



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 12

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

17 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Before we proceed with Statements by Ministers I would like to remind the House, and draw to the House's notice, that this is the eighth anniversary of the election of the then, and indeed the still, hon. the member for Green Bay (Premier Peckford) as Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
While St. Patrick's Day is traditionally celebrated throughout Newfoundland in honour of the great Saint himself, and perhaps even in honour of our illustrious Speaker, it may also be celebrated by some in honour of the Premier. I am sure all hon. members join me in congratulating the hon. the Premier, hon. members on both sides, and I would suggest including the two hon. members on the other side who participated in the same event.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we join with the Government House Leader in expressing congratulations to the Premier on having survived yet one more anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, some of us who have participated in events of that nature are still finding that the thrill of the chase is still there and that in recent days we have seen that chase becoming even hotter. We look forward, over the next couple of months, to being in a position once again to enjoy with the Premier the solidarity which from time to time he has enjoyed, and we look forward to having the opportunity, in the not too distant future, to be able to invite the Premier to take that well-deserved rest which he is about to obtain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, I do not have to remind all hon. members that today is the official St. Patrick's Day, March 17, and it is my pleasure to welcome to the Speaker's gallery His Excellency Shaun Gainer, the Irish Ambassador to Canada, and Mrs Gainer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
If I may, I would like to bring an Irish greeting to all. Beannactha na Feile Padhraig Dhibh go leir agus go mbeimid beo ar an am seo aris.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Without unduly delaying the House, Mr. Speaker, in addition to, of course, welcoming the Ambassador and hoping he has a good stay, I would like to point out that some of us who do not have any green showing, it is because we are Irish all year round, like the Ambassador.

MR. SPEAKER:

I know some hon. members may not understand my Irish, so for their benefit I would like to translate that greeting. It is the blessings of St. Patrick's Day to you all and may we all be alive and well this time next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome to the galleries the Mayor of Trinity, in the district of Bonavista North, Mr. Ernest Rogers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I thought the reason why the Leader of the Opposition was not wearing green was because he would be green with envy.

I have a statement here that I would like to give, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that all hon. members who have been following the curling action at the Brier last

week were delighted by the showing of the Mark Noseworthy rink from the St. John's Curling Club.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Newfoundland placed third overall in the competition with an eight and three record, and in addition Mark Noseworthy was named to the second all-star team at the end of the tournament.

It is somewhat sad, therefore, that despite the excellent showing of the Newfoundland rink, they were not selected as one of the three teams to attend the Olympic trials for curling - Canada/France all over again. The Adams rink from Quebec, which finished in fifth place with a six and five record, was chosen instead as the third rink to attend the trials, along with first place Ontario and second place British Columbia.

In light of this disappointing decision, I have telexed the President-Elect of the Canadian Curling Association outlining our deep discontent. I have also telexed the Honourable Otto Jelinek, Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport, requesting that he investigate the process which led to the decision to disregard the Noseworthy rink.

Nevertheless, this negative decision should not overshadow the excellent sporting accomplishment of the Newfoundland team. I am sure all honourable members will join with me in extending the congratulations of this Honourable House to Mark Noseworthy and his team of Randy Perry, Gene Trickett and Rob Thomas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we join fully and wholeheartedly in the Premier's statement. However, we invite the Premier to go a bit further. Prior to coming to the House today, members on this side agreed that we would seek a resolution, pending unanimous approval by the House.

MR. DAWE:
We?

MR. BARRY:
Yes, we, in our caucus, because we believe that in sports as in politics it should not be a matter of discretion, the test should be the win. The Newfoundland team came third, they had their metal tested in the process of competition, and that is how sporting events evaluate who is entitled or who is not entitled to participate in events such as the Olympics or the Olympic trials. It is very dangerous when we get an element of discretion which involves all sorts of subjective analysis by those doing the evaluating. We would submit, Mr. Speaker, that there should be a unanimous resolution of this House, and we suggest to the Premier and the Government House Leader that they join with us, and we invite the members on our right, as well, to join with us in expressing the unanimous disapproval of this House for the action taken in ignoring the Mark Noseworthy performance and to see if there is any way at all

possible that the decision be reversed so as to include Mark Noseworthy and his team at the Olympic trials.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We will agree, Mr. Speaker. If representatives of the three parties get together and work out a resolution which is acceptable to all three, then we can put it before the House at some appropriate time during the afternoon and have it passed.

MR. BARRY:
Sure.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, we would like to echo the sentiments of both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition and say that we, too, are quite proud of the Noseworthy rink and what they accomplished. We, as well, are dismayed that they are not being invited to the Olympic Trials.

I would like to point out one thing, because it has been mentioned to me a dozen times since I returned home from the convention, and that is that we had nothing to do with cutting off the end of the semi-final game, it was a decision of the television network, and we were just as irate as everybody else, since we were trying to follow the game ourselves. We will be very happy

to participate in the unanimous resolution.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, as Minister responsible for Housing, I am pleased to advise members that the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation will be engaging in a comprehensive assessment of social housing needs across the Province. I take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in announcing that this assessment will be the first of its kind in the Province devoted to a measurement of relative provincial housing needs. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to establish a framework for determining social housing need priorities. To assist Newfoundland and Labrador Housing in this major research initiative and resulting from a recent public proposal call, the local consulting firm of D.W. Knight Associates has been selected to carry out this work. Mr. Knight's firm will be joined by Ekos Research Associates, a company which has extensive knowledge and expertise in the area of housing research.

Coincident with the development of a comprehensive assessment of housing needs, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation will be engaging in an extensive public consultation process which will involve a series of seminars/workshops throughout the various regions of the Province. Through this consultation process all municipalities and organizations

representing low income families, senior citizens and special interest groups, as well as individuals with an involvement or need for housing, will be invited to come forward with their ideas on how social housing objectives can best be met in the Province. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call upon all members of the House to encourage interested groups and individuals who are known to them, to participate in this process. In this regard as well, an extensive publicity campaign will be undertaken to ensure that all individuals and groups who are affected by this special review are included in this most important study.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, waiting list information and/or requests from individuals or groups for housing services have been the main criteria for distributing housing resources. Such information, however, does not necessarily reflect a complete or truly accurate picture of housing need within the Province. In large measure this situation has resulted from the split in housing responsibility which previously existed between the provincial and federal housing agencies in terms of programme delivery. However, with the finalizing of the global agreement on social housing between the federal and provincial governments in mid 1986, the previous method of allocation is no longer satisfactory and must be refined to reflect a more precise measure of provincial housing need. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that we, as a Province, will be able to influence the targeting of available social housing programmes in keeping with our own criteria and define the relative need of all communities and

special needs groups requiring assistance. Accordingly, the so-called "one stop shopping" for housing services in this Province through the provincial housing agency will be fully realized.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise members that the Corporation is committed to this provincial housing needs study and public consultation process, and together these components will combine to enable the development of a multi-year housing strategy for the Province. This strategy will focus on the identification of priority housing needs, the formulation of programme responses to meet these needs and related financial planning of required resources. Indeed, I look forward to the completion of this major initiative by late Fall, as it will enable a rational and planned approach to the provision of social housing programmes and services in the Province for years to come. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the minister for sending me a copy of the statement. We also, in the Opposition, welcome the announcement that they are going to do a reassessment. The minister says that they are trying to get a rational and planned approach to the provision of social housing programme and services in the Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that it is about time that they are finally going to get around to trying to do something about it.

Because in this Province there is a crisis in social housing; there is not enough, for one thing; there is also a problem with the way in which it is allocated, and people cannot afford to live there. As a matter of fact, I have constituents, and other members on this side have constituents who are getting thrown out of social housing because they cannot pay the rent, supposedly, and they are being sent legal bills from Newfoundland and Labrador Housing because the lawyers for the Housing Corporation cost so much money. So while they are looking at it, they are planning a comprehensive assessment and everything else, I would ask the minister to take these other things under advisement and do something about them quickly, because there is a crisis out there in the system.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

We, too, are pleased to see the initiative by the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn). In the last couple of years, it has been my experience that we have received a tremendous number of calls from individuals who have a very difficult time getting into social housing especially, sometimes indicating waiting lists of 200 or 300 people ahead of them. It is certainly helpful that the provincial government will now be addressing the question of exactly how long those lists are, and what kinds of

needs we have. It is encouraging to see this kind of social planning going on. It is unfortunate we have not been able to do it in the past. But now, maybe, we will at least have a good handle on what the needs are, and hopefully be able to respond to those needs over the coming years.

MR. SPEAKER:

Any further Statements By Minister?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to inform the House of Assembly that Chief Donald Randell of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary has decided to retire from the Force on August 31, of this year. Chief Randell, who was born in Port Rexton, has had a varied and distinguished career with the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, which has spanned more than thirty years.

Chief Randell joined the Force on May 5, 1956, and performed highway patrol duties for the first year. In 1957, he moved to the Criminal Investigation Division and was promoted to Sergeant in 1967. He was further promoted to the rank of Head Constable in 1970. In 1971, Chief Randell became a Detective Lieutenant and was in charge of detective field activities for the Force. He was made a Detective Inspector in 1976, and in 1980, was appointed Deputy Chief of Police.

He was made Chief of Police in 1984, and as Chief, he has

overseen major growth and significant improvement in the Constabulary. Under his leadership the Force grew to its present size of 382 members and expanded its geographic jurisdiction beyond St. John's to the Northeast Avalon area, Labrador West and Corner Brook.

Chief Randell is a graduate of the Canadian Police College and has been an active member of the Atlantic Provinces Association of Chiefs of Police.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government, I extend gratitude to Chief Randell for the exemplary way he has discharged his duties and responsibilities as Chief of Police.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House Assembly that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has approved the appointment of Deputy Chief, Edward Coady as the new Chief of Police, effective September 1 of this year.

Deputy Chief Coady, a native of St. John's, joined the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary in 1980, following twenty-four years with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and one year as Director of Emergency Measures with the Provincial Government.

Deputy Chief Coady served with the R.C.M.P. in New Brunswick, Harbour Grace, St. John's and Ottawa. In 1969, he became a Sergeant and worked as a supervisor in the R.C.M.P. Career Planning Branch. In 1973, he was promoted to the rank of Staff Sergeant and became a Senior Programme Analyst responsible for planning, development and administration of the R.C.M.P. National Airport Policing Programme. In 1978, he

served as a Senior Advisor in the R.C.M.P. Staffing and Personnel Branch in Ottawa.

In 1979, he retired from the R.C.M.P. and returned to Newfoundland to assume the position of Director of Emergency Measures for the Province.

In 1980, he was appointed Deputy Chief of Police (Administration) of the R.N.C. Deputy Chief Coady was directly responsible for the planning and development phases of the expansion of the Force to the Northeast Avalon, Labrador West and Corner Brook.

Deputy Chief Coady brings a wealth of operational and administrative police experience to his new position. As well, he is a graduate of the Canadian Police College and the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration College.

On behalf of the government, I extend congratulations and best wishes to Deputy Chief Coady for the challenges that lie ahead.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we thank the minister for supplying us with a copy of the statement beforehand.

We wish to join with the minister in expressing good wishes to the retiring Chief Randell. Those of us who are not yet ready to retire hope that he enjoys his retirement. Mr. Speaker, we congratulate Deputy Chief Coady on being moved to the position of Chief. We hope that he will have

the same support from the police membership that I believe Chief Randell has had. It seems that it has been a period of some stability in terms of the force, at least from public, outward appearances and we hope that this continues, because there have been problems from time to time. We are delighted, Mr. Speaker, to join in congratulating Chief Coady, and we wish him every assistance that we can provide in the way in which he carries out his job.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, we also wish the retiring police chief a happy retirement and hopefully a fulfilling one. We also bring our best wishes to Deputy Chief Coady as he assumes the position as chief and hope that these upward promotions will leave additional spots to fill within the ranks of the constabulary and from our perspective, since we are interested in seeing more women involved with the uniformed services, we hope that perhaps some of the fine young constables and other ranks who have been brought into the constabulary in the last five or six years, the women, will be considered for some of these promotions so that we will have better role models in the future for increasing the participation. Also, we hope that new Chief Coady will have a very open attitude towards the recruitment of women and we are going to insist, as we have in the past, that there be a considerably larger number of women hired as time goes on.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the establishment of a Workers' Compensation Appeal Tribunal which becomes effective today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:
Members of the House of Assembly may recall an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act passed last year which provides for a restructuring of the Workers' Compensation Commission. As we know, Mr. Speaker, that has taken place, the restructuring and a new board has been put in place. A principal feature of the restructuring is the establishment of an appeals mechanism completely independent of the Commission.

The Appeal Tribunal has jurisdiction to deal with all appeals from workers or employers with respect to actions or decisions of the Commission on matters respecting: An injured worker's or dependent's entitlement to compensation benefits; an injured worker's entitlement to rehabilitation services and benefits; a provision of medical care; an employer's assessments; assignment of an employer to a particular class or group; an employer's merit or demerit rating.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of

the Appeal Tribunal represents an important action on the part of this government to provide workers and employers with an appeals system which will operate in a fair and independent manner.

The members who comprise the Appeal Tribunal are: Mr. David Buffett as Chairperson; Ms Lisa Byrne-Clarke is the Vice-Chairperson; Mr. Gonzo Gillingham and Ms Judy Greenland are Workers' Representatives on the Tribunal; and Ms Caroline Barker and Mr. Gerard McDonald are the Employer Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, before I resume my seat I would like to make a correction of a typographical error in the title. It is the 'ESTABLISHMENT' not the 'ENTITLEMENT OF AN APPEAL TRIBUNAL FOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, we did not notice the typographical error on this side, thanks to the minister, because I do not see a copy of it over here lying around. The decency of the minister in giving us a copy on such an important matter, surely must be underscored.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, a copy of this Ministerial Statement was sent to the Opposition this morning at about eleven-thirty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to stand and clarify in this House to whom, if indeed there was a copy sent to the Opposition Office? A cute little trick.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it illustrates the same type of incompetence he has shown in putting the Appeal Tribunal in place.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. the House Leader on the Opposite side (Mr. Tulk) was too busy in his meetings this morning, and too preoccupied, but my secretary did send the required number of copies.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I say to the hon. gentleman that his attempt to communicate to the Opposition was done in the same manner as he has been communicating to the people of

Newfoundland in regard to the Appeal Tribunal, when the patronage deals that have been put in place by his own government caused workers in this Province problems that should have been solved last Spring, when the legislation should have been proclaimed in the Summer. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. gentleman that we welcome finally that workers in this Province will have an opportunity to be heard by an independent -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The papers want to know who is the leader.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Can somebody keep the Premier down?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

- by an independent tribunal rather than by the Workers' Compensation Board, the same people who ruled on them in the beginning. It is long overdue and we would like for the minister to stand at some point and tell us how much it cost the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to get rid of the patronage appointments of the Premier and the former Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

We cannot have any satisfactory oral questions unless we have some silence from hon. members on my left.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:
He has a copy, look!

MR. PATTERSON:
He has Leo's copy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Actually, Mr. Speaker, we just got a copy about a minute ago from the Pages. We did not get one this morning either, to be accurate about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:
I apologize, Mr. Speaker. There has been a mix-up in this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:
At eleven-thirty this morning, Mr. Speaker, a sufficient number of copies for everybody in the House, plus about twenty-five or thirty extra copies for the media, were sent from my office up here. Now, where it got mislaid between all the members over there, I do not

know.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
I can only say that when they bring television cameras into the House, I hope they are in colour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, just a few comments. We, too, have been waiting eagerly for the appointment of this board. We have seen in the past a number of what we consider injustices that have been perpetrated by the tight-knit appeal system that yesterday was in place with the Workers' Compensation Commission. We are pleased to see the independent tribunal. We feel that this will at least give claimants a feeling of justice having been done. Hopefully, the claims that are being rejected on a frequent basis will be more sympathetically heard. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
I would like to welcome to the galleries the Deputy Mayor of Pasadena, Leila Janes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. TOBIN:

Get up, 'Roger'!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, would you name that fat fellow?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier is aware that the Premiers of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario were invited some weeks ago to form an action group by the federal Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski), to discuss how to sell more Western Canadian coal to Ontario Hydro? I wonder if the Premier would inform this House whether any similar action group has been offered by the Government of Canada with respect to proceeding to the development of Labrador hydro?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we have as many provinces who are involved in the Labrador power situation. I do not know if any other province besides Newfoundland has claimed jurisdiction over Labrador. Therefore, I am not sure if it is

apples and apples, because, as I understand it, the Deputy Prime Minister, as a representative of the West, is dealing with the Western provinces, all of whom have coal and who want to ship some of it East to Ontario. So I am not sure if it is an apples and apples situation where Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would have some Labrador power that they own, in the same way as Manitoba or Saskatchewan have some coal with Alberta and B.C. So I am not sure if the same parallels exist as the Leader of the Opposition is trying to construe. So I do not think it is exactly the same thing.

As I understand it, the provinces in the West are trying to sell coal to Ontario Hydro. We are continuing to pursue, with both the Quebec government and the federal government, ways of breaking the impasse with Labrador power and we will continue to do so.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, it is not apples and apples. It is Canadians and Canadians.

I ask the Premier is he aware that Ontario is discussing with Quebec the possibility of purchasing hydro-electricity from that Province? Is it not in the interest of this Province, Mr. Speaker, to sit down with Ontario, with Quebec and with the Government of Canada to find a way in which this Province can see any surplus that would result from the development of Labrador hydro

available for sale in other parts of Canada, wherever the Province would get the best price, if that in fact could be economically viable? Is the Premier aware of Ontario's interest in purchasing hydro electricity and what has he done about it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we cannot do anything about Ontario purchasing electricity. We have been to the National Energy Board - I do not know how many times - as it relates to exports from Quebec either to a Canadian province or to a state in the United States, on many occasions, both through the National Energy Board or through the courts, to try and get our legitimate concerns realized, and they have not been. We are continuing to have discussions with the Government of Quebec and with the Government of Canada over the issue of Labrador power, over the present inequitable situation that exists under the Upper Churchill power contract, that was signed and entered into at a time when the Leader of the Opposition's party was in power in this Province, was the government of this Province. We have been using all avenues that we can to try to correct that inequitable situation and, additionally, to see further developments of hydro power, as it relates to the Lower Churchill River and the five other rivers that have been identified, as soon as we can. We will continue to do that and continue to try and make changes and see developments occur as quickly as we can.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would tell us whether it is correct that the Prime Minister of Canada offered help to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, offered to become involved in breaking the impasse which exists with respect to hydro-electricity between Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec, and has that Prime Minister been required by the Premier to live up to that commitment, or is it yet again an example of lack of credibility on the part of the Prime Minister and lack of action on the part of the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Leader of the Opposition should chose his words carefully. The word 'credibility' is not one that should be on the tip of his tongue these days. Mr. Speaker, we have taken the Prime Minister up on his undertaking and we have, as I already indicated in the answer to the previous two questions, been working with the federal government through the Prime Minister's Office, through the Energy, Mines and Resources ministry, and with the Premier of Quebec (Mr. Bourassa) and other members of the Quebec cabinet and other people in the Quebec government to try to resolve the problems that we face as it relates to Labrador power. So, the answer to the question is, yes, we have taken the Prime Minister up on that and talks are ongoing between both governments, both governments being the

Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) and it is with regard to his answering questions in the House a couple of days ago with regard to the toxic waste sites at Come By Chance. In answering the question the minister said, "So, besides the \$5,000 that was already spent we are going to have to spend probably five or six times as much," so that indicates he is going to spend another \$25,000 or \$30,000. My question is why, Mr. Minister? What exactly was in the first, now secret, \$5000 study of those toxic waste sites that requires or forces the minister to do another \$30,000 study?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to the hon. member in previous answers that we did a preliminary study for Cabinet's consideration and it was even our intent at that time to do a more comprehensive study. I estimate that the cost of that study will be somewhere in the order of \$30,000. We have gone out now for proposals to do just that.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the

member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Also in the minister's answer, Mr. Speaker, were these short lines, "taking soil samples and so on, that would be required to ascertain" - it can be ascertained - "exactly what constituents of the soil are there, what it is made up of, what ... has drained into it," or what has drained out of it? Now my question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister is what exactly is there in those toxic waste sites that something can drain out of or something can drain into?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, that statement by the hon. the member is not really a question. I mean, the fact of the matter is that that is what we will ascertain from the study. That is why we are going to spend about \$30,000 to do a more comprehensive study to find out if indeed there are any problems with the two sites at Come By Chance, and that study will clearly show that. That is why it is being done, obviously.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister said that something has drained into or something has drained out of. But, anyway, Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is in view of the now public call to stop the cover-up and to release that report, will the minister

consider - he has now got a public call as well as calls in this House of Assembly to stop the cover-up, stop the secrecy - releasing that report so as to ease everybody's mind with regard to the situation with both toxic waste sites?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans would do if it were not for the reporter at The Sunday Express who keeps asking these questions. Let me say to the hon. gentleman, again, that the preliminary study was done for Cabinet consideration. I say to the hon. member, along with his colleagues, from what they have been doing these past few days I doubt that he will ever be in a position to ever view a Cabinet document. I doubt that they will ever do it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. In rising to pose my question let me, as one who had the privilege of working side by side with him in Green Bay, wish him the best on his anniversary.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You are not coming over, are you?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

No, I am not coming over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I want to raise a question about the Premier's recent attendance at the First Ministers' meeting on the matter of the free trade issue. I wonder if he would indicate to the House whether he is satisfied that he and his government are having, and will continue to have, an adequate voice in the Canada-US trade talks?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, very much so. I guess I could lament that if we were as well informed a few months ago on the Canada-France fisheries issue and other issues in other areas that are going on in Canada as we have been on the trade issue, I think we would be far more advanced than we are right now. There has been a really good system put in place at the officials' level, at the ministerial level, and then at the First Ministers' level, and the ambassador for trade, Mr. Reisman, and his people have briefed our ministers and the officials and the First Ministers completely and totally. The Premier for Ontario, (Mr. Petersen) may have some concerns about a more comprehensive free trade agreement, but I do not think he has any concerns about the process in the sense that we are getting the total information. And this

past meeting was by far the best of all the meetings in the sense that we are getting all of the information. So I am very happy with the process.

On the question of ratification, which was hinted at in the hon. member's question, some of us take different views on that. As First Ministers, I do not believe that it is in the interest of Canada for each province to have a veto on an international trade agreement. I think there has to be some kind of consensus. My comments at the time were, and still are, that after the package is presented to the premiers, if there is a majority of premiers opposed to it, and if the federal government still wants to move on it, it moves at its peril towards implementing that agreement. But I think it is by consensus rather than by any veto mechanism that ratification of the agreement will have to come.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Does not the Premier, though, see some inconsistency between his position on there being no need for a veto in this international trade agreement and the case he made for one insofar as the Canada - France trade agreement was concerned, where, by implication at least, he asserted that without Newfoundland's agreement to the allocation of the Northern cod there should have been no allocation to France?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We never, ever argued for a veto. We were opted out of the secret meeting that was held in France. I think, in light of what has happened since across Canada on the matter, that the federal government are moving against the wishes of the Province most directly affected and against the wishes of most Canadians. We would never ask for a veto in those talks. But once you present a mountain of facts to the Government of Canada and they ignore that mountain of facts, we think it diminishes the strength that the federal government has in this field. Unfortunately, it did, but we have never asked for a veto.

MR. SIMMONS:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
So in the light of the Premier's latest response, is he saying to the House, then, that there are circumstances under which he could have agreed to the allocation of Northern cod stock to France?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, we would have always opposed that consistently throughout. We opposed the allocation of any Northern cod stocks in any interim fisheries agreement, opposed it in writing at the officials' level,

opposed it in writing at my level, opposed it all the way through.

MR. SIMMONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may, very briefly?

MR. SPEAKER:

That was a final supplementary, but I will recognize the hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, just a final and brief supplementary. In the light of the latest response, then, once the Government of Canada knows the Government of Newfoundland's position on the issue, how can the Government of Newfoundland prevent it from happening, despite the vociferousness of his position, short of having a veto on that matter?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You cannot. There is no way you can do it. All you can do is present the facts and argue. That is why I will be going to the Senate tomorrow in Ottawa, presenting my facts to the Committee of the Whole of the Senate tomorrow afternoon, to do just that. The feeling, and I guess this is the way Canada has always worked and this is the argument that I used in the trade negotiations, is if in their wisdom or lack of it - in this case it is lack of it - they persist in moving ahead in the way they had up to January 24, well, then I think they move at their peril, because I think over time it will come back to haunt them and will be reversed by some

future government.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) and it has to do with the situation in Corner Brook where an investment counsellor, I believe, in the last number of days has been charged with a number of counts of misappropriation of funds. My question has to do with the minister's department and its responsibility for supervising investment dealers and investment brokers in the Province. And I would like to ask him has his department done any investigation of this particular individual, and the situation, in order to see what has happened to what is evidentially hundreds of thousands of dollars that have gone missing from people who have entrusted it to this individual?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think I would rather be a bit cautious about making any comments in the Legislature pertaining to this particular case. It is, as the hon. member knows, before the courts. As I understand it certain charges have been laid. So perhaps I would be remiss in making any statements here other than to say that my department has

been contacted and we do do audits and inspections of various persons such as those engaged in this particular kind of business. I am not aware of any specific details pertaining to this particular case. I will, however, get some more details and if there is something that I feel I can relay to this House, or maybe to the hon. member privately, then I will, but I would like to be cautious in saying anything publicly about it.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek, a supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary has to do with my understanding that investment dealers like this can actually set themselves up in business with virtually no regular inspection of their books. Is it correct to assume that individuals in this Province can set themselves up as dealers, such as he has, and that these individuals have no regular audit that they have to go through, and no inspection by your department other than on an infrequent or casual basis?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, there are periodic visits, inspections and audits done on businesses such as this. I would not say they are done as frequently as perhaps they should be because of a lack of staff and the numbers that are around. They have to apply to the department for a license to do that kind of thing. I understand that in this

particular case the hon. gentleman referred to did not renew his license for a considerable period of time prior to this incident taking place. But we do carry out periodic inspections and audits on all the businesses that we have time for and can possibly deal with within the limits of the manpower that we have.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, if, as the minister has just indicated, this individual's license had lapsed, my question to the minister is: Does that mean, then, that any of the other people licensed under your legislation could actually be continuing to practice as investment brokers or investment dealers of this kind even though their licenses have lapsed as well? In other words, what happens when you license lapses? Why was this person not reined in and said, "Look, you have not renewed your license. Stop doing it"?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, situations, I suppose, occur - I kind of feel like I am making excuses - and perhaps with the limited manpower we have to check on every single business of this nature, and others, there are times when a license will lapse and by the time we become aware of it and get a chance to check on it and go out and ask for the renewal, then

unfortunately certain things have happened in the interim. But we do try to contact people in a reasonable period of time subsequent to their not renewing their licenses to see if they intend to renew them and if they are still continuing in the business they were in. Unfortunately circumstances happen in the interim and we do not catch everything.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) a question. The minister will be meeting here tomorrow in St. John's with Tech Corporation which is the parent company which runs Daniel's Harbour zinc mine. I want to ask the minister: In light of the fact that 165 miners and their families will have no income whatsoever in two weeks time, whether he is approaching this meeting with a sense of optimism that this mine will indeed open soon?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, of course we are always very optimistic, but I do not know if optimism is all we will need with respect to Daniel's Harbour. We hope that the company will have a proposal that they can put to us tomorrow. I am meeting with a Mr. Latewich and the manager of the mine. We would hope that a proposal will come forward, but we certainly do not know at this stage whether they

will have a proposal to present to us tomorrow. If they do we will certainly give it quick assessment because we know that April 14 is the cutoff date of U.I. payments to the people in Daniel's Harbour. That is one of the reasons we called the meeting at this stage, because we did not seem to be making much progress and we wanted to make sure that we had a yes or a no for the miners out in the hon. member's district.

MR. FUREY:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if government is prepared to offer any financial help to the mine at Daniel's Harbour in light of the fact that Baie Verte was given help -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It has a lot more reserves, though.

MR. FUREY:
- the St. Lawrence mine was given help, and Hopebrook was given help? I would just like to ask the minister is he approaching this meeting with a mind open to offering government help should it be sought?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member, if he looked at the history of what has happened over the past year, would see we have had good looking times with respect to the price of zinc and times when they were not so good.

The prices have ranged to a peak of something like forty-five cents this year, and that was the time at which the company made a presentation to government for the possible reopening of the Daniel's Harbour mine. The price went from there down to about thirty cents at one point, and right now it is sitting at thirty-three cents U.S. on the London exchange.

It is very difficult to see what the company has in mind at this stage. We would hope that their review of zinc prices and projections of zinc prices are a little more optimistic, I can tell the hon. member, than what we can say. Our investigations reveal that the prices will waiver somewhere between thirty and forty cents. It is quite a thing for any company to take that on but we would certainly have an open mind with respect to any proposal that the company might make to us tomorrow. We will be wanting some guarantees as to the length of time the mine will be opened. We certainly would not just lash out some money and have the mine not reopen at all, but we will certainly listen with an open mind and I am sure my colleagues in Cabinet will view and receive it in a positive vein.

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 Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn). I would like to know could the minister tell us if the Newfoundland and Labrador

Housing Corporation employs its own lawyers or do they tender out for legal help? Also, when they pursue legal action against social housing clients, are they using this legal help from the Housing Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, in the St. John's region generally what we do with legal work is we have our solicitor with Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. He handles most of the work in the St. John's area. In other areas or regions of the Province we have names of people we call on short notice when lawyers are required, and the work is apportioned out in that way by the solicitor for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, is it the policy of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, Mr. Minister, after attempts to evict social housing clients, to send them the legal bill that was incurred in trying to evict them?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, there was a little bit of noise down in this area of the House and I did not quite get the total question the hon. member

was asking.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

After failing to evict social housing clients from the Housing Corporation, after failing to evict them many times, to get them out, to throw them in the streets, could the minister tell us is it the policy of the Housing Corporation to send the legal bill to the these same people after they have come up with the money from God knows where?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

It is a very rare occasion when somebody gets evicted from a house. Any person, for example, on social assistance, it is just about impossible in that situation to evict. When some people on low incomes run up a bill of \$3,000 or \$4,000, and it takes a period of years for these things to happen, and no attempt is made at times by these clients to pay the 25 per cent of their income which is what the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation as a federal/provincial policy have to charge, when they do not pay the 25 per cent of income for their units, then, Mr. Speaker, after a period of time certain actions have to be taken, certain actions we are forced to take because the federal partner will not participate in a programme where clients do not pay their share of the housing costs. So in those situations, unfortunately, eviction has to take place and the courts award charges for actions

taken - either they award them to the client or to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation - and when the courts do that, of course, they have to be collected.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward). In view of the difficulties experienced by the Bay d'Espoir salmon growers in the development of their co-op, would the minister agree to having an independent assessment panel appointed to look at their development plan and to make recommendations to these people as to how they might make their plan more feasible thereby not needing the financial input of National Sea or any other large corporation in order to make their plan viable?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I thank the hon. member for the question.

One way to make the plan very viable, and one way that we are researching, is to get an infusion of private capital in the Bay d'Espoir area, Mr. Speaker. That is one very certain way to get the salmon hatchery or the development of the salmon farms off the ground.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

I asked the minister really about the appointment of an independent assessment panel.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is in recent weeks members of the groups from the Bay d'Espoir Salmon Growers Co-op have been in St. John's looking for financial direction in the process of setting up their business. Would the minister now agree to appoint a civil servant, familiar with the different types of funding, whether it be federal, provincial or private enterprise, thereby cutting down on the difficulties that these people are experiencing in finding funding and cutting through the bureaucratic red tape? In other words, ask a civil servant to lead those people through the process that they must have, to point out all funding that is available in order to finance this project?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman must be misinformed, because I know at least two people on my staff who have been working over the last week with the salmon development co-op people.

They have been working with them, and I am also familiar with three other public servants who are working on the proposal from National Sea and the Co-op at the

present time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILBERT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

What I would like for the minister to do is appoint one civil servant so that those people know where to go. I know people who have been into St. John's wandering around for weeks. Appoint one civil servant who is able to acquaint those people with where they go for funding.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the Bay d'Espoir Development Association and the Co-op in Bay d'Espoir know full well, and are dealing presently with very supportive staff of my department on their proposal. The hon. member might not realize it, but the Bay d'Espoir Development Association are more familiar with whom to deal on this programme within my department than probably even I am, Mr. Speaker, and certainly more familiar than he is.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is only time for one short question and answer.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My

question is for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), Mr. Speaker. The minister was not in the House the last couple of days, and I would like just to inform him briefly that on a number of occasions I have been requested by the young boy, who is presently at the Health Sciences Complex, and by his family, to visit him in private, and I have been very unsuccessful in being allowed a private visit with the young boy in hospital. I ask would the minister give an undertaking today to arrange for me, as the member of this constituent of mine, to visit the young boy for a few minutes in private?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was given authority, if in fact he needed it, to visit the youth in question. But it is my understanding that the security people with the boy feel that it is not in the best interests that anybody be left alone with the boy. I have no intention of questioning the decision of the security people, anymore than the Minister of Justice would question the action of the police. In my opinion they are doing a very good job. They feel that the boy should not be left alone with anybody, and that is the way it will remain, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

I would like to welcome to the galleries councillor, Robert French from the Town of Conception

Bay South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, under the Financial Administration Act I have to table all guaranteed loans which I hereby do, and also all temporary loans. This will cover the period from April 18, 1986 to February 26, 1987.

I would also like to table the annual report for the year ending March 31, 1986 of the Newfoundland Liquor Licensing Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Notices of Motion

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to present the following resolution:

WHEREAS the Goose Bay Air Base is being considered for a NATO tactical training center; and

WHEREAS Canada is competing with Turkey for the establishment of a NATO tactical training center; and

WHEREAS the health environmental and wildlife concerns are being addressed about the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador; and

WHEREAS the vast majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians support the establishment of the NATO tactical training center in Goose Bay; and

WHEREAS the establishment of a NATO tactical training center will be of great economic benefit to Newfoundland and Labrador;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly go on record as unanimously supporting Canada's effort to attract a NATO tactical training center to Goose Bay, Labrador.'

I give notice of the motion. I point out that this was the motion which was unanimously endorsed by the House of Assembly last year, by the government, the official Opposition, and the then one person NDP. It was unanimously passed, and, therefore, I am giving notice of it now and asking leave that it be passed without debate or a couple of minutes. I point out that this is the resolution which was unanimously passed last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, is this -

MR. BARRY:

Yes, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. BARRY:

We would consent, Mr. Speaker, to the immediate adoption of this resolution by leave of all members of the House. It is really only the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), who are the only two new members who have not already voted on this resolution and adopted it. We think that it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we protect the economic well-being of the people of Labrador by encouraging employment wherever possible. It is not a case of increasing militarization. The training is going to be done somewhere in Canada. It is training for defensive and not offensive purposes. The jobs are going to go somewhere and, heaven knows, they are desperately needed in Labrador, so we would expect to have the unanimous approval of all members of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

By leave, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Am I correct, Mr. Speaker, in assuming that you want leave to discuss it today? Is this what you are asking for?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

We need to pass it today without debate.

MR. FUREY:
It is the same resolution.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, we would very much like to debate the resolution. We have a lot to say about it and, I think, other members of the House should say something about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, if it is the government wish to put it on the Order Paper and bring it up at its next opportunity -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:
- it is entirely alright with us but we intend to debate it. We intend to bring our concerns to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
No leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, what was requested was leave to pass it without debate, the same resolution that was passed unanimously in the last session -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
- with the support of the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Obviously, there has been a new matter, which has intervened before, and that is the resolution of the New Democratic Party of Canada which went on record as, among other things, opposing the establishment of NATO operations -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
- in Canada, including tactical fighter and weapons training at Goose Bay. Therefore, we do not have leave to pass it and that is all we can do.

MR. SIMMS:
They should be ashamed of themselves.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, am I given to understand that in this House a resolution which was passed unanimously last year by the three parties represented in this House, without debate, but for some reason or other the Leader of the NDP group in this House is now saying that they cannot reaffirm what they already affirmed last year, that we were for the establishment of a NATO base in

Goose Bay? Or, is the problem that we now have the federal wing of the NDP Party dictating to the provincial wing of the NDP Party?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has to answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

What is it that has -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

- changed from last Spring to this Spring?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It does not appear to the Chair that that is a point of order. I think the hon. member got up to make a point, that a certain resolution was passed by certain members unanimously last year.

MR. SIMMONS:

To a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I suggest to the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) - this is not normal but I am sure it is quite parliamentary - may I suggest to him that since the motion was passed unanimously so recently, he might not want to put the House through the time consuming ritual of having to vote again,

that instead we could agree among ourselves that we just get an indication from the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) as to where they stand on it and then, consider them to have shown their position on the issue and that would resolve the matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very helpful, laudatory suggestion. There are only two hon. gentlemen here who were not here last year. They could indicate whether they are in favour of us forwarding the same resolution. Could they both tell us if they are in agreement or not in agreement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, the request was made by the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) to have leave in order to pass that resolution with no debate. I have clearly indicated that we do not give leave. If he wishes to introduce it as a government motion, we would be very glad to make our feelings known on the resolution at a later date, but we have no intention of giving leave. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we go on to some other business.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
I have heard members on each side. I will hear the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) but it does not appear to be a point of order. However, I will hear the hon. member.

MR. PARSONS:
It is a new point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. PARSONS:
As the member for St. John's East Extern, I am in complete agreement with that resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I believe we are now at the point of resolving this whole matter. There are only two hon. members in the House now who were not in here when it was passed unanimously. The hon. the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parson) has agreed that he does not mind the resolution going forward again representing a unanimous view of the House. The hon. the member for Menihek (Mr.

Fenwick) was here last year and agreed with it. Obviously, he is going to be consistent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
So there is only the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) left.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

This seems to be completely irregular. The hon. the member for -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
We do not have unanimous leave to debate this matter today and there will be -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

- and all members will have an opportunity when this motion is called.

Order, please!

Are there any other notices of motion?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I do not think so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Ha, ha!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the week before last the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) asked me a series of questions about the provincial court work load last year related to applications for leave to review custodial dispositions under the Young Offenders Act of Canada, and the projected work load of the new Youth Disposition Review Board recently appointed.

One of his questions was, "Would the Minister of Justice not admit that there were only eleven cases for review under the Young Offenders Act in St. John's last year and that this is the entire number of cases heard last year?"

Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity since to get all the figures from the Department of Social Services, which is responsible for youth corrections and applications under the Young Offenders Act. The data indicates that instead of eleven cases, province-wide last year there were thirty-eight, eleven in St. John's; one in Placentia; three in Grand Bank; two in Clarenville; five in Grand Falls; one in Bonne Bay; two in Corner Brook; ten in Stephenville and three in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

Furthermore, the Department of Social Services officials project some 250 applications for review and reviews this year during 1987 will be put to the Youth

Disposition Review Board.

Petitions

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition today signed by 116 high school students from the Grand Falls - Windsor area, in Central Newfoundland. These signatures, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, were collected in only one afternoon, last Thursday, following the presentation of the all-party resolution in the House on Wednesday with respect to the torch relay. In fact, it came in to me on Thursday by CN bus. That is how enthusiastic these students were about responding and participating in this movement.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the prayer of the petition. It says:

"WhEREAS the Olympic Torch Relay Route only includes a small geographical portion of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and, indeed, it eliminates more than three-quarters of our Province; and

WHEREAS this Torch Relay Programme is a major and significant national event; and

WHEREAS Newfoundland and Labrador should supposedly be a part of this nation-wide event; and

WHEREAS a large number of people and municipalities in Central and

Western Newfoundland and Northern Labrador are extremely interested and anxious to participate along with other Canadians in this programme;

WE HEREBY petition the House of Assembly to use whatever efforts it can to see that the Olympic Torch Relay Committee include the three-quarters of the Province that has been eliminated from the original schedule."

Now, Mr. Speaker, most of the discussion with respect to this took place last Wednesday, when we debated the all-party resolution briefly, but I just want to once again mention, and refresh members' memories, that the route in the rest of Canada, as far as we can ascertain, includes touching the major centres or the major areas of all the Provinces with one exception and that exception is Newfoundland and Labrador. As everybody knows, it is proposed to run it from Signal Hill down to Argentia and to run it across on a ferry. But there is no ferry. The schedule will not have a ferry running, I gather, and now they are talking about using a helicopter. So that is one point.

The Sports Federation here in Newfoundland have proposed a route that would require two days, one additional day to what they have proposed, and that route would see that torch being shown and carried in Central and Western Newfoundland and in Labrador. In fact, that is in their proposed route. The schedule is there, and all it would require would be one additional day at the beginning of their eighty day programme, or whatever it is. It does not start until November, so surely there should be lots of time to organize

something in that respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been doing some more follow-up on this over the last couple of days, since I first got involved in the matter, and I find that Petro Canada is, in fact, the party that is organizing and sponsoring this Torch Relay programme, and I am suspicious of the fact that there are not many Petro Canada outlets outside the Avalon Peninsula, I am suspicious that they may very well be eliminating the rest of the Province simply for a commercial reason and no other. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, then I think Petro Canada has a lot to answer for.

Mr. Speaker, we presented an all-party resolution in this House a few days ago which received unanimous support, and now I have this petition. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I have another petition to present tomorrow, and I just had a note sent in to me from my office saying that I had a call from the Buchans area - the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) will be delighted to hear this - and there is an individual out there who is circulating a petition to request that the Torch Relay go through Central Newfoundland as well as the rest of it.

So, Mr. Speaker, the long and the short of this is that it is, in my opinion, another example of typical Upper Canadian thinking when it comes to involving the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and we have seen example after example over the years. I mean, how many times have we seen maps that have had the Province of Newfoundland left off them? How many times have we heard advertising, Mr. Speaker, that

says, 'We are a coast to coast company, from Halifax to Vancouver, British Columbia', again leaving out Newfoundland? We have this issue here, and more recently we had the issue raised by the Premier today in a Ministerial Statement with respect to the Newfoundland Curling Team. All of those things, Mr. Speaker. With respect to that curling issue, if I was involved with the St. John's Curling Club or some other group, I would be kicking up the biggest fuss I ever could with respect to the Newfoundland teams elimination from that Olympic trial.

It is, as I said, typical of Upper Canadian thinking when it comes to Newfoundland, just simply ignore us, we are too small. I do not think we should give up this fight, Mr. Speaker. I think we should urge people to write letters to Jim Hunter, Chairman of the Olympic Committee, to the federal minister, to the Prime Minister, to whomever they wish.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I only have thirty seconds left, surely the hon. member would like me to finish.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

The minister says he wants everybody to fight this issue. I would like to let the House and the minister know that I have already written to the appropriate officials with regard to Labrador. Also, because it is an

important issue, I think we should all be involved in it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

I am well aware of that, Mr. Speaker. The hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) spoke in this House last week and indicated that other members were getting involved. I mean, I do not care who writes. I am urging everybody to write and use whatever methods they can to try to get them to change this particular issue. It is a simple request, to add one additional day. I think we have to keep up the pressure, because as it stands now this is a slap in the face to Newfoundland and Labrador. And do not anybody belittle it, because it is a fact, it is a slap in the face. I think all of us as members have the responsibility to do whatever we can to pursue the matter over the next few days. Mr. Speaker, I hope hon. members of this House will join with me in this fight and aggressively use whatever methods they can, including getting petitions from their own regions, to get this stupid mistake changed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I take a great amount of satisfaction out of supporting

the petition so ably presented by the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms). Mr. Speaker, the reason I rise is because the member for Labrador is chomping at the bit, of course, to speak in this debate on behalf of his constituents, because I would suspect that he has done as much up until now as the minister has done in bringing attention to his desire to have the relay in Labrador.

I noticed the minister, Mr. Speaker, indicated that the petition was from the Windsor - Grand Falls area. I have not seen the petition. He also indicated that he is expecting one from Buchans. I am sure the minister will do the honourable thing when he receives that petition, if he receives it, and send it to me, as the member representing the people of Buchans, to present, or I am sure he has indicated to the people he is talking to that the honourable and proper thing to do is to send the petition from Buchans to their sitting member.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Just to inform the hon. member, I did not talk to anybody. I just had a call saying that there is somebody circulating a petition around Buchans to send to me to present with respect to the Torch Relay Programme. That is all I say to the hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT:

All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is if the minister is not playing politics with this issue, I am

sure he will do the honourable thing and indicate to the people concerned that they should send the petition to the member representing the constituency that is sending it.

MR. SIMMS:

Go get your own petitions.

MR. FLIGHT:

I may get one or two in Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, why do you not?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, let me say that the minister should stop now because he is going to be seen as playing politics with this issue, and that is something we do not want to have happen.

MR. SIMMS:

You are the only one bringing it up.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, when one realizes that the Torch Relay is going to spend fifty-odd days in Ontario, two days in Newfoundland, one has got to consider the amount of thought that was put into this. I agree with the minister, one has got to recognize the Upper Canada way of thinking. Fifty days, Mr. Speaker, in Ontario, digressing off the Trans-Canada Rural Routes, yet two days in Newfoundland, from St. John's to Argentia. Only a very minute part of the Avalon Peninsula will get a chance to participate in or witness that very significant, historical event that we are going to see, the Torch Relay opening the Winter Olympics.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the minister, or this House of Assembly, or if our efforts can convince the organizers of this Torch Relay to use on the Island even the Trans-Canada route, Mr. Speaker - one could argue it would be nice if they were to digress to the Burin Peninsula and the Northern Peninsula - even that much would allow the rest of Newfoundland to have access to either participating in or witnessing it, Mr. Speaker. There is no question of logistics. The Torch Relay starts in Newfoundland, so nobody from Halifax on West need even know it is happening. All that has to happen, Mr. Speaker, is the Torch Relay start two or three days earlier in Newfoundland. It causes no problems. It causes no complications. It is very simple. We would be in trouble, Mr. Speaker, if the Relay was starting somewhere else and we were in the middle. Then the other provinces and other towns could say, 'Well, you are going to throw our schedules out of kilter.' But, Mr. Speaker, since the Relay is starting in Newfoundland, there should be no problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would have to give this some thought before I would recommend this action, but I have had people suggest to me that if Petro Canada or if the co-ordinators of the Olympic Relay are not prepared to consider our request and are not prepared to give Newfoundland what Newfoundland considers its right in this matter without infringing on anyone else's rights, we should consider pulling out of the Torch Relay.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Just pull out?

MR. FLIGHT:
Yes, not participate.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Yeah, but I mean -

MR. FLIGHT:
The minister says, 'Yeah.' I just simply threw out to the minister just how strong feelings are in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I would need to think about that before I would support that particular action. However, feelings are running strong enough that people are prepared to recommend that kind of action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth is going to speak in support of this petition.

MR. MATTHEWS:
No, I am not.

MR. FLIGHT:
One would have to ask him - this government always seems to be some kind of a crisis control situation - did we not have people this past year talking to the organizers of this Relay? Did we not in Newfoundland, the Newfoundland Government and Minister, know that the Olympics were taking place in Calgary and that would be a flame run? Did they not have any input into the routes? Did they not consider asking how long the Relay would be in Newfoundland? No, Mr. Speaker, they did not consider that. They wait until we have a crisis on our hands and then they react, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, we support the minister and this petition. I would add, Mr. Speaker, that I would want to go on record as saying, as will the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), that the Relay should go to Labrador in a meaningful way, that is satisfactory to the people who speak for Labrador. We support the petition.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like, of course, as Minister responsible for Sports in the Province, to join with my colleague who so ably presented that petition, and, as well, with the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) in supporting the petition.

The situation is, there have been numerous letters of support written from all sides of the House on this situation. I must say, with regard to Labrador, that the first objection to the Torch Relay, the actual run and where it was going to take place in the Province, was raised by the residents of Labrador because they were not included. Of course, a number of individuals in Labrador, the members and myself, have all written to the organizers of the run to voice our concern and disappointment that Labrador was not included. Of course, from that voice of objection then came the broader objection, that there was not enough of the Island portion included in the run.

I would just like to go on record

once again, Mr. Speaker, as totally supporting the petition. Hopefully the organizers will see the light, come to their senses and not just be involved in this for totally commercial purposes of sponsorship, of running in an area whereby they do have retail outlets, but they will expand it right across the Province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to briefly make a comment on the present petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has been granted.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, members. Very briefly, to reiterate and offer additional support wherever we can to the petitions, and supporters of the petitions, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth is quite right, the request for additional appearances of the Torch Relay did start in Labrador because of the fact that they were left out of the provincial scene. But it also became very, very apparent to the people in Labrador and, of course, the Newfoundland portion of the Province, as well, that, as I said in the House in support of the petition last week, it was purely minimum tokenism to have the torch go from St. John's to Argentia. So I would like to

reiterate our very, very strong support and make the comment that it is pleasing to me and pleasing to other members on this side when we do reach a common ground in this House for the common good of all of our people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to present a petition, signed by 103 residents of Labrador. The prayer of the petition is as follows:

"We, the undersigned, wish to petition the Newfoundland and Labrador House of Assembly to intercede on behalf of concerned citizens regarding the flagrant breaking of the law by a number of Innu of the community of Sheshatshit. We refer specifically to the illegal taking of caribou by the Innu from the protected Mealy Mountains caribou herd. We are concerned that not only is the law of the land being broken intentionally, but we are also concerned that a herd of caribou, which had been protected from extinction for many years, is now in danger of being wiped out. We hereby call upon the government to find a resolution to this untenable situation and to act upon the matter expeditiously."

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that earlier the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) had the opportunity to get up and say a few words concerning Native people and at that time he never had the intestinal fortitude - last week

when I was speaking he was shooting across the House at me concerning the Innu people in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. gentleman now has a chance to get up and show his true colours to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Is the hon. gentleman going to be party to laws being broken in this Province, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows that those Innu people are breaking the law. The laws in this Province today apply to everybody, whether it be the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), or the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), or the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long). The same laws apply to everybody and, Mr. Speaker, if we, the elected members of this House, support anybody who takes illegal action in this Province, then we should not sit in this House. The member should not be allowed to sit in this House if he is going to support anything illegal, and that is what the hon. member is doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

If there are illegal actions being taken, I hope the Justice Department of our Province will take the necessary steps. I said that in Goose Bay on Thursday evening to the Committee that was set up. I do not know if the hon. gentleman was in Labrador or not - he probably has not been past the overpass yet - but I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should realize that the caribou in the Mealy Mountains are not only there for the Innu people, they are there for constituents of mine in Rigolet, they are there for the constituents of the member for

Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and they are there for the constituents of the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland). Those caribou were protected for the last nine or ten years for all people in Labrador, not a distinct number of people.

Mr. Speaker, they have been breaking the law. It is very, very interesting to note that I was asked by one of the CBC reporters in Goose Bay on Thursday night, 'One Indian leader has said that the First Ministers' Conference on aboriginal rights is coming up at the end of the month, would this have anything to do with it? Would this have anything to do with the First Ministers' meeting on aboriginal rights on March 26 and 27?

Mr. Speaker, I should advise the hon. gentleman that I just came back from Hopedale and Postville where it was suggested to me, what is the Newfoundland and Labrador Government and the Federal Government doing spending so much money in Sheshatshit if they are going to break our laws? I just want to, Mr. Speaker, in the last minute I have if the House will allow me -

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WARREN:

Could I have about one minute?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. WARREN:

In 1983 - 1984, \$960,000 went to Sheshatshit; in 1984-1985,

\$1,021,000; in 1985 -1986, \$717,000, and this present year, up to today, \$1,119,000 of taxpayers' money has gone into the community of Sheshashit, where we have a bunch of Indians breaking the laws of our Province. Mr. Speaker, they do not recognize the Government of Newfoundland nor the Government of Canada, therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the Department of Justice and the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) to take action against anybody in this Province who intentionally breaks the law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to rise and speak to this petition and to speak in support of the intent of the petition. Just to clarify matters or to make it plain to those members who are not aware, having come back to raise a question with the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth on Friday, on Tuesday I made a press release which was issued, generally speaking, in the region of Labrador which said I do not support illegal hunting of caribou by either Innu or non-Innu hunters, it really makes no difference, and that the law must be applied equally to all - and I had one qualifier - with one exception, that up to such time as the native peoples of Labrador, the Innu and other native groups, have been able to secure a land

claims settlement agreement, or an aboriginal rights agreement, which would give them a certain jurisdiction hopefully, and, of course, both jurisdictions or several jurisdictions would each honour and respect the others jurisdiction. That was my statement and it was quite clear and plain.

Since that, I have been back in the district and I have talked to a number of members of the Mealy Mountains Caribou Conservation Committee, and I have talked to Innu leaders, as well, and I have made that position extremely clear to them, that I do not support illegal hunting of caribou by anybody and that the law must be equally applied until some other jurisdiction by agreement changes that, and that is quite plain.

But in the whole thing, and I commend the minister and I thank the minister for being in the district this morning to meet with the Committee, we have to keep in mind that this is a very trying time in Labrador, and perhaps the whole Province. It is a time for cool heads to be involved, but at the very same time it is a time for concise action, so that if a wildlife law is being broken, then the law has to be enforced.

Now, I do not think the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) is naive enough to think that we are naive enough to believe that we are purely talking about hunting for the sake of having meat to feed some hungry people. I do not think he believes that, and I do not think he would expect us to believe that, because that is not the case. There is a larger, much more complex political statement being made by that.

Now, if the member for St. John's East does not understand that, then he totally misunderstands everything that is happening in Labrador. And it is totally interrelated to questions of NATO, questions of low level flying, questions about the economic future not only of Naskaupi district but all of Labrador, indeed all of our Province, in that the boom of a NATO base would supply perhaps, on an estimate, anywhere from 500 to 1,500 civilian jobs, properly protected and properly lobbied for by all of us. If he does not understand that, then he does not understand very much about our districts. And I call on the member for St. John's East to follow a fine example

MR. WARREN:
And Menihek.

MR. KELLAND:
Well, Menihek, supposedly, we would have to say, has already supported NATO, unless he now wants to weasel out of this, which it sounds like he is trying to do. I would like to know what comments, if any, the Provincial Leader of the NDP may have made on this particular resolution up in the Province of Quebec?

I would like to know what the member for St. John's is going to say when he rises, obviously in support of this petition so ably presented by the member for Torngat Mountains. So we are in a much more complex situation, Mr. Speaker and members, than hunting for meat. It is much, much more complex. If the member for St. John's East has never set foot in Labrador, he should keep his bloody nose out, too.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave to speak to this petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, this petition which was brought in by the member for Torngat Mountains and spoken to by the member for Naskaupi has to do with an important issue, one that goes right to the backbone of my district. In 1978, the caribou herd was down to 178 animals. I have been the member for that area going on eight years, and each year pressure has been brought to bear by communities in the district that wanted to have the Caribou herd opened up. I always took the attitude, get the officials from the wildlife division to get the statistics and the reports done. Last year a survey was going to be done, and the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth did away with the idea. Now, a new one is being done.

After all the years, Mr. Speaker, of residents of Cartwright, Black Tickle and Southern Labrador seeing the herd gradually build up, now we have over forty-odd of the eighty-nine Caribou killed. The law, Mr. Speaker, is the law of the land. While we agree that

this government is dragging its feet, as well as the federal government, on settling land claims, the law has to be respected until changes come about.

Mr. Speaker, before this issue was raised I wrote the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth concerning Naskaupi Indians in Romaine, St. Augustine, and the North Shore of Quebec coming down into Southern Labrador and killing Caribou over the years, so much so that the herd has not been able to build up there. We do not have proper surveillance there, and this is what happens. Wildlife officials should have seen this coming. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, with the number of Innu who went out to the hunting grounds, I do not think we had sufficient people to go out and deal with the situation in the way it should have been dealt with.

I was amazed! And the reason why I wanted to speak to it is that the member for St. John's East made a statement the other day, when he was talking about North West River, and he said that this government and the Province seem to be more concerned with protecting caribou than with protecting the Innu. I take offence to that, Mr. Speaker. As pointed out by the member for Torngat Mountains, a lot of money has been spent in that community. The people in Southern Labrador are extremely upset that this herd has been taken from them. They trapped alongside the Innu over the years with no problems. Now we see a herd that was gradually building up being slaughtered, and that is the main concern of the people of Southern Labrador. The law is the law and it has to be abided by by all, otherwise, there is going to be anarchy. And if

there is going to be anarchy, Mr. Speaker, the ones that are going to suffer are the Caribou herds, because people are just going to poach and every other thing.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition, as a responsible elected member of this House of Assembly. We are here to make laws. We do not make them lightly. We do not make them flippantly. As a result, we expect the laws to be carried out. If the laws are unjust, then it is up to the people to go through the appeal process, either in the courts, or through the Ombudsman, or whatever avenues are open to them.

In supporting this petition I want to say again that the people in Cartwright, in the district of Eagle River, are extremely upset, are extremely mad as a result of the action taken by fellow citizens in our Province, namely, the Innu.

I would ask the provincial government and the federal government to step up their land claims procedures that need to take place so we do not have this blatant violation of rules. I also have to say, Mr. Speaker, that when this government are talking about land claims, let us not forget the people that are in Southern Labrador who, over the years, have inter-married with the Innu and the Inuit. The people in Southern Labrador, in the district of Eagle River, also have traditional claims to that land and to those rights, as well as anybody else in Labrador.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do hope that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) has an opportunity to clarify a issue that was raised by him, which I think was

irresponsible, perhaps in the heat of the moment. I think he should address this issue with regard to what is the Province's stand with regard to law and order and what his party's stand is on law and order.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications. Was this to speak, by leave, to this petition?

MR. MATTHEWS:
He has a new petition. May I speak by leave?

MR. SPEAKER:
Does the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes, yes.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just thought, as the Minister responsible for wildlife, that it would be appropriate to speak to the petition so ably put forward by my colleague for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and as well, of course, so very ably supported by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) and the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). Having just come back from Labrador a couple of hours ago, I can say that the explanation and the update on the feelings of the people in Labrador are certainly spot-on with what the member for Torngat and the

member for Naskaupi have said.

There was very serious situation in Labrador over the last couple of weeks which now seems to have settled down somewhat. Of course, the member for Naskaupi has said, quite correctly again, that it is a larger issue than the Mealey Mountain caribou herd itself. It certainly smacks of land claims, aboriginal rights and a number of other things that are happening or about to happen in the area, with development and the suggested boom.

I, as well, would like to say to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) and the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) that, after coming out of there this morning, people are really not to pleased with the stand that has been taken on the NATO base for Goose Bay and neither are they very pleased with the stand taken on the illegal hunting of the Mealey Mountain caribou herd.

To react to a statement made by the hon. the member for Eagle River when he said that the member for St. John's East said we are more concerned about the welfare of caribou than we were of the Innu, Mr. Speaker, the point is that both are very directly related because if that caribou herd is not protected and managed properly, then that would directly effect, very negatively, the welfare in future years of the Innu at Sheshatshit. So, the two are very much related, Mr. Speaker.

I think the hon. member should realize if that herd is eliminated, wiped out and not properly managed, then there will not be any caribou there for the Innu, the white hunters, and the

other people of Labrador. That is a point, I think, we all should remember. As the Minister of wildlife, that is the point I have been trying to make for the last couple of weeks. We want to settle the issue peacefully and in a conciliatory manner but, at the same time, not putting on the back burner the concern that we have for that wildlife resource and what it means to all the peoples of Labrador.

I would like to go on record as supporting the petition and to inform all hon. members that, as Minister of Wildlife, I fully intend to enforce the laws of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is this a new petition?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) has changed his mind on this matter? I think it is shameful for the hon. gentleman to come into this House and make statements condoning the breaking

of the law, even though it might be a bad law, he is condoning the breaking of it, so I would like for him to get up and speak to this petition and defend himself or defend why he is making that kind of statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East, by leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am glad to take this opportunity, for the record, to clarify remarks that I made in a preamble to a question during Question Period.

The written record, I am sure, will demonstrate that, I, in no way, condoned the breaking of the law. I asked a question of the minister on what action was being taken to protect the position of the Innu people with respect to their rights to hunting. That was not to suggest that they have a right to break the laws of the Province. I was raising an issue that has been referred to by the member from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) and others.

Behind this specific episode, that is continuing, and it is not clear that it is now on hold, there are more leaders of the Innu people who are in jail. Maybe that might calm the situation down but what we have is a very difficult situation that is going to continue. There are numerous issues behind this particular incident. That is what I have

raised in the House. The context in which this incident has arisen shows the lack of recognition of these people by both the provincial government and the federal government. These people are not recognized and, beyond that, they are not recognized as having any claim to land or any special rights.

I would also say that it is recorded in Hansard in the preamble to my question that I referred to other jurisdictions in the country in which Native people living on unoccupied Crown Land have special exemptions that flow from a recognition of their special rights to hunting as aboriginal people. That is what I referred to when I earlier spoke and I will continue to raise those points.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

One of the things the hon. gentleman has to recognize in this House is that if a member rises in his place, he has to say whether he supports the petition or not. Is he supporting the petition?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. member is speaking by leave.

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is not a point of order. I was speaking because I was speaking by leave and I was not speaking to the petition.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Could I have leave to speak to the petition?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. the Government House Leader have leave to speak on the petition?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Number one, I would say that I support the petition.

I would want to comment on some of the matters put forward by the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Long). It is not a question that the Government of Newfoundland does not recognize the Innu people. The Government of Newfoundland fully recognizes the Innu people, fully recognizes the NMIA, the Naskaupi Montagnais Indian Association. The Government of Newfoundland fully recognizes that these people have 'aboriginal rights' and that they are among those groups with whom the provincial government and the federal government is going to enter into negotiations with respect to comprehensive land claims. There are two groups in the Province for which that is the case. One is the NMIA or Innu people, and the other is the LIA, the Labrador Inuit Association.

So it is not a question that the Government of Newfoundland or indeed the Government of Canada does not recognize these people and does not recognize that they are aboriginal and does not recognize that they have

aboriginal rights. It is really the other way.

It would appear that these people do not recognize the legitimate authority of the Government of Newfoundland. It is the other way. It is not that the government does not recognize them, it is that they say they refuse to recognize the government and that is where the problem is. The government would be absolutely derelict in its duty if it did not maintain the position that the resources of Labrador, and here we are talking specifically about the Mealy Mountain caribou herd, if that resource were not protected in the best interests of all the people of Labrador because if that herd is decimated, it is of no use to the Innu, it is of no use to the non-Innu, it is of no use to the Inuit, it is of no use to anybody. We are all here in this Province and we all have to participate in an equitable and fair way in the sharing of these resources. Unless the government takes necessary measures to protect that resource for all of us, including the Innu, then there will be no resource there for any of us, including the Innu.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to present a petition signed by approximately 3,500 people. It is from two districts really, the Lewisporte and

Twillingate districts. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is very brief and kind of self-explanatory. It says, "We, the undersigned, fully support the offering of first year university courses at Lewisporte in September of 1987."

Mr. Speaker, there has been an ad hoc committee, if you will, set up in Lewisporte and it has done its homework exceptionally well. It found out that there are approximately 60 potential first year university students from Lewisporte and Twillingate districts. I think there are some from the hon. member from Fogo's district as well who have also indicated that they would attend first year university courses at Lewisporte, if they were offered.

Mr. Speaker, those persons in this Legislature and in this Province who have had sons and daughters go to university here in St. John's fully appreciate the cost involved in doing that. It is, in my opinion and certainly the opinion of the residents of Lewisporte and Twillingate districts and, I suspect other districts in the Province as well, it would be much cheaper in this particular case for students to attend classes at Lewisporte where they perhaps can commute back and forth during the year and live at home.

Mr. Speaker, this petition and this prayer has the support of the various religious denominations in Lewisporte and area, the town of Lewisporte, the town of Norris Arm, the Lewisporte Chamber of Commerce, the Lewisporte PTA, the Norris Arm Lions Club, the Twillingate/New World Island/Change Islands Development Association, some 25 or 30 communities in the Lewisporte

district and, as I said, in the district of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter).

The committee has met with my colleague, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), and had some very positive and very interesting discussions with the minister. I think the request certainly falls in line with government's policy for the new community colleges concept.

Apart from making it a little more financially feasible for the parents in those areas, of course it would add something to the economy of Central Newfoundland and to Lewisporte as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and be presented to the department to which it refers. I would certainly hope that the minister concerned would give it very serious consideration and that the Lewisporte Community College see the implementation of first year university courses at that facility in September of this year.

Thank you, very much.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very happy to support this particular petition. I have spent quite some time recently looking into what is happening with this offering of first year university courses throughout the Province. This was a direction that was

taken by the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies with a view to having Memorial University reach out into the Province, first of all, for students who would not otherwise go to university to have an opportunity to start and complete their first year courses.

Secondly, to try to capture a greater share of the market of students who are now leaving the Province by making it more convenient for them to do first year university courses here in Newfoundland and at home.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, and not last, but perhaps the most important reason from the point of view of the people in the communities, for each student taking the first year university at home this way it would save about \$5,000 a year. There are an awful lot of people who are under financial constraint and find it very difficult to send their students into St. John's to do university courses when perhaps the facilities out there can be made adequate to offer these courses.

I would point out to the minister, being a member of Cabinet, that there are an awful lot of peripheral concerns here. Number one is the amount of money allocated to bring this programme in. I understand that in this first year there is enough money to implement courses in four centers. Perhaps they should have thought in terms of implementing courses in more than four centers.

Secondly, it is getting rather late in the year, I would say to members opposite, to announce decisions of this kind. Maybe the whole process is rushed so much

that it will not be efficiently brought in. I am very concerned about that. I am concerned that the courses be brought in as quickly as possible, but not in such a way that it would endanger the future development of the courses down the road.

I think that perhaps the Department of Career Development has not done its homework on this one, Mr. Speaker. I do not think they know the tremendous demands out there in the Province for these first year university courses. They are going to be swamped, they are going to be inundated with students that want to take these first year university courses in all centers of the Province where it is possible, where the caliber of teacher exists and so on, to do the courses. They are going to be literally swamped.

They are thinking in terms of in each center having maybe thirty or forty students. Well I can tell the department, Mr. Speaker, that in Lewisporte they will have much more than that. In Grand Falls they will probably have a demand for maybe 150 to 200 students from that area who want to do first year university courses. Also in Gander I can document, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a demand of around 200 students that want these first year university courses.

So I support this petition. I think that the demand is in the Lewisporte area for several classes of first year university courses. I urge the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) to make sure that this programme is brought in properly, is brought in with due regard to facilities and to qualified staff, and is brought

in with a view to allowing all students in this Province to do their first year university courses at home if they so desire.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say in support of the petition presented by my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the member for Lewisporte district (Mr. Russell), who also has some responsibilities, as a government member and a government minister, to the district of Twillingate. It was the residents from Twillingate and the Lewisporte districts that signed this petition, some 3,500, I think my colleague said. That, Mr. Speaker, is a very, very significant number of people seeking the first year courses to be presented at the vocational school.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to what my friend from Gander (Mr. Baker) had to say about it. I think what we all have to realize and remember is that the government has already announced its position and what it plans to do with restructuring of vocational schools in this Province, and the development of community colleges. Mr. Speaker, in that announcement, I recall, because I participated in it, as a matter of fact, there was a clear indication of the plans. There was also a clear indication that

this was not going to happen overnight, that this would have to be developed over a three year period or something along those lines. Obviously, not every school was going to get the programme that it wanted immediately in the coming September.

Mr. Speaker, I know of where I speak, because in Grand Falls we have had a university credit programme ongoing in Grand Falls district for the last several years. It was put together by a group of concerned and interested citizens several years back. It has worked very well. It has worked reasonably well. In fact, I suspect, because we have had the programme in place for five or six years, it may even give us a bit of an edge in getting the programmes into the Grand Falls vocational school quicker than perhaps we might have, because they have experience with it. They have had instructors who have, albeit, been school teachers, and that is not the way the programme is going to work in the community colleges, but still, we have had some experience. I think there have been at times thirty or forty students that have been able to pick up five credits or whatever and save the expense of having to come all the way into St. John's. I mean, who would want to come all the way into St. John's anyway for university? But if they have to, then they have to. But hopefully, Mr. Speaker, that will change.

I suspect and hope that the member for Lewisporte will be successful in his efforts. His efforts were shown in his remarks in support of this petition today. I hope he is successful, and I have no doubt that he will be.

The member for Gander may even be successful in his attempts to get first year university courses in his school. Now, whether it is this year, 1987, or September of 1988, I do not know. The fact of the matter is, it will come about, because government has already announced that is the plan, it is just a question of when it will develop.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support the petition presented so ably by my colleague, the member for Lewisporte (Mr. Russell) and Minister of Consumer Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Motion 1.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have received a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. All rise.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

This message is dated March 17, 1987, the hon. the Minister of Finance:

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending 31st. day of March, 1988, by way of Interim Supply and in accordance with the provision of the Constitution Act 1867, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

(sgd).....

Lieutenant-Governor."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I move that the message together with a bill be referred to a Committee of Supply.

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

Committee of the Whole on Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Chairman, just briefly, hon. members will recall that the procedure here is governed by specific Standing Orders: The minister introducing has fifteen minutes and everybody has ten minutes, and people can speak more than once or as often as they want. It is usually the practice, too, that a person does not adjourn the debate because people can go back and forth. Also, hon. members will recall that the hours which are consumed come out of the seventy-five hours with respect to the Budget. This is all in the Standing Orders. I just point that out because, we have two new hon. gentlemen here, one of whom was in favour of the resolution and one of whom was not

in favour of the resolution, but they are two new hon. gentlemen all the same.

If there would be agreement, perhaps we could at 5:55 come out of Committee and then unanimously pass this resolution, which I think everybody has seen.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh sure!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No, no, this is the resolution with respect to the curling club.

MR. SIMMS:

The curling team.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The curling team, on which everybody has agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for that thunderous applause. I will speak briefly, but very much to the point. I am sure that I will persuade hon. members to pass this resolution with very little delay.

Mr. Chairman, hon. members of the Committee know that Interim Supply is a necessary procedure, unless we were to bring in and pass a budget within a very short period of time in anticipation of the end of the end of the fiscal year. But that has never happened to my knowledge, and I think it is almost impossible by the procedures we pursue. So this makes it necessary to bring in Interim Supply. Interim Supply is usually for a period of three

months, which would bring us up to the end of June, and this is what this particular Supply Bill, if accepted by the Committee and subsequently passed by the House, will do.

The amount of the Supply Bill this year for the three month period is \$753,486,100, which is a sizeable amount. It represents, in actual fact, somewhat over a quarter of what is a usual type of budget; our usual budget would be about four times that or there about. Mr. Chairman, it is slightly more than last year, but really the percentage is not that much different.

Mr. Chairman, Interim Supply really allows government to carry on its usual activities until the main supply bill comes down. You can include new capital and new current account expenditures, as long as the Committee is informed of these particular things. In this Interim Supply Bill we have included some new items, so I would just like to inform the Committee of these now. We have some new capital account items which total just over \$56 million, and these represent what we would expect the cash flow to be during the 1987/88 fiscal year for these particular items.

Improvement and construction of roads would be just over \$16 million, \$16,280,000. Roads and bridge rehabilitation somewhat over \$8 million; bridges and causeways approximately \$4 million; highways - these are Transport Canada and therefore are cost shared - \$12.5 million approximately; forest resource roads - these are under DREE agreements - just over \$2 million; Coastal Labrador water and sewer projects - this is under the

Native People's agreement - \$2.5 million or slightly more than that; airstrips - this is 100 per cent federally funded - \$900,000; NLDC business equity activities, \$2 million, NLDC youth entrepreneurship \$500,000; hangar number 21 at Gander - Where is our friend from Gander? He would be interested in that. Hangar 21 at Gander, that has to be altered to accommodate the new water bomber, \$500,000; and then the Offshore Development fund which, as hon. members know, is cost-shared with the federal government 75/25: There is \$1 million there for the Centre for Offshore and Remote Medicine and Telemedicine; \$4 million for a Petroleum Technology Training Programme; \$600 million for the Cow Head Access Road; and \$1 million for block funding. That is under Capital Account, and that totals, as I mentioned earlier, roughly \$56 million.

Now, under Current Account there are some new projects, too, that I have to report to the Committee as required, and these total just over \$10 million. Similarly, they represent the cash flow expected for 1987/88 for these items.

The Offshore Development Fund: There is in Current Account \$1.3 million for industrial infrastructure planning; \$2 million for research and development block funding; \$1 million for Offshore Technology Transfer Opportunities Programme; \$1.5 million for C-Core; \$3.5 million for NORDCO; \$1 million for Marystown, shipyard infrastructure planning; and \$600,000 for administrative support.

So that is the essence of the situation, Mr. Chairman, and I would hope, as the hon. the House

Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) said, that we will pass this Interim Supply Bill in a timely fashion. We obviously need it as of April 1, so I suppose we have a few days to debate it. I think a number of hours of debate would be a very good thing, but in actual fact any debate that we have on the Interim Supply Bill comes out of the final main supply bill debate, the budget of the Province, and hon. members may wish to retain most of their speaking time for that occasion.

With those few remarks, I move the resolution and a bill subsequent thereto.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to inform the minister that the passage of this resolution depends to a great degree on how co-operative he is in terms of answering questions that we on this side of the House will and must raise during this particular debate. So with the co-operation of the minister, with his readiness, with his co-operation to address questions that will be raised by this side, to respond to the questions in a precise and concise manner, that certainly will expedite the passage of this Supply Bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think the minister indicated that it is quite normal for a government to come in with an Interim Supply Bill while awaiting the approval of the budget and the various

expenditures. The size of this Bill is \$750 million. There is no question that this is the highest amount that has ever been asked for in an Interim Supply Bill, \$750 million, which, by the minister's own admission, is somewhere in the vicinity of a quarter of the budget and possibly a little more. That is the range of the figure we are talking about, and talking about three months. So I suppose the amount and the time put together would suggest that it is within one quarter of the budget to be granted by Interim Supply.

I can assure the minister that we would rather get into this debate and approve this rather the system that we have been accustomed to for the past little while, and that is the Special Warrants, but, Mr. Chairman, we will get into these a little later. I have said that this is a normal procedure by governments, to come in looking for Interim Supply, and what is becoming normal as well in this Province, Mr. Chairman, is the inability of this government to handle in a proper and efficient manner the fiscal affairs of this Province. That is what has become very, very evident over the past little while, and what else is becoming evident, of course, is the inability of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to be able to properly determine just what the expenditures of this Province are.

I am surprised that the minister, up to this point in time, has not alluded to or has not clarified the recent statements by the Premier, erratic, irresponsible statements in my view, about the financial mess that this Province is in. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no way of knowing whether this

Province is in a financial mess or not, but when the Premier indicates that it is in a financial mess, then we must believe him. If we do not believe the Premier, who else are we going to believe? Mr. Chairman, that statement by the Premier about the financial mess in this Province, so grave, he said, so serious that it was a situation something like the 1930s, the dirty thirties when we lost Representative Government, that is a pretty serious commentary about the financial condition of this Province. And the minister just cannot slough that off, the disastrous, the devastating effect that that statement must have had on this Province in terms of eroding investor confidence in this Province and in terms of the financial world being concerned about the credit rating of this Province, these two things alone. That has not been addressed. Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that somebody, in particular the Minister of Finance, addressed that situation as to why the Premier was forced to make these very devastating, irresponsible, erratic statements, in my view. So that needs to be addressed, Mr. Chairman, in view of the tremendous impact that this statement will have, as I have said before, on investor confidence in the economy of this Province, and particularly with respect to our credit rating.

Now, there is another issue that the minister has deliberately avoided to comment upon, and that is the deficit of this Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not the person who has raised the deficit, I am not the person who has been talking about it, it has been the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance, last Spring, indicated

that this Province was going to have a deficit of \$49 million. In his mid-term report he indicated that the deficit had increased to \$53 million, this, in spite of two very significant events, or two very significant activities, maybe is the better wording, or in terms of two significant developments, that will be a little more precise. As I go on, Mr. Chairman, thinking about this, I am getting more precise. So a \$53 million deficit by mid-term in view of two significant developments.

What were these two significant developments? One was that the minister predicted the \$49 million, it escalated to \$53 million, and that in spite of the Province, the minister, getting monies amounting to \$32 million from the federal government because of some previous miscalculation with respect to the transfer payment formula. Because there was some miscalculation, the minister got \$32 million that he did not anticipate. So, Mr. Chairman, that shows how well this minister can manage the fiscal affairs of this Province, predicting a deficit of \$49 million, and he got \$32 million that he knew nothing about, that he was not anticipating. Mr. Chairman, not getting that \$32 million obviously would have put the deficit to \$71 million. That is what it would have been.

Now, that would have been a \$71 million deficit. On top of that we are informed by the federal Minister of Transportation that he gave the Province another \$46 million to help offset the deficit. So here was another \$46 million, Mr. Chairman, on top of that \$70 million. Now we are up to a \$116 million deficit, which

should say something about the minister's ability to manage the fiscal affairs of this Province. We are up to a deficit of \$116 million.

Then, Mr. Chairman, on top of that we learned a little later from that same minister, the federal minister, that much maligned minister, the hon. Mr. Crosbie, that the Province had approached him for \$150 million to help offset the deficit. Mr. Chairman, we are up somewhere now in the \$200 million bracket with respect to this Province's deficit.

Mr. Chairman, these are not my figures, these are the figures that are currently being thrown around in the press. Now, with that kind of escalation in the deficit, certainly it is incumbent upon the Minister of Finance to comment upon what looks to be a very disastrous situation. It is incumbent upon the minister to comment upon the financial situation of this Province, and it is incumbent upon him to do it now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, his time is up.

MR. LUSH:

Yes, and I can tell the hon. member his time is up, too.

Mr. Chairman, we have some questions to ask, as I have said, and we want these questions answered.

Mr. Chairman, another question that the minister has not sufficiently addressed has to do with the excessive abuse with respect to the issuing of Special Warrants and, it has been suggested by members on this side of the House, not only excessive

abuse, not only showing disdain and contempt for this House by the excessive use of Special Warrants, it is also being suggested that in some cases it is illegal, downright illegal, against the Administration Act of this Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are going to be looking into these and I want the minister to pay particular attention.

Of special concern, as well, are those that are issued under The Administration Act, Section 28, subsection (3). I will read for hon. members what this particular subsection says. It says, 'If, when the Legislature is not in session or when the House of Assembly has stood adjourned for more than thirty days an expenditure not foreseen and not provided for by the Legislature in respect of a new service is urgently and immediately required for the public good so on and so forth ... then the appropriate can be taken for a Special Warrant.'

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us get this again: It is when the House is not in session and 'when an expenditure is not foreseen'. These are the key words, Mr. Chairman, 'when the expenditure is not foreseen and not provided for by the Legislature in respect of a new service.' And the new service must be urgent, for the public good. It has to be urgent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are somewhere close to \$5 million of Special Warrants issued under that section which clearly spells out how it is that a Special Warrant can be issued. I will refer the hon. minister to a couple, and I am sure members on this side will address others. Mr. Chairman, I want the minister to explain to this House why it is that this

particular Warrant is urgent, why it is that it was not foreseen, and I refer to the sum of \$225,000 granted to the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies, and it says: 'This sum is urgently required to enable the government to cover anticipated expenditures for the Career Awards programme.' Now, Mr. Chairman, that in itself, a Career Awards programme, does not seem to have any connotation of urgency to it, that it is going to serve the public good. Now, maybe it will, but certainly the minister needs to respond to that to tell us what was so urgent about that expenditure of \$225,000 for expenditures for the Career Awards programme, and why it was that it was not foreseen. Mr. Chairman, the minister should address that particular Special Warrant to convince members on this side of the House that that indeed met the conditions of The Financial Administration Act of this Province.

I refer the minister to another Special Warrant, the one that was requested by the Department of Social Services to the tune of \$2.7 million. Mr. Chairman, this one says, 'This sum is urgently required to enable the government to cover anticipated expenditures for the Federal/Provincial Employment Enhancement programme.' Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no question about urgency when it comes to money for creating jobs in this Province. There is no question about that.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I understood the hon. member was to have, at most, fifteen minutes, and by my reckoning he has used up about twenty. What is the position?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Bonavista North still has two minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to inform -

MR. TOBIN:

You do not have much time left, Brother, I will tell you that. Two minutes, that is about it. You are gone with the new (inaudible).

MR. LUSH:

I will be sitting around here long after other hon. gentlemen are rooted out of this place, let me assure you. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to have my train of thought disrupted by people that have no concern about the financial matters of this Province.

We have a government, Mr. Speaker, that is spending and squandering money like drunken sailors, but this is much worse than drunken sailors, Mr. Speaker, because drunken sailors are spending their own money. This crowd, Mr. Speaker, is spending the taxpayers' money of this Province and that is what they are behaving like. Mr. Chairman, let them behave responsibly.

Mr. Chairman, I want the minister

to address what was not foreseen in putting monies into an employment programme in this Province. The minister should address these very serious concerns.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. LUSH:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has brought up a number of points that need a response.

He mentioned the old hack about projections. I am not going to defend that because it is too ridiculous. Our projections, if they are compared with the budgetary projections made in other provinces, compare extremely favourably. I am sure hon. members know that various provinces have reported severe slippages in their budgetary accounts in recent years since the recession came in. The federal government has done it many, many times. So our projection slippages and our differences are relative minor in comparison.

The hon. member was also commenting on a statement that the Premier was said to have made in

regard to the economy of the Province. Now, he expressed some surprise at that and I could hardly believe my ears because he is the Finance critic on the other side. He is surprised that the people are saying that the economy in Canada is very uneven; that it is extremely good in some parts of Canada and therefore the total picture is pretty healthy, but in many other parts of Canada it is extremely poor, and not only in Newfoundland. It is extremely poor in Alberta; it is extremely poor in New Brunswick; it is extremely poor, but not quite as poor, in Nova Scotia, and in certain other provinces. In Manitoba they are doing pretty well, but they are starting on a low base.

For the hon. member to express surprise that our Premier should come out and make the same statement, to get the attention of the federal government and to get activities going and that type of thing, that our economy has not fully recovered from the recession - and those statements have been made in many other provinces that are similarly suffering - for him to be surprised of that is very strange indeed. I do not understand it, especially as he is supposed to be the Finance critic.

Mr. Speaker, he also made some projections himself on the deficit for 1987-88. He has totted up some figures and I am not going to compare what will be the true figures with what projections he has made. All I can say is that he is in for some severe slippage himself if one pays any attention to the arithmetic that he just went through.

In terms of Special Warrants, there are statements being made

off the top of the head, without any facts behind them. We had tremendous Special Warrants in the year now ending, 1986-87. We had \$33 million in Special Warrants. Oh, the hands were thrown up. That is terrible! In 1985-86, Special Warrants amounted to \$52.5 million; in 1984-85, \$56.4 million; in 1983-84, \$134.6 million. So our Special Warrants this year were down compared to the recent past, not up. These sort of remarks that are thrown out have no validity. They are thrown out just for the sake of making a noise. You know, the old empty barrel making a rattling as it goes down a rocky hill, that type of thing. Anyway, that had to be commented on.

He also wondered about the career awards amount. I think it was something about \$250,000, some of that order, and he is wondering why that was not foreseen. That amount was for particular subsidization concerning on the job training for some of our workers who went to Norway to get this on the job training. The opportunity came up. Does the hon. member want us to ignore that opportunity and not put funds in for these people to get that on the job training when they are going to be needed for the developments that are in prospect? Of course, that amount did come out of our Offshore Development Fund. It is made up of contributions of 25 per cent from the Province and 75 per cent from the federal government. I am afraid I cannot find much validity in the hon. member's remarks. I hope the hon. member who wishes to speak next will have more valid comments.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, it is good to see you back in the Chair again. We have missed you over these months.

Mr. Chairman, this exercise today in which we find ourselves having to pursue this latest insult to the process brings to mind that this is really part of a long serial event. Today the assault is on the Financial Administration Act but before that, Mr. Chairman, we saw an assault -

MR. YOUNG:

I am going to get (inaudible.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

That is right. The gentleman, to the degree that he does read, is reading my notes because the first item in this serial -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Gentlemen, settle down. If it is a few tickets to caucus you want, there is no problem. It is the hottest show in town and we realize it, but right now, we want to talk about something else.

It is the way in which this crowd has savaged the Public Tender Act. That was the first item. They threw that out the window. They tore that up. They are giving out largesse to their friends right, left and centre, without due respect for the law.

Now they go and rip up the Public Service Act. If you are not from

Port de Grave you cannot get a job with this government, or from Harbour Grace somewhere. I will not deal with that because the Speaker will deal with that situation tomorrow. That is another issue. They have torn up the Public Service Act. It does not matter a whit whatsoever.

MR. TOBIN:

You tore up the Liberal constitution. What is the difference?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Listen, what are you doing for the next couple of months?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. TOBIN:

I would take you on. I have a mind to go with you, brother.

MR. SIMMONS:

They have torn up the Labour Relations Act. That is not worth anything anymore thanks to the lobster member for Bay of Islands.

MR. BLANCHARD:

You are just jealous because I have a good colour now, 'Roger.'

MR. SIMMONS:

It is not your colour that bothers us, I say to the minister. It is not his colour that bothers us. It is the way he has coloured his job since he became minister. We keep wishing he had remained as Deputy Minister because there he acted according to his beliefs,

there he did what he thought was proper. But, these days, Mr. Chairman, if he is acting according to his beliefs, then I say his beliefs are few and far between because he has acted very little since he got into the job of being minister of that department. He has aided and abetted the tearing up, the treading under feet of the Labour Relations Act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fourth in a series. Now it is going to be an assault on the Financial Administration Act. I say to you, check the dates on those Special Warrants and you find that when the Parliament of this Province should have been sitting, December, January and last October and September. They should not have had to do this.

MR. TOBIN:

You were away. You do not even go to your district. Why should you be in the House? You were elected to -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Could we have order, please? All hon. members will have time to speak.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, when these warrants were issued the House should have been open. It was not because this hon. crowd were scared to meet the House.

MR. SIMMS:

If we had known what was going on, we would have opened earlier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

I say to my good cousin friend for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), what he is doing is known in some circles as whistling past the graveyard. So whistle all you like. Indeed, whistle a little louder, you might give yourself a little encouragement. Better still, lull yourself into a false sense of security if you want.

MR. SIMMS:

The campaign is on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I am glad for your sake in this Chair that I matter so little. Imagine what a noise they would make if I mattered very much.

Mr. Chairman, this Special Warrant relating to the Hope Brook gold mine is just one of several abominations perpetrated by this government. This is the kind of thing that should have been brought to this House. This House holds the purse strings in theory.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) Rushoon, 'Roger?'

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman who, at least on paper, represents Rushoon that it is nowhere near Hope Brook. It is several miles away from Rushoon.

This is another abomination, this particular one, because the House should have had the opportunity to deal with it. We were robbed of that opportunity because we are dealing with a government on the run, a government that does not want to meet the House, a government that wants to

manufacture a few dramatic issues.

We saw two lots of straddling today. I thought the best example of the picket fence approach to politics was by the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). But a close second today, with his own picket fence, was the Premier, who said, 'Yes, I was outraged because of the Canada - France agreement but we have kissed and made up, no problems. The Canada - U.S. thing is all going to be hunky-dory. Not to worry.' Now, Mr. Chairman, how is he going to be able to translate that into action when he has got to work the troops up again about another Canada - France insult such as the federal government perpetrated on us?

How many times can you say, Mr. Chairman, that bad crowd from Central Canada did us in, and then the next week be saying, 'I was just up to Ottawa, everything is all fixed up. No problems with the crowd in Central Canada?' How many times can you do this Jekyll and Hyde approach to leadership? How many times?

MR. MITCHELL:

He certainly cannot take lessons from the Liberals.

MR. TOBIN:

Ed Roberts, Bill Rowe, Don Jamieson, Len Stirling.

MR. SIMMONS:

Some people are incapable of taking lessons from anybody.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose they took the time to put the amount on this. It is getting fast to the point where they have such disregard for the Financial Administration Act they will not even issue the Special Warrants.

We have on our hands, Mr. Chairman, a group of people who think this is their own chest that they just dip into at will without even obeying the niceties of the legislation anymore. A half million dollars, probably a good expenditure but that is not what is in question here. We were not given the opportunity to decide whether it was a good expenditure or not.

I see the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), and I remember the days before she entered elected politics. I remember well the things she espoused then about fair play, about equal opportunity, about ensuring that things were done according to the book in the interest of the people of Newfoundland. Now she is part of this honourable clique that does not want the House open, that wants to shove it through, that wants to ram things through.

Mr. Speaker - Mr. Chairman, my apologies, Sir. I keep thinking you should be Speaker, but at the moment, you are Chairman. Maybe he will be Chairman if he does the right things, but that is not a matter for this House.

Mr. Chairman, this is but one example of many that I and my colleagues, the gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), the gentleman from Gander (Mr. Baker) and others, will be addressing.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I must say if we have done no other service to this country these past few days, we have enlived the wretched lives of the hon. crowd opposite. I have never seen them so animated. Suddenly they have found a reason to live. We have done them such a marvellous favour, an absolutely marvellous

favour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

I must admit, you have (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I say to him it is like most of the favours you do for that crowd, backhanded favours.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Sir. Thank you.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is incumbent on ministers to answer any questions or to make comments on Interim Supply. The hon. member may make comment about the Hope Brook Gold Mine and that brought me to my feet because what we may be able to do is compare how the Province was operated during the reign, we will call it, of the hon. members opposite or their predecessors, and how we operate with respect to assisting industries in getting started in Newfoundland today.

Mr. Speaker, just to clarify for the hon. member, with respect to Hope Brook. Hope Brook is the first gold mine in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador. I was involved on a daily basis for several months with respect to what was needed for Hope Brook to get started.

One of the things the company said they needed was power to the site. They said, "Once we get power to the site, of course we will pay the normal industrial rates." So we had a look at it, Mr. Speaker, and we decided that it was a good idea to supply power to the site at Hope Brook so that that mine could operate. We thought it was a pretty fair thing that we do this and that the company pay the normal industrial rates as applied in the Province by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to step back from that.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I am trying with every bit of patience that is in me to hear the words of wisdom of the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn). I have no doubt that he has a contribution to make. I ask you to restrain the gentleman from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). He has moved momentarily to his own seat but you have allowed him, Sir, without being unduly critical, to go on for the past twenty minutes, not from his own place in the House, and in the interest of my good friend from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn), would you give him some protection from the gentleman from Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, if you watched the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir

(Mr. Gilbert) for the past few minutes, he was in the seat that he is in now discussing something with the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). I would suspect, Mr. Chairman -

MR. SIMMS:
The leadership.

MR. TOBIN:
I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, it is more than the leadership he is discussing. I would suspect he is wondering if the hon. gentleman had some sort of a stone so he could sharpen up his knife again.

MR. SIMMONS:
Further to that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
In fairness, Mr. Chairman, to the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), he should not be attacked like that in his absence.

MR. TOBIN:
Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

I would ask all members to please be silent while the hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing is speaking.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Chairman, I do not know why in this House we cannot operate normally as a House of Assembly. I mean I do not know why the hon. members opposite cannot get up and speak without being interrupted by spurious points of order and I do

not know why we cannot do it on this side.

The hon. the House Leader recommended that and of course I was willing to comply as most hon. members. It seems that we are starting to break down that system. I think that we should probably examine our consciences, if you will, overnight and start off a new day tomorrow with a little better attitude.

Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is interrupting. I can understand that in recent days he is starting to smarten, much like Caesar did, in the death of Caesar, and I do not know which of his hon. colleagues he looked to prior to the weekend and said, 'And you, Brutus'.

MR. BARRY:
I make a good Caesar salad.

MR. DINN:
Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member might make a good Caesar before this is all over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:
He might take fourteen of his hon. colleagues and make a Caesar salad out of them.

Mr. Chairman, I would to just address the Hope Brook situation because the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) brought it up. Mr. Chairman, this is not a lineboard mill situation where the government sat down and wrote out an order for some \$117 million and put it into the back pocket of one John C. Doyle so that he could go off and see if he could raise some more money on

that \$117 million to build a lineboard mill. That is not what happened in this situation.

Neither is it what happened when the hon. members former colleagues, previous Liberal members were in government and built an oil refinery. When they decided that not only would they give John Shaheen the money for the refinery, but they would guarantee any losses for that refinery.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned in previous occasions in this House, if that deal had not been renegotiated by one, Frank D. Moores, a former Premier in this Province, we would have been on the hook at the Come By Chance refinery for over \$600 million.

Hope Brook is not in the class of the Come By Chance refinery or the Stephenville linerboard mill. What the company wanted was, number one, hydro power. They did not want hydro power for free. They were going to pay normal, industrial rates as prescribed by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro for the provision of that power. So we thought that was not too bad a thing for the Government of Newfoundland to provide any industrial complex being developed in Newfoundland, especially a gold mine that is going to supply upwards of 400 to 500 jobs during construction, and 275 permanent jobs when the mine is operating.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other thing that the company requested was some assistance with respect to some of the other facilities that needed to be provided. There was a wharf down at Couteau Bay, is that correct to the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Mitchell)?

MR. MITCHELL:
It is in LaPoile.

MR. DINN:
In the district of LaPoile.

There was a road to be built. The federal government was going to provide under DIRE 30 per cent of any processing equipment that was put in there thus, under a programme now, no special programme for just this project, but there was a programme in DIRE where they would supply 30 per cent of processing equipment and, therefore, provided \$14 million. We, in the Government of Newfoundland, decided that we would provide some assistance for some of the infrastructure that was required like the road, the wharf and the spur line that was to come in from the main line from Bottom Brook to Burgeo.

MR. MITCHELL:
Do not forget it also has meant power for Grand Bruit and Burgeo.

MR. DINN:
And, of course, Mr. Chairman, as a result of this development the people of Burgeo and the people of Grand Bruit will be getting hydro electric power.

So, Mr. Chairman, we agreed as a government to provide on this \$150 million development \$6 million. Mr. Chairman, now that to me is the least we could have done for an operation the size of Hope Brook and for the first gold mine ever developed in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Chairman, for that \$6 million, as I said, we will get 400 to 500 jobs during construction. We will get 275 jobs during the mines operations. And, Mr. Chairman, these are what we called direct

jobs. These are not the spin-offs.

Normally when somebody speaks of a development in the Province, they do not just talk about the 275 direct jobs, they talk about the multiplier affect. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about the multiplier affect. We are investing in this Province \$6 million on a \$150 million project and we will have for that \$6 million 400 to 500 jobs during construction and 275 jobs or thereabouts during the operation of the mine. The minimum prediction that that mine will operate for right now, based on the reserves that they have identified - they have not done an extensive delineation of the reserves down there, but based on what they have right now - is an eleven year operation.

Mr. Chairman, the company agreed not to develop a town here, that they would ship in and ship out, so we will not have the social problems that we would have in other mining communities. Mr. Chairman, they are going to ship in and ship out from Port aux Basques to Couteau Bay.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Chairman, I will get into it a little later on because I think it is important for the House to understand what is going on.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I want merely to point out that it was agreed that at five to six we

would go with the resolution.

So I move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) will then introduce the resolution.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

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

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have conferred with the two parties opposite on the resolution that was discussed earlier today. So we are looking for a unanimous all-party resolution without debate.

I would like to move:

WHEREAS Newfoundland's Mark Noseworthy Rink had an 8 and 3,

win/loss record at the Labatt Brier Canadian Curling Championships, finishing third overall; and

WHEREAS the Quebec Rink had a 6 and 5 record, finishing tied for fifth place; and

WHEREAS Mark Noseworthy was named Skip to the Second All-Star Team this year, and was awarded the Ross Hartstone Award as the most effective and congenial Brier competitor in the 1982 Brier, and

WHEREAS three of the four members of this year's Newfoundland Rink, including Noseworthy, finished tied for third in the 1982 Brier; and

WHEREAS the Mark Noseworthy Rink should therefore have been selected as one of the three teams for the Olympic Trials,

BE IT RESOLVED that all members of the House of Assembly urge the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport and the President-Elect of the Canadian Curling Association to review the present selection process used in choosing the three teams for the Olympic Trails; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that appropriate action be taken to rectify the completely unjustified omission of the Mark Noseworthy Rink for the Olympic Trials this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have looked at the wording of this resolution. We have agreed with the contents and consent to it being put to the House at this time.

On motion, resolution carried unanimously.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

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

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