



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 27

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

8 April 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, there are still some people trying to get into the galleries. I have a Ministerial Statement to make but I would rather wait for a few minutes, for everybody to get in. I am very paranoid over things like that; I do not think we should start until everybody is seated.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time later today, I shall give notice of a resolution which will be introduced in the House of Assembly on Friday, April 10, to amend Term 17 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada in order to provide the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland and Labrador with the same rights and privileges respecting denominational schools and colleges as are now held by other denominations under Term 17. The result of the amendment will be to place the Pentecostal school system on an equal footing with the school systems operated by other major denominations in the Province.

A similar resolution will also be introduced in Parliament of Canada. Once the provincial and federal resolutions have been passed the Governor General of Canada will issue a proclamation making the amendment effective in accordance with the Constitution Act of Canada.

The resolution and amendment marks the completion of more than two years of negotiation between the federal and provincial governments in consultation with the representatives of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland. The original request to amend the Terms of Union was made in a brief submitted by the Joint Executive of the Denominational Education Committees of Newfoundland to the Joint Senate and House of Commons Committee on the Constitution of Canada in 1980.

Notice of Motion to introduce the resolution will be given by me and the resolution will be called on Friday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, first of all let me congratulate the Premier and his administration on this very important initiative. We support the principle. We will want, of course, to see the resolution, but I am sure, even without seeing it, if it reflects the spirit that is

embodied in his statement, we will have no difficulty with it.

I remember well, having been there as a spectator at least, the Constitution Day, the Proclamation Day, April 13, five years ago next Wednesday, when the important event of the signing into law of the Constitution of Canada, the Constitution Act, took place on Parliament Hill. I remember also, as does the Premier and others, the set of events, sometimes controversial but always important because of their significance for the future of the way this country would evolve, that led up to that initiative on April 13, five years ago.

We said at that time, and I believe the Premier to his credit said, too, at least by implication and maybe even directly - I am not wanting to say it was one or the other, but I believe that he was fully on side on this particular issue at that time, if I remember correctly. And that is to his credit because we salute two principles here, Mr. Speaker, the undoubted principle of fairness; the Pentecostal people, the Pentecostal denomination is a viable entity within our system and the same rights ought to be accorded those people as are accorded other religious groups in this Province who provide education services to our young people, and secondly, Mr. Speaker, the principle that you ought to salute excellent effort, you ought to salute contribution to the evolution of a society. In that context, Mr. Speaker, the Pentecostal denomination, the leaders of that denomination and the adherence of it can take second place to none in terms of the manner and the degree to which they have contributed to the

advancement of education in this Province and, in the process, to the preservation of values which we all hold dear.

In that context, Mr. Speaker, we on this side have great pleasure in saluting the Premier's endeavour and wishing the process well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We also congratulate the Premier and we will have no problem giving our support to this resolution when it comes into the House inasmuch as we see it as basically an overdue housekeeping measure to bring the Pentecostal Assemblies in line with the same rights and privileges that other denominational schools have. We would take this opportunity to remind the Premier and others in the government of discussions that have taken place in the Estimates Committee on Education on other real concerns about the denominational system itself that have been very recently aired in this city with representatives from both the Avalon Consolidated and the Roman Catholic school board, the concern of wasted resources, especially given the report of the small schools study. Those concerns are going to continue to be brought forward, in particular the problem of discrimination that exists when there is an entrenched

denominational system. Those concerns will continue to be brought forward, and it is not simply a matter of accepting the denominational system as it is but recognizing that change must eventually take place with this system.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, as Minister responsible for Historic Resources it is my pleasure to announce a job creation initiative for the Red Bay Provincial Historic Site.

This initiative is another of this Government's programme of funded activities designed to add significant long-term value to the community in general and to provide workers with job experience that could lead to long term employment prospects.

This Summer, the Historic Resources Division of my Department will spend a total of \$144,153 to create 32 jobs and continue the archeological excavations at Red Bay.

As with other projects under this programme, 40 per cent of the jobs will be assigned to youth aged 24 years and under, in order for them to gain experience in their search for permanent employment.

These jobs are in addition to the approximately 21 positions created each Summer for students by the Historic Resources Division at Provincial Historic Sites and the

Newfoundland Museum.

Approximately 26 of those employed at the Red Bay Site this year will be from the community of Red Bay or elsewhere in Southern Labrador, maximizing the positive employment impact of this project in this area of the Province.

The project will continue the intensive research on this world-class archeological site, where Basques Whalers were present from about 1520 to 1610. As well as the economic benefits accruing from the purchase of supplies in the area by the excavation team, this work will greatly enhance tourism in Red Bay and Southern Labrador in general. Laboratory facilities will be kept open throughout the Spring and Summer and an effort will be made to have the facilities open on Sundays and for extended hours, to enable more tourists to visit the exhibits. In the long term, when the excavation work is complete, this Provincial Historic Site will generate an ongoing tourism industry in Southern Labrador.

This initiative will thus create much needed jobs in this part of the Province, benefit many of our young people, and further develop an understanding of our Province's history in a manner that will lead to long-term economic benefits.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for his kindness in sending his statement over to me. We welcome any announcement on any

initiative that this government will take to try and deal with the unemployment problem, especially in Labrador and Southern Labrador. The only thing is it is not going to put a big dent in the 17,000 unemployed there, especially the young people.

I welcome the announcement in that it is going to help with the tourism industry up there, and get some added attractions for the area. And I am looking forward to the minister announcing when they are going to have this Youth Employment programme, this big one they were talking about to deal with the big problem we have, because there is a gigantic problem out there. Also, I hope government will live up to its mandate to create jobs. They certainly have not done it in their first two years.

I have a suggestion for the minister and the government as to a new tourist attraction that they might want to have: A statue of the hon. minister with a soccer ball attached to his foot would be a worthy tourist attraction as it would indicate the activity of the minister which is stalled, like this government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We welcome the announcement by the minister and thank him for the copy in advance. We would again

register our concern about the short-term nature and the ad hoc way in which announcements are made about job development. The arithmetic in the statement by the minister would suggest that these jobs will be providing a little more than minimum wages, as has been announced in the last couple of statements that have been made by ministers.

We would see this as a very exciting project, and simply wonder whether the minister is not able to develop a more long-term programme for this particular site to incorporate not only Summer activity by students and long-term tourism potential, but to have a programme in which the site and its excavation and the ongoing research can be developed in such a way that there would be a comprehensive plan in place so that people in the area can count on employment from year to year, and not just Summer to Summer waiting for announcements by the minister.

We would like to congratulate the minister on what is obviously a very exciting project.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I want to reiterate Government's commitment and determination to protect our vital forest resource and to preserve the jobs of thousands of people in this Province who earn their living from the forest. Therefore, I want to inform the

House about government's plan to combat a massive infestation of the destructive insect pest hemlock looper which continues to seriously threaten the health of our forest resource. For the third consecutive year, we are faced with the possible loss of thousands of cords of valuable timber, especially in the Western part of the Island. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate that there is no looper infestation in Labrador.

Surveys conducted jointly by my department and scientists of the Canadian Forestry Service show that more than 1.1 million acres of forest will be damaged by the hemlock looper this Summer. The majority of this total, more than 813,000 acres, will be in the severe or moderate category of defoliation damage. In simple terms, Mr. Speaker, moderate to severe defoliation means the trees will die this year or in 1988 unless the looper threat is halted.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that last Fall the Cabinet, in response to my request authorized my department to undertake a spray programme in 1987 to protect the forest. This authorization was based on egg mass surveys which clearly showed that we were in for a heavy infestation this year. As I mentioned, these fears are now being borne out.

This Cabinet authorization was, of course, based on the government's overriding commitment to protect the forest from damage or destruction from any cause. This commitment rests largely on the importance of the forest resource to the Province's economy. Close to 14,000 people in Newfoundland earn their living directly and

indirectly from forest-related employment. With spinoffs and other economic factors, forest-related earnings affect the livelihoods of some 25,000 people in this Province. There can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that these jobs and earnings must be maintained and increased wherever possible. As well, there are other compelling reasons to protect the forest which is so much a part of our everyday life. Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the vital necessity of protecting the millions of dollars of taxpayers' money that have been invested in this resource in the last dozen years.

This year alone, Mr. Speaker, we will be investing \$12.5 million under the Canada-Newfoundland Forest Resources Development agreement, including \$7.5 million for silviculture. In addition, the Province itself is investing a further \$1.3 million in special projects, for a total in silviculture of \$8.8 million. A major component of the silviculture programme will be the planting of 12 million trees.

Mr. Speaker, it must be clearly understood that all these jobs and earnings, all the investment and all the pleasure we get from the forest can be lost if the hemlock looper is left unchecked. We cannot afford the risk of waiting for the infestation to run its natural course with the hope that the insect population will collapse. There is too much at stake in human terms. The plain fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have to fight the looper and we have only one weapon and that weapon is fenitrothion.

I keep hearing, Mr. Speaker, from various quarters that there are

alternatives to fenitrothion in battling the hemlock looper. Mr. Speaker, there are no alternatives. Fenitrothion is the only spray registered by Agriculture Canada for use against the hemlock looper. We are the only Province using fenitrothion against the hemlock looper because we are the only Province with an outbreak of hemlock looper. However, we are not the only Province using fenitrothion. New Brunswick is using it against the spruce budworm. As we have in the past, Mr. Speaker, we will be seeking temporary registration of the bacterial agent B.T. for use against the looper in environmentally sensitive areas.

While B.T. is not effective enough to use in a full scale spray programme, we can use it in environmentally sensitive areas because it does give some protection and since these areas are relatively small, any timber loss would not be as great.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it gives us the opportunity to observe results in order to work with the manufacturer of B.T. to improve its effectiveness with the hope of one day getting full registration.

Mr. Speaker, before giving the extent and other details about this year's spray programme, I want to deal just a little bit further with this question of alternatives. We have been accused of not wanting to use B.T. because of its cost. I want to take this opportunity to assure hon. members that this is not the case. While B.T. would cost approximately twice as much as fenitrothion, we and our partners, the two paper companies, could obviously find ways of absorbing the extra expense if B.T. was

fully registered and was fully effective against the looper. But it is not fully effective. We have used it to spray environmentally sensitive areas such as watersheds and cottage country, but we have then found that it did little to protect the foliage.

B.T. does not simply kill the looper while the insects are eating the needles and therefore at their most destructive stage. So it would be foolish of us to spend millions of dollars to spray infested forest stands with B.T. only to find out later that it did not work. It would be a complete waste of millions of dollars and we would likely find that the trees died anyway. The fact is the effectiveness of B.T. has not been shown and is still being researched.

Mr. Speaker, we have also been accused of not trying to find a more environmentally acceptable product than fenitrothion. That is not so. We have been researching this matter and we are going to continue to work with the Canadian Forestry Service in a two-year experimental programme designed to evaluate new chemicals which may hold the promise of being effective against the hemlock looper while being environmentally acceptable.

This programme is intended to determine the efficacy and acceptability of dimilin, B.T. and a new formulation of fenitrothion.

As we did last year, my department will be undertaking an intensive public awareness programme. We will be making information packages available to the public; we will be holding information sessions before the spray

programme starts in areas where spraying will take place; we will be setting up a telephone hotline for the public to call for information on the protection programme; we will follow our past practice of issuing daily reports to the news media ahead of time of each block to be sprayed; we will make maps available for public viewing in Forestry Offices in spray areas; and we will make frequent public announcements about the progress of the spray programme.

Last year, we protected 84,000 hectares in a programme that cost \$1.7 million, a programme that was somewhat curtailed due to weather conditions. This year, we estimate the cost of the programme to reach \$3.6 million with the government paying one-third and the paper companies sharing the other two-thirds.

We will be undertaking an aerial protection programme covering just over 585,000 acres. As I mentioned, we will be using B.T. in watersheds and other environmentally sensitive areas, but the rest will be treated with fenitrothion. Most of the area to be sprayed is moderate to severe.

Some of the 58 blocks are forecast for light defoliation but they are in areas of existing or proposed silviculture treatment and are of high potential value. A map and a list of spray blocks attached to this statement will give hon. members a general idea of the extent of the programme.

We have applied to the Department of the Environment for a licence to spray. This application will be reviewed by the Pesticides Advisory Board. We expect that the licence will require us to

continue to monitor the effects of the spray on songbirds and pollinators, and we will do that.

The protection programme is expected to begin in late June or early July and will take about four weeks to complete, depending on weather conditions and insect development.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize again this government's policy of protecting our vital forest resource from destruction. We believe we have a responsibility to the public we serve to ensure that our forest is not destroyed. We are committed and determined to protect the jobs and livelihoods of thousands of our people. To do otherwise would be to invite disaster and would be totally irresponsible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is difficult to respond to such an indepth statement, Mr. Speaker, with a couple of minutes notice, but I will attempt to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition, and I am sure every other person in this House of Assembly and in Newfoundland, is aware of the value of our forest resource. We are not sure though, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of forest management we have seen up until now will ever see us tap the full potential of that resource and I am thinking in terms of jobs, Mr. Speaker, jobs available from our forest

resource to the people of Newfoundland.

We say now, Mr. Speaker, that we have to support anything that is proven necessary to protect the forest resource. But we are also aware, or I am aware, that there is a lot of rhetoric contained in the statement, the same rhetoric we heard in this House of Assembly when the Government of Newfoundland was proposing a budworm spray programme. We were told then, Mr. Speaker, that the only protection the Newfoundland forest had against the budworm was to spray with either fenitrothion or matacil, it had to be done; the paper companies were saying it, the government was saying it, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) was saying it, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) was saying it, yet, Mr. Speaker, after a couple of years of massive spraying with fenitrothion and matacil, with whatever inherent damage there was to the environment, the budworm indeed came under control. But the spray programme had nothing to do with bringing the budworm attack in this Province under control, Mr. Speaker, it was weather conditions - weather conditions were right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

That is nonsense.

MR. FLIGHT:

I did not interrupt the minister when he was making his statement and I would appreciate him doing me the same courtesy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, it is a well known fact that the collapse of the

budworm was tied to weather conditions we had that particular year, when we were getting frost and snow in early June. The minister can sit there and laugh, but those are the facts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister says in his statement that he has researched the matter. I would like to be in a position to ask the minister to put on the table the type of research that he or the Newfoundland Department of Forestry have done on fenitrothion. I am sure he is depending, Mr. Speaker, on CFS, on Canadian Forestry Services research. Well, let me tell this House the situation with regard to environmental spraying in this Province. This government approved, Mr. Speaker, and indeed tried to push down the throats of the people of Central Newfoundland a spray programme using 2,4-D, the purpose of which was to stop the growth of hard woods so that the soft woods we cut would grow uninterrupted.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Millertown, one community in particular, rose up against it. They tried to stop it because the spraying was going to take place in their recreational areas, but the Minister of the Environment, and the sitting member of the House of Assembly for that district went to Millertown, met the people, tried to allay their fears, and told them, "We have proof, we have all kinds of research and proof that 2, 4-D is not dangerous, you can drink it.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, was that sometime within the past months the federal Departments of Forestry Services, Environment, and Agriculture withdrew the permit to use 2,4-D in a spray

programme anywhere in Canada. Mr. Speaker, now the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) will have to get up one day and explain why it was that he was prepared to have the forests of Newfoundland sprayed with a herbicide that he knew absolutely, totally nothing about, and found himself in the embarrassing position of having to stop that programme. Mr. Speaker, people almost went to jail over that issue.

I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, the same thing will apply with fenitrothion, but I tell you this, fenitrothion kills birds. Mr. Speaker, wildlife groups have gone to the Minister of Environment and demanded and asked for reports of last year's spray programme and have not been able to get them. So, Mr. Speaker, people are worried. People are concerned. Yes, people are saying, 'Protect the forests, do what you have to do,' but certainly we have a right to know that the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Forestry know what they are talking about, and we have lots of proof, Mr. Speaker, that with regard to spraying in Newfoundland they do not know what they are talking about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Forestry, under this spray programme, to make sure that he meets his commitment to the people of Newfoundland more so than it was met in the past, that the monitoring of the spray programme is indeed made available to the general public. There are still groups attempting, Mr. Speaker, to get the results of the last spray programme.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that if fenitrothion kills looper it kills insects, and birds feed on insects.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, in winding up, we are supportive and we are aware of the value of the forest resource. I will tell the minister there are concerns, Mr. Speaker, in this Province with the by-product and what the results of a spray programme will be, and the biggest concern has to do with the lackadaisical way this government have gone about allowing and monitoring spray programmes in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

It is now 3:30 p.m. and I would like to point out that on Wednesday we commence Oral Questions at 3:30 p.m. according to our Standing Orders.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, as I understand it we commence at four o'clock with Private Members' business.

MR. SPEAKER:
I refer the hon. member to our Standing Order No. 53, Section (4); "On Wednesdays the Question Period shall commence not later than 3:30 p.m." and it is now 3:30 p.m.

Oral Questions

MR. FENWICK:
I am standing for Oral Questions then, Mr. Speaker. May I have the first Oral Question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Sit down! Sit down!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Learn the rules.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Stephenville has been lobbying with the federal government for a Sea Cadet Base for the last sixteen months. I would like to ask the Premier what is his government's position on that? I would also like to know the results of the lobbying they have undertaken. A consultants report is now going to the federal government and it looks like it might again be recommending Cornwallis in Nova Scotia over Newfoundland, so I would like to get his response to that.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I thank the hon. member for his question. The hon. member has just recently written me a letter, in the last two weeks, for which there is a reply in the system now, or in the mail, has gone back to the hon. member, which will give him some of the detail, but I am pleased to answer it today in the House. We fully support the efforts of the Stephenville people to get the Sea Cadet Base in Stephenville and to that end months ago I wrote the Minister of Defence, who is now Mr. Beatty. As I understand it, the junior

Minister of Defence (Mr. Dick) is handling those kind of matters and the senior Minister of Defence is handling international matters, but I also asked the senior Minister as well as the junior Minister to look at it. Those letters went out months and months ago. We have followed it up since with additional representation, in the last several weeks. Thirdly, I myself, as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, in my last two trips to Ottawa have had meetings with Mr. Crosbie on the matter and shown him our documentation. I had copied him earlier and asked him to use his good offices to try to get the base for Stephenville. I met with Senator Cochrane while I was in Ottawa as well and pursued the matter with her and also obtained from her some information about a recent inspection that she undertook in Cornwallis to see the differences in the two settings, and there is no question, from a land base point of view, an acreage point of view, and a facility point of view that Stephenville is very superior. We have left no stone unturned in dealing with this matter, from the senior Minister of Defence, to the junior Minister of Defence, to Mr. Crosbie, to Senator Cochrane. We have done that both personally and we have done it through letters to those various people. We will continue to push to see that Stephenville is recognized, and not only recognized but achieves its just share of defence dollars, which Newfoundland never received since we entered Confederation, and one way to do that now is to allocate to Stephenville this Sea Cadet Base.

Mr. K. AYLWARD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, now that I see that full support I also, at this time, would like to table the annual report of Defence Construction Limited, which is the federal Department of Defence. Over \$15 million was spent in Atlantic Canada last year and not a cent in Newfoundland.

I would like to ask the Premier, since he and his government fully support it, and since I have made at least a half dozen requests, and the file is getting thick as to his ministers meeting with the Minister of Defence or the Associate Minister of Defence, to make sure that that case is fully put, because we now have a Nova Scotia firm recommending a Nova Scotia site, I would like to put this proposal to him, as I have done before, that an all-party committee be struck from this House of Assembly to travel to Ottawa, because the decision is going to be made in another month or so, and I think that it is time we went up there and at least gave them face-to-face representation on the issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, you know, there are elections and then parties are elected to govern and parties are elected to oppose. This party has been highly successful, since 1972 in having been elected to be the government of this Province. We are quite capable of making our representations to the federal government. I do not think spending more money on an

all-party committee to go to Ottawa will assist in the matter.

The hon. member says he has done some work. I think the individual who has done the most work on this matter, from everything I can see in the correspondence and the representations going back and forth, is the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). I think he has been in the forefront of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The member for Port au Port, months and months ago, when the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) was Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, was on to the Government House Leader, and since he has been on to me three or four times on it. I really commend the member for Port au Port for his interest in the district of Stephenville, which obviously needs some help very, very badly. That help is being given by the member for Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to be nice about the whole matter for the last sixteen months, lobbying, meeting with Ottawa, at my own expense, with no minister's salary or expenses, going to Ottawa to meet with the federal minister on my own, with my own committee.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
I would like to put the question to the Premier, since he thinks that his government is there to govern: Will he have his Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) - a simple request - meet with the federal Minister of Defence on this very, very big issue for this Province, since he mentions in his budget about defence spending? Is he going to get around to doing it and doing what he should have been doing for the last sixteen months?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, we are doing it. We have met with the Minister of Defence and the junior Minister of Defence, and we will meet with them again and we will do whatever is absolutely necessary to ensure this. I might remind the hon. member for Stephenville, with his poor mouth, he is not the only member in this House, on either side, who represents their constituents and spend their own money to do things on behalf of their constituents. I would think that every hon. member, both the members opposite, his colleagues, and the members on this side, do that as a matter of course. That is what we are elected to do. If the hon. member did any less, then he would not be doing his job and he should get down on his hands and knees and thank the member for Port au Port for all the support he has given him on it as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans, while I do not like cutting into Question Period, I would like at this stage to recognize fifty-two Grade XII students and their teachers, Susan McLeod and Albert Legge, from Holy Trinity Regional High School in Heart's Content.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would also like to welcome the Grade IX and X students and their teachers, Ray Gosse and Larry Sampson, from Whitbourne High School.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would like to welcome Alex Parker, councillor, from the community of Cockles Cove, Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt). I want to tell the Minister of the Environment that the Federal Department of Fisheries has spent, and is spending, millions of dollars on the Upper Exploits to

improve the salmon runs in the Exploits.

The Upper Exploits, if properly developed, has the potential to guarantee the commercial salmon fishery and provide a world class sports fishery. Now the question is how long has the minister known that the pollution levels in the Lower Exploits have been threatening the success and therefore the hopes and the jobs and the economy that could be provided by the work being done on the Upper Exploits?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, it was brought to my attention I think first when I became Minister of the Environment, about two years ago. I might add for the information of the hon. member that it is not only the federal government now which is putting money into the Salmon Enhancement Programme on the Exploits Valley, but in fact there was a very positive announcement made here in the House the other day -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yesterday.

MR. BUTT:

Yes.

- by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and, of course, we will be getting into that programme, too. This is not new news, this is old news. The basic facts are there is a \$20 million job out there to collect the out-falls and to build a treatment plant. Every time the hon. member goes to his district he contributes to the pollution in

the Exploits River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

I mean, that is the reality. The reality of the situation is that it costs \$20 million to build a sewage treatment plant to treat the sewage before it goes into the Exploits River, and, Mr. Speaker, we cannot undertake that alone. I raised it as a high priority in October with the federal Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan), pointing out specifically the problem in the Exploits River. We want to, and have made representation, and ongoing representation, on numerous occasions to get the federal government involved in municipal infrastructure in a structured programme, not being addressed on an ad hoc or emergency basis as happened in Port aux Basques. When we can get the federal government involved and the municipalities involved, then I want to assure the hon. member that the provincial government will be more than willing to come forward with their share of the monies to build such a treatment facility.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the dollars that have been spent on the Upper Exploits, and therein lies my concern for the Lower Exploits. I am concerned about

the level of the pollution in the Lower Exploits. Let me ask the minister this specific question: Does the minister have any concern that the pollution levels in the Lower Exploits could become concentrated enough to stop the salmon from entering the rivers anyway, thereby rendering useless all the work and all the development that is going on in the Upper Exploits that he is talking about?

MR. SIMMS:

Unnecessary alarm.

MR. FLIGHT:

It is not unnecessary alarm. Let him answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, from the work that has gone on to date, and the testing that has gone on to date, there is no indication whatsoever from Federal Fisheries, as well as the Department of the Environment, that in fact the enhancement programme is in danger. It is undesirable. Let us face it, I mean, that is a fact of life. If you have three large towns that are putting raw sewage into a freshwater body that is undesirable, but it is a fact of life. The amount of money involved, in 1985 dollars, I think was \$20 million, and we simply do not have the money to undertake that alone.

MR. LUSH:

After fifteen years of Tory Government.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, I want to ask the minister why he attempted to lay the blame for the fact that nothing was being done regarding the pollution problem in the Exploits River on the municipal governments of Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop's Falls? When the minister, has had reports, and has been aware for years of the level of pollution down there, why did he attempt to shift the blame to the town councils? Will he table, since indicated earlier he had it - this is my last question - the documentation, the letters that indicate that he has been talking to the Minister of the Environment in Ottawa over the years? When are you going to accept your responsibility and act as the Minister of the Environment in this issue, and not try to shift the blame to the municipal councils?

MR. BUTT:

You sit down now. Sit down. That is a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

I will tell the hon. member, and I know what he is referring to, but the fact of the matter is, and this is a fact, there has been no request come to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) or to me from the mayor or Council of Bishop's Falls, Windsor, or Grand Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

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

MR. BUTT:
That is a fact. That is not putting the blame on them, I am simply saying that an application has not been initiated -

MR. FUREY:
Come on, boy!

MR. BUTT:
Well, it would be in any other town, so what makes those towns any different?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

It is impossible to hear any answers if the hon. members to my right keep interrupting.

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, my question was for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but he is not here, so in his absence I will ask the Premier. The minister stated in the House that he would be announcing the water and sewer projects and municipal road upgrading and paving projects for the various areas of the Province immediately after the Budget was brought down. Now, will the minister be making this announcement before the House closes for Easter?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure the hon. minister will. The Budget has been brought down and, of course, the estimates are before the various Estimates Committees and so on. The minister had indicated that decisions would be made. I am quite sure that the minister will be in a position to announce the projects around the Province before Easter.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:
I wonder would the Premier undertake to ensure that the minister does as he promised to do and make those announcements before Easter and not do it after the House closes, like he did last year?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to remind the minister. The Minister of Municipal Affairs always keeps his promises.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the

Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) and it concerns the recent cutback in the staff at the Unified Family Court. In fact, the cutback, in the number of eight, was made because of the Budget. I would like to ask the minister how much money the government or the department is saving by this cutback? Does she think that these cutbacks in the number of staff at the Unified Family Court it is going to cause a problem in the already overcrowded court?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, it is a fallacy that there have been cutbacks in staff at the Unified Family Court. As I assume all members are aware, the Unified Family Court building on King's Bridge Road was completely destroyed by fire last Summer. While government proceeds with rebuilding on that site - and there is a definite commitment to rebuild and Public Works is proceeding with designing a new facility - the Unified Family Court has had to be temporarily housed in the former District Court Building on Duckworth Street. In the aftermath of the fire, Mr. Speaker, a number of people were engaged on a temporary basis to assist in the transition from the fire and to assist with restoration of records that were destroyed in the fire. Mr. Speaker, the people engaged temporarily have finished their temporary assignments, and that is the only change in personnel at the St. John's Unified Family Court. The number of permanent staff is the same and has not been reduced.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, when you ask the Minister of Justice a question you do not expect an answer and she did not disappoint us again.

It has been very clearly stated that eight people on staff lose their jobs at the Unified Family Court. So I would ask the Minister of Justice was that amount of money saved at the already overcrowded Unified Family Court so that her government, the administration of which she is a part, could pay for the expense of the appointment of the hon. Mr. Hickey to the Young Offenders Review Board and the furnishing of his office supplies and new secretarial staff?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have already said, and I repeat it now, that the only staff changes at the St. John's Unified Family Court have been temporary staff engaged after the fire in August to assist with the restoration of records and the move to the temporary quarters on Duckworth Street. The temporary assignments have been completed and as originally planned the people engaged for temporary periods have finished their assignments and are no longer required, but the permanent staff complement has not changed.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier and it relates to the company called Newfoundland Energy Limited and Dor Chemicals. I want to ask the Premier if in fact the reports that the government repaid Dor Chemicals \$135,873 for maintenance costs, which Dor had paid to Petro-Canada, is true, and if it is true why was this kept secret and the public not informed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Nothing was kept secret, Mr. Speaker, on it. I think we have paid Dor a certain amount of money because under an original agreement we had with them -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You shut the door on them.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, we did not shut the door on them. They wanted \$58 million in subsidized loans, and an \$18 million grant, had no way to get crude, had no way to operate the refinery, and had no way to market it. I mean, that is a Liberal deal, that is not a Conservative deal. That is not a PC deal, that is a Liberal deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I can understand the hon. member's frustration and concern because he wanted to sell out again like they did in the first deal on Come By Chance. But this party is different, and that is why we are over here and that party is over there, Mr. Speaker. We paid Dor so much money for the mothballing of the refinery for last Summer because under a deal we had agreed

to do that, so we compensated Dor for the money that they had spent on their share of the mothballing costs while they were still negotiating with government. That was fair and reasonable.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, may I just confirm again what I said yesterday, in the questions emanating from the Leader of the Opposition and others, that I have again checked the whole issue of the rumours on the street in Newfoundland, and especially in St. John's, about the fact that Newfoundlanders and Canadians -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You did not check very hard, though.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, they wanted the information yesterday. I have confirmed with Mr. Brown, the president of Newfoundland Energy Limited, that there is not a Newfoundlander, not a Canadian involved in Newfoundland Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Did you read the share list?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have not seen the share list. No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If the Leader of the Opposition wants to talk to Mr. Brown he will confirm it to him.

MR. SIMMONS:

Table the share list.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

All the shareholders are Americans except two, and under the

incorporation of the company two of them are lawyers, as in the normal course of incorporating the company. One lawyer is British by birth, the other lawyer is Bermudian by birth or by nationality.

MR. FLIGHT:
How many lawyers?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
There are two lawyers, that is the information I just received.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
So I just want to allay any concerns that hon. members have, or Newfoundlanders generally have, that Brian Peckford, Citizen, Esquire, or any member of this government, or my buddies or friends in the Conservative Party of Newfoundland, have anything to do with Newfoundland Energy. It is a private corporation. They have lived up to the letter of the agreements that they signed with Petro-Canada. They have more people employed at Come By Chance than they said they were going to have employed at Come By Chance. As it relates to Dor they did not have a good proposal, but as fair bargainers with DOR, because we were dealing with them for two years, and because we were agreeing to share mothballing costs, we were fair with them and paid them whatever the price was for the mothballing, I think it was for last July or August.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. MORGAN:
That embarrasses the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, the question was not meant to drive the Premier into a tantrum but since he has admitted that he has not seen the share list of the company that surprises me. I thought the Premier yesterday was really indicating that he had seen it. I would ask him now that he has given this refinery to -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Petro-Canada gave it to them.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Sold it to them.

MR. TULK:
The Premier had to be in agreement with that and this is company called Newfoundland Energy and Cumberland Farms. Now that he has paid \$135,000 of taxpayers money to Dor Chemical, will he not now admit that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador have a right to see the share list of that company? Will he indeed not go about, as the Premier of this Province, getting that share list and tabling it in this Legislature?

Never mind whether Brian Peckford is in it, never mind whether any of your Tory friends are in it, let me ask him: Will he not now give Newfoundlanders the right that they deserve to know who is on the share list of that company for which they have paid good tax dollars?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland Energy Limited is a private corporation. We have no involvement with Newfoundland Energy as a government. It is a private corporation. Americans have invested in that corporation. Now, those Americans may have also invested in other corporations. They might not want, for their own reasons, the thing released. I do not know. The member for Fogo or the Leader of the Opposition can go to Mr. Brown and ask about the corporation. It has nothing to do with me. Newfoundland Energy owns Come By Chance, lock, stock, and barrel, and they are making it work, which the Liberal Party of Newfoundland could not do. We are still paying off a \$50 million debt that they left on the shoulders of Newfoundlanders because it went bankrupt. We are still out \$50 million. It is a private corporation. If that corporation wants, in its wisdom or lack thereof, to give or not to give who are the shareholders of the company, that is their prerogative, not mine.

MR. FLIGHT:

After you have given them Come By Chance.

MR. PECKFORD:

We never gave them anything.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier once again. It is a private corporation that is essence has received considerable sums of money or properties that

belongs to the Newfoundland people. Now, I cannot believe that the Premier of this Province is standing in the House, and I am not getting into the patronage issue -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, because you know there is none.

MR. TULK:

No, no. I am just saying that as a matter of principle.

I ask him once again to stand in this House and try to explain why it is that the Premier of this Province, regardless of whether the company is private or public, says, 'No, I am not even going to bother about getting that company's share list or telling the Newfoundland people who owns the company,' when, in fact, the Premier knows that there are millions of dollars of taxpayers' money tied up in that refinery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there are not millions of dollars tied up in that refinery. The millions of dollars that were tied up in that refinery was a Liberal fiasco that we are paying off today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I say to the students in the gallery, before most of you were born, \$50 million was committed under the old Liberal regime which saw the largest bankruptcy in Canada's history. Now, do people who invest in private corporations, Mr. Speaker, have the right, if they want to, if they are investing in those private corporations, not to

release that they have invested in it? Have they got that right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I am rebuilding a Liberal fiasco and making it work, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

It is impossible to get an answer to a question if there is a continuous howl from the right side.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We are taking Liberal white elephants and turning them into healthy Tory blue elephants, like Stephenville, like Come By Chance, like the Hope Brook gold mine, like Fishery Products International, like Kruger, and like Marystown Shipyard, which we rescued, Mr. Speaker. We are proud of what we have done! Today from the Opposition there are no more accusations, no, 'We heard on the street rumours of your Tory buddies' because everybody opposite knows, as does just about everybody in Newfoundland and Labrador, that I or my friends are not involved in Newfoundland Energy. Now they got to change their tune and try to find out who down in the United States has invested in a private corporation. If they want that information, Mr. Speaker, they go to Newfoundland Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:
I would like to ask the Premier whether or not he said that the Come By Chance Refinery should have been scrapped?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I said at the time, years ago, that if there was nothing that could be rehabilitated or no investor there - right? - that then it should be scrapped and taken as a scar off our landscape, Mr. Speaker. But luckily, Mr. Speaker, luckily, it took a PC government to turn it around and have 300 Newfoundlanders working today who would not be there only for this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
A brief supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:
Would the Premier indicate whether the Premier discovered Cumberland Farms or whether in fact it was Cumberland Farms from reading the newspaper, that came up and saw the Premier to get the refinery started?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wants to start his leadership campaign here today with all his shouting and bawling. I think it was the hon. member who on a number of occasions years ago did not want to keep Marystown Shipyard opened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Now where are the Liberal Opposition? 'Did you find Cumberland or did Cumberland find you?' Mr. Speaker, it has gone all the way from me having shares in Newfoundland Energy, my buddies having shares in Newfoundland Energy, over to what Americans have shares in Newfoundland Energy, all the way down to did Cumberland find you or did you find Cumberland. I would say, Mr. Speaker, they are going down the sliding scale of quality very, very quickly, and before long they are going to be digging holes in the ground.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! I now ask my hon. friends on the left now to please keep quiet.

MR. TULK:
That is unusual.

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

MR. PEACH:
Go meet with your council.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I do not have the time now, but I will respond to the gentleman for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) later, I say to him. Mr. Speaker, first of all, Come By Chance was brought to fruition by a Tory Government.

MR. MORGAN:
Go way, boy!

MR. FLIGHT:
This is the preamble.

MR. SIMMONS:
By a Tory Government. So first of all, cut the blarney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
The question is this, Mr. Speaker. Given, Mr. Speaker, that Ayres and Lundrigans did not run to Bermuda to hide their shares, given they had nothing to hide, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier

address the essential point here? The essential point has nothing to do with the fact that we have an industry which may take off again, and we hope it does, but that is not the issue. The question is who, beneficially, are these people? Mr. Speaker, not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, my question is who are these people? Not the shareholders of record, who probably, as I understand it, are a bunch of legislators in Bermuda, another indication that the real shareholders are being hidden away for a reason. The Premier should ask himself why not register this company -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Is that a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I am trying, but I do not intend even to put it until I get enough silence to put it so the Premier can hear it.

MR. SPEAKER:
I would remind the hon. member that the Question Time is almost finished.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I will do it quickly with your assistance to keep the hon. crowd quiet for a minute.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier why is it that these people apparently went to such trouble to conceal the true identity of the beneficial owners of that company? Does it not at all twig the Premier's curiosity that the

people who have the first call on Hibernia oil, the people who have been given \$120 million of asset in terms of a wharf and a facility, are not even known to the people of Newfoundland whose assets they hold in trust? Does he not have any curiosity with that?

Does he not see that there is a public element here? I understand him to say that it is a private enterprise, but that is not the issue. But they are dealing in a very public way so it is a public enterprise. Does he not see the need at all for us to know these people?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, you know, if this continues over the next few days we are going to be up on points of orders and points of privilege for a long period of time because the hon. member gave a speech. He did not ask a question, he gave a speech. Now, Mr. Speaker, we know all about what is going on at Come By Chance. Some of the investors, by the way, as I said on television last night, were actually here in the Province when we made the announcement about the reopening of Come by Chance, Mr. Speaker.

I do not necessarily have as suspicious a mind as the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. Because I would like to challenge the Leader of the Opposition today to start saying outside the House some of the things on cover-up and hiding away that he says in here in and has immunity for. Because if the Leader of the Opposition goes outside and says before it the people, then he can be challenged in the courts, Mr.

Speaker, and if he does that the hon. Leader of the Opposition will find himself in court in 1987 for the second time in 1987.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would indicate to the House just exactly who these individuals are who are going to take the Leader of the Opposition to court?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

It is a good point, though, is it not?

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PEACH:

You have to meet with your counsel at four-thirty.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) is the kind of reason I have to rise on a point of privilege. He keeps

repeating that phrase and I know exactly what he is talking about. I will tell you in time, but right now I am on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please state his point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) -

MR. TULK:

He is outside there.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, I am glad to see he is in the precincts of the House because I am going to be talking about him and his actions for a moment. The Minister of the Environment said something today that is quite unparliamentary. Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that you may or may not have heard it. One, I submit Hansard will pick it up. I have asked Hansard to do that as quickly as possibly, but I do not have the results yet. Yes, I do. Mr. Speaker, I have the transcript. I just did not realize it had been placed on my desk. My colleague is going to check to see if the offending word is there. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman did is offensive on two counts, I say to him. First of all, what he said is clearly unparliamentary. Hansard has not picked up the expression, but I believe that several hon. members on both sides of the House will have heard the word 'pollution.'

MR. YOUNG:

Pollution? Yes, every time you flush the toilet.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is the way that man raises the level of the House that I admire.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I do not think the hon. member is getting to his point of privilege. I would like him to be as brief as possible and get to it.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with you and I hope you have noticed why I am not getting to it. I am having some difficulty getting an intelligent word in, given the kind of garbage that is coming from that side of the House. Now, I say the words are garbage. The man is a decent man but his words are garbage, and that is the difference I make. The point of privilege is that the Minister of the Environment referred to the gentleman for Buchans, not his words but his person, as pollution. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is clearly unparliamentary. There are a number of people here who can attest that that is what he said, even though Hansard may not have picked it up. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to Page 105 of Beauchesne, Fifth Edition and on the bottom of the page, the second last word but one - I shall not read it, because it is not only unparliamentary it is also crude. Mr. Speaker, can see the word and I submit to you-

MR. SIMMS:
How do you spell it?

MR. SIMMONS:
Do not be such a clown, Len.

AN HON. MEMBER:
You are the clown.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make a serious point. First of all, I submit that the word that was uttered by the minister is in the category of the one I have just directed the Speaker to. I refer him also to Page 113 and you will see the word 'rotten', the word 'stinker', and the word 'obscene' on page 112. These words also, Mr. Speaker, connote the same general meaning that was embodied in the word 'pollution'. So, first of all I submit it is unparliamentary, to the point, Mr. Speaker, we do not need I say to the minister, and I have known him for many years, to go to a book to see what is proper and what is not proper.

He knows, Mr. Speaker, and here is the second half of my point of privilege that it is thoroughly unbecoming a member of this House and a Minister of the Crown to engage in that kind of garbage rhetoric. He does, I say, owe an apology to the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), and to the House, for engaging in that kind of language in this Chamber. It is unbecoming of him, completely unbecoming. I have known him for many years and that is not the kind of person he is normally. Let him get up and say that in a fit of passion he lost control. Let him withdraw it.

MR. PEACH:
Lost control! That is a good one.

MR. SIMMONS:
On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, he may find it funny, which confirms something about him that I do not want to believe. So, I invite him to withdraw and apologize and there would then be no point of

privilege.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Environment, to that point of privilege.

MR. BUTT:
To that point of privilege or point of nonsense that the hon. member raises, the fact of the matter is in answering a question from the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans I made some reference - I am not sure what my specific words were - to the effect that the hon. member contributes to the pollution in the Exploits River. Now, that was not casting aspersions on an hon. member or anything else, Mr. Speaker. It is not a point of privilege, it is not even a point of nonsense, it is just a waste of the time of the House when we should be getting on with Private Members' Day, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, it is in Hansard. It reads as follows, Mr. Speaker: This is quoting Mr. Butt.

MR. BAIRD:
That is something to read, today's Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
To think, Mr. Speaker, that my brother lost to him by

seventy-five votes.

MR. BAIRD:
It is probably a good thing, because we could not take both of you in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
What a favour you did him.

The quote, Mr. Speaker is this: "Every time the hon. member goes to his district - and the context will show who he is talking about the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans - "he contributes to the pollution in the Exploits River."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is despicable. He must be made to withdraw. He treats it as a light matter. He must be made to withdraw at the very least. If he is a man at all he will also apologize to the House and, particularly, to the member for Windsor - Buchans.

I have not bothered to address the second point, but I give it to Mr. Speaker, for his information: The member also, during the same exchange, referred to the member for Windsor - Buchans as a liar and that was heard on this side, too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my reason for rising is this: We are either going to sit here and sink further and further into the gutter and call people names and refer to them by how they dress or what colour their hair is, or we are going to debate the issues. I am giving notice that we are going to be diligent. We are going to try and debate the issues. We will not be dragged into personal vilification. I give notice we

will not be dragged into it. We will be vigorous, but we are not going to have that kind of nonsense going on in this Chamber.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, let me speak briefly to it. I understood that the hon. the Minister of Environment, when he replied to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's points, indicated that he intended no personal insult or no personal reference to the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans whatsoever. I think he indicated that and that, I think, resolves it.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, I do not think the hon. member has established any prima facie case. Obviously, from the comments of the hon. member, there is not a comment in Hansard on the first point that he raised. The second one, it does not appear to the Chair that in the context it was said there was really anything objectionable to it. So I must rule there is no prima facie case.

MR. TULK:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of privilege.

MR. TULK:

The Speaker, I have no doubt, in the din that was going on during the statement by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands and the

reply by the member for Windsor - Buchans as his shadow, did not hear, perhaps, the statement. It may or may not show up in Hansard, but the hon. gentleman, the hon. the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), clearly stated on two occasions -

MR. HODDER:

That has been ruled on already. Are you questioning the Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I am not questioning the Speaker.

He clearly stated on two occasions, 'That is a lie.'

MR. FLIGHT:

'Liar,' he said, not 'That is a lie.'

MR. TULK:

That is the same, Mr. Speaker, as calling a person a liar. In any case, it is unparliamentary. Now, he knows, I know, and Hansard may show tomorrow that he in fact said it, and if the hon. gentleman is any sort of a gentleman at all he will come back from wherever he is - I suspect he is outside somewhere - and stand on his feet and say that indeed he did utter the statement and withdraw it. Now, Mr. Speaker, if he does not do that, I ask Your Honour to check Hansard and see if indeed Hansard did pick it up, and to make a ruling tomorrow and ask him to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point, I will certainly check into Hansard and, in fact, if there is reference to somebody being a liar or uttering lies, I will certainly have that withdrawn.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I realize that now Your Honour calls the Private Member's Motion, but if I have the agreement of the House then the Premier would give notice of this motion with respect to the Constitutional amendment for the Pentecostal Assemblies. It is my understanding that notice is going to be given in the House of Commons today and we have sort of undertaken do it here today, as well, and then it will be debated in both places on Friday. It will only take a minute. So if we have agreement.

AN HON. MEMBER:
It will only take a minute now?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
It will only take a minute. He is just going to give notice of the motion. It is just to get it on the Order Paper, so that we give notice the same time it is done in the federal parliament.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
If all members agree, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution.

WHEREAS section 43 of the Constitution Act, 1982 provides that an amendment to the Constitution of Canada in relation

to any provision that applies to one or more, but not all Provinces may be made by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada where so authorized by resolutions of the Senate and House of Commons and of the Legislative Assembly of each Province to which the amendment applies; and

WHEREAS Term 17 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada provides as follows:

"17. In lieu of section ninety-three of the British North America Act, 1867, the following Terms shall apply in respect of the Province of Newfoundland:

In and for the Province of Newfoundland the Legislature shall have exclusive authority to make laws in relation to education, but the Legislature will not have authority to make laws prejudicially affecting any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, common (amalgamated) schools, or denominational colleges, that any class or classes of persons have by law in Newfoundland at the date of Union, and out of public funds of the Province of Newfoundland provided for education,

(a) all such schools shall receive their share of such funds in accordance with scales determined on a non-discriminatory basis from time to time by the Legislature for all schools then being conducted under authority of the Legislature; and

(b) all such colleges shall receive their share of any grant from time to time voted for all colleges then being conducted under authority of the Legislature, such grant being

distributed on a non-discriminatory basis."

AND WHEREAS the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland have been recognized by the Newfoundland Legislature to be possessed of all the same rights and privileges with respect to denominational schools, common (amalgamated) schools or denominational colleges as those held under Term 17 by any other class or classes of persons in the Province at the date of Union of Newfoundland with Canada; and

WHEREAS the equality of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland with the other religious denominations in the Province should now be enshrined in the Constitution of Canada;

NOW, THEREFORE the House of Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland resolves that Her Excellency, the Governor General be authorized to issue a proclamation under the Great Seal of Canada amending the Constitution of Canada, in accordance with the Schedule set forth below; and

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that upon approval and adoption by This House of This Resolution, the Speaker be directed to forward a true copy of this Resolution to Her Excellency, the Governor General, certifying that the provisions of the Constitutional Act, 1982, respecting the adoption of a Resolution by the House of Assembly of Newfoundland have been met.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now Private Members' Day and I call on the hon. the member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ordinarily, on Wednesdays the commotion from the Opposition settles down by four o'clock. Today it went on for a few minutes more, and one has to wonder what they had for lunch.

I will read the resolution. It is quite short.

"WHEREAS the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment emphasizes the importance of the educational system in economic development; and

"WHEREAS government has announced plans for a Provincial College System to be initiated by September, 1987;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that government be encouraged to implement changes in the school curriculum; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Provincial College System provide appropriate courses to meet the social and economic needs of the regions concerned."

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the operative words there are in Clause 3, 'changes in the school curriculum,' and Clause 4, 'appropriate courses.'

Now, some years ago it was the fashion for students who were not doing very well in their courses to wear dunce caps and go and stand in the corner. I do not

know when this practice died out. It was not to suggest that the students were stupid, it was to suggest that their poor marks were as a result of laziness and could be corrected. Now, I think, with all due respect to all the people here in this House today, that perhaps a few dunce caps would be useful again, and perhaps we should all take our turn in the corner.

I would extend my remarks to the press, particularly to the National press, because I want to give, for instance, a very good example of where our educational system has obviously failed us and failed us very badly, for which we are paying the price now and we will continue to pay the price long into the future, I am afraid, and that is our failure to recognize the threat that was posed to the seal fishery back some years ago when our friend, Mr. Brian Davies, started his campaign to enrich himself. This was the purpose of his campaign, as far as I am concerned, and in that he was highly successful.

Now, what went wrong? What happened? All of us in this Chamber and all of us who have been in this Chamber, we can read and we can write and we can add and subtract, yet, we did not recognize the danger that this fellow posed. We just did not. We did not realize that when Brigitte Bardot and a few more of the luminaries went up to St. Anthony and decided to play games on the ice that this would really affect a whole industry. In fact, it did not only affect an industry, it affected two industries. Because it is not only the seal fishery that was very badly damaged, it was also the cod fishery, because the seals

are the intermediate host for a particular parasite that affects the codfish.

It is too bad the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is not here, because in his remarks a few days ago he was able to say much more succinctly than I am able to say just how much danger the uncontrolled expansion of the seal herd is to our fishery.

Now, some years ago I found myself, in March, in Manchester, England, and I was asked as a Canadian to comment publicly on t.v. about the seal fishery. The reason for my being there is not relevant to this debate and I do not need to go into it. Anyway, I found myself in Manchester in a t.v. station in front of a crowd of people; there was a local audience as well as a t.v. audience. The first thing that was shown was a large white China seal on a white carpet. This seal was clubbed and, of course, its skull was bashed in and the whole China doll was shattered. Then they said, 'This is what these nasty Canadians do. They go out and kill baby seals.'

I replied that it was not a case of the unspeakable chasing the uneatable or inedible, that young seals, and old seals for that matter, were edible, in fact they were considered a delicacy by those who like them, the seal oil was valuable, and the pelts themselves made almost indestructible garments that would last for years and years.

The whole seal fishery or hunt was worth many millions of dollars and had been prosecuted for many hundreds of years so that the seal herds could not be said to be in danger of extinction. In fact, I

suppose the number of seals that were taken by the 1960s were considerably less than the bumper years of the twenties and thirties.

Anyway, there was another member on the panel, the chap who wrote *Watership Down*, Richard Adams. He wrote a very successful book that portrayed baby rabbits doing all sorts of intelligent things.

One of the things we should have spotted is the misuse of the word "baby". Baby seals do not grow into anything but adult seals. Adult seals perhaps can balance a ball on their noses and they can hunt fish, they are very good at hunting fish, but they cannot participate in debates. They do not grow up into people. When you call baby seals babies, you are implying that they grow up to be something other than seals. They do not. They become seals, no more, no less, and even if some hon. gentlemen on the opposite side look like baby seals, or some baby seals look like them, it is not true that baby seals become anything more than adult seals. They do not have any more abilities.

It is wrong, in fact, it is very wrong to equate young animals like that with babies and give them human attributes. They are not humans. They never will be. Their maximum potential is extremely limited. To suggest that it is wrong to use them for food, as we do, is to overlook the fact that there are quite a number of animals that we do use for food. I do not see the difference in harvesting young sheep or lambs and harvesting baby seals. The one thing I would say is that the harvest of lambs is much more cruel than the harvest of seals. I would hope for some change in

the practices there.

But the harvesting of seals has been quite humane and very reasonable and responsibly done. For these foolish do gooders to get into the act merely for their own enrichment, and the proof of the pudding is in the eating, Brian Davies and his crew are now extremely wealthy, very well off. There is no reason for us to believe that he is anything -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I know that debate on this kind of thing is wide ranging and practically wide open but, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could take a look at the resolution.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is not finished yet. Let him finish the point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

For heaven's sake.

MR. TULK:

Keep your cool. Keep down over there now.

If the Speaker would take a look at the resolution and perhaps listen a little closely to the words of the hon. gentleman, perhaps he is the only person in the Legislature that will, but have him explain to us where he is at all speaking to this resolution that he has put on the Order Paper and obviously feels very strongly

about.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to draw the member's attention to the fact that our present education system has got a great flaw in it if, for instance, otherwise intelligent, sensible people can be sucked in by the types like Brian Davies, then there is something wrong with our education system. This is proof positive.

MR. TULK:

The same thing could be said about being sucked by a member of the PC Party.

MR. J. CARTER:

These very same people say, "Well, what is the good of being able to read Shakespeare backwards" and still be taken in by these kind of charlatans. Perhaps we would be a lot better off if we did read Shakespeare forwards and backwards because every kind of scalawag is portrayed in Shakespeare. We might have recognized the likes of Brian Davis long before we did, and the kind of damage he was able to do. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I thank you in your wisdom to come to my rescue from this attempt to divert my thoughts from the point at hand.

I would like to point out too that

the battle is far from over. Do not think that because the slight protest this year fizzled that these people are going to give up. They have struck another load. They know that they can get an awful lot of money out of the public for these particular causes. I think the kind of education that is offered is going to have to be, perhaps, changed slightly in the light of its obvious failure to equip us to deal with this kind of a threat, and the threat is a very, very serious one. One whole industry has been practically destroyed, and another industry has been severely threatened, and I quote the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), who, in his address last week, gave us much better examples than I am able to provide. I think hon. members will agree with me.

In fact, with the possible exception of the third party in this House, I expect absolute agreement on this one. Now, we may all be able to give our own particular examples. I am giving my particular example, the one that stands out most strongly to me. There is something wrong with an educational system when a whole Province is unable to recognize a very serious threat, a threat long before it manifests itself. We all know now -

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

We know the hon. member is getting on with dribble but at least his own crowd should be here to listen to him.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is

no point of order.

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

MR. TULK:

Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, a quorum call.

MR. J. CARTER:

Why did you not say so?

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sorry, I thought you said a point of order.

MR. TULK:

No, a quorum call.

MR. MITCHELL:

You said a point of order.

MR. TULK:

No, I did not. I said a quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A quorum is present.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

As I said, the battle is far from over. These environmentalists groups are still anxious to threaten our livelihood and will continue to threaten our livelihood. They have not given

up. While I would take the position that our educational system is seriously flawed when we cannot recognize irrational attacks from outside, and these irrational attacks can be as wide-ranging as environmentalist groups or quacks like the chiropractors. I, myself, believe this to be a threat.

Hon. gentleman may laugh, but these irrationalists are waiting in the wings to suck Medicare dry. What would the hon. member opposite think if he knew that the Province of Ontario pays them \$60 million a year. That is, by my reckoning, twenty CAT scanners. It will be too late when they get their claws into Medicare and we cannot afford CAT scanners. That is why I think we should be educated to see these threats long before they materialize.

Now I do not have any good answers, and this is why I welcome the debate that may ensue over this resolution. I would love to hear what hon. members on both sides would suggest is an answer to this serious flaw in our educational system which prevents us from recognizing all the many threats, the threats that I have outlined and probably lots of other threats that other people can think of. Is it perhaps a comment on our educational system the fact that for many years a Liberal government was maintained in this Province? Perhaps hon. members opposite might like to address that. So, having posed the question, I will sit back and listen to the debate with great interest and make a few closing remarks next Wednesday.

Thank you.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

I was wondering if the comments by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) referring to chiropractors as quacks and as a waste of money is a position announced as government policy. Is that government policy that he speaks here today about these doctors?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the resolution so ably put down by my friend and colleague for St. John's North, a man who knows education first-hand having served in the first Moore's administration as the Minister of Education. He identifies in this resolution two issues which need to be flagged or highlighted at this particular time and I commend him for doing so. He says, first of all, that there ought to be in effect some momentum towards changes in the school curriculum and I could not agree more. He says further in effect that there ought to be appropriate courses in the regional college system to better address the social and economic needs of the regions concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty with either of those concepts. My colleagues who speak in this debate will be saying other things which bear very directly on the

point but I want, with the indulgence of the House this afternoon, to address items which I submit, Mr. Speaker, are fairly directly related to the first resolution, that is the need for changes in the school curriculum, because you have to ask yourself why we need changes. I would expect that one looks at the results of what the school is producing these days and if we are satisfied it is letter perfect, there would be no need for change. So, the corollary is that there must be something wrong, there must be something less than perfect, less than adequate with the products of that school system, that is to say the men and women of the Province; that is to say we here in this chamber and I believe that to be the case.

I believe we saw today, Mr. Speaker, evidence that somewhere along the line the school system is failing us very miserably. I give notice to the Government House Leader and to others that it is not my intention during the next fifteen minutes or so remaining to engage in a partisan diatribe, as much as I love to do that from time to time, I want, instead, to respond as sincerely as I know how to a couple of instances today in the hope that what I say can be a bit instructive, as instructive to myself as to other members of this Chamber.

I believe, and I said to the Government House Leader the day I became the leader of this parliamentary group, I spoke to him on the telephone - it was not the day I became leader because he was out off the Province, but on the following Monday, about five days after, he did me the courtesy of calling me and wishing me the

best. In the process of the conversation I mentioned to him that I knew where he was coming from. I had seen him in many parliamentary forms. I stood beside him with pride in Kenya, in Africa, when he was the Chairman of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I watched him with great pride in Nassau when he performed so well his functions there. I have seen him in other forums throughout the world, including here, particularly, in Newfoundland on a couple of occasions. Indeed, I think my first introduction to the CPA was at the home of the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount back around 1974 when he hosted the Atlantic Conference.

I know where he is coming from. I know his respect for the institution. So, it was not accidental that after he made that courtesy call a week or so ago on Monday, that I took the opportunity to say to him, in fact, "Gerry, I hope that we can together do something to help edge the House along a bit towards its real role of becoming a parliamentary forum, a forum for the debate of issues, rather than a bear pit for name calling, rather than a place where the guy who gets the loudest laugh is the guy who called a lower name than the guy before him."

I have to say, without being holier than thou, I have been just as guilty at times as others, but I believe it is time. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that I am cognizant of what the resolution says. I believe this is very apropos. We had youngsters in this gallery today, and I have them here sometimes from my district and all members from their respective districts, and when you

ask them what they thought of the House, once they get past the bit of theatre and the novelty of coming into a Chamber such as they do not see in Rencontre East or Harbour Breton or somewhere like that, once they zero in on the substance of what they see, the uncoded message is they are less than impressed.

Mr. Speaker, assuming I run in another election, and that is a decision I never made until just before the event, and I believe that goes for most members here, if they are at all in charge of their lives. To say you are going to be in politics for the next twenty years would be kind of foolhardy. I have other agenda items I would like to attend to before they put me in the box. Perhaps after a couple of more years, I will have had enough of this. I do not know. But, Mr. Speaker, I may go back and seek election again, as other hon. members will.

MR. WARREN:

I will. I will not say where, but I will.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish him much success whatever party he runs for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. REID:

You do not mean that.

MR. SIMMONS:

I say to my good friend from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) - by the way, I mean that too, 'good friend from Trinity - Bay de Verde, because I tell you,

Mr. Speaker, that sometimes, and this bears on the point I am attempting to make this afternoon, we get on this other hat in here and we forget that we are in this together. We differ on principle. But I am not here on this side because I am more intelligent or less intelligent or better looking or less good looking. That is surely not what divides us. Surely it is something else. The gentleman from Trinity - Bay de Verde is a case in point.

I went to Norway. I remember first when I came into this Chamber he was the Minister of Rural Development and I was his spokesman. He and I got into some fairly vicious fights in this Chamber, some of them not very complimentary to either one of us. I really did not know that particular man until I travelled to Norway with him, and I found another side of him, a completely different side of him. Had I not been so blinded I would have seen it a long time ago, but I just saw him as a guy who sat on the backbench and shouted things across the House. He probably saw me in the same light. But I got him in a situation away from here and I found out that he was as concerned about his constituents as I am about mine. Now, why should I be surprised at that? The man has gotten himself elected again and again.

That is what we forget in this House. All the guys on that side are the bad guys, and we are the good guys, and vice-versa. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if you go to the great parliaments of this world, if you go to England, for example, if you go to Ottawa, and what am I saying, 'the great parliaments of this world.' We

ought to be one of the great parliaments of this world. Greatness is not decided by volume or numbers of people. Greatness is decided by the commitment and the dignity you bring to the cause. I submit to you -

MR. REID:

It is not always decided by the noise you make.

MR. SIMMONS:

Exactly. It has nothing to do with how loud you shout. It has to do with the quality of the debate and whether here, in this place, we are contributing to the lives of people who live in Ming's Bight in the minister's riding or the people who live in Gaultois in my riding. That is the ultimate test, it seems to me.

I would hope that one day just one of my constituents can sit in that gallery and can come out and say to me after, 'Boy, I am proud of what I saw there today. I am proud to be a Newfoundlander. I can go away from this place knowing that you fellows, yes, you have vigorous differences, but what I saw today encourages me that the 'government' of this Province is in good hands." I say government in quotes because, as you know under our system the administration is led by the gentleman from Green Bay, but the government is all of us. We are part of the governmental process here and for there to be effective government, you have got to have effective Opposition.

I say to the gentlemen opposite in a quasi-partisan tone that the day you try to destroy the effectiveness of the Opposition is the day you begin destroying yourselves. I point you to 1966. We were in our various places,

some of us in classrooms, I was over editing on an interim basis at the Western Star. I tend to do most things on an interim basis as, you know. It does not take me long to get the job done, sometimes ten days, a couple of weeks right now, today. I might quit this any time at all, things are going so well. I have got the job nearly done but that is another issue, Mr. Speaker. I take most things just on an interim basis, you understand.

Mr. Speaker, my point is about effective Opposition. I refer you to 1966, and at that time I was the Editor of the Western Star in Corner Brook on an interim basis, and I found myself having to be out of city on the evening of election day, September 8, 1966, I believe it was. I had to write an editorial. Do you remember, that was a Stephenville election? Joey was going to put fifteen industries in Stephenville. Do you remember that election? I was over there and I had to write an editorial so I wrote an editorial about 5:00 p.m. in the evening and I gave it to the secretary to type it up. I put it on the dictaphone and I have it to her to type up. It went essentially like this, I lamented - I was writing the editorial at 5:00 p.m., the polls were not going to close until 8:00 p.m. but I had to be out of town. I had to drive out to Springdale where I was getting ready to take over a school principalship. I wrote an editorial that went like this: 'How sad it was that Newfoundland would find itself' - this is the editorial of the next day - 'would find itself with such a lamentably, small, Tory Opposition.' That was my editorial. Then, about 7:00 p.m., as I was beginning to leave, I

said, no, I might be caught with my pants down so I better write one more editorial so my assistant can put in the right one tomorrow because I will not be here. So my second editorial said how lamentably sad it was that there was no Opposition in the Newfoundland House of Assembly because the only question in the 1966 election was whether the Tories were going to elect two or three or none. Forget Tories, this is not partisan. The only question was whether the second party was going to elect two or three members or none. As it happened they elected three in 1966.

Now, if you were the Premier of the day and you were some of the ministers in that Cabinet and if you had a good set of blinkers on, you would say hurrah for us. If you had your ear to the ground, the morning after, when you saw the real results in terms of popular vote, you would have said this is the beginning of the end. Why? For a number of reasons but one of the whys was that the Opposition had been reduced to a point - no reflection on the quality of those men, there were three good men there - but the numbers were such that it was very difficult for them to mount an effective Opposition and so what happened? What happened was what will happen to this government if the day comes when they do not have an effective Opposition sitting or what would happen to us as a government if we were sitting with no effective Opposition.

Other Oppositions will arise and create themselves because the people under our system, we do not settle our arguments with bullets like the do in Lebanon and Nicaragua, we settle them with

words. If the words are not uttered with dignity and force in this Chamber, they will be uttered outside the Chamber by the editorialist and by the action groups.

I put it to you that the decline of the Smallwood administration beginning, almost as a free fall, from 1966 on, certainly from 1968 on, the federal election when the noisy six were elected to Ottawa, our good friends John Lundrigan, Ambrose Peddle and Frank Moores and I am missing a couple of names unfortunately.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Walter Carter and Jack Marshall.

MR. SIMMONS:

Walter Carter, Jack Marshall and Jim McGrath.

The noisy six. That was the public signal that the rot had set in, but those of us who were watching the scene knew it had already set in long before then. No wonder why, I, and others, I believe the gentleman from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) but he can speak for himself, but at least a couple of others on this side who were invited to run in the 1966 said, 'Thanks, but no thanks.' That is no reflection on the man whom we honoured the other night. It is a reflection on what was happening in terms of the realities of this Province. So in 1968 she was into a free fall until 1971, and then the public were not quite sure so they had a tie election but then, a few months later 33 for the party that had been in outer darkness, and 8 or 9 for the party that had been in power so supreme for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lesson

there in two ways. The first one is obvious, that effective opposition is necessary to good government and that message we have to get through to our schools because I submit to you that by the time we come to this Chamber, it is already too late. We have a lot of baggage with us and we believe in some cases, and how can you blame us for believing, if we sat in those galleries, as I did up there in 1965 when I was a university student, as others did here, how can you blame us if as impressionable young people, twelve or fifteen years of age, we see a bunch of grown men act like a bunch of clowns? How can you blame us when we get here ourselves if we do not believe that is exactly what you do when you get in the House of Assembly, out clown the other clown? That comes back, Mr. Speaker, in the broad context to our education system.

MR. J. CARTER:

(Inaudible.)

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). I respect his view. I say to him kindly it is not my view and I am attempting to the best of my ability to put across my view. I would ask him to hear it. If he wants to disagree, I shall defend his right to disagree with me at the appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker, the first point that I wished to make was that the effectiveness of the governmental process is contingent on there being an effective opposition. The second point, Mr. Speaker, and I wish I had more time and I am just about out, but hon. members might consider the option of

allowing me just a few minutes to clue up, if not I will say it at another time, but I undertake not to be particularly partisan, there is a point I want to make here that I have been seeking the floor to make for some time. I promised the gentleman from Carbonear (Mr. Peach) I would address the matter he raised and I intend to do that but I am in the hands of the House on that matter.

MR. PEACH:

Carry on.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the second point that I wish to make on this matter of the importance of the Opposition, and the importance of our decorum in this House. Decorum is too light a word. More correct is the matter of the substance of what we do here. Do not misunderstand me, I am no choir boy. I enjoy fun as much as anybody in this Chamber and I love giving my good friend from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) a flick, as he loves to give me a flick. Okay? But I do it in admiration because when I see him, I do not see an enemy. I see a man who took me into his home and gave me a meals.

When I see the gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) I do not see a fellow I want to pulverize, even if I had the capability to do so. I see a fellow who fought beside me in some political wars and then, for his own reasons, which I respect, he finds himself in another part of this Chamber.

When I see the gentleman from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) I do not see a person whom I want to denigrate. I see a fellow whom I

have great admiration for. He knows why.

I just do not buy the line that because you cross that centre line there you are a culprit, or because you are on this side you are a culprit. I just do not buy it and I do not believe any member of this Chamber buys it for a moment.

Mr. Speaker, if the concerns of the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), as voiced so well in this resolution, the first part of it, are to have any effect, as they say in a church hymn, "Let it begin in me." If there is going to be any real change out there, if the students who come here to broaden their education see something that is not very elevating, then this Chamber will not have made the contribution it can make.

We have here what can be, what ought to be, the voice of the people. We do not have to shoot a leader because we do not like him. We do not need assassinations. We have got the most powerful gun in the world called the ballot box. That gentleman who sits there from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) will be the Premier as long as he can get elected because of the weapon that we have, not he has or I have, but the people have. The people will decide how long he is there, and that I respect. The people will decide how long we are on this side, and that we respect.

Mr. Speaker, this is the appeal or the suggestion I made to the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount. It need not be an appeal to him, because his contribution to Parliament is unequalled in this Chamber. The

suggestion I made to him on that day, a week or so ago, was that we would undertake to determine whether it were possible for us to stick to the issues. Mr. Speaker, I have since seen that it is not obviously possible to stick to the issues. For that, I do not score the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount. I do not score any particular member of this House. I just say that I believe we just have to try a little harder, because if we do not, we do ourselves a lot of damage. It is not very dignifying some days to come into this Chamber.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker, and I will not talk in partisan terms. I do not even care if the people who read this Hansard one day know who I am talking about. I will just let you know I am talking about members of the Chamber. To make my point, it is not important whether they be identified as Opposition members or government members.

We have a gentleman in this House, for example, who has a very serious case of diabetes. I have heard in this Chamber on two or three occasions somebody shout at that member, 'Go out and take your needle.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that, in my book, has nothing to do with parliamentary repartee. That is a sick joke. Because here is a man who has a personal condition over which he has no control, and therefore, that kind of thing, in my view, is not very elevating for anybody.

Now, today I heard a gentleman - I have the transcript - in reference to me a statement was made, and I want to respond to the statement. I thank the hon. members for leave because what I want to say I

believe is, at least from my standpoint, an important personal statement, but I undertake not to unduly take advantage of the kindness of members in giving me leave.

What can be more public than the set of circumstances which found me before the courts in late 1983? What can be more public than that? Several times in this Chamber I have had aspersions cast on the matter. I have never felt it was relevant to the debate. But if hon. members wish to debate that issue with me, I tell them a couple of things. Yes, I was in a Cabinet for only ten days. Let me tell you two things. One, I was there; I was invited. I was one of a very few Canadians to be invited into a Cabinet, and that is something I will proud of for as long as I live. Two, I resigned as soon as I found I was in a potential conflict, as soon as the matter was brought to my attention. Nobody had to run me out. Indeed, when I talked to the Prime Minister on the phone - he was in the Mediterranean that day - he suggested that, at the very least, I would remain until he got back. That was his suggestion. One of the biggest rows I had in my life with an individual, who is no longer with us and I will not mention his name, but a very great friend of mine, the man who was my mentor in public life, chewed me out for about two hours for resigning. I knew then, and I know now, that I did the right thing because in this life you do what you think is right and you take the consequences. I said it is not possible for a person to be a Minister of the Crown, to be a minister of an administration, and to be under investigation by that same administration.

So I am proud of two things. I was proud to have been invited and I was proud that I had the good sense to leave when I did. That it was ten days after instead of fifteen years after is completely irrelevant. If somebody is suggesting that I should have bought time so it would look better and stayed fifteen days or tough it out for two months or three months, then, of course, that is unthinkable. Either the thing is right to do or it is not right.

It was not less right on the tenth day than it would have been on the third month.

Number one, let me say very clearly, if people want to talk about that issue that found me before the courts in 1983, I tell you I am prepared to talk about it ad nauseam, ad infinitum, day in, day out. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. The whole set of events will come out one day, and I am at the point where I do not need to convince anybody at all about what really happened. The determination was made by the courts. It is not a determination I could find favour with, but I respect the system, even with the system it does something you do not like or if the system makes a mistake, you still respect the overall system. I am a great believer that justice will out in the end, that finally it will out. I have long been bouyed by the knowledge that my enemies will not think well of me anyway, and my friends know what kind of an individual I am, and will judge me accordingly, warts and all.

So I give notice that if you are surpressing in this House an unquenchable desire to talk about my tax issue, anytime you want at

any length, and if you think I am just giving brave words now, I refer you to The Sunday Express this Sunday. I have not seen the article, but I fully expect that the subject we are now talking about will be talked about. Number one.

Number two, a member of this House today said the following; and again because I do not want to make a partisan point, I will not say who it was. I am sure hon. members may know. They just need to go and get Hansard, but I am not in it for a partisan point. The quote is this from today's Hansard in Question Period, "Mr. Speaker, if he does that, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will find himself in court in 1987 for the second time in 1987". That speaker is absolutely correct that if I go one more time, I would have been there twice in 1987, and I want to tell you why I was there in 1987.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I will clue up too, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) raised the matter and I undertook to respond. I believe I would like the opportunity, but if members do not want, I can do it another time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I own a business called Kona Enterprises. I have operated it since 1971. We had our sixteenth year in 1986. Each year I have a pro forma fight with the South Brook Town Council, and each year I wait until they get the summons issued. I did it in 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974 right up

until and including 1987, I do it every year. Why do I do it? Because on principle it is wrong, it is wrong in principle, and I face this as a representative of the people every day. It is wrong for people to have to pay taxation without direct benefit. Those of you who know my property know I am within the municipality of South Brook, but far removed from anywhere where they can provide municipal services such as street lighting, and so on and so forth. Yet I am assessed at the same tax rate. I have debated it with council on many occasions and every year for fifteen years, I can show you all fifteen summons, I stand back to make the point, and when the day comes that the court date is set, I then pay the bill because I wanted to reinforce the principle. I have sat down with council many times. They do not collect my garbage; they do not clear my snow, not that I want them to, -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Hold on now! Hold on now!

MR. BUTT:
A man in your position should not do that. That is wrong.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, it may be a terrible example. My point is that if aspersions are going to be cast, then I want you hear the whole story and then you can make your judgment, and your judgement, I say to the Minister of the Environment, may well be that it is a terrible thing and I respect that. I have no argument with

that. I am just telling you why I did what I did. For fifteen years I could not make a dent, and so the sixteenth year I said, 'I am going to contest this.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was not born yesterday. I contested it I believe on March 4. I knew that that one, coupled with another event - I knew that the Premier happens to represent the area, and I knew it was only a matter of time before I would hear what I heard today. I knew all that, but I did it because for me it was the right thing to do if I believe strongly enough I should have my day in court, and so I went and I argued the point. I argued the point on principle that a person ought not to be obliged to pay taxes for garbage that is not collected, for streets that are not cleared, for streets that are not lighted, and for water and sewer that is not provided. I argued that. I argued it.

The gentleman hearing the case had to find what I was 90 per cent sure he would find that the act does not talk about the provision of services. It does not connect the payment of taxes to the provision of services.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) services.

MR. SIMMONS:
No, that is right. And I knew that, but I thought the principle was important enough for me in my own behalf and on behalf of people that I represent, to make that point. Now, other people might do it another way.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, we are on a private member's resolution and I think the hon. member has been given enough leave. Yesterday I asked for leave and hon. members over there would not give me leave, therefore, leave is cancelled, please.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member for Torngat Mountains withdrawing leave?

MR. WARREN:

Leave is withdraw, yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the hon. member has been given plenty of leave. Furthermore, I think he has explained his situation and I think all hon. members are quite satisfied.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I did not mean to be that long. Will the member give me about one minute just to clue up? Just one minute. I appreciate that he wants to make his speech this afternoon, and I did not mean to delay him unduly.

MR. WARREN:

Go right ahead.

MR. SIMMONS:

I wanted to get into the record

that issue and I have done so and I thank you for your indulgence. My overall point, which I believe relates very well to the resolution and very well to the theme that I struck at the beginning is this, and I believe I have the sense of the House, I got the sense from the interjections that have been made across the House, that I have wasted my time the past forty minutes, that the invective is going to continue, that the name calling is going to continue, and I just want all of you people to know that we on this side are going to restrain ourselves, we are going to try and debate the issues and if gentlemen elsewhere get some particular charge out of personal attacks and bringing in unrelated issues, that is fine. I am prepared at any time, and I wanted to show this afternoon that I am prepared at any time. Because I am a public figure, no matter that I am involved in, be it a court case or any other involvement, is immune to public debate. I am prepared to debate it and defend my position even if others disagree with it. That is one issue.

The second issue is this: I find in some sadness that it is not the mood of the Chamber to be prepared to debate the issues and that was to be the point I was making this afternoon. I have to confess to the House that I have failed miserably, but I want to give notice on behalf of my colleagues that we shall do our best to address the issues. We will not be boy scouts all the time and we will lose our temper sometimes. But I happen to say, and just reflect - this is almost my last sentence - that if it is skeletons you are interested in, a lot of people have skeletons and the skeletons do not relate to party

stripe.

This is my next sentence: We do not intend to respond in kind by dragging out matters that are personal matters and part of a person's overall career. We are not going to do it, and I want to ask members opposite if they find us doing it to bring it to our attention. We will debate the issues, and I would invite all members of the House to think about that before they decide not to participate in the debate with us.

Thank you very much.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

If I might just comment very briefly. I partially agree with the Leader of the Opposition. The only thing I would say is that there should not be personal attacks, but I do not agree that it should be a quiet, decorous place. I would deplore the lack of wit. As long as a remark is witty, I think much will be forgiven.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, I thank the gentleman from St. John's North. He has heard - whether he agrees is for him to decide - what I have been saying. I am not saying let

us have a quiet little meditation type church service here, I am saying let us be vigorous but use our vigor and our energy on the issues rather than on attacking each others personalities. That is what I have said.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to rise in debate on this resolution, but before I begin I should say to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, since he came forward with such a passionate plea, would he also talk to his colleagues? Yesterday, for example, the hon. member was not here when there was a petition presented in this House. It had to do with U.I.C. on the Labrador Coast and one of his colleagues denied this member leave to speak. So, I would ask him to take his plea to his own caucus, also. The hon. gentleman is now up in the gallery. He should be ashamed of himself. They had to send him away.

MR. PEACH:

He is. That is why he is up in the gallery.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I say to him, I hear what he is saying. But another rule of life is this: If you reap you sow.

After what the member for Torngat did last week with the gentleman from Bellevue, whatever he got yesterday, he got off lightly.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

You see, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman wants to start again. I will say to the hon. gentleman, what I did last week I got leave from the member from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) to do.

MR. SIMMONS:

Under false pretenses.

MR. WARREN:

It was not under false pretenses. As the hon. member said, the hon. member would not withdraw leave. The hon. member got up and said it. So, I say to the hon. gentleman from Fortune - Hermitage, the Leader of the Opposition for the time being, that I will continue to do what I can in this House of Assembly to represent people who ask me to do something for them.

Now, to get back to the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I must compliment the government and the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) on bringing in the community college system in the school year beginning September. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have five community colleges. I am going to make my few remarks - I may not go the twenty-four minutes - on the Labrador community college.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few minutes dwelling on this college to be situated in

Happy Valley - Goose Bay is because it is going to be, and it has to be, much, much different than the other four colleges. I hope that my intelligent friend from St. John's East will understand a little bit more about Labrador when I am finished than he does now. Mr. Speaker, I understand he has never been in Labrador. I hope to illustrate to him the four distinct areas in Labrador, and the three distinct culture differences in Labrador. So the community college has to be able to address the specific needs of the people.

In the Central area of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Mud Lake North West River, and Sheshashit, a population of roughly about 6500 to 7,000, just in that area alone we have Inuit people, we have Innu people, we have settlers, if that is the proper term to use, plus we have many people with the Canadian forces who could be of different nationalities.

Mr. Speaker, before I go any further, I want to compliment the member for Gander (Mr. Baker).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I understand that the member for Gander has decided to enter the leadership campaign of the Liberal Party in this Province.

If the hon. gentleman is looking for some delegates, I am sure I can arrange to get some delegates from Labrador who would lean toward him. I wish him the best of luck in his leadership fight. I know it is going to be a difficult battle, but I wish him the best of luck anyhow.

Let me get back to the community college system. I had the opportunity about a month and a half ago to travel throughout my district and one of the concerns, one of the issues that was brought to my attention was that one of the courses that they would like to see in the community college in Labrador is a nursing assistants course. In each community on the Labrador coast there is a nursing clinic. As you know, you are many, many miles away from road connections and the only means of getting to a central hospital is by aircraft or by boat, usually by aircraft. What better way for our community college to institute a programme that will show the needs of the various communities throughout Labrador than to bring in a course so that at least a person from a community can go back into that community or town and be able to practice that profession. At the present time, there are only seven permanent residents of Labrador working in the twenty-two clinics along the coast of Labrador. What an opportunity now for one course, just one course, to show the necessity of involving community representation.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we have major water and sewerage systems in various towns, such as Cartwright, Makkovik, Nain, Red Bay, and Mary's Harbour, just to name a few. Now, individuals need to be trained to look after the maintenance and the repairs to those systems. I had the opportunity last Wednesday to visit a factory that manufactures piping, and also does installation of piping that is used up in my district of Southern Labrador, and that company is interested in assisting students to get the proper training so that they can

go back and work in that community.

One should also realize that a community college in Labrador is going to require a students' residence. The students cannot travel back and forth daily to the community college. Again, I say the only way to get in and out of Happy Valley - Goose Bay is by aircraft, so I think government have to realize that if they are going to set up a community college in Labrador, then a students' residence will be a necessity.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think we should also remember that we have two very distinct cultural groups, the Inuit and the Innu. If we have the college set up there, there are going to be more and more of those people interested in obtaining a higher education in order to be able to get into the work force. Subsequently, there are qualified individuals within my district who can be instructors in a particular field, plus there has to be interpretive services in this community college.

So these are some of the hidden cost factors that are not associated with the other four colleges within the Province. Because of the distinct cultural differences we are going to need interpreters, and maybe in a year or so down the road some of those people could qualify as instructors. I believe we should pick the proper person, the most qualified person as a particular instructor, but at the same time we should realize that it is not only the educational ability or the academic qualifications that a person has that counts. You cannot rely only on academic qualifications. I think the

biggest thing you most realize in rural Newfoundland and Labrador is that an individual may not have a university degree, a Bachelor of Commerce degree or a Business Administration degree, he may not have that, but he does have knowledge of the people, and you have to have knowledge of the people more than anything else. In order to be able to teach properly you not only have to have academic qualifications, you should also have environmental qualifications, I will call it, to go along with a particular position. I would say to hon. gentlemen in this Chamber that we should seriously look at picking the best qualified individuals for a particular position, but not merely pick them on the basis of their academic qualifications.

I am also quite pleased that the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) has decided to advertise for the five CEOs, I guess you could call them, principals of the various colleges. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), will agree with this and the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) will contend with this, that there are individuals in Labrador who are well qualified to do an excellent job as CEO of the Labrador Community College.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend said, a good knowledge of the needs and aspirations of the individuals living in Labrador is needed. What I am saying is, if we are going to advertise for those five positions I think it is ludicrous to expect a fully qualified person in Labrador to come down to Carbonear or vice versa, to expect somebody who is fully qualified to go to Labrador. I think we should

look at the most qualified person who knows most about the area.

I also note, Mr. Speaker, with very much interest that the Advisory Board which has been set up has five women and six men on it, or five and five. What is so interesting about this, and I must give the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies full marks on this, is that we have an Inuit person on that Advisory Board as well as five other people from Labrador. So, actually, three of the ten people are from outside working in Labrador.

MR. BAKER:

All they all Tories?

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you want me to name some of their names -

MR. DINN:

Ninety percent of the people in your district are Tory anyway.

MR. WARREN:

- I would say to the hon. gentleman who is running for leadership -

MR. TULK:

There are none left up there.

MR. WARREN:

- of a political party that I could give him some good names who would probably come out and support him in the leadership.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I have to say to the hon. gentleman -

MR. BARRY:

No deals.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I must compliment you, Sir, you look very dignified in your position there in the chair. You bring prestige to the position, Sir.

MR. SIMMS:

That is a matter of opinion.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is a matter of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

MR. WARREN:

I want to say to my hon. colleague for Gander (Mr. Baker), I can only be honest to the hon. gentleman and say to him of those ten people who are on the Advisory Board I can honestly say that I know for sure that there are two who supports this party.

MR. BAKER:

Only what?

MR. WARREN:

I know for sure there are two. Mr. Speaker, I also tell the hon. gentleman I know for sure that there are three on that Board who did not vote for this party in the last election.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shameful.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague says, shameful. Yes, but I will say they are going to vote in the next election for this party now.

MR. BAKER:

You are moving somewhere else are you?

MR. WARREN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to say to my hon. colleague, I was hoping the hon. gentleman would not make any remarks, because the district

of Naskaupi has been pounding on my door, telephone calls, etc. wanting me to run in Naskaupi. It is getting to the point I can only take so much. I said to them, 'Look, you have a good member there now in the member for Naskaupi, and he appears to be very unhappy over there.' Half an hour before the nomination closed in the last election, he was knocking on the door to join the Conservative Party.

MR. BAKER:

What about Menihék?

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the district of Menihék, in fact, I should remind the hon. gentleman I am making an announcement tomorrow that will be of much benefit to the people of Menihék. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that with the latest poll in Menihék, I would say you do not need Garfield Warren to take the member on. I think a much lesser person who could beat the member for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick) under the present circumstances.

MR. SIMMS:

An orange dog.

MR. BAKER:

They would love you in Gander.

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, he is talking Gander. No, Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. gentleman that I will not go to Gander. I must say I am a little bit scared to go to Gander. I do not think I will go to Gander.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, by the way, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

I might go to Gander.

MR. SIMMS:
(inaudible) for St. John's East.

MR. WARREN:
Hold on, Mr. Speaker, this is coming up now. He told me that the hon. gentleman wanted notice. I am leaving tomorrow on Air Nova. I understand there is an extra seat on Air Nova tomorrow. I am going into Goose Bay -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:
No, no, no, there is a debate in Goose Bay tomorrow between the member's colleague and Mokami Project Group representative, but I will not be there at that, because I am on my way out to Rigolet. I think I can get a seat for the hon. gentleman to accompany me from Goose Bay to Rigolet and we can have a debate tomorrow night in Rigolet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:
Now, what he has to do though is he has to get to Goose Bay the best way he can. I am not going to bring him to Goose Bay, okay.

MR. SIMMS:
Can you get him to Rigolet?

MR. WARREN:
Yes, I can make sure that I can accompany him out to Rigolet and we can have a debate. That would be the first time ever that he saw the Coast of Labrador, or saw Labrador period.

Meanwhile, I am giving the hon. gentleman twenty-four hour notice. I am not going to back out. I am going to be in Rigolet.

MR. SIMMS:
You should send him up now and have two (inaudible) now in Rigolet.

MR. WARREN:
Well, I think that would be very, very embarrassing. I would have to give the hon. gentleman a little bit of courtesy. It would be very, very embarrassing. But I will tell the people in Rigolet tomorrow night when I am there that I have accepted his challenge.

I say to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, there is so much to talk about in this debate.

Let us go back to another district in Labrador, Eagle River. The calls that I am getting from that district! The calls that I am getting from Charlottetown, Cartwright, and Mary's Harbour! Mr. Speaker, here yesterday, in this House, we were debating the Minister of Education's (Mr. Hearn) budget. I think the hon. gentleman was here. We were talking about school buses.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN:
By leave?

MR. SIMMS:
A couple of minutes by leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave.

MR. WARREN:
I have to tell you. We were debating the Minister of Education's (Mr. Hearn) estimates yesterday. We were talking about school buses. This is very, very

interesting. By the way, it is not funny. It may appear to be funny. I had a call from my secretary who asked me to call this person in St. Lewis, in the Eagle River district. So I found out what the trouble was. They had trouble with school busing. I said to my secretary, "Look, there is all kinds of snow down there. There are no roads open or anything like that." No, but in St. Lewis they use a skidoo with a komatik locked on to transport the kids back and forth from school. With the mild weather in the last two or three days it has gotten so bad that it is really rough on the children. All they asked of some other department, while they had a machine there would they come out and level off the road there. It would be much smoother for the children.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they did not ask for the road to be paved or the road to be upgraded. All they are asking for is for it to be straightened out a bit where they can accommodate the children to school. So now there are two kinds of school buses.

I know I have to clue up, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say to my hon. colleagues that I am supporting this resolution. The college system is great. There is going to be an extension to the college system in Labrador West. I am asking that the college system go to the people, instead of the people coming to the system. The college system will work like that. I compliment the minister for bringing in such a worthwhile resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is going to be very difficult to follow up after that wicked speech on post-secondary education, but I will take it and I will heed as much as I can.

The resolution is nice, Mr. Speaker, but I wish there was a lot more to it. I think we all want to see changes in the community college system that will make it a lot more adaptable to the Province and to the people of the Province. We want to bring in courses that will see our young people, and people who want to go back and get their education and proper training so that they can come out into the work force. So it is not a problem supporting such a resolution, but there is a problem supporting it when there is not much to it.

The resolution talks about encouraging the Province to bring in the provincial community college system. In Stephenville we have the Bay St. George Community College which, I feel, has been the leader in this Province and, indeed, one of the leaders across the country in community colleges. It has built itself up for ten years and the staff there have done a tremendous job in putting forward courses that are wanted by the local area and by the Province, introducing the courses and doing all the work behind the scenes. So they have built up, I think, a fine reputation as a leader in the community college system in this

country.

I must say, after seeing some words on the first draft of the legislation, I was somewhat concerned, as were many people in the area, that the community college of Stephenville was getting kind of pushed to the back. While it is an equal partner with the rest of the community colleges, it was felt by many people that some of the programmes were in jeopardy. I have been assured by officials in the minister's department that is not the case. I am looking forward to hearing it from the minister himself and also seeing it in writing as there has been a lot of good work done in Stephenville and the community college there on putting courses together that will address the needs of the area and of the Province. I think it is a provincial institution and I feel it should be kept that way.

I want to commend the people there who have worked so hard over the years to put together the community college as I have been told that the new Community College Act is based the Bay St. George Community College Act, so 90 per cent of it is just a transfer with some changes made. I think when the minister addresses and brings in the Community College Act, he should make special reference to the fact that the Bay St. George Community College has had a great influence on the formation of policy and the formation of the role of community colleges in this Province, and on the formation of the legislation which is now going to be put in place by this government. I think the people of that college should be commended and held in high esteem by educators and other

people of the Province as they have made, I feel, a major contribution to the education of people in this Province.

As a matter of fact, there was a recent announcement that there is a nursing assistants programme being brought into the community college which is going to be brokered from the college in St. John's. There is a need in the Province for nursing assistants and we are now going to see the Western Community College, as it is now called, take on the need, put a course together and address the lack of nursing assistants in the Province. It is another example of that community college and others which have also been working, meeting the needs.

The only problem is that it has taken two years to get that far. The bureaucratic wrangling involved with all the different governments working with the different institutions has slowed down the process. I think that is a major problem that this government is going to have to address in trying to address the needs of people in this Province and the education of people in this Province in the courses that are going to be put forward.

I hope autonomy is going to be given to the community colleges to allow them to address the needs of the local area and also of the Province, as recommended by the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment. They talk talk about the community college system and they talk about seeing the department allowing a lot of autonomy to the community colleges, letting them put forward courses to have their own initiatives put forward. As a matter of fact, the community

college in Stephenville, in Bay St. George has put forward a course just recently, this past year, on entrepreneurship. It was one of the first in Canada.

They developed the course over the past couple of years and they put forward the course. It has been a raving success and we now see the provincial government adopting the entrepreneurship type of idea and bringing it into the provincial system. Again, it is another example of how a provincial community college can certainly have a positive effect on the educational aspects of the Province. I would like to make sure that the provincial community colleges are given the flexibility and the autonomy to do what they are allowed to do, and are not restricted by government regulation and bureaucracy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Right on. It is good to hear that the minister agrees with me, my colleague.

This resolution also talks about - "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Government be encouraged to implement changes in the school curriculum."

I, for one, have wanted to see entrepreneurship, or that type of a business idea, put forward in the school system, at least in the high school system, where you give students at least a look at entrepreneurship or the idea of creating their own initiative. I think it is a good thing. I think it is something that should be offered to students so that they can be encouraged, and there is nothing wrong with encouragement,

encouraged to think about creating their own careers and creating their own businesses, etc. I think it is a good idea and it is one that is long overdue. It is one that we recommended for a long time on this side of the House and I am waiting to see exactly how it is going to be transferred into the high school level and into the junior high level, which I believe is what they are going to be doing in the near future.

I think it is one of the ways to deal with the attitude problem which this government has let exist and go on amongst young people about how we they are going to get their education and what they are going to do after they get it.

While I see a resolution which says, 'Let us change the curriculum,' it gives no specifics as to how you would do that. We have urged, and we will continue to urge, that you address the attitude in the school system of young people who maybe feel that getting an education is not as high a priority as it used to be. That type of thing has to be addressed. I think a move of bringing in entrepreneurship or that idea is a good idea, but it is one that has to be carefully monitored and has to be shown to be effective and should be given the proper resources. Also, there should be proper in-service with teachers in the system so that they can adapt and address those courses and give the proper professional treatment to the courses and to the students.

We noticed in the Budget Speech a lot of this talk about entrepreneurship. I noticed a lot of talk but I did not notice a whole lot of money behind it. I

am somewhat concerned because throwing out the words and not following with the substantive action is not a way to solve the problem. We are looking to try to see if this government is going to put more resources behind trying to address the problem with the community colleges, with trying to re-establish them and trying to get them to meet the challenge of the eighties, to meet the challenge of getting our people educated and trained in the proper professions so that they can come out and either create their own opportunities or be ready for jobs in the Newfoundland and Labrador work force.

Looking at the resolution, it also talks about the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment and emphasizing the importance of an educational system in economic development. When we talk about economic development we are talking about bringing education out to rural communities which the Royal Commission stresses very strongly.

I must again bring up the fact of MUN Extension Service offices being closed out in certain areas of the Province. I think that that is not the way to address the economic problems and to bring education to the people. I think it is a backward move. I have met with the President of the university and will continue to make representation on behalf of Extension Services because I feel that that office and that part of the university should be allowed to continue the good work it has been doing out in the field. It is a way of reaching out to people in the Province and asking them to get involved with creating their own economy and bettering the economy of this Province because

you are asking them to participate. The closing out of MUN Extension Service offices is not a move which we can welcome. It is a move that should not be allowed to go ahead. Hopefully enough pressure will be brought to bear and we will see the reopening of offices that were closed down last year. I specifically refer to the one in Stephenville and there was also one on the South Coast. I think that is a backward move. It is not 'building on our strengths,' as the Royal Commission on Unemployment and Employment talked about. It is taking away from our strengths, it is taking away from our people because we are not providing them with the proper service, we are not providing them with the proper opportunity to deal with and to address the problems.

There are a lot of good ideas being developed out there in the Province and we have to put the resources in place to deal with those ideas and to get them to the bureaucratic level where we can transform these ideas into realistic policies. That has been one of the problems of this government. They have not been able to transform these ideas and I think it is probably from not listening. That is probably what it has been because the ideas are out there and I feel that they be listened to by the provincial government.

One aspect of this resolution again talks about the provincial college system. One of the recommendations that I would like to see, and we are going to continue to push on this side of the House, is extended co-operative education in different faculties in the community college system and

within the universities. A co-op programme will provide educational training and would also provide work experience, a good combination, and would allow for a better educated individual when he came out of the training institution. I think it would provide for the employer a better trained individual which would mean all around economic benefits and, of course, benefits to the whole Province.

This type of move to expand to other faculties in the community college system I think would be a move that would be welcomed by most educators of the Province, by young people of the Province and people going back to school who are trying to get a course. When they get the course, the hardest part is getting experience. The co-operative education model has been one, I think, that has been successful. It has been successful with the engineering faculty of the university, also with the commerce faculty of the university and I feel that it should be extended to other faculties to deal with the syndrome of not being able to get work experience. It may be a somewhat costly measure but it is not a costly measure when you consider the benefits that will accrue to the people who are going to be going through the training and going through the institutions who are going to participate in a work force at a later time.

I was a beneficiary of the Commerce degree which allowed me, Mr. Speaker, to work in the work force in different areas and to also do the business courses at the university. So, it allowed for a good blend of theory and reality when you got out in the work force. I think it is

something that we got to push. We will be pushing it on this side and it is something that the community college system should be looking at, that the minister's officials in Career Development and Advanced Studies should be looking at because it is an idea that has a long-term future. It gives a long-term future to the people of the Province who are going to participate in these institutions and who are going to go to these institutions looking for leadership and looking for proper training and a proper education. It will be a way to get them in there too which is one of the problems that we have been having also with, I think, an apathy towards education by some of our young people. This may be a way you can address the problem.

These are some concerns that I have, Mr. Speaker. It is too bad the resolution does not have a lot of meat on it, Mr. Speaker, where it could bring in strong recommendations. It is unfortunate. I leave you with those few short words.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to say a few words on this resolution. I have spoken on many occasions in the past, both in the House and outside the House, in support of government's intention to bring in legislation to establish a community college system in our Province. I have spoken in a very positive way. I recall, in fact, not too long ago, a petition being presented in this House by my

colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell), the member for Lewisporte, on behalf of some 3,500 people, I believe, in the Lewisporte - Twillingate district area who were calling for the establishment of first year university courses to be brought in in their facility in Lewisporte. I remember having the opportunity to speak in support of that petition. I followed, in fact, the distinguished member for Gander, who, only today, Mr. Speaker, as I speak, is presently on a fund raising campaign to help him with his leadership aspirations to lead the Liberal Party. I am quite prepared to make a small, modest contribution to the campaign of the member for Gander. My cousin might even decide that he is fed up with this interim stuff and want to go at this full-time, in which case I would have to allow for a modest cut to go to him. I have already indicated that I have a great deal of interest in the career of the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry), therefore, I might want to make a small contribution to the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island's campaign.

Most of all, I have to confess, with all due respect to my cousin from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), my good friend from Gander, and my former colleague from Mount Scio - Bell Island, I have to honestly confess, Mr. Speaker - I know this is not really related, but obviously the members opposite do not mind - that my real support and my real interest is in seeing the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) seek the leadership of that party. Here I am making a speech on his behalf, but I truly and honestly believe that that

gentleman is indeed a gentleman and would, indeed, make a good leader for the Liberal Party, and I say that seriously.

MR. SIMMONS:

By implication, then, I am not.

MR. SIMMS:

No. By implication it means that if the member for Bonavista North should decide to throw his hat into the ring -

MR. SIMMONS:

You will cross the floor.

MR. SIMMS:

No, I would not dare threaten the hon. members like that. - what I will have to do is withdraw my commitment to the member for Gander, my commitment to the member for Fortune - Hermitage, and my commitment to the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island of a financial contribution and throw it all to the member for Bonavista North.

MR. SIMMONS:

The whole dollar?

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, the whole dollar. I am afraid I would have to throw it his way because he is indeed, I think, a good potential leader.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not totally related to the new community college system being established in this Province, but it is somewhat related. Because I know, for example, if the member for Gander should find himself elected as leader, God forbid! next June 5, of the Liberal Party, being the education critic in the House for the Liberal Opposition and having sometimes weird and strange thoughts with respect to the post-secondary educational

system in the Province, then he might just have as part of his plank in his next platform an objective in mind to scuttle the community college system. I know that he has lobbied the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies for the establishment of university credit courses to be offered at the Gander campus of the Central Newfoundland community college, whose headquarters are in Grand Falls, of course. I know he has lobbied to have the first year university courses offered there.

If he should not be successful, for example, in his efforts - let us just say, if - well, then, he is likely to throw a tantrum and base his entire leadership campaign on that one issue in order to ensure that he gets the sixteen delegates from Gander to support him at the leadership convention.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can see clearly that it is related to the resolution which deals with the community college system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons that I have such an interest in the member for Bonavista North and seeing him pursue his goal of being leader is because I know he desperately wants to lead the Liberal Party, and that is only overshadowed by his other greatest ambition, and his other greatest ambition, Mr. Speaker, is to sit with his friends over here. Because let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that member, the member for Bonavista North, has more friends over here than he does over on that side, I can tell you. But I said in his absence that if he decides to run I will be happy to take all the contributions I promised to everybody else and throw them into

one pot and give it to the member for Bonavista North because I think he is a fine gentleman and a fine leader and, Mr. Speaker, a very strong supporter of the legislation that is about to come in to establish a community college system in this Province, a very strong supporter, being an educator himself, or a former educator - perhaps he still is, I am not quite sure. I know the member has done some substitute teaching on occasion. I am not sure if he still does, but he is either a former educator or is still an educator. But I can tell you he has a great deal of admiration for this government for bringing in this type of legislation with respect to the proposed community college system.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I dealt with the interest of the member for Gander in the community college system. I know Your Honour, by the way, has a deep interest in this, and although Your Honour cannot express his views in a partisan sort of way, I know if he had the opportunity he would say how delighted he is that this government is bringing in this particular legislation. Because this will do wonders for the young people of our Province, we will finally be moving into the '80s and '90s. At the present time, the system in our vocational schools around the Province reflect policies that were brought in back in the '50s and '60s and, unfortunately, we have not moved to the times, we have not changed with the times. But this legislation when it comes in this session will see to it that we will, in fact, move into the '80s and '90s and change with the times, because we will be offering courses and programmes that are consistent with the needs of our

young people and consistent with the needs of today's industry and so on.

Mr. Speaker, may I also take the opportunity to indicate my great interest in the community college system as it applies to my own constituency of Grand Falls. There has been a committee in Grand Falls for a number of years which had worked quietly behind the scenes and were fortunate in establishing the offering of first year university courses at Grand Falls. It has been done for a number of years. It has been quiet. We did not talk about it a lot, because obviously when you do everybody else wants it. But they went ahead a few years ago and had negotiations with the University; I remember meeting personally with the President of the University at the time to try to get his support. As a result, this committee was fortunate in bringing in first year university courses in Grand Falls. They have been in existence now for five or six years and, as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, young people just leaving secondary schooling have the opportunity of taking first year university courses and getting credits for them in Grand Falls, so that they do not have to come all the way to St. John's. And as I have said on occasion, who would want to come to St. John's to take university courses if there was another alternative?

MR. J. CARTER:
Oh, come on!

MR. SIMMS:
If there was another alternative. No reflection on the people of St. John's, I am talking about the distance and all the rest of it. So the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) who, by the way,

presented in a very eloquent way and articulated his position very clearly on this resolution, and whose resolution I am now supporting, I hope he will not interrupt me and consider that I am making negative comments, because I am not.

In Grand Falls we have had this system in place and, because we have had this system in place in a quiet way for the last half a dozen years, one of the big decisions facing this government at the present time is to extend to our new community college system the brokering of first year university courses.

MR. YOUNG:
Right on!

MR. SIMMS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, that is going to cost a lot of money. We know that. I do not think anybody, as far as I know, in any of the schools that I am familiar with, the people that I have talked with involved with the schools, really expect that to take place overnight, or, indeed, to happen in the first year. However, I think government has indicated that it wants to bring in first year university courses to some community colleges, some campuses. I am very, very optimistic, Mr. Speaker, that the community college headquarters campus in Grand Falls will be at least one of them that will get first year courses for this coming September because of the fact that they have had this programme in place for five or six years, have the experience, and because I know there are teachers - professors, I guess, they would be called - available to teach university courses in Grand Falls, and, indeed, in Lewisporte, which is

not too far away.

As I have said, not too long ago I supported a petition presented by my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, from people who are also looking for first year courses in Lewisporte, so maybe, Mr. Speaker - who knows? - just maybe the community college in Grand Falls and the community college in Lewisporte may be fortunate enough to get first year university courses this September. Who knows! I hope they are successful.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, the community college in Gander will get them. I have no idea at this point in time. But I do know that we have said we want to see the courses introduced. I am optimistic that that will take place. Obviously not all the campuses will be able to get them, it would just cost too much money in one year.

MR. BAKER:
He is a good buddy of mine.

MR. SIMMS:
Who is that?

MR. BAKER:
The minister.

MR. SIMMS:
Which minister?

MR. BAKER:
The Minister of Career Development.

MR. SIMMS:
Is he? That is good! I do not know what that has to do with the debate, but the member for Gander points out that he is a good buddy of the Minister of Career Development. He is obviously a good buddy of the member for Menihek, too. He is sitting bum to bum and cheek to cheek with him

there next door. Of course, having run for the NDP not too long ago, I guess there is a bit of -

AN HON. MEMBER:
What!

MR. SIMMS:
Oh, yes! The member for Gander, who announced his leadership aspirations today, has in his curriculum vitae, or whatever it is called, that he ran for the New Democratic Party, back in 1979.

MR. HEARN:
Does he say he is sorry?

MR. SIMMS:
No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) remembers the NDP?.

MR. SIMMS:
Do not worry about it, Mr. Speaker. At least I won, which is more than I can say for the member in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, I also remember the member for Gander one time - I happened to be in attendance at a meeting with the former Premier, Mr. Moores, and the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) will recall this, too - when there was a by-election in Twillingate district. Mr. Rowe, the open line host, ran and was Leader of the Liberal Party, ironically enough. We were having some discussions with the now member for Gander about possibly running for the Conservative Party in Twillingate district. Mr. Speaker, he may protest this, but I know for a fact that he was very, very seriously considering that. I know he was in his heart and soul, but he was afraid.

MR. BAKER:

It shows that somebody over there had good taste.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. But here is my point, Mr. Speaker. Somebody over here had good taste back in 1977, so he considered running for the Conservative Party in 1977. In 1979 he ran for the New Democratic Party, then, finally, in 1985, there was only one party left, at least at this point in time.

MR. DINN:

Well, there is the Rhinoceros Party.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, that will be his next one, you see. Because what will happen if he does not win the leadership is he will get very, very riled up.

MR. DECKER:

Does this have anything to do with the bill before us?

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes. It is all related. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who is not even in his seat and breaks the rules of the House consistently, is doing it again. He is not even in his seat. He cannot speak from his seat.

MR. TOBIN:

Name his district for the record.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, who is a very congenial individual, by the way.

MR. TOBIN:

He loves Barry.

MR. SIMMS:

Loves? Well, I -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

It will be interesting to see who the hon. member is going to support now, the member for Gander, the member for Fortune - Hermitage, the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, or my favourite, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

My favourite and everybody's favourite.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this is all very clearly related to the community college establishment in this Province because the member for Gander is the critic on education and my concern is that if he is elected Leader of the Liberal Party he may lead some kind of a force to scuttle the legislation that we are going to bring in, to scuttle that situation.

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAKER:

I would simply like to set the minister straight. As he should know, the community college system does not come under Education but comes under Career Development and I would suggest that that throws out his whole argument. Therefore, what he is saying, then, obviously bears no relevance.

MR. DINN:

What a leader!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. I remind the hon. member it is almost six o'clock.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I think I have three or four minutes left. If hon. members would agree, we can call it six o'clock and that will give me a chance to advise the House of the Estimates Committee and so on for the next day or so. Is that agreeable?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SIMMS:

Shall we call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SIMMS:

I adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker, before you adjourn the debate I want to advise the House that the Resource Estimates Committee will examine the estimates of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development at 8:00 p.m. tonight. All the meetings are here in the House of course.

MR. FLIGHT:

8:00 p.m.?

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. There is a slight change there, from 7:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., I understand.

Secondly, the Government Services Committee will review the estimates of the Department of Consumer Affairs tomorrow morning at 9:30 a.m. here in the House. And, finally, tomorrow night the Social Services Committee will review the Health estimates, the estimates of my friend from

Exploits (Dr. Twomey), the Minister of Health, at 7:30 p.m., Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

It now being six o'clock the House stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m. tomorrow.