to put people on trial, that is what he is doing. If you want to extend this into the general public, it means somebody could be pulled in off the street and have to prove that they were honest before a court of law. And that is where the hon. gentleman is on some very, very weak and sick ground. I suggest that he and Rex get together. He has the answer. Mr. Speaker, the policy has not changed. Now he and Rex can sit down and make what they want of it.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I have another question. I would like to ask the minister whether there has been any change in policies since the Premeir made the following statement on the same day, on page 4851 of Hansard, Mr. Speaker, 'But secondly, Mr. Speaker, on this whole question of perception, it is not only a perception as it relates to -

MR. PATTERSON:  
No wonder your caucus is fed up

with you. No wonder they want Neary back. Two of your members are ready to come over with us now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! The Chair finds it very difficult to hear the question if there is continuous interruption.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the Premier said, 'On this whole question of perception, it is not only a perception-

MR. TOBIN:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:  
The Parliamentary Gofer.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, we have been in this House long enough listening to what is taking place here in question period today. The Leader of the Opposition is continuing asking supplementary questions that goes into a preamble, Mr. Speaker, that is usually longer than the initial question. He is continuing again today. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that for the past two or three weeks we have been listening to question period which is basically a legality debate between two hon. lawyers. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition and the President of the Council, if they have some

legal tangles or something they want to argue, let them go down on Duckworth Street in the Courthouse and do so and let us get on to the business of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and deal with the unemployed, deal with the fishing industry and the problems that have been created with the fishing industry and other related matters.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this all started from the fact that the law firm of the President of the Council took a client from the Leader of the Opposition's office

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, order!

MR. TOBIN:  
His firm took a client, Mr. Speaker, from the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) law firm and I honestly think that the House of Assembly's time is being wasted.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Would the hon. member state his point of order? He is making a speech right now.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, I will state my point of order, and that quite clearly is that the time of the House is being wasted by listening to the Leader of the Opposition, a lawyer by profession, and the President of the Council, a lawyer by profession getting on with legalities. Instead of arguing their points in the Courthouse, they are using the people's House to do so, while the unemployed, the forest workers, and everybody else in this Province who have

problems are totally ignored and I think they should be dealt with.

MR. BAKER:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:  
There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members is simply trying to use up our valuable time in question period.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the number of questions that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is asking, I find it difficult to feel that they are new questions sometimes rather than a supplementary. But in answer to the point of order raised by the hon. member, there is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Well, Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase it if Your Honour is having difficulty seeing a new question there. Would the Government House Leader confirm, Mr. Speaker, that the policy as set out by the Premier's statement to which I referred is the same policy as was held in 1972 in the Province of Ontario when Mr. Darcy McKeough spoke about perception being important? Is that not what the Premier was talking about when on page 4850, he said 'that the perception on the street'.

MR. YOUNG:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!



A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I am not on my feet everyday in the House, but I would like to draw your attention to the Standing Order 31(d). If the hon. Leader of the Opposition is not abusing question period this afternoon, I would like to know what he is doing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

The heavyweights are up now.

MR. YOUNG:

Never mind the heavyweights, you snake!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Public Works, Standing Order 31(d) reads, "Oral questions must not be prefaced by the reading of letters, telegrams, newspaper extracts or preambles of any kind." So to that point of order, I think that point is well taken. Maybe the hon. Leader of the Opposition would restrict the reading of a preamble to the bare essentials.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will restrict it to the bare essentials, as has been the tradition and the custom of this House. Now I am getting up on individual questions I am not getting up on supplementary questions, I am getting up on new questions and, Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to a reasonable preamble. I am entitled to be allowed to finish without interruption, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I ask the protection of Your Honour from the harassment that has been given us today in Question Period where we are not being permitted to question this matter of vital importance going to the integrity of the entire system, Mr. Speaker. And we can understand why members opposite want to have this line of questioning cut off, but it is not going to be allowed, Mr. Speaker.

Now I would like to ask the Government House Leader -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I ask the protection of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

- Mr. Speaker, is that not what the Premier was talking about when he said "that the perception on the street of politics and politicians and of governments generally is at a very low level"? And he talks about having to elevate that perception "so that the public perception is different." Now, was not the Premier saying that as of 1982 we had the same standard as was held in Ontario, where we had that quote yesterday from Mr. Darcy McKeough, and would the Government House Leader indicate has that standard now changed and become lower?

MR. PATTERSON:

You have lowered it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:



Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The standard in government has now lowered but the standard in Opposition, even though it was thought to be inconceivable, most certainly has.

Mr. Speaker, I am not worried about the perception that the people of the public have about me but I think that the hon. gentleman should have a little bit of concern over the perception that fiar minded in the Province of Newfoundland would have with respect to him and his line of questioning.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is another new question. With respect to the failure of the Government House Leader to file a written letter with the Premier disqualifying himself from Cabinet discussions when clients interests are discussed, I would like to ask the minister whether the policy of the administration of which he is a member has changed since the Premier, in response to the now member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), had said, "Must we 'assume' that everything is going to be okay?" said, "We are not going to assume everything is going to be okay. We are going to actually make sure everything is going to be okay. Assumption are one thing, actions are another"?

And he goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "It is not a very good defense for any member of government or for any member of the Legislature to say for that matter, after something happens, 'Well, I just assume that everybody understood the principles under which we operate.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that not what the minister is doing? Is he not saying after the fact what his method of operation was rather than following those guidelines that we laid down by the Premier for the very reason we are talking about today, so that we cannot assume that everything was okay?

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

We are being subjected to the most ridiculous outburst in this House, one was disposed of 2500 years ago by the Greeks who recognized that the syllogism: 'The minister has two eyes. Crooks have two eyes. Therefore he is a crook' is a most ridiculous line of reasoning and should be thrown out utterly.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

That just shows what the hon. gentleman is doing. He thinks that if somebody has an interest he is to be assumed to have that in conflict with his public duty and you have to put him on trial.

So he is conducting, I might say, a very bad cross-examination over there.

The fact of the matter is that things are not after the fact, they are before the fact. The fact of the matter is I have never been in a conflict position with respect to anything that I have done in my government duties. If the hon. gentleman does not believe that, I cannot help it. If the hon. gentleman wants to continue to press this and carry on his little innuendos and what have you, I cannot help that. The fact of the matter is that the policy of this government, I say, has not changed. This government is the most open and honest, and the government with the greatest degree of integrity of any government that has ever been in this Province. That is why we have stayed in power and that is why we are going to stay in power for many years yet to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
While the hon. gentleman - I say, Mr. Speaker, as a little diversion - was questioning me, one of my colleagues asked for yet another autograph on that famous Atlantic Accord.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
It could be the Leader of the Opposition could have been there, but I do not think he could have. The only picture of the Leader of the Opposition would be of him pushing a wheelbarrow to Jean Chretien with all the interests of the people of Newfoundland, and all their money. Do not be so

jealous, my little boy!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
I would like to ask the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
- Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), whether the Minister of Justice, in her instructions to departmental officials, is adopting the definition of conflict of interest that is being set out by the Government House Leader? Is the Minister of Justice taking the position with respect to ministers, with respect to public employees, with respect to members of boards and members of commissions, that the interpretation to be given to The Conflict of Interest Act means that it is only where there has been a dishonesty proven that there is something for her department to investigate? Must the Opposition, or must any member of this House, prove dishonesty before the minister takes it upon herself to ask her departmental officials to make enquiries?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:  
Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Justice and Attorney General, and as a member of the administration of the present Premier, I accept and abide by the definition of

conflict of interest which has been embraced by this administration which is set out in official government documents, including The Conflict of Interest Guidelines for minister and for public servants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether law officers of the Crown have supplied the minister with a definition of conflict of interest under the Conflict of Interest Act and the Conflict of Interest Guidelines as they currently apply in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, since I have been minister I have had no reason to request of any lawyers in the employ of the Department advice on the definition of conflict of interest. The matter of conflict of interest has been dealt with quite fully, and I believe properly by the administration, was so dealt with a couple of years ago, and the members of the administration are all now abiding by the conflict of interest policy as set out in the guidelines and regulations.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is just time for a very short question and answer.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the minister, with respect, for example, the meaning of 'qualifying share.' Have the law officers of the Crown been requested to supply a definition of qualifying share as it is contained in the Conflict of Interest Act?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have had no reason to do that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Question has now expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, by leave.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you.

Would the Minister of Justice indicate how the Premier, then, could bring in a decision with respect to their being only qualifying shares without receiving such an interpretation?

MR. TOBIN:

No, leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNG:

Leave is withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I asked if there was leave of the House and I understood that there was leave. When the question was asked two members then said that there was not leave. I indicated that there was leave at the time, so I am going to allow that question and the answer to same.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, what I said is that I personally have not discussed with the lawyers in the Department of Justice the definition of qualifying share in the Companies Act as I have had no reason to do that. Now it is quite possible, and perhaps probable, that lawyers in the department, who are doing work for various departments and agencies of government, in their capacity as providing opinions to those respective departments have indeed provided opinions on the subject of the definition of a qualifying share for Executive Council, for people giving direct advice to the Premier on this question. But I personally have not commissioned any opinions from staff of the department on this subject.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion one, Supplementary Supply,

Mr. Speaker.

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

#### Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I want to carry on along the lines that I was talking yesterday, about the lack of initiative of this government in terms of creating employment for the people of this Province. It is absolutely disgraceful, Mr. Chairman, to realize that we have been sitting in this House now for several weeks and we have not seen the government, not one Cabinet minister, advance one single policy or one single programme that is going to create any jobs for the people of this Province.

Here we are, Mr. Chairman, with the highest rate of unemployment in modern history and this government, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WINDSOR:

Ask a question.

MR. LUSH:

I asked questions yesterday. When we ask a question we cannot get a straight answer because this government has no employment

policy and they have no job creation strategy. I will ask a question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the President of the Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

I have been sitting in this House since this House opened and not one question has come from the Opposition to me or most other ministers on this side. All they have gotten into is their petty politics. I sat here for five and a half years as Minister of Development. I got one question on all the resource developments in this Province in five and a half years. That is how interested these people are, Mr. Chairman, in the economy, in resource development and in job creation in this Province. All they are interested in is their minor, petty politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We will get to the minister in due course. Mr. Chairman, if there have not been any questions addressed to him, it has a lot to do with the fact that he has done nothing, Mr. Chairman. He has done nothing in his time as minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

But the minister need not be concerned, Mr. Chairman. There is underbrush to be cleared away and he is part of that underbrush, while we deal with the main stump.

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, I have to take exception to the remarks raised by the Leader of the Opposition as it relates to the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor). The facts are very clear. The people of the Marystown Shipyard would certainly prove what I am saying. When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was the minister responsible for the Marystown Shipyard, he threatened to close it. When the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) became responsible for it, he revived it and made it a very viable operation that showed a profit.

MR. CALLAN:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman, the President of Treasury Board and other ministers tried to insinuate that the sole reason for question period is for the Opposition -

MR. TOBIN:

Follow your leader.

MR. CALLAN:

You just had your words. - to ask questions about jobs. The House of Assembly is only open for three months of a year. It is the duty and the responsibility of government to create jobs twelve months of the year. Do we have to ask questions in order for government to create jobs? What silly nonsense.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, we have just seen an illustration of what happens when we talk about unemployment. The minister did not want to hear about it so he gets on questionable points of order. Hon. members opposite do not want to be questioned about unemployment because they know it is the number one problem in this Province and they know, Mr. Chairman, it was the mandate that the Premier used to get elected. He asked for a mandate to create jobs. Where are the jobs?

The hon. minister gets up and talks about all of the jobs created in development, all the jobs in the resource sector. Well, Mr. Chairman, it has not changed the rates of percentage any. We are still hovering around 20 per cent. Where are the jobs? Again, I ask the minister, let the minister get up and answer this question if he is so excited and enthusiastic about the jobs that he has created.

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, if the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is going to get up and make all of these accusations he might as well address and give the House the information. He is here pretending to be the great critic of labour and the great friend of labour. Why does he not lay on the table how many thousands of jobs that have been created in the past twelve months?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, again, every time an hon. member stands over there on a point of order it shows, Mr. Chairman, how sensitive they are about this issue of unemployment. Mr. Chairman, no one is going to muzzle this member from talking about unemployment in this House. I will have lots of opportunities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

I know hon. members are embarrassed. They are embarrassed to tears. I know they do not want to talk about unemployment. Well, Mr. Chairman, it exists and this government is doing absolutely nothing in terms of reducing the rate of unemployment in this Province - absolutely nothing. If the minister wants to show the people of this Province otherwise,



let him stand in his place today and tell the people of this Province by how many percentage points his government plans to reduce unemployment over the next twelve to twenty-four months. If they have an employment plan, let them tell the people of this Province by how many percentage points they plan to reduce the level of unemployment over the next twelve to twenty-four months. Let us not hear the minister get up and talk in vagaries and generalities, Mr. Chairman, but let the minister get up, either the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) and tell the people, tell them today, tell them their plan of attack with respect to employment creation in this Province and let him tell the people today by what percentage points his government plans to reduce unemployment over the next twelve to twenty-four months. Let him do that now. That will certainly let the people of this Province know that they have a plan, that they are not adrift, that they have a job creation strategy for this Province. Let the minister tell the people that now, Mr. Chairman. Otherwise, the people of this Province will know that the Premier's mandate to create jobs was nothing but a colossal bluff. It was a hoax, Mr. Chairman. Let the minister get in his place, either the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) and answer these specific questions, not prattle and prate vagueries and generalities about jobs here and about this resort sector. Tell us about the jobs, tell us about the systematic and the substained plan that they have over the next twelve to twenty-four months in terms of attacking this vicious

unemployment problem that we have. Let us hear that, Mr. Chairman, this is what I am waiting for. I raised the question yesterday and the Minister of Finance just got up and talked about jobs that will be created in the offshore, jobs that will be created in the forestry and jobs in the future.

When the people of Newfoundland responded to the Premier's call to give him a mandate to create jobs, they were not talking about two years down the road, they were not talking about three years down the road, they were not talking about five years down the road. They were expecting to see the Premier give a plan for this year, they were expecting to see a plan, they were expecting to hear of the job strategy program for this Province and we have not got one, Mr. Chairman.

If hon. members, ministers cannot get up and tell the people how they systematically are planning to go about reducing the levels of unemployment in this Province, then Mr. Chairman that clearly is an indication that this government has no plan, that they do not know what to do about the unemployment problem in this Province and that they are just a government that is drifting along, Mr. Chairman, without any sense of direction.

It is the largest problem that we have Mr. Chairman, in this Province. It is a vicious problem, a cancerous problem and I am not sure that all hon. members, and particularly ministers, realize the gravity and the seriousness of the unemployment problem that is gripping this Province today. People are frustrated and do not know where to turn. People not able to live



according to any kind of proper standards; people are hungry; people are without clothes or proper shelter; people are not able to keep their homes properly with tremendous frustrations, Mr. Chairman. Here they are waiting to hear from this government, waiting to hear their employment strategies for all levels of society and the minister has got the nerve to get up and just talk in generalities and vagueries. If the minister clearly wants to show the people of this Province what he is doing, if he wants to show how sincere they are, let him today stand in his place and report to the people of this Province in terms of by what percentage point they plan to reduce unemployment over the next twelve to twenty-four months. What is their target for the level of unemployment? Is it to keep it at twenty per cent? There is no effort to keep it at twenty per cent, so what is the target level? Tell the people of the Province today, give them some hope and optimism for the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. KELLAND:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just let me say, before I get into my own comments, that my colleague certainly nailed the nail right on the head, there is no question about that. Everybody in our Province recognizes our major problem and everything stems from

the fact that we are much less than we should be in the field of employment and unemployment. We have nonstudent young people up to twenty-five years of age who are approaching the fifty per cent level of unemployment. If you think it is bad on the Island of Newfoundland, consider more remote like Labrador and Naskaupi district. It is frightening and discouraging to every single soul in this Province who has a care for what happens to the people here and whether or not they have decent jobs and are not put in this soul-destroying situation that they are now in and have been in under the present administration. It is disgusting and I totally support what my colleague just said.

As we adjourned debate yesterday, I was about to mention some areas where both sides of the House could see some co-operation. There are areas in which we could co-operate, but before I go into that - I hope to get a chance during debate to hit on these items - I would like to talk about the effects of the fuel adjustment charges as relates to electricity in our Province, particularly in areas that have diesel generated power. Within the Naskaupi district itself we have one small community, Mud Lake, which is subject to this particular aspect of the extra charges caused by the fuel adjustment system. Now, beyond that, of course, we have my colleague's district of Eagle River, which is subject to the same sort of a situation, and within Labrador itself the Torngat Mountains region. Even though we have heard the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) get up and try to sound like an opposition member, on occasion, so he can send copies of Hansard up there

and thereby mislead the people of his district that he is actually doing something for them, I would like to see him up more often and have a greater input into what is happening to his people and his district.

I have gotten calls from people in Torngat Mountains saying, 'Jim when are you going to also speak? We have to do something about the fuel adjustment charges,' which they see as an Island-based problem. If we can believe the releases yesterday about the increased charges now under fuel adjustment, people in the diesel generated areas will now be paying three times more than they normally would pay under fuel adjustment for the month of November and perhaps for December as well. This is based on the less than normal rainfall that would allow for more hydro generated power. The people in Mud Lake cannot understand what they call an island problem. They are saddled with something that they call an island problem. They are a very small community, with no tax base, subject to all kinds of conditions and extremes of weather, with much longer Winters than you have on the Island of Newfoundland and still, under an averaging basis, they are forced to pay a fuel adjustment charge over which they have no control.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
It is cruel.

MR. KELLAND:  
It is cruel, indeed it is. My colleague says it is cruel. It is about time that the House really addressed that situation. What bearing at all does a rainfall in the Holyrood area have on the poor people in Mud Lake who were forced to pay, during November, three

times what they would normally pay on a fuel adjustment charge. It is just unfair and it is cruel. It is showing an absolute disrespect for a small community that is in no position to defend itself, except perhaps through the way we can do it here, as members of the House of Assembly.

Looking at the question only of a longer Winter. Under normal circumstances we could expect Winter, say in the Naskaupi district and in other parts of Labrador, perhaps earlier in the Torngat Mountains, but in the Naskaupi district a month earlier than most parts of the Island. That means higher fuel bills and heating costs over a longer period of time, higher food costs, and lower quality in food because of the long Winter months when a lot of this stuff has to be stored in there. Mud Lake residents are subject to even more charges and more extremes that might be experienced, say, in Happy Valley-Goose Bay or perhaps the Menihek district, Labrador City and Wabush. They really, as I have said before, do not understand why they would be subject to a fuel adjustment charge over which they have no control and which they definitely see as an island-based problem. They are not so much complaining that they have to pay for the fuel consumed, but rather charge that they see it as cruel and unfair to them in their particular circumstances in Labrador.

I totally support that and I call on other members of the House of Assembly who have constituents who are in areas where there is diesel generated power to also speak on behalf of their constituents.

On the other subject that I

started to address yesterday, there is an area where, I think, a deal of co-operation could be appreciated here in the House of Assembly. There is frequently a call from the government side to have the official opposition support them on various issues and there is an area that relates, again specifically, to Naskaupi district in which there could be a level of co-operation but I think a more positive approach than has been taken to date is what may be required, Mr. Chairman. I speak specifically about the use of Goose Airport for increased military activity. I understand from statements from the government side that they are in support of an extended or an expanded use of Goose Airport for military purposes and perhaps, hopefully at some future time, for civilian use as well. The Opposition's position on that is basically the same. In a general sense and in a specific sense we support the expanded use of Goose Airport for military and NATO uses. There is a rider on that though, to a degree, in that within Labrador there are three ethnic origin. I do not need to go into great detail but there are three levels of concern if you talk about ethnic origins in that we have the Inuit, whom some people refer to as the Eskimo people, the Innu, often referred to as Indian people and, of course, those of European background. They are scattered throughout the region of Labrador but more concentrated with respect to ethnic origin in various regions and various electoral districts.

Besides supporting the greater use of Goose Airport as a viable operation and one that will have great economic benefit, not only

to Naskaupi district and Labrador generally, but the entire Province I would suggest, we take it a little further than the government has been doing up to now. Even though the Native peoples may have an opposing view with respect to the expanded use of Goose Airport for military purposes, they disagree with our position in that, but we do maintain that the Innu and Inuit in Labrador have as much right as any other residents, or those of other ethnic origins in the territory, in the region, and we would fight for their opportunity to have some input into what happens. In other words, what I am saying here is that we do support expanded military use and a greater defence dollar being spent at the Goose Airport in Naskaupi district, but we would have to and we do recognize the right of the Native Labrador people - the aboriginal people - to have some input into what transpires. They should have every possible opportunity to say which areas of the region they are more concerned with and every opportunity to express their concerns over the effects on wildlife.

I do appreciate and welcome the statement recently in the House by the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) in that a study will be undertaken to try to decide the effects of low level flying on the health of Native people. In fact, I suppose - the study should be comprehensive enough to include the possible effects or the potential effects on all residents of Labrador and not just simply restricted to one ethnic group.

I welcome that kind of an input. I go along, however, with the criticism of my colleague from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) who

suggested that it was quite a long time coming and that that sort of thing should have been entered into a long time ago. We would like to think of it as not a form of lip service in that because of the militant stand by a lot of the aboriginal people that the minister and the government has now decided, "Well, gee whiz we had better do something about that. Let us start a study." I hope the intent of the study is a meaningful one and it will give some results that are believable and creditable.

So, in that regard, we do support, as the government apparently does, the use of Goose Airport by NATO and by the Canadian Armed Forces and a continued and expanded use by those who are already there. We do defend the right and will fight for the right of the Native people to have their say and have their input into what transpires, how the plans are accomplished, and what exactly happens so that their rights in all developments of that and any other nature are defended to the fullest possible extent.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. KELLAND:  
If I can just make a closing comment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Leave is granted.

MR. KELLAND:  
Even though the groups are a minority, they certainly, and every single individual in the

Innu and Inuit communities, deserve exactly the same sort of treatment and deserve to be recognized as citizens equal to everybody else in Labrador, and in the Province, of course.

I close this section for the moment, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps I will discuss one or two other items I have at a later time in the debate. Thank you.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Chairman;

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to deal with a very important topic in our Province, basically the youth. The member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has pointed out that the number of unemployed in our Province is staggering, moreso among our youth, and the only thing we as a legislative body can do is vote money to the various departments, in particular the Department of Education, to make sure that they have the opportunity to get a good education and then, whether they find employment in this Province or elsewhere, we have the satisfaction of knowing they are qualified.

I hope the Minister of Educaiton (Mr. Hearn) is within hearing distance, and if he is not, I hope he will read what I have to say. I want to deal with the issue of bursary students in our Province who have to go from small schools and, at the age of eleven, twelve or thirteen, leave their families and go to a larger community and board for the full academic year in order to get an education.

At present there are only 115 students who are making use of this programme. But there are twenty-three different communities around our Province which do not have any secondary high school levels I, II and III, and some have even less than that, and the students have to go outside these communities.

Now, only 115 students are taking part in this programme and one of the reasons the number is so small can be attributed to the outstanding dropout rate in our rural communities. The report that was done on the dropout rate, by the DEC's and the NTA, pointed out that in some rural areas the dropout rate is as high as 80 per cent or 90 per cent. I have communities in my district, and I am sure it is happening in the other twenty-three communities where they have to send the students to larger areas, where the dropout rate is 100 per cent.

So what are we doing for these 115 students who want to further their education and in order to do so have to leave their homes and the support students normally get from their families? These students do not get that support, they are out in boarding homes. And, Mr. Chairman, a lot of them have difficulty finding good boarding homes, the reason being they only get \$150 per month. Now let us make a comparison. These 115 students get \$150 per month for their education, out of which they have to buy books, clothes, pay their board, travel to and from their communities during the Christmas and Easter breaks, as well as the original trip in September and the return trip in June. No extra money is provided for that, Mr. Chairman, they just get that \$150 per month, while the

hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), we learned today in Question Period, has hired himself an advisor at \$150 per hour. What a difference!

These students, the cream of those communities, who have to overcome great difficulties in those small schools, such as multiple grades, not enough teachers, schools having to be heated by wood stoves or oil stoves, electricity having to be generated - in Norman's Bay and Pinsent Arm - having to study at home by oil lamp, these 115 students get \$150 per month, while the government is paying out \$150 per hour to an advisor to the President of the Council.

Further to that, the Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission, as was pointed out today, gets a \$200 monthly stipend, and a \$70 hourly rate for meetings. Where is the equality?

MR. J. CARTER:

Here, look!

MR. HISCOCK:

Where is the equality? The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), a former Minister of Education, probably has to bear some responsibility for the fact that these students get \$150. A few years ago they only received \$75 but now it is up to \$150.

Mr. Chairman, you have to consider that some of these young men and women in Level I, or Grades X, XI, and XII, are involved in sports and need a lot of sports equipment, they have great appetites, and they need pocket money etc. And, as the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) said, a lot so these students are from the most remote rural and poorest communities in our Province. We



have a dropout rate as high as 100 per cent in a lot of these communities. I would venture to say we should have at least 2000 students in this bursary programme. The fact that we only have 115 students participating is one of the greatest criminal acts that is being perpetrated on the youth of this Province by this government. Because the allowance is only \$150 per month, a lot of parents will not send their children out of the communities because they cannot find anyone to board them. Also, a lot of students do not want to leave their loved ones. Yet, with the advanced technology at our disposal today, has there been an attempt to develop a system of education for remote places, such as videos and other things, to help these students? No, Mr. Chairman. I hope and I pray and I wish that the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), who spent I do not know how much money on a television commercial to encourage people to get involved in the election of Boards of Education, in next year's budget we will see this mere pittance of \$150 raised and we will see also other support given to these remote communities and schools. It is amazing when you look at it. People say, 'Oh, it is 115 students so it does not really matter. Give them \$200. Give them \$300,' but money is not the answer.

The criminal act that is being perpetrated, Mr. Chairman, is how many students are not getting through those systems? How many students are having to read by oil lamps? They are not like the Premier, with his own chef and dining hall, his rent paid and his chauffeur and X number of other things. These are the young people of our Province, Mr.

Chairman, who are grappling, who are going to have to face the realities of life, and the realities of life in this Province are very, very bleak with our high unemployment, Mr. Chairman.

I would hope, as I said, that at least if we cannot give them a job, we can give them an education. The only way we will be able to give those students an education in those remote areas is to increase the financial contribution. They at least should be given two trips a year, over and above the amount of money that they are getting. If you get through Grade XII, Mr. Chairman, you at least can make use of the student loans and the grants. Maybe the Minister of Education and maybe the Premier, who was a former educator himself, feel that that is fine, that is good enough, but I do not think it is, Mr. Chairman. Here we are paying somebody in our Province on a consulting basis \$150 an hour and here we are trying to get people to take in students of eighteen and nineteen years of age, do their laundry, make their beds and cook three meals a day for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Chairman, I hope I will see an increase for this in next year's budget.

MR. HEARN:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly I must say it is a delight to see my critic back in the House. It is rather lonesome here this past few weeks when nobody bothered to ask questions concerning education in the Province. All directions were geared towards another topic that probably had absolutely nothing to do with the problems that exist out there, one of which is the problem that we face in relation to education in the Province generally.

The member, in a very sincere way, has addressed one of the problems that affects people in his district. In fact right now, at present, there are a couple of people from his own district, I know, experiencing severe difficulties because of the very problem he just mentioned.

He did refer to the fact that a few years ago the bursary was considerably less. In fact, in 1982, when I came in here for the first time, I had a community in my own district, and the children from it went to a larger area on bursaries. At that time the bursary was \$100 per month. I approached the then Minister of Education (Ms Verge) and, hopefully, with my persuasion and that of others, the bursary was increased at that time to \$150. That was a 50 per cent jump in one year. However, if you look at \$150 now towards assisting a person who is in, say, Grade X, XI or XII - actually, level one, two or three, and in some cases Grade IX - considering the fact that that bursary could be the only source of funding that parents have to send their child to another community - quite often the parents themselves are in the position where they cannot afford to put in too much extra - then

\$150 given to some other person in the far community to board that person is certainly not a very great reward when you consider at least three meals a day, plus lunches, if you consider responsibility for the child, and when you consider having quite often to do the clothes and so on that the children have. You are looking at paying somebody about \$5 a day for those services. It is certainly not very much. I am well aware of it. I personally experienced it and it is one of the things that we are looking at for the coming budget certainly and hopefully we can do something to help those people out.

It should be pointed out, however, that a bursary or a scholarship or anything else is certainly not designed to pay the full shot for education, but it is an assistance to help people go outside when the opportunities are not available locally.

We have 115 students who are presently obtaining bursaries, as the member mentioned, from twenty-four communities around the Island. A few years ago the number was considerably higher, but because of the progress made by the present government in relation to transportation developments, we are now paying \$22 million a year for busing, and because of improvements in the transportation services throughout the Island, road improvements in particular, many people who could not readily get to school daily, travel to school today by bus. Among those who had to go outside their home communities, quite a few did not, of course, decide to continue their education. When they got to the age where they had to leave home to go to another school for Grade IX, X and XII,



many of them dropped out because of two reasons: number one, they did not want to leave their own home; number two, because the bursary was so small, I guess, the parents could not afford to send them. As I say, the bursary was not designed to pay the full shot, it was designed to help out. Unfortunately, I suppose, several dropped by the wayside.

Because of improvements in bus transportation, in roads around the Province many children who could not ordinarily get to school now can go daily and we do not have to see as many leave home and go for a week and, in some cases, go for longer periods and a couple of times a year, perhaps, that is all they get home - Christmas and Easter.

There are places in the Province and, especially as it relates to parts of Labrador, where, due to geography, the bursary might be in place for sometime. Hopefully not, but in the event it is, then I think we have the responsibility of seeing especially the parents who are in the low income bracket do receive as much assistance as possible. We will certainly be looking at that.

However, as I mentioned, despite the fact that we do have now 115, there are, undoubtedly, in those areas from which the 115 come, some students presently who opted to drop out and stay home in their own communities for the two reasons I mentioned, one, they do not want to leave their own community to go elsewhere to go to school; and secondly, in cases, and I know of cases, where parents say "well, we just cannot afford to send the child to school. That is half enough to cover his board and we cannot afford to pay the

rest, nor can we afford the other necessities that the students need when they are away from home." So we have a responsibility there, as I mentioned.

The things that should not be forgotten in all of this, however, his, as we look at problems today, not only in education, but in relation to our fisheries, our roads etc., we complain about what we have not got. I think we are all guilty perhaps of not looking back and seeing what we did not have some years ago. When we do that and look at the numbers, when we look at the disadvantaged in those days, and we look at the tremendous opportunities we have today, then we can see that we have come a long way. We have come a long way because a lot of money has been spent in the right directions. Hopefully, there will come a time when we will have utopia, but it is not here now and we have to try to make the best of what we have and to try to spend the dollars well and wisely.

We have made advances in education, not just through monies that have been spent in education alone, but through dollars that have been expended through road improvements, transportation etc. which have helped in many ways to improve the educational facilities and opportunities around our Province.

For the next three years the department has committed \$20 million a year to capital construction. This is committed \$20 million a year to capital construction. This is a tremendous increase over what it has been in the past and has enabled a number of areas to plan a bit ahead. We will be hopefully looking at extending that

commitment so that they can make plans down the road a bit in relation to new facilities in certain areas.

Just a few days ago I had the opportunity of going out for the official opening of a new high school in Carbonear and any members who are anywhere in the area should drop in to see that school because it is a ultramodern facility which offers the type of opportunities that we would possibility never think possible in the Newfoundland setting.

The member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) mentioned that some children have been so disadvantaged that they had to learn by the light of a kerosene lamp. In this day and age that is certainly nothing to be proud of. Once again, if we look back, there were certainly some members over there and members on this side, including myself, who did learn under the light of the kerosene lamp and I certainly pity any child who still does today. The hon. Chairman did not, apparently, he was one of the more fortunate ones, but I pity anybody in this day and age who has to try to work under those conditions. It is a matter, once again, of looking at priorities and one of the chief priorities in the Province is the education of our young. If we do not look after that, then we have a very poor foundation to build upon.

I would like to mention to the member, I hope, as he said of me, that he is within hearing distance, that I appreciate his concern for the students who go on burseries. I am aware of it, we are looking at it and, hopefully, in the near future we can do something to offset some of the

problems and the difficulties that he is facing.

Thank you.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
I certainly appreciate the minister comments as they relate to the education problem around the Province.

I wonder how the minister felt the other night, when he watched the late news and saw the chairman (Dr. Howse) of the Royal Commission looking into the problem of unemployment and employment opportunities in the Province, as he dressed down the education system in this Province and he talked about how the education system is really bad in terms of giving our young people the necessary skills to partake in the labour force beyond education. I think one of the phrases that the chairman used at that time was that perhaps what our young people need to do is to create a revolution in the education system - turn her on her head. We all know about revolutions, one only has to look south beyond the Florida Quays. I think he was also inferring as well that the problem of youth unemployment is so engrained and branded upon the conscience of this Province that everybody is willing to walk around and say, "There is no problem. Where is the problem? What are you talking about? What problem?" Again, he used the would revolution, revolt, to get up in arms, to show that you are mad.

I noticed the President of the Treasury Board give his maiden speech here today for five seconds on a point of order and give a little miniature tirade about how nobody asks him questions about unemployment. Ask him questions about unemployment! Well, let us look at unemployment because this government has been in power for eight months on a mandate clearly spelled out to the people from Port au Port, where they have pockets of unemployment as high as ninety per cent, has it improved? Will the member for Port au Port tell us if it has improved? He will have his opportunity to stand here, perhaps in a few minutes and tell us about those improvements in Port au Port.

What we seen the President of the Treasury Board do today is to stand here and say, "Ask us questions about development. Ask us questions about employment. Ask us questions about unemployment." This government has been in for eight long months and we are heading into the winter months now, Mr. Chairman. We are going to be seeing seasonally adjusted figures coming out, not the actual rate, but seasonally adjusted figures and those are going to drive the unemployment rate up. Let us look at some of the figures that were released last week for Newfoundland and Labrador in terms of unemployment.

On the Avalon Peninsula the unemployment rate last week we are told from Statistics Canada was 16.8 per cent. Can you imagine? The Avalon Peninsula, near St. John's where they have hundreds of millions of dollars worth of construction last year, all kinds of it. What hope do we have beyond the Overpass? What hope do

we have? On the Burin South Coast, where the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) jumps up and down and pounds on his chest and rails out at how wonderful everything is down there, it was 17.3 per cent.

MR. TOBIN:

What is your solution?

MR. FUREY:

In Central Newfoundland and the Northeastern section of Newfoundland, it was 16 per cent. Let us get to the worse section of all, Western Newfoundland, which includes the great district of St. Barbe, and the Northern Peninsula in its entirety and Labrador. It went from 19 per cent up to 21.2 per cent. It jumped 3 percentage points! Now, these are not the seasonally adjusted figures, these are the actual figures. What hope do we have as the long Winter months begin to set in when we get these kinds of desperate and desolate and horrific unemployment figures.

I want to go beyond just the unemployment statistics that we have currently because it is one thing to talk about unemployment as it stands now and quite another to talk about possible things that could drive unemployment further up. Let me just reiterate and repeat for the record and for this hon. House the problem, as I foresee it, in the community of Daniel's Harbour. In Daniel's Harbour, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), when he was the Minister of Mines and Energy, I believe, negotiated with Tech Corporation out of Vancouver and another corporation, I believe, out of the United States - a minority shareholder - to come into Daniel's Harbour and open a zinc mine and he did a terrific

job. As a result of his hard work, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Minister of Mines, he brought in a company that created well over 200 jobs, 170 directly down in the mine. That mine has been operating for ten and a half years. It has a current payroll of \$4 million for that little community of Daniel's Harbour.

Now, just picture this, Mr. Chairman. We have a mine operating for ten and a half years, providing an excellent source of employment for 200 people and along comes the hon. the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Neilsen), that great consultative Yukon Eric and what does he say? He says, "Let us reopen the Cyprus Anvil Mine in the Yukon. Forget that it is in my district," the hon. Deputy Prime Minister said, "forget that. My business is to create jobs. So why not start in the Yukon, north of White Horse in a little community called Faro."

So what did he do, Mr. Chairman, he went to the Cabinet table of Canada and he managed somehow, I do not know how, because he is the man in charge of cutting programmes back to the bone, cutting back transfer payments by the year 1990 to Newfoundland, I think the amount was - and the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) perhaps can correct me - well over \$200 million, I believe, by 1990 was it? This is the man who went to the table, he cut back with the left hand and whatever he cut back he doused it over and decked it over and shuffled it over to the right hand and he came up with \$18 million to reopen a defunct mine that the private sector walked away from in 1982 in Faro in the Yukon - \$18 million in grants, guaranteed

loans and subsidies.

The hon. member for St. John's North can tell me to shut up but there are 200 jobs on the line here. You know nothing about it because you suffer the overpass blindness. That is your problem.

Do not ask questions. Do not provide solutions. Do not say anything, shut up, be a Tory or get out. That is your solution, a savoury solution.

MR. J. CARTER:

How about some solutions?

MR. FUREY:

Here is the solution.

MR. J. CARTER:

What is the solution?

MR. FUREY:

Here it is. There are 200 jobs on the line in Daniel's Harbour, 200 miners and administrative personnel worked very hard and they supplied good, hard earned taxes to the Federal Treasury.

MR. J. CARTER:

So, what are you saying?

MR. FUREY:

What I am saying is let us rethink this massive subsidy going into the Yukon because are we going to take tax dollars from the miners in Daniel's Harbour to reactivate a mine that the mining executives across this country say cannot work. Take their tax dollars to put 200 people to work in the North and knock them out of work on the Great Northern Peninsula, is that your logic? That is Tory talk. The problem is this, you are so blinded by your blue-blooded buddies in Ottawa that you do not look at logic. Apply your Greek syllogisms to

that problem in Daniel's Harbour.

Mr. Chairman, I have telexed the hon. Deputy Prime Minister and I have pointed out that there could be as high as 200 jobs in jeopardy because of this massive infusion, \$18 million of subsidies, guaranteed loans and the sort going into the Yukon. I have asked him to rethink it, to weigh it in a part of the country that Mr. Kirby and his entire Commission called one of the two or three most grossly underdeveloped areas of the Nation - not of Newfoundland, not of the Maritimes, of the Nation. And what are they doing? They are taking one of the most stable areas of employment - the zinc mining industry - and they are possibly closing it down because Mr. Nielsen wants to score political points with his Tory buddies in Faro, North of Whitehorse. How ridiculous can you get!

MR. J. CARTER:

This is a provincial Legislature, you know.

MR. FUREY:

Does the hon. the member for St. John's North want to say something? You can rise in your place too. Otherwise, you can stop wagging your tongue. What is it going to be? Are you going to stand up and speak or are you going to listen? If you do not want to listen to me, read your newspaper because I know you do not give a damn about those miners. You never did. You have overpass glasses, big concrete glasses called overpass glasses and you cannot see beyond them. Now, reach right down by your feet and haul your intellect up to your physical height.

What else is the problem in the North, Mr. Chairman? We are waiting since 1982 for one other sector of the economy, called the fishery, to be helped. In 1982 when Ottawa tried to sign, as part of the restructuring agreement, a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation to look after the North, one of two or three of the most grossly underdeveloped parts of the country - it does not have an overpass see - what did they do? They walked away from that \$15 million agreement because they said, 'It is not on our terms.' We have been waiting ever since. Mulroney has been in power since September. This hon. government has been in power since April. That is eight months these guys have been in power. Over a year the other guys have been in power. Why have they not sat down and signed an agreement for such a desolate part of the country, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

I would like to have a little flick at the member who has done nothing for his district and talk to him about something right in his district that he has never done anything about - the Bonne Bay ferry. Let us talk about that, shall we? Let us talk about that and the neglect that the hon.



member has given that particular issue, the fact that he does not even try to do anything about it.

Here is what needs to be done for the Bonne Bay ferry. The argument that is used is that it is more expensive to put the Bonne Bay ferry off than to keep it on because of the additional expense incurred to other departments of government. Now, the hon. member, if he was doing his homework, he would go to these other departments of government and say, "Look, let us monitor the situation for a while. Let us see if these arguments hold any water." But oh, no! He is just as content to come here and mouth off and make abusive statements. Let him do his homework. There is a real issue he can get his teeth into and let us see if he will do something about it.

Now the genesis of this particular problem was a long time in the making while the hon. member was a toady for the present federal member who is out there, Brian Tobin, a lackey, I suppose, just a toady. The road that went through the -

MR. FUREY:

Is this a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. J. CARTER:

No, it is not a point of order. I am referring to gross neglect of the member's district and I am talking about an issue that is right in the heart of the member's district that he has done nothing about, he does not intend to do anything about, and has very little knowledge about.

While he was the federal member's toady, the present road through the National Park out there was

upgraded and paved. The old ferry route was the main link going up the Great Northern Peninsula. Ideally, the road should have gone somewhere in that vicinity and the bit between Woody Point and Norris Point could have been bridged. There is where your overpass could have been. If, instead of following the Woody Point Road, it has just been diverted a few miles, you would now have a road and no need for the ferry. That is all water under the bridge, literally, but, in the meantime, the member will not do his homework. He will not go to the various branches of government and say, 'Now, let us monitor this situation. Let us see how much it is costing not to have the ferry.' Maybe the ferry solution is the cheapest.

And also, while he is at it, why does he not ask various people who might wish to run a ferry to come up with proposals, instead of just sticking with one ferry operator who is not, apparently, very open about how much of a subsidy he actually needs. So there is a number of things for the hon. member to do, if he cares, but I submit he does not care; all he wants is a few headlines to come in here and mouth off. Now, I have given him a bit of homework to do, let him go and do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Was that a point of order?

MR. J. CARTER:

No, it was a speech.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. FUREY:

(Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I would not mind deferring to my colleague, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to reply to the words of wisdom by St. John.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that he ought to make that comparison between the Yukon and Daniel's Harbour and Bonne Bay. It is very interesting. It is so interesting, because once you utter something that is truthful, the ugly head of reaction arises. That is why, Mr. Speaker, they will always be a collection of negatives, a coalition of antis, a collection of malcontents, because they are not content to deal with the truth.

Here is the truth about the the Bonne Bay ferry, if the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) wants to know. You are right, a road was built, but it is still a vital link, and those people who live on the South side of Bonne Bay - and I have said that many times. Again, not only do you have concrete overpass glasses, but you have wads of concrete in your ears too, obviously, because you have not listened. You, that collection of negatives over there, took away a \$130,000 subsidy. I think the study which we initiated, which we gathered people together to do, listen to the results. The results are astounding!

On the South side of Bonne Bay,

removing that subsidy threw seventeen people out of full-time work, it threw twenty-four seasonal workers out of their jobs forever, and the figures are based on \$10,000 a year full-time, \$3,500 a year part-time, for a loss of \$254,000. Now, you do not have to be a mathematics scholar to know that if you take a \$130,000 subsidy away and you take \$254,000, over a quarter of a million dollars, away from the community, it is going to kill the community! That is what you guys are. You are killers, negatives, a coalition of antis, and that is the problem! And I am not even dealing with these people who are thrown out of work. How much will they bleed from the Treasury in social services? How much will they bleed from the Treasury in unemployment insurance? Add that to your quarter of a million dollars! You are blinkered, narrow-minded, and that is the problem! That is why the people in Bonne Bay are on to you. The gig is up!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was interested in the exchange between the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey). I am glad the member for St. Barbe has set the record straight, because obviously the member for St. John's North does not know very much about what is happening



on that coast.

Mr. Chairman, having sat through a few Question Periods and listened to the way that the ministers opposite can flick around figures - \$150 an hour - as came to light yesterday, with respect to the amount now being paid to Cabot Martin, a former employee of the Premier's Office, it is an appointment that has the potential of enabling that person, I suppose, to earn \$300,000 a year. If it can be shown that his services are needed and if they are engaged, Mr. Martin can very well earn well in excess of \$200,000 in any calendar year, and that is a lot of money, Mr. Chairman, in anybody's language.

We have heard the Premier get up and try to rationalize the appointment of Mr. Peter Lougheed, now special advisor to the Newfoundland Government at a cost to the taxpayers of this Province of at least \$40,000 a year. Again, who knows, that might, and in fact I suppose, could very well be \$100,000 or even more, all things taken into account. We hear these figures being tossed around, Mr. Chairman. We have seen ministers, with a very cavalier attitude, try and justify their actions. We have seen in recent months, for example, huge expenditures on the Premier's Office. I am told, I do not have the exact figure here, that the cost of renovating the eighth floor will be in excess of \$500,000.

We know, of course, there is a large building being erected West of Confederation Building here that I suppose will end up costing well over \$50 million.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

My namesake, I have to refer to him as my namesake.

MR. W. CARTER:

There is no relation.

MR. J. CARTER:

Although there is no relation. We admit that, there is no relation. Is he aware that any attempt to effect any repairs on the eighth floor uncovered the gross mismanagement, or gross -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Patronage.

MR. J. CARTER:

- patronage, ripoff, I should say. The way the wiring was done meant the whole place had to be rebuilt. Once they lifted off the first bit of panelling and saw what was underneath they realized that they practically had to rebuild the eighth floor. It was the neglect and the scamp labour and the poor quality workmanship that went into it in the first place - I do not know what the total expenditure was - but certainly it was the frightful job that was done in the first place.

MR. W. CARTER:

That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. CARTER:

Sure it is. We cannot allow anyone to mislead this House intentionally or otherwise. Every time anyone tries to it is a point of order and I will certainly get up.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

There is the ample justification for having television in this House. When the hon. member can get up and try to rationalize an expenditure of \$500,000, possibly more,-

MR. LUSH:  
\$800,000.

MR. W. CARTER:

\$800,000, my friend and colleague here says - \$800,000 on refurbishing an office for the Premier in times like these when we have people unemployed, the highest unemployment in recent history, when we have a fishing industry, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. YOUNG:

(Inaudible), the \$13 million dollar man.

MR. W. CARTER:

The hon. minister is stealing my line. We know whose the the \$7.8 million bionic man in this House. That is what he cost the people of Newfoundland to be elected.

MR. YOUNG:

That is what you cost the (inaudible) Fisheries Loan Board.

MR. W. CARTER:

That is the worse example of inflation, Mr. Chairman. That is the total amount \$7.8 million for the bionic man.

MR. YOUNG:

Sure half of that was given when you were in government, boy!

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, and if I listened, Mr. Chairman, if I were insane enough to accede to the request made by the hon. member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young)-

MR. YOUNG:

Name one! Name one!

MR. W. CARTER:

- I expect the Fisheries Loan Board would have been bankrupt.

MR. YOUNG:

Name one. I would not go and visit your office.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, may I have silence? I have ten minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Could we have silence, please while the hon. member is speaking.

MR. W. CARTER:

The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) just ruined four or five minutes of my time on a silly point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

These lunches at the Holiday Inns, Mr. Chairman, do not lend itself to good decorum in the House. Lunches in the Holiday Inn do not lend itself to a good decorum in the House.

MR. YOUNG:

Tell us about the plant you had up in your office, a \$250 plant?

MR. J. CARTER:

How do you know where lunch is?

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, and the member was elected and did not have the guts to defend it.

MR. YOUNG:

(Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ignore him.

MR. W. CARTER:

I will ignore him, that is right.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen figures being tossed around \$150 an hour, a potential of \$250,000 a year, if the gentleman concerned can so justify. We have seen large expenditures on the Premier's Office.

This morning I had a telephone call, I am glad the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) is in the Chamber, from a small community in my district, Pikes Arm to be specific, where there is a community well and the pump that supplies the water from that well to, I think, thirty houses in the district, including one house that is occupied by a number of senior citizens, one of whom is blind. I requested funds from the department to repair that pump, or maybe replace it, and the minister wrote me back and had the gall, having sat here for the past few days and listened to some of these figures being tossed around, had the gall to say that here were no funds available and that he would consider it in the 1985-86 budget. Mr. Chairman, an expenditure, I suppose, of maybe less than \$1,000, it might very well be less than \$1,000 to repair a water pump that would enable twenty or thirty families to have running water brought to their homes. The hon. minister, like I say, came back with an excuse that

funds were not available.

We heard a speech today by my colleague for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). I thought he made a very good speech and brought out some very good points, especially as related to unemployment. It is a very serious matter and the government opposite has not addressed the problem and they have not set targets to decrease unemployment. They are obviously drifting aimlessly around, hoping for a miracle, hoping for something on the offshore that will have the effect of curing all their problems but we all know that the age of miracles is past. Miracles seldom happen.

We have people in the Twillingate district, as we have people in other districts in Newfoundland, that are hurting and hurting seriously, unemployed people and young people. I had a call this morning from a gentleman in the Twillingate area who asked me what I could do for his daughter, eighteen years old, who just finished Grade XI. She is taken of the family allowance rolls, the tax credit, of course, is gone, no employment, unable to get any help from welfare. The family is barely scraping through. The father is a fisherman who has four or five other children in the family, barely got enough unemployment stamps this year to get unemployment insurance benefits and those that he has are low, the end result being that the amount he is going to get from unemployment insurance will probably be less than he would get on welfare.

What are we doing for those young people? There are thousands in that boat around this Province. Young adults, having just

graduated from, maybe high school, have now reached the age of eighteen where, to all intents and purposes, they are on their own as it were, certainly as far as social assistance is concerned and other government programmes. What can we do for these people? Again, we hear the government brazenly justify or at least try to justify paying Cabot Martin \$150 an hour, for how many hours, we will never know.

For example, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) took him on a trip to Japan and China. Now, the question, of course, must be asked. It is about a sixteen hour flight from St. John's to Japan and that would be about \$2,400 in fees. Was the advisor paid the full rate while he was travelling to Japan, Mr. Chairman?

He was advising on aquaculture, was it not, on fish farming. Now, I would suggest that the gentleman in question knows as much about fish farming and aquaculture as I know about nuclear physics and that is nothing. I would say that he is no better qualified to advise the government on that particular area than what I would be advising the United Nations on nuclear arms.

MR. YOUNG:

How much did you make advising on the Atlantic salmon - \$80,000 a year?

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, in the past few days we have seen evidence of hydro rates being once again jacked up. No explanation from the government side, no rationalization for allowing the company concerned to up the rates. They try to justify it by talking about fuel adjustment and all that nonsense,

the end result being, of course, that the average Newfoundland family will be paying, I am told by my friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), an additional forty-five dollars a month for his or her light bill this Winter.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. W. CARTER:

Recently we have seen, Mr. Chairman, the appointment of a Consumer Advocate, I think his correct title is, to the Public Utilities Commission, Mr. Andy Wells, who just happens to be a city councillor, which is almost a full-time job, and who just happens to be a member of the Commission for Employment.

MR. TOBIN:

No more leave, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Leave is withdrawn, I am sorry.

MR. W. CARTER:

Do I have leave to continue or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No. The hon. member's time is up.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make a few very brief comments on what has happened. The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) made

reference to what took place in Question Period. I can only say to the member for Twillingate that I sympathize with him, Mr. Chairman. I am sure I would feel exactly the same as he does when his leader comes in here every day and tries to entice the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) into a legal triangle. Obviously, it just does not wash with the interests of the public of Newfoundland. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to get involved in legalities and the law, the judgement of legal qualms, whatever they are, Mr. Chairman, why does he not do it elsewhere? The Government House Leader is not here to be part of that, the Government House Leader is here, Mr. Chairman, to represent the government, and I believe he is doing a very excellent job. He has been able to achieve what the Leader of the Opposition could not achieve. I would suggest that the actions of the Leader of the Opposition are based solely on the fact that the President of the Council has been able to negotiate an offshore agreement, something which the Leader of the Opposition was unable to do and, as a result of that, he is sitting on that side of the House today instead of on this side, in the position which he envies the Government House Leader.

As I said when I rose on a point of order earlier today, Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would do better dealing with the kinds of questions and technicalities we have heard discussed here for the past three weeks down on Duckworth Street, and I say that sincerely.

Mr. Chairman, the leader of the Opposition questioned two people

here today, one was the Government House Leader, who is a lawyer, and the other was the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) who is also a lawyer. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are other ministers in this House: There is the Minister responsible for Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), who has been involved, certainly, in a number of contracts in the Province, there is the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), who said he has had something like two questions asked of him regarding the education system in this Province, there is the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), whom the member for Twillingate just addressed, there is the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), there is the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), there is the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), there is the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). There has not been one single question addressed to these ministers, all they are doing is dealing with lawyers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the member for Twillingate gets up and he talks about unemployment - the government does not address the necessity for employment in this Province - and he alluded to the speech made by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). Why does not the member for Twillingate and the member for Bonavista North come square with this House and tell us how many thousands of jobs have been created in this Province from October, 1984 to October, 1985? They talk, Mr. Chairman, in terms of percentage. How many thousands? I know the figure. Thousands and thousands and thousands of jobs have been

created in this Province in the last year, Mr. Chairman. I know of the thousands of jobs that have been created, but the member for Twillingate, Mr. Chairman, never, ever speaks about those jobs.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) spoke in this House in response to a question.

MR. W. CARTER:

Cabot Martin is fine!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) did something in this House today that, I must say, I always thought the member for Twillingate was far above. I always thought, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Twillingate was far above making a statement like the one he made in this House just a few minutes ago. The fact of the matter is, he mentioned Cabot Martin. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) addressed that matter the other day. I am sure the member for Twillingate, and all hon. members over there, would like to be as knowledgeable in at least one field as Mr. Martin is in the many fields in which he is involved. Unfortunately, they are not, Mr. Chairman. They do not even have any knowledge of what is going on in this hon. House - all you have to do is listen to the questions they ask during Question Period.

The fact of the matter is, the Minister of Finance totally dealt with the situation yesterday as it relates to the trip to Japan, or J-pan, as the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) likes to call it. The Minister of Finance dealt with that totally, the amount it cost and what it involved, and he stated, 'No, it

was not \$150,000.'

Let me ask the member for Twillingate how much money his leader was paid by the federal government, as well as his law partners. In the past two or three years it accumulated up in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Yet, your leader came into this House and said, 'My professional ability far exceeds the numbers of dollars that are paid by the federal government.' Mr. Chairman, we know the professional ability of the Leader of the Opposition. We certainly do know. There are several of us who have copies of letters that were circulated in a professional issue by your leader. He was a member of our caucus at the time.

MR. BAKER:

Produce it.

MR. TOBIN:

Produce the letter? Produce what letter? Mr. Chairman, we can produce the letter that was circulated by the Leader of the Opposition. Is the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) and the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) saying they are not familiar with it? That is only one of them.

MR. EFFORD:

Why are you talking about it, then?

MR. TOBIN:

We do not need you or anybody else to tell us about the letter or the professional ability of your leader. We do not need any instructions from the member for Port de Grave as it relates to the professional ability of the Leader of the Opposition, I can assure you of that.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Twillingate sits in this House and



he talks about the dollars that are being paid to Mr. Martin, who is a member of the legal profession in this Province. He is no less a lawyer than anyone else in that profession in this Province because he was associated with the government, with the Premier, and with the Leader of the Opposition at one point in time, I believe, as an adviser to the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister of Energy. I never heard anybody saying anything about the credibility of the man at that time, and it is unfortunate that the member for Twillingate stands in this House and questions the ability of that person now.

As it relates, Mr. Chairman, to other issues in this Province -

MR. W. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I did not, and Hansard will prove it, cast any reflection whatever on the ability of Mr. Cabot Martin. I am questioning the need for Cabot Martin to be hired by this government at a cost of \$150 an hour. That is my only point. I have a lot of respect for the ability of Cabot Martin, but I certainly do not think we can afford the luxury of Cabot Martin right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, it is just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for St. John's West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, that is typical of the Opposition. They do not feel that this government is entitled to anyone to advise on any matters, whether they be legal opinions, or whether they be consultants' opinions on various issues. That is typical a example of the Opposition, as the member for Twillingate just quite clearly explained - 'We do not feel we deserve the luxury.' It is not a luxury, it is a necessity that this government be associated with the best possible people who are around.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Martin has been an advisor to several people. I believe he was hired, Mr. Chairman, by Mr. Doody when he was Minister of Energy and went on with Mr. Crosbie, with Mr. Barry, your Leader, with the Premier of this Province, and others in the energy field. We could afford the luxury of having him at that particular point in time, but now, all of a sudden, since Mr. Martin has gone out into the private sector and gotten involved in other areas, to hear the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) talk you would almost think that Mr. Martin, does not have the right to continue -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. TOBIN:

Do I have leave, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CALLAN:

No. Never!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I feel duty-bound to try to drag this hon. House out of the mud and gutter that we have just seen it smothered in. I will not stoop to such a depth as to even answer some of the vicious innuendo that has been cast across the floor.

I wish the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) were here, because I have some questions for him again. No doubt, he is out back again. I would like to ask a question which I am sure is going to sound totally irrelevant, but if hon. members will bear with me, I will show that indeed it does have relevance to what has been going on in this Province over the past number of years. The question that I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, is this: Has he ever bought a lotto ticket?

I want to refer members to something which happened to a very dear friend of mine many years ago. I will even say that the man was a relative. This particular person bought a lottery ticket - this was five or six years ago - and he so convinced, Mr. Chairman, that he was going to win that \$1 million that he never struck a tap for just about six months, or however long it took. He was so convinced that he had the \$1 million that he went out and financed a brand new car, Mr. Chairman, and he booked a trip to Barbados. He did not hire anybody at \$150 a hour, but he did begin to look at himself as an aristocrat. He began to think

money, he began to dress differently, he began to think that he was a wealthy man, Mr. Chairman, because he had bought the ticket; he had paid the \$10 and he was convinced that he was going to have the \$1 million and he was going to be able to live a life a leisure for the rest of the days that he had upon this planet. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is not exactly a common thing to happen to people, but I have read in various newspapers and various question and answer columns, that it is not uncommon for people to be so convinced they are going to win when they buy those lottery tickets that they actually begin to spend money on the strength of the money that they believe they are going to win. This happened, Mr. Chairman, five or six years ago.

Five or six years ago, Mr. Chairman, Newfoundland bought a lottery ticket; the announcement was made that we had struck oil on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, and the purchaser of the ticket, who, I suppose, we would personify in the hon. the Premier, was absolutely convinced that all our worries were over, Newfoundland would immediately become a have Province - no more poverty, no more hunger, no more lights cut off - 'The sun would shine forever and have not would be no more', and all our compatriots in Alberta could come back home again. We had bought a lottery ticket; we had bought oil on the Grand Banks and all our troubles were over.

Now, I see the similarity, Mr. Chairman, between my close friend, my relative who brought a lottery ticket, and what has happened in this Province on the strength of a lottery ticket, because

Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, has not struck a tap since. We have seen a government sit on its haunches, play with the lives of Newfoundlanders, play with the Newfoundlanders, tell our people, 'Look, suffer a little bit of short-term pain, it is only a matter of a few more days and the oil will start to come ashore and we will all be rich.'

While this was happening, Mr. Chairman, the fishery was completely ignored. It took intervention by the federal government to get Fishery Products International back on its feet. Our provincial government was forced out of its inaction, forced out of its dreaming about the lottery ticket which was going to pay off, forced into doing something with the offshore fishery. So bent was this government on winning the lottery, winning the wealth, that they completely ignored the fishery, Mr. Chairman. They ignored it and it would have been completely destroyed had we not had a federal government who forced its way into the fishery and tried to salvage it.

Mr. Chairman, after our government, our hon. Premier had brought this lottery ticket on the Grand Banks, he forgot all about our mines. That is why my colleague can get up and tell us about the disgraceful thing that is happening in Daniel's Harbour. If it had not been for this lottery ticket that we were sitting on, I am sure that we would have known that government subsidies going into the Yukon would hurt our mining industry. We have a private company in Daniel's Harbour which is now competing against the federal government, and believe you me,

Mr. Chairman, there is no competition. When you try to compete against the federal government you might just as well take your cap and go home, because you are beaten before the battle begins. You might as well give up and go home, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, while the hon. the Premier bought this lottery ticket on the Grand Banks, he forgot about the unemployment which is devastating this Province of ours. They played around with a few figures just after the election, they tried to create a few short-term jobs, and they have the audacity to get up and say, 'Will someone comment on the thousands of jobs that have been created?' I will comment on the thousands of jobs. Where are the thousands of jobs?

We saw the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) come up with some silliness about creating 5,000 or 6,000 make-work jobs so that people could get their stamps and sit on unemployment insurance all year, because the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies is brainwashed by the hon. the Premier into believing that the oil is going to make us all rich, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I said at the beginning of this little oration that a close friend bought a ticket and acted as if he had won. In actual fact, he lost. Mr. Chairman, we bought a lottery ticket on the Grand Banks. A few months ago, we had the draw. The draw was made, Mr. Chairman, and we lost. We lost our ticket to oil on the Grand Banks, because whatever the Atlantic Accord is or whatever the Atlantic Accord is not, the Atlantic Accord is Clause

54. And if there was anything good in the Atlantic Accord, it was completely nullified, it was completely negated, it was completely thrown out with Clause 54. Because Clause 54, Mr. Chairman, is the ultimate sellout.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! The hon. member's time is up.

MR. DECKER:

By leave! By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I cannot let that go by because, as I mentioned the other day, if one lets things go by, sooner or later they become true. Clause 54 is not as the hon. member said. Clause 54 was part of an agreement between ourselves and the federal government. We had absolutely no interest in that particular exercise, in giving a benefit to other provinces. I mean, it is like saying in the offshore fishery agreement that we were interested in giving benefits to Nova Scotia. If we were, we would have put in that agreement there, 'When the restructuring is done, Nova Scotia should get factory freezer trawlers.' We did not put that in there, we put in, 'There shall not be factory freezer trawlers.' Because it was an agreement between ourselves and the federal government, and it was to our advantage. We would not put in a clause that was to someone else's advantage.

Similarly, in the Atlantic Accord we had no interest in putting in a clause to someone else's advantage. This agreement was between ourselves and the federal government and was designed for our benefit not someone else's benefit, and it would be stupid and foolish and ridiculous and asinine to put in such an agreement a clause that would be to someone else's advantage. I mean, you just do not do that sort of thing. You do not cut your throat when you get up to shave in the morning. It is not a sensible thing to do, and we do not do nonsensical things.

Now, if the hon. members opposite do not know how to read a clause in an agreement, I suggest they get someone to advise them. I would suggest they not get Mr. Rex Murphy. He has been giving too much advice across the way already. Please, get someone else to advise them on the meaning of English words in that agreement.

That clause states, in summary, that insofar as we have the ability to get supplies from the offshore, and it is to our advantage to do so, we have access. That is the substance and meaning and intent of the clause. "Insofar as we have the facilities and we have the interest, i.e. the good welfare of the Province in mind, we can have access to supplies offshore." It does not give preferential access to any other Province over us. If we do not have a means of using the supplies, we will not want them. If we have the means of using the supplies but it is not in our best interests, we will not want them and we do not care who gets them. But if we have the facilities and we have interest for the welfare of the Province, that clause gives

us preferential treatment.

Now, if the hon. members opposite want to slew it around for nefarious purposes, or if they do not understand it, I beg them not to perpetrate untruths or distortions about the Atlantic Accord. It will redound to their disservice ultimately, as will any sort of lie sooner or later that gets out, as long as it is countered -

MR. CALLAN:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman, in a few days hence the Opposition will be accused of filibustering and prolonging the debate on this bill. Now, the minister, Mr. Chairman, is talking about the Atlantic Accord. If the minister wants to talk about the Atlantic Accord, why does he not bring in the Atlantic Accord legislation, as was promised by the Premier. Several weeks ago, the Premier told us that it would be brought in around the middle of this month. That was last Friday, the 15th. Here we are Tuesday, the 19th. and if the Minister of Finance wants to talk about the Atlantic Accord, let us get on to that legislation and have a full-fledged debate on it.

MR. BAIRD:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

The hon. minister was a lot more relevant than I heard the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) a few minutes ago, when he was talking about a dream that he had about somebody buying a ticket. Since we are talking about the debate, I would remind some hon. members on the other side to maybe smarten up a little bit.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Perhaps the member for Humber West could refer to Webster's, under m for metaphor.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Sir. There was some concern expressed yesterday, and a moment ago I got an indication there was maybe some concern that this legislation was not proceeding quickly enough. I would like to point out to hon. members opposite that we have some very real concerns to point out during this particular debate, which is wide-ranging. When we have expressed our concerns, and when we have dealt with the topics we want to deal with, then the Supply Bill will pass and we can



get on to more legislation. We intend to go through with this process until we are satisfied that we have dealt with the matters we want to deal with.

I would like to deal with a matter that involves a couple of departments of government, one of them the Department of Health. I am glad to see that the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) is in his seat today. I would like to point out to him a concern that is not really dealt with in our health care system. We, over the past number of years in North America, the past thirty or forty years, have been subjected to conditions that humans in our history before have not been subjected to. We have been subjected to ever increasing amounts of a variety of minerals, metals, chemicals and things of that nature that the human race has not been subjected to before in our history, and this has resulted in one particularly alarming situation. As the human body is exposed to chemicals, the human body can either handle the chemicals and they have no effect, or they have some effect, or they hurt the human body. Generally, the human body processes the chemicals in some way or other, and these chemicals are foreign material. Now, the human body has a defence against foreign materials entering the body and this defence system, if it is subjected to more and more and more stress, reacts in a variety of ways; it can break down completely, and when it breaks down completely, of course, the person very quickly dies. Or it can cause the body to react in a number of other ways that can cause a variety of illnesses.

MR. BAIRD:

It would make some people think

Liberalism.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I hear those remarks coming from the peanut gallery and they are amusing. I appreciate them, and I thank hon. members opposite for making a few comments. It kind of lightens this rather serious topic I am trying to get into. It is a topic that is becoming more and more serious as time goes on, and I intend to explore the topic one way or the other.

However, one indication of the extent of what has now been called an environmental illness - it is called THE environmental illness by medical people in North America - is shown in the number of allergies that show up in the population.

MR. YOUNG:

I have an allergy, maybe that is what I have.

MR. BAKER:

Yes, I have an allergy, too, and the hon. member is probably the cause of it.

MR. YOUNG:

In that case, there is no cure.

MR. BAKER:

If we go back through history and medical history, we will find that the number of allergies that the population has been experiencing has been increasing over the years. As a matter of fact, a lot of illnesses that are now being treated in another way are in reality allergies. There is a specialist in environmental medicine in Toronto who says that 80 per cent of the present population suffer from allergies - this is far beyond anything that has ever before been experienced



in history - and 20 per cent of these are extremely serious, life threatening.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the first generation to suffer from this buildup of foreign materials over the past few decades. This is the first generation to actually suffer the effect of this chemical buildup, and the next generation is going to suffer the full brunt of this particular buildup. The next generation is going to have to suffer the brunt of this buildup of chemicals within our system. This environmental illness is becoming a more and more serious problem.

Now, then, you might say, "Well, why bring this up here?" The reason I am bringing it up at this particular time is that it is something that the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) is going to have to consider at some point. It is something that his department is going to have to consider. It is something that many departments of government are going to have to consider, because government is responsible for the spread of an awful lot of these chemicals, as is the food industry and a lot of other industries. Government, maybe, has a minor part, but it has a part to play in the introduction and spread of many of these unusual and foreign materials, unusual chemicals into our environment.

I have talked to a number of people who have suffered very seriously from environmental illness. Just today I received a letter from an individual who suffers from that particular condition. According to this letter, our systems are not set up to handle the problems. The lady refers to the fact that she had to

visit an environmental specialist in Toronto eventually, because the nature of the allergies could not be ascertained. She was so ill, and getting worse and worse - eventually she could not work and was almost incapacitated - she had to go and see an environmental specialist in Ontario.

One of the points she makes is that the health insurance and MCP do not cover this kind of testing. Now, she is going to see a specialist in environmental medicine, who is a legitimate doctor, but MCP does not cover this type of expense. This person managed to recover \$66 from MCP, which was two thirds of a particular \$100 consultation fee that was paid along the way. The expense of travel, the expense of being there, the expense of seeing this particular specialists and so on, and the expense of the extensive testing - that is the only place the testing could be done properly - all of this expense had to be borne by the individual and it was rather large. This individual, by the way, is now back at work but she has had a couple of relapses since.

But the point is, it is rather amazing that this well-defined new illness in North America is not covered by our MCP. I stress the fact that this is not the only case. I have talked to a lot of people who are in the same situation, and maybe some members here know of some instances where people suffer from environmental illness. This is not an isolated case, there are many of them, yet it seems as if our various government systems have been very slow to react to that reality.

One interesting sidelight of this particular situation is that one

of the things that this lady was most allergic to, because of the variety of chemicals that are used in the production and so on, was meat. In the production of meat there are a variety of chemicals used to make sure that the cattle grow as quickly as possible and put on the right amount of meat in relation to fat and so on. These chemicals that are in the meat, and the preservatives that are put in there, she was highly allergic to.

I am sure that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) in his usual quite, eloquent style could indicate the kind of chemicals that he might use in some of his savoury. However, because of this particular thing with meat, this lady has been advised to eat wild meat instead, and she has had some problem in obtaining it. For two years, I think, she had a moose license, but this year she did not get one and she is now requesting that some kind of arrangements be made to suit her particular situation. She can buy rabbits, but this was a rather poor season for rabbits in the vicinity of Gander. She is in the process of talking to other government departments concerning the availability of moose meat or some other arrangements that could be made to suit her particular situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave!

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Leave is granted.

MR. BAKER:

However, it is good to see that at least this lady has an audience, this lady has gone to people and pointed out her concern. There is probably a need for some kind of organization in Newfoundland to deal with this particular situation, to bring it to the attention of the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and other ministers opposite who might be able to have some input into the situation. I think there are some organizations in existence, but perhaps we need to concentrate a little more on this one particular environmental problem. Because, as I pointed out, there are few of them now, but we all know of the fact that the allergy situation in our population is getting worse and that the next generation is going to be even worse, and at some point we are going to reach the stage where we will have to deal with it and we will have to understand it and we will have to be able to test for it here in Newfoundland. We will have to have people here who can deal with that particular illness, whom we do not have now, apparently.

The Minister of Health, I would hope, will respond to this particular concern. I do not know if he needs time, or if he needs days, or whatever, to look into the situation, but I am sure that in his usual style he will respond openly and fully to the situation that I have just extensively outlined and that I know he has been paying close attention to.

I have some other concerns not related to the Department of Health. I have a lot of concerns, for instance, that I would like to talk about before I finish with this particular bill. I was invited to speak by the member for

St. John's North (J. Carter), concerning international status for the airport in Gander. I decline that opportunity right now, but I will at some future date. Instead, I would like to talk about a particular concern with my prime interest right now, which happens to be municipal affairs. I brought this up a number of times, and I am assuming that the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) is within earshot and that perhaps he will respond at some later date. I am concerned about lack of information, or inability to get information, certain information that I have requested a number of times from the Department of Municipal Affairs. What I am concerned about is, in essence, the use of public money, how it is being doled out and so on, access to information that is public and that I would like to see. One specific instance is the money that was allocated last year for the 60/40 roads programme. Now, this is a matter that affects municipalities all over the Province. As Municipal Affairs' spokesman for this side of the House, this information is something that would be useful to me in doing my job here in this House. There are regulations that apply to this 60/40 roads money. The provincial government pays 60 per cent and the municipalities pay 40 per cent and, in essence, it is a marvelous programme. It is an admission by government that roads constitute an necessity and communities should be able to do road work and should be provided with money to do road work. This money is being provided to them - 60 per cent of the cost by the provincial government. It is an excellent programme! It allows municipalities to develop their road systems, to do proper upkeep

and maintenance and so on, at a cost that is below the actual cost - they have to come up with only 40 per cent. Every year municipalities apply for this money, some are accepted and some are turned down. There are municipalities, for instance, which have been turned down six years in a row. I have had letters from some municipalities that have been refused six years in a row. I know of other municipalities that get money five and six years in a row, and obviously there is a reason. Obviously, there are a number of things that have to be taken into consideration; you have to take into consideration the ability of a municipality to pay its 40 per cent. Obviously, the government is not going to give money to a municipality and pay its 60 per cent share, and then, all of a sudden find that the municipality can no longer pay its share and then the government has to pay the 100 per cent. The Department of Municipal Affairs does not want to get into that, and I can understand it. So one of the conditions, obviously, that has to be checked into is that a municipality can pay its 40 per cent. So I assume that this is one of the bases on which the money is given out, the ability of a municipality to do the work and to pay its share.

But I am wondering if there are other considerations, as well. Looking through the application forms, I suppose it is not so obvious. However, the simple request that I have put in - and I have done this, first of all through writing a letter when the estimates were being discussed, after the budget was brought down this Spring. I did it through questioning during the Supply

debates. I did it through a letter during the Summer. I have done it through phone calls. I have made innumerable requests, in other words, Mr. Chairman, that I be allowed to see or be given a list of municipalities that were funded under the 60-40 programme.

Now, I would like to see a lot more. I mean, I would like to see a list of those who have applied, because I know a lot more applied than could be funded. I would like to see a list of those who received the funding. I would like to perhaps see a list back for a couple of years. Thinking that perhaps this was too much to ask, I have narrowed it down to simply one year and requested a list of communities that received the money. I am having great difficulty getting it. As a matter of fact, I have not received a copy of that list yet.

I understand that it is readily available. Obviously, someone somewhere in government, either when Cabinet was considering the lists, or whatever, someone somewhere has a list written down saying: 'Community A, \$60,000; Community B, \$89,976' and so on. A list is in existence. I have asked the minister a number of times and there have been a number of replies from the minister in the House. One reply, for instance, was that, 'Well, it takes a long time to put together those lists,' or 'We cannot do it overnight,' and so on. I understand those replies. I realize the minister cannot do something like that overnight.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. BAKER:

I thought I had leave, Mr. Chairman. By leave?

MR. FUREY:

Yes, by leave. They have given leave, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Carry on.

MR. BAKER:

I will take only another couple of minutes, Mr. Chairman.

I was talking about the 60-40 programme. I have been given a number of answers by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and, as I say, I can appreciate that, except that the answers really have little relevance to the situation. He has had lots of time. The lists, I am assuming, do exist. It is public knowledge because, as the minister says, 'Well, you can check *The Evening Telegram* when they do the tender calls and so on. This is all in the newspaper. They are done individually.' I mean, for somebody to say, 'Check *The Telegram*' - I know it all goes to public tender, or should go to public tender, although that is another question that one could get into in this House. You can go back over weeks and months of *The Telegram* and clip out little things here and there. I would never know if my list was complete. I would never know the amounts of money, because in the tender call they do not tell you the amounts of money. It would be rather silly for a municipality to do a tender call and put in the tender call that they want bids on \$85,000 worth of road work. That is not the way tenders are done. I could not get the information I want from these things in *The Telegram*.

At one point, the minister said, 'There was a list printed in The Telegram. There was no list printed in The Telegram. I have checked to find out about the list. If there were one list printed in The Telegram, that is easy for me to get. I have checked. There was no list of municipalities receiving 60-40 funding for roads and the amounts they received. It did not exist.

MR. J. CARTER:  
We get the list.

MR. BAKER:  
Now, that raises an interesting point. The hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) pipes in and says, 'We get the list.' I do not believe that. They might be notified of the municipalities in their particular districts that have received funding. That is reasonable, you can do that, but I do not believe that they get lists. I do not believe that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) would have the gall to stand up in this House and say that the list does not exist and that you cannot make it overnight and he cannot provide it, but, at the same time, provide a list of the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). He is not that kind of man.

I would also go as far as to admit that the lists are made by the Cabinet but the hon. member for St. John's North is not in Cabinet. He was once upon a time. He does not make up the list, so I do not believe that he has any such list, Mr. Chairman.

I think that the problem with the list is simply this. Mr. Chairman, for the first time I am going to tell you what I think the problem is and I know you are very

interested in finding out what the problem is, why an hon. member of this House has difficulty in getting a list from a minister that is public knowledge and a list that is around and easy to get. You are going to be very interested to hear why that is so.

I think the reason why I and the members on this side have not got the list - I understand the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) also requested the list - the reason that we cannot get the list is because - I hesitate to say it, I really do - but, could it be that there is something wrong with that list? Could it be that there is something on that list that might shock me? It is sad to say, Mr. Chairman, but I suspect that that is the problem with that list. The Minister of Municipal Affairs assumes that there is something on that list that would shock me, something that is unexpected. I would say to the hon. minister that he really need not have that fear. I am not a person that is easily shocked. I can handle anything that is on that list and much, much more.

Seeing I am on municipal affairs, I would also refer some points that some hon. members opposite brought up within the last week of so when talking about municipal matters. I believe that we were discussing a resolution on municipal affairs, if my memory serves me correctly, that dealt with the way that funding for some municipal services was carried out. It dealt with the suggestion that there be a halt put to changes in funding to municipalities until the situation can be looked at. There were some suggestions made as to what kinds of changes could be made in



municipal funding and the major suggestion was that there be a crown corporation set up that would be responsible for municipal services and municipal utilities and that certain services in municipalities would be considered necessities. Things like roads and things like water and sewer because surely in this day and age, Mr. Chairman, everybody has the right to have good, clean, clear water provided for them and everybody has the right to methods of sewage disposal. So this was the kind of thing that I assumed was being debated. When members were speaking, I really began to wonder.

There was a lot of reference made to the municipal elections. The indication that municipalities were totally satisfied with the way things are now is that there was a great turn out of people running for municipal election. The fact that in some areas there was a high turn out of voters indicates complete satisfaction with the way that municipalities are run in this Province with complete satisfaction in the Department of Municipal Affairs and how they handle the affairs of municipalities. I got to thinking what kind of logic is this? I could not quite follow it myself, because enough people in seventy per cent of the communities run for office, does that mean that everything is okay, that things do not need to be changed, that there is nothing more that can be done, that we are now in a perfect system? Members opposite made fun of the fact that we would even dare suggest that there could be more done simply because a large number of people offered themselves for municipal office. That is a weird kind of logic.

Also the fact that there was a high turnout of voters, this was an indication that everybody was completely satisfied with what goes on in municipal affairs. That is not giving any credit to the candidates. I mean, if I am a candidate for municipal office, I make sure that my supporters get out and vote. The reason that there was a high turnout, obviously, is that we had good candidates who were active and ready to work and willing to work and willing to get the votes. It had nothing to do with the general satisfaction of people in the Province with the way municipal affairs are run. It had nothing to do with the fact that the people were satisfied with their water and sewer services. It had nothing to do with the fact that the people were satisfied with their level of taxation and all this kind of thing - nothing to do with it, Mr. Chairman.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that I have been given leave and I still have a number of points that I would like to deal with that would perhaps take considerable time. However, in deference to some of my colleagues who wish to take some of the time of the House to debate items of concern to them, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down and take advantage some other time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to go back a little bit to



a topic that we were discussing a little earlier this evening. I had to leave the House instead of following up after the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey). However, before I do, maybe I should pass this along to the gentleman who just spoke. When he was discussing a constituent or friend who was in need of wild meat, there is, on occasions at least, quite a lot available at the various wildlife divisions that might be worth checking into. They do, I know, make provision for special cases like that. I am sure the hon. minister will look into that.

Earlier this afternoon the member for St. Barbe was discussing the standard of education in the Province and he referred to remarks made by the chairman of the unemployment commission or the Chairman of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment, I presume. He mentioned the word 'revolution'. He said perhaps that is what is needed in the Province, a revolution. I suggest to him, Mr. Chairman, that a revolution -

MR. FUREY:  
Suggest to who?

MR. HEARN:  
To you.

MR. FUREY:  
The member for Placentia or to me?

MR. HEARN:  
No, no, to you. You quoted the Chairman as saying a revolution should take place. I am suggesting to you, and perhaps to him also, that a revolution is taking place in the Province in the field of education. If we look, just within recent years, at what has been happening and what

is presently happening, we can see this revolution occurring. The opening of the new Fisheries College just a short while ago certainly has to speak well for what has gone on from the time the old university was taken over, a university that some of the members here attended. It became the Fisheries College just a few short years ago and it has grown now into an multi-million dollar modern facility that, hopefully, will provide the type of courses that our young people will need for the challenges that lie ahead.

The reorganization in the trades school. We realize at present there is quite a lot of discussion on the White Paper but that is all it is, a White Paper and discussions which hopefully will lead locally to a reorganization that will be beneficial to people throughout the whole Province.

We have also in my own department, in recent years, reorganization of the high school programme. When it came out originally, about three or four years ago, it was criticized from all quarters. The loud voices of criticism have become practically mute over the last few years and most people now, who are involved directly with education or indirectly, will tell you that the reorganization of the high school programme has certainly worked. There are still yet and, I presume, always will be, some bugs in the system, but that just offers a challenge for the people who are trying to change the system.

I would like to give hon. members perhaps a few little statistics that have recently come out in relation to the new reorganized high school programme. Comparing the achievement in percentile

ranks in a number of areas, the final graduates from the old programme, the Grade XI graduates of 1982 were tested. Since that time we have tested the first graduating classes, the 1984 and 1985 graduating classes, under the new programmes.

In the field of reading comprehension, students generally in the Province have gone from 24th percentile to the 38th percentile; in mathematics, from the 35th percentile to the 41st percentile; in written expression, from the 28th percentile to the 45th percentile; using sources of information, from the 26th percentile to the 43rd percentile; and in encomposite, from the 25th percentile to the 41st percentile.

We are still slightly below the Canadian average, but the improvement in just three years has been tremendous and that has to say something for the reorganized high school programme. The interesting thing about these statistics is the fact that if we look at the schools involved we will see that many of the larger high schools in the larger areas are doing exceptionally well in relation to the national standards, but many of the schools in our smaller areas are not doing so well. As I say that there are exceptions, of course. We have some large high schools in large areas that are not doing so well and we have some small schools in the smaller areas that are doing exceptionally well. But, on the average, schools in some of our smaller areas are not doing as well as others in relation to the national average.

That comes back to a point made by the member for St. Barbe (Mr.

Fury) when he said 'What hope do we have beyond the Overpass?' It is a good question for those of us who live beyond the Overpass. A lot of people think that only people West of Grand Falls live beyond the Overpass. What is forgotten quite often is that places like Ferryland District, almost adjoining St. John's, and places like St. Mary's-The Capes, are well beyond the Overpass and sometimes we experience the same frustrations as members from St. Barbe or from Corner Brook or from Grand Falls or whatever. However, you do not just sit back and complain because you live beyond the central city where most of the facilities are, and that is common in any capital city across the country or anywhere in the world. You have to try to make sure that you are not forgotten.

The member talked about his problems in Daniel's Harbour. I certainly hope that he, as the representative, and his federal counterpart - it being a federal issue basically - are taking up the fight for the people in Daniel's Harbour because, if not, it is very hypocritical to come in and criticize the provincial government for doing nothing if he and his counterpart and not taking up the fight in the corridors of power, especially in Ottawa.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

If the hon. minister wants to lecture me a little bit about that federal issue -

MR. HEARN:

I just asked a question.

MR. FUREY:

Well, just let me speak for the record. The Speech from the Throne 1985 stated, and I quote, "On the economic front, the mining industry in this Province has stabilized and showed signs of growth." I raised that issue because I want the mining industry to continue showing signs of growth and I am very, very concerned that our tax dollars in Newfoundland, tax dollars in Daniel's Harbour, those hard paid tax dollars, paid to the federal treasury, are being shifted West and North to the Yukon to open a mine that the industry itself admits, Adam Zimmerman himself from Noranda admitted, will put zinc on the world market for twenty-seven cents, undercutting the world price now, thirty-eight cents. What hope do we have if we do not raise the issue, whether it is federal, provincial, international or planetary?

MR. BAIRD:

To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

That was nothing but an abuse of the House rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there was no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Chairman, I know what the gentleman was trying to do, he was trying to set the record straight, and there was really no need for it because I certainly was not

accusing him of doing anything which he should not do as a good representative of his constituents. I just suggested that it would be hypocritical of him to suggest we do something as a government if he and his counterpart who represents the area in Ottawa were not doing the job that they were elected to do. I presume he is doing that from his reaction.

Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) spoke he also mentioned the fact that a lot of our youth are unemployed. Basically we have two major problems as it relates to youth employment or unemployment. There are two questions we could ask. Number one, are there jobs there ready for the youth and the second part being, are the youth ready for the jobs? In relation to the first remarks I made, I think we are now in the process of preparing our youth for the jobs. I mentioned the Fisheries College, the Trade School reorganization, the changes in the high school programmes, and the growth of our university. We, in the next few years, should be turning out students, as we have been doing in recent years, who will compare with any students across the country. That leaves the second part of the question to be answered, are the jobs there? Hopefully, if they are not there right now, they will be there by the time many of these students come out to look for them, even though many young people who are in the marketplace today are a little frustrated.

That once again leads to two questions. Number one, what are we doing about all of it? I think, we as individual members should be making sure that we try

at the local level to create an interest in our resources to make sure that jobs are created. There are things out there that can be done and perhaps can only be seen with a local perspective. If various members were worth their salt, they would then dig into those possibilities to make sure that jobs are created.

The final point I would like to mention to the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), and to others who asked the question, 'what hope do we have beyond the overpass?' In relation to education I would suggest to him, and I say this in all sincerity, that I have the same concern because when we look at the statistics here and we see that the smaller schools in our smaller places are not doing as well, due to no fault of the parents or the teachers, but geography is against us and the system is against us.

Consequently, I will say publicly, as I have said in other forums in recent days, the main emphasis of our department within the next few years will be towards the small schools in the remote areas that do not have the same opportunities today as the schools in the larger areas, to see if we can equalize the opportunities. I would appreciate any help, co-operation, suggestions, etc., I can get from hon. members or others in the field.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. minister's time is up.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
By leave! By leave!

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
By leave.

MR. HEARN:

There are just two other points I wanted to make Mr. Chairman. In relation to job creation, our future for the young people depends basically on two areas, our fisheries and our offshore. I know my leave is going to be cut off, but I have to say that these are two areas where the Opposition have stymied attempts by us in recent days to try to provide jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

They were against the type of agreement that we got in the Atlantic Accord and our resolutions on UIC and the factory trawler matter, of course, which showed where they stand. I think that is disgusting in relation to the unemployment situation in our Province.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
On the point there where the minister raised two questions: Are there going to be jobs for youth? I think that was the first question. The second question was: Will the youth be trained for those jobs? Why were not those two questions asked eight months ago when we were in the middle of a provincial election where you asked for a mandate to create full-time and meaningful employment? What are you saying? That that was a lie, that mandate to create jobs? Was that a sham, a con?

MR. HEARN:

500 jobs in my area.

MR. FUREY:

Are you now admitting that you do not know how to get rid of this evil youth unemployment, this staggering 30 per cent, some would say 40 per cent? Some would say there are so many who have given up on the system and they do not even bother to register any more.

I can give you an example in my district of Bird Cove where fifteen young people two weeks ago hitched-hiked to catch the ferry to get up to the Mainland to get their stamps to get back home for Christmas. While you raised very important and fundamental questions - are there going to be jobs for young people and will the young people be trained? - I think that that Mr. Minister genuinely gives a lie to the election mandate and to your party slogan.

I move that the Committee adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

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 Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 20, 1985 at 3:00 p.m.